

**THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY**  
**REFERENCE**

**INTERNATIONAL  
STANDARD BIBLE  
ENCYCLOPEDIA  
VOL. 6  
J-KUSHAIAH**

**Books For The Ages**  
AGES Software • Albany, OR USA  
Version 1.0 © 1997

# J

## JAAKAN

<ja'-a-kan>.

*See BEEROTH-BENE-JAAKAN.*

## JAAKOBAB

<ja-a-ko'-ba>, <ja-ak'-o-ba> ([<sup>hbqḡy</sup> , ya`aqobhah], for meaning compare *JACOB*, I, 1, 2): <sup>1006</sup>1 Chronicles 4:36, a Simeonite prince.

## JAALA; JAALAH

<ja'-a-la>, <ja-a'-la> ([<sup>al</sup> [y" , ya`ala'], meaning unknown, <sup>1078</sup>Nehemiah 7:58) and (ya`alah, “mountain goat” (?), Ezr 2:56): The name of a family of returned exiles, “children of Solomon’s servants” = “Jeeli” in 1 Esdras 5:33.

## JAALAM

<ja'-a-lam>: the King James Version for *JALAM* (which see).

## JAANAI

<ja'-a-ni>: the King James Version for *JANAI* (which see).

## JAAR

<ja'-ar> ([<sup>r</sup> [y" , ya`ar], “forest” or “wood”): Is only once taken as a proper name (<sup>1006</sup>Psalm 132:6 the Revised Version margin), “We found it in the field of Jaar.” It may be a shortened form of the name Kiriath-jearim, where the ark had rested 20 years.

*See KIRIATH-JEARIM.*

## JAARE-OREGIM

<ja'-a-re-or'-e-jim>, <-or'e-gim> ([~~μygr̥ḡr̥ḡy~~ , ya`are'oreghim]):

In ~~1219~~ 2 Samuel 21:19, given as the name of a Bethlehemite, father of Elhanan, who is said to have slain Goliath the Gittite (compare 1 Samuel 17). The name is not likely to be a man's name; the second part means "weavers" and occurs also as the last word of the verse in the Massoretic Text, so it is probably a scribal error here due to repetition. The first part is taken to be

(1) an error for [~~ry~~[y; ya`ir] (see JAIR), which is to be read in the parallel section in ~~1316~~ 1 Chronicles 20:5;

(2) in ~~1234~~ 2 Samuel 23:24 Elhanan is the son of Dodo, also a Bethlehemite, and Klostermann would read here Dodai as the name of Elhanan's father. David Francis Roberts

## JAARESHIAH

<ja-ar-e-shi'-a> ([~~hyr̥t̥~~[y] , ya`areshyah], meaning unknown): In ~~1307~~ 1 Chronicles 8:27, a Benjamite, "son" of Jeroham. The King James Version has "Jaresiah."

## JAASAI; JAASAU

<ja'-a-si>, <ja'-a-so>.

*See JAASU.*

## JAASIEL

<ja-a'-si-el> ([~~l aḡc~~[y] , ya`asi'el], "God makes" (?)): In ~~1314~~ 1

Chronicles 11:47, a Mezobaite, one of "the mighty men of the armies," and probably = "Jaasiel" of ~~1372~~ 1 Chronicles 27:21, "the son of Abner," and a Benjamite tribal prince of David's. the King James Version "Jasiel."

## JAASU; JASSAI; JAASAU

<ja'-a-su> (the Revised Version (British and American) and Kethibh, [~~wc~~[y] , ya`asu], meaning uncertain); (the Revised Version margin and Qere, [~~yc~~[y] , ya`asay]), (the King James Version): In Ezr 10:37, one of

those who had married foreign wives. Septuagint translates the consonantal text as a verb, *kai epoiesan*, “and they did.” 1 Esdras 9:34 has “Eliasis.”

## JAAZANIAH

<*ja-az-a-ni'-a*> ([*Whyn̄*” *aȳ*” , *ya'azanyahu*], in <sup><253></sup>2 Kings 25:23; <sup><481></sup>Ezekiel 8:11; [*hyn̄*” *aȳ*” , *ya'azanyah*], in <sup><483></sup>Jeremiah 35:3; <sup><610></sup>Ezekiel 11:1, “Yah hears”):

(1) In <sup><253></sup>2 Kings 25:23, “son of the Maacathite,” and one of the Judean “captains of the forces” who joined Gedaliah, the Babylonian governor appointed by Nebuchadnezzar over Judah, at Mizpah. He is the “Jezaniah” of <sup><418></sup>Jeremiah 40:8; 42:1. Though not mentioned by name, he was presumably one of those captains who joined Johnnan in his attack on Ishmael after the latter had slain Gedaliah (<sup><411></sup>Jeremiah 41:11-18). He is also the same as Azariah of <sup><412></sup>Jeremiah 43:2, a name read by the Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus in 42:1 also. <sup><415></sup>Jeremiah 43:5 relates how Johnnan and his allies, Jaazaniah (= Azariah) among them, left Judah with the remnant, and took up their abode in Egypt.

(2) In <sup><483></sup>Jeremiah 35:3, son of Jeremiah (not the prophet), and a chief of the Rechabite clansmen from whose “staunch adherence to the precepts of their ancestor” Jeremiah “points a lesson for his own countrymen” (Driver, Jeremiah, 215).

(3) In <sup><481></sup>Ezekiel 8:11, son of Shaphan, and one of the seventy men of the elders of Israel whom Ezekiel saw in a vision of Jerusalem offering incense to idols.

(4) In <sup><610></sup>Ezekiel 11:1, son of Azzur, and one of the 25 men whom Ezekiel saw in his vision of Jerusalem, at the East door of the Lord’s house, and against whose iniquity he was commanded to prophesy (11:1-13).

*David Francis Roberts*

## JAAZER

<*ja'-a-zer*> ([*ryzēȳ*” , *ya`azer*]).

*See JAZER.*

## JAAZIAH

<ja-a-zi'-a> ([l aʒiʔy" , ya`aziyahu], "Yah strengthens"): In <sup><1306></sup>1 Chronicles 24:26,27, a Levite, "son" of Merari. But the Massoretic Text is corrupt. The Septuagint's Codex Vaticanus reads ([ ' Oζειά, *Ozeid*]), which some take to suggest Uzziah (compare 27:25); see Curtis, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles, 274-75; See Kittel, at the place.

## JAAZIEL

<ja-a'-zi-el> ([l aʒiʔy" , ya`azi'el], "God strengthens"): In <sup><1318></sup>1 Chronicles 15:18, a Levite, one of the musicians appointed to play upon instruments at the bringing up of the ark by David. Kittel and Curtis, following the Septuagint ([ ' Oζειήλ, *Ozeiel*]), read "Uzziel," the name they adopt for Aziel in 15:20, and for Jeiel in 16:5.

## JABAL

<ja'-bal> ([l by; yabhal], meaning uncertain): In <sup><1003></sup>Genesis 4:20, a son of Lamech by Adah. He is called 'the father of those who dwell in tents and (with) herds.' So Gunkel, Gen3, 52, who says that the corresponding word in Arabic means "the herdsman who tends the camels." Skinner, Gen, 120, says that both Jabal and Jubal suggest [l by; yobhel], which in Phoenician and Hebrew "means primarily 'ram,' then 'ram's horn' as a musical instrument, and finally 'joyous music' (in the designation of the year of Jubilee)." See also Skinner, Gen, 103, on the supposed connection in meaning with Abel.

*David Francis Roberts*

## JABBOK

<jab'-ok> ([qbʔ" , yabboq], "luxuriant river"): A stream in Eastern Palestine first named in the history of Jacob, as crossed by the patriarch on his return from Paddan-aram, after leaving Mahanaim (<sup><1022></sup>Genesis 32:22 ff). On the bank of this river he had his strange conflict with an unknown antagonist. The Jabbok was the northern boundary of the territory of Sihon the Amorite (<sup><1023></sup>Numbers 21:24). It is also named as the border of Ammon (<sup><1016></sup>Deuteronomy 3:16). It is now called Nahr ez-Zerqa, "river of blue,"

referring to the clear blue color of its water. It rises near to `Amman — Rabbath Ammon — and makes a wide circuit, flowing first to the East, then to the Northwest, until it is joined by the stream from Wady Jerash, at which point it turns westward, and flows, with many windings, to the Jordan, the confluence being just North of ed-Damiyeh. It drains a wider area than any other stream East of the Jordan, except the Yarmuk. The bed of the river is in a deep gorge with steep, and in many places precipitous, banks. It is a great cleft, cutting the land of Gilead in two. It is lined along its course by a luxuriant growth of oleander which, in season, lights up the valley with brilliant color. The length of the stream, taking no account of its innumerable windings, is about 60 miles. The mouth of the river has changed its position from time to time. In the lower reaches the vegetation is tropical. The river is fordable at many points, save when in full flood. The particular ford referred to in Genesis 32 cannot now be identified.

*W. Ewing*

## JABESH

<ja'-besh> ([vby̌ yabhesh]): A short form of *JABESH-GILEAD* (which see).

## JABESH-GILEAD

<ja'-besh-gil'-e-ad> ([dʃɪ ʃɪvby̌ yabhesh gil`adh]; or simply [vyby̌; yabhash], “dry”): A city East of the Jordan, in the deliverance of which from Nahash the Ammonite Saul’s military prowess was first displayed (<sup>QHO</sup>1 Samuel 11:1 ff). At an earlier time the inhabitants failed to share with their brethren in taking vengeance upon Benjamin. This laxity was terribly punished, only 400 virgins being spared alive, who afterward became wives to the Benjamites (Judges 21). The gratitude of the inhabitants to Saul was affectingly proved after the disaster to that monarch on Gilboa (1 Samuel 31). David, hearing of their deed, sent an approving message, and sought to win their loyalty to himself (<sup>QOH</sup>2 Samuel 2:4 ff). Robinson (Biblical Researches, III, 39) thought it might be represented by ed-Deir, about 6 miles from Pella (Fachil), on the southern bank of Wady Yabis. The distance from Pella agrees with the statement of Eusebius, Onomasticon (s.v.). Others (Oliphant, Land of Gilead, 277 f; Merrill, East of Jordan, 430, etc.) would identify it with the ruins of Meriamin, about 3 miles Southeast of Pella, on the North of Wady Yabis. The site remains in doubt;

but the ancient name still lingers in that of the valley, the stream from which enters the Jordan fully 9 miles Southeast of Beisan.

*W. Ewing*

## JABEZ

<ja'-bez> ([6Bḗy̌" , ya`bets], "sorrow" ("height")):

(1) Place: An unidentified town probably in the territory of Judah, occupied by scribes (~~<1025>~~ 1 Chronicles 2:55). For an ingenious reconstruction of the passage see EB, under the word

(2) Person: The head of a family of Judah, noted for his "honorable" character, though "his mother bare him with sorrow" (~~<1040>~~ 1 Chronicles 4:9,10), ya`bets being interpreted as if it stood for ya`tsebh, "he causes pain." The same play upon words recurs in his prayer, "that it be not to my sorrow!" His request was granted, "and the sorrow implied by his ominous name was averted by prayer" (Dummelow, in the place cited.).

## JABIN

<ja'-bin> ([yby̌; yabhin], "one who is intelligent," "discerning." The word may have been a hereditary royal title among the northern Canaanites. Compare the familiar usage of *par`oh melekḥ mitsrayim*):

(1) "The king of Hazor," the leading city in Northern Palestine, who led an alliance against Joshua. He was defeated at the waters of Merom, his city was taken and he was slain (~~<1010>~~ Joshua 11:1-9).

(2) "The king of Canaan, that reigned (or had reigned) in Hazor." It is not clear whether he dwelt in Hazor or Harosheth, the home of Sisera, the captain of his host at the time of the story narrated in Jgs. He oppressed Israel in the days preceding the victory of Deborah and Barak. To the Israelites he must have been but a shadowy figure as compared with his powerful captain, Sisera, for the song makes no mention of him and there is nothing to indicate that he even took part in the battle that freed Israel (~~<1005>~~ Judges 4:2,7,17,23,24 bis; ~~<1030>~~ Psalm 83:9,10).

*Ella Davis Isaacs*

## JABNEEL; JABNEH

<jab'-ne-el>, <jab'-ne> ([<sup>1</sup>אבנִי" , *yabhne'el*], "God is builder"; Septuagint [<sup>2</sup>Λεβνά, *Lebna*], Swete reads *Lemna*; the Apocrypha has [<sup>3</sup>Ιαμνία, *Iamnia*], [<sup>4</sup>Ιαμνεΐα, *Iamneia*]):

(1) A town on the northern border of the land assigned to Judah, near the western sea, mentioned in connection with Ekron (<sup>5</sup>Joshua 15:11). The place is now represented by the modern village of Yebna which stands upon a hill a little to the South of the Nahr Rubin, about 12 or 13 miles South of Jaffa, on the road from there to Askelon, and about 4 miles from the sea. It had a port, now called Mina Rubin, a short distance South of the mouth of the river, some remains of which still exist. Its harbor was superior to that of Jaffa (PEFS, 1875, 167-68). It does not occur in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament except in the passage mentioned, but it appears under the form "Jabneh" ([<sup>6</sup>חבנִי" , *yabhneh*]) in <sup>7</sup>2 Chronicles 26:6, as is evident from the mention of Gath and Ashdod in connection with it. The Septuagint reads [<sup>8</sup>Γεμνά, *Gemna*] (Jabneh) where the Hebrew reads [<sup>9</sup>חבנִי" , *wa-yammah*], "even unto the sea," in <sup>10</sup>Joshua 15:46, where Ekron and Ashdod and other cities and villages are mentioned as belonging to Judah's inheritance. Josephus (Ant., V, i, 22) assigns it to the tribe of Dan. We have no mention of its being captured by Joshua or occupied by Judah until the reign of Uzziah who captured it and demolished its wall, in connection with his war upon the Philistines (<sup>11</sup>2 Chronicles 26:6). The position of Jabneel was strong and was the scene of many contests, both in the period of the monarchy and that of the Maccabees. It is mentioned frequently in the account of the wars of the latter with the Syrians. It was garrisoned by the Seleucid kings, and served as a base for raiding the territory of Judah. When Judas Maccabeus defeated Gorgias and the Syrians he pursued them to the plains of Jabneel, but did not take the fortress (1 Macc 4:15). Gorgias was there attacked by the Jewish generals Joseph and Azarias, contrary to Judas' orders, who were repulsed with loss (1 Macc 5:56-60; Josephus, Ant, XII, viii, 6). Apollonius occupied it for King Demetrius (1 Macc 10:69); and Cendebeus for Antiochus, and from there harassed the Jews (1 Macc 15:40). Judas burned the port and navy of Jabneel (2 Macc 12:8-9). It was taken by Simon in 142 BC (Josephus, Ant, XIII, vi, 7; BJ, I, ii, 2), together with Gazara and Joppa, but was restored to its inhabitants by Pompey in 62 BC (Ant., XIV, iv, 4), and was rebuilt by Gabinius in 57 BC (BJ, I, viii, 4). It was restored to the Jews by



Augustus in 30 AD. Herod gave it to his sister Salome and she bequeathed it to Julia, the wife of Augustus (Ant., XVIII, ii, 2; BJ, II, ix, 1). The town and region were prosperous in Roman times, and when Jerusalem was besieged by Titus the Sanhedrin removed to Jabneel, and it afterward became the seat of a great rabbinical school (Milman, History of the Jews, II, 411-12), but was suppressed in the persecution under Hadrian. Antonius allowed it to be revived, but it was again suppressed because of hostile language on the part of the rabbis (ibid., 451-52). The Crusaders built there the castle of Ibelin, supposing it to be the site of Gath. It was occupied by the Saracens, and various inscriptions in Arabic of the 13th and 14th centuries have been found there (SWP, II, 441-42).

(2) A town of Naphtali mentioned in <sup><0693></sup>Joshua 19:33, and supposed to be the site of the modern Yemma, Southwest of the sea of Galilee (SWP, I, 365). It is the Kefr Yama of the Talmud

*H. Porter*

## JACAN

<ja'-kan> ([<sup>ˈ</sup>k[<sup>ˈ</sup>y] , ya`kan], meaning not known; the King James Version, Jachan): A chief of a family descended from Gad (<sup><1363></sup>1 Chronicles 5:13).

## JACHIN

<ja'-kin> ([<sup>ˈ</sup>yki, yakhin], “he will establish”):

(1) The 4th son of Simeon (<sup><0460></sup>Genesis 46:10; Exodus 6:15; <sup><0262></sup>Numbers 26:12). In <sup><1304></sup>1 Chronicles 4:24 his name is given as “Jarib” (compare the King James Version margin, the Revised Version margin). “Jachinites,” the patronymic of the family, occurs in <sup><0262></sup>Numbers 26:12.

(2) Head of the 21st course of priests in the time of David (<sup><1347></sup>1 Chronicles 24:17). It is used as a family name in <sup><1390></sup>1 Chronicles 9:10, and as such also in <sup><1610></sup>Nehemiah 11:10, where some of the course are included in the list of those who, having returned from Babylon, willingly accepted the decision of the lot, and abandoned their rural retreats to become citizens and guardians of Jerusalem (Nahum 11:1 f).

*James Crichton*

## JACHIN AND BOAZ

<ja'-kin> ([ˈyky̌; yakhin], “he shall establish”; [z[ Bɔbo`az], “in it is strength,” <10715> 1 Kings 7:15-22; <12516> 2 Kings 25:16,17; <14815> 2 Chronicles 3:15-17; <26217> Jeremiah 52:17): These were the names of the two bronze pillars that stood before the temple of Solomon. They were not used in supporting the building; their appearance, therefore, must have been solely due to moral and symbolic reasons. What these are it is not easy to say. The pillars were not altar pillars with hearths at their top, as supposed by W.R. Smith (Religion of the Semites, 191, 468); rather they were “pillars of witness,” as was the pillar that witnessed the contract between Jacob and Laban (<013152> Genesis 31:52). At difficulty arises about the height of the pillars. The writers in Kings and Jeremiah affirm that the pillars before the porch were 18 cubits high apiece (<10715> 1 Kings 7:15; <26221> Jeremiah 52:21), while the Chronicler states that they were 35 cubits (<14815> 2 Chronicles 3:15). Various methods have been suggested of reconciling this discrepancy, but it is more probable that there is a corruption in the Chronicler’s number. On the construction of the pillars and their capitals, *see* **TEMPLE**. At the final capture of Jerusalem they were broken up and the metal of which they were composed was sent to Babylon (<12513> 2 Kings 25:13,16). In Ezekiel’s ideal temple the two pillars are represented by pillars of wood (<26019> Ezekiel 40:49).

*W. Shaw Caldecott*

## JACIMUS

<ja'-si-mus> (Ant., XII, ix, 3).

*See* **ALCIMUS**.

## JACINTH

<ja'-sinth>.

*See* **HYACINTH**; **STONES**, **PRECIOUS**.

## JACKAL

<jak'-ol>:

(1) [ṣṣyNIT" , *tannim*], “jackals,” the King James Version “dragons”; compare Arabic *tinan*, “wolf”; and compare [ṣṣyNIT" , *tannin*], Arab *tinnin*, “sea monster” or “monster” the English Revised Version “dragon” (<sup><1872></sup>Job 7:12 m; <sup><19413></sup>Psalm 74:13; 148:7; <sup><23701></sup>Isaiah 27:1; 51:9; <sup><25134></sup>Jeremiah 51:34), “serpent” (Exodus 7:9,10,12; <sup><15223></sup>Deuteronomy 32:33; <sup><19113></sup>Psalm 91:13), the King James Version “whale” (<sup><10121></sup>Genesis 1:21; <sup><1872></sup>Job 7:12); but [ṣṣyNIT" , *tannin*], “jackals,” the King James Version “sea monsters” (<sup><20413></sup>Lamentations 4:3), “jackal’s well,” the King James Version “dragon well” (<sup><14123></sup>Nehemiah 2:13), and *tannim*, “monster,” the King James Version and the English Revised Version “dragon” (<sup><23013></sup>Ezekiel 29:3; 32:2).

(2) [ṣṣyYai *iyim*], “wolves,” the King James Version “wild beasts of the islands”; compare [yai ‘i], plural [ṣṣyYai *iyim*], “island”; also [hYa" , ‘ayyah], “a cry,” [hwa; ‘awah], “to cry,” “to howl”; Arabic ‘auwa’, “to bark” (of dogs, wolves, or jackals); ‘ibn ‘awa’, colloquially *wawi*, “jackal.”

(3) [ṣṣyYki *tsiyim*], “wild beasts of the desert.”

(4) [ṣṣy j aṣ ‘ochim], “doleful creatures.”

“Jackals” occurs as a translation of *tannim*, the King James Version “dragons,” in <sup><1872></sup>Job 30:29; <sup><19413></sup>Psalm 44:19; <sup><23722></sup>Isaiah 13:22; 34:13; 35:7; 43:20; <sup><24113></sup>Jeremiah 9:11; 10:22; 14:6; 49:33; 51:37; of the feminine plural form *tannoth* in <sup><3013></sup>Malachi 1:3, and of *tannin* in <sup><14123></sup>Nehemiah 2:13 and <sup><20413></sup>Lamentations 4:3. *Tannim* is variously referred to a root meaning “to howl,” and to a root meaning “to stretch out” trop. “to run swiftly, i.e. with outstretched neck and limb extended” (Gesenius). Either derivation would suit “wolf” equally as well as “jackal.” The expression in <sup><24122></sup>Jeremiah 10:22, “to make the cities of Judah a desolation, a dwelling-place of jackals,” seems, however, especially appropriate of jackals. The same is true of <sup><23413></sup>Isaiah 34:13; <sup><24113></sup>Jeremiah 9:11; 49:33, and 51:37.

The jackal (from Persian shaghal), *Canis aureus*, is found about the Mediterranean except in Western Europe. It ranges southward to Abyssinia, and eastward, in Southern Asia, to farther India. It is smaller than a large dog, has a moderately bushy tail, and is reddish brown with dark shadings above. It is cowardly and nocturnal. Like the fox, it is destructive to poultry, grapes, and vegetables, but is less fastidious, and readily devours the remains of others’ feasts. Jackals generally go about in

small companies. Their peculiar howl may frequently be heard in the evening and at any time in the night. It begins with a high-pitched, long-drawn-out cry. This is repeated two or three times, each time in a higher key than before. Finally there are several short, loud, yelping barks. Often when one raises the cry others join in. Jackals are not infrequently confounded with foxes. They breed freely with dogs.

While *tannim* is the only word translated “jackal” in English Versions of the Bible, the words ‘*iyim*, *tsiyim*, and ‘*ochim* deserve attention. They, as well as *tannim*, evidently refer to wild creatures inhabiting desert places, but it is difficult to say for what animal each of the words stands. All four (together with *benoth ya`anah* and *se`irim*) are found in <sup><2132></sup>Isaiah 13:21,22: “But wild beasts of the desert (*tsiyim*) shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures (‘*ochim*); and ostriches (*benoth ya`anah*) shall dwell there, and wild goats (*se`irim*) shall dance there. And wolves (‘*iyim*) shall cry in their castles, and jackals (*tannim*) in the pleasant palaces.”

In the King James Version ‘*iyim* (<sup><2132></sup>Isaiah 13:22; 34:14; <sup><2132></sup>Jeremiah 50:39) is translated “wild beasts of the islands” (compare ‘*iyim*, “islands”). the King James Version margin has merely the transliteration *iim*, the Revised Version (British and American) “wolves,” the Revised Version margin “howling creatures.” Gesenius suggests the jackal, which is certainly a howler. While the wolf has a blood-curdling howl, it is much more rarely heard than the jackal.

*Tsiyim* (<sup><19719></sup>Psalm 72:9; 74:14; <sup><2132></sup>Isaiah 13:21; 23:13; 34:14; <sup><2132></sup>Jeremiah 50:39) has been considered akin to *tsiyah*, “drought” (compare ‘*erets tsiyah*, “a dry land” (<sup><19501></sup>Psalm 63:1)), and is translated in the Revised Version (British and American) as follows: <sup><19719></sup>Psalm 72:9, “they that dwell in the wilderness”; 74:14, “the people inhabiting the wilderness”; <sup><2132></sup>Isaiah 23:13, “them that dwell in the wilderness,” the Revised Version margin “the beasts of the wilderness”; <sup><2132></sup>Isaiah 13:21; 34:14; <sup><2132></sup>Jeremiah 50:39, “wild beasts of the desert.” There would be some difficulty in referring *tsiyim* in <sup><19719></sup>Psalm 72:9 to beasts rather than to men, but that is not the case in <sup><19714></sup>Psalm 74:14 and <sup><23213></sup>Isaiah 23:13. “Wild cats” have been suggested.

‘*Ochim*, “doleful creatures,” perhaps onomatopoeitic, occurs only in <sup><2312></sup>Isaiah 13:21. The translation “owls” has been suggested, and is not unsuitable to the context.

It is not impossible that *tannim* and ‘*iyim* may be different names of the jackals. ‘*Iyim*, *tsiyim*, and *tannim* occur together also in <sup><2343></sup>Isaiah 34:13,14, and ‘*iyim* and *tsiyim* in <sup><2343></sup>Jeremiah 50:39. Their similarity in sound may have much to do with their collocation. The recognized word for “wolf,” *ze’ebh* (compare Arabic *dhi’b*), occurs 7 times in the Old Testament.

*See DRAGON; WOLF; ZOOLOGY.*

*Alfred Ely Day*

## JACKAL’S WELL

([<sup><2312></sup>h" ʿy[e`en ha-tannin]; Septuagint has [<sup><2312></sup>πηγή τῶν συκῶν, *pege ton sukon*], “fountain of the figs”; the King James Version dragon well): A well or spring in the valley of Hinnom between the “Gate of the Gai” and the Dung Gate (<sup><2312></sup>Nehemiah 2:13). No such source exists in the Wady er Rababi (*see HINNOM*) today, although it is very probable that a well sunk to the rock in the lower parts of this valley might strike a certain amount of water trickling down the valley-bottom. G.A. Smith suggests (Jerusalem, I, chapter iv) that this source may have arisen as the result of an earthquake, hence, the name “dragon,” and have subsequently disappeared; but it is at least as likely that it received its name from the jackals which haunted this valley, as the pariah dogs do today, to consume the dead bodies which were thrown there.

*See HINNOM; JACKAL.*

*E. W. G. Masterman*

## JACOB (1)

<sup><2312></sup>*ja’-kub*:

## I. NAME.

### 1. Form and Distribution:

[**bqḫy**" , *ya`aqobh*] (5 times [**bwḳy**" , *ya`aqowbh*]); [**Ἰακώβ**, *Iakob*], is in form a verb in the Qal imperfect, 3rd masculine singular. Like some 50 other Hebrew names of this same form, it has no subject for the verb expressed. But there are a number of independent indications that Jacob belongs to that large class of names consisting of a verb with some Divine name or title (in this case '*El*') as the subject, from which the common abbreviated form is derived by omitting the subject.

**(a)** In Babylonian documents of the period of the Patriarchs, there occur such personal names as Ja-ku-bi, Ja-ku-ub-ilu (the former doubtless an abbreviation of the latter), and Aq-bu-u (compare Aq-bi-a-hu), according to Hilprecht a syncopated form for A-qu(?)-bu(-u), like Aq-bi-ili alongside of A-qa-bi-ili; all of which may be associated with the same root [**bq** , *`aqabh*], as appears in Jacob (see H. Ranke, *Early Babylonian Personal Names*, 1905, with annotations by Professor Hilprecht as editor, especially pp. 67, 113, 98 and 4).

**(b)** In the list of places in Palestine conquered by the Pharaoh Thutmose III appears a certain J'qb'r, which in Egyptian characters represents the Semitic letters [**l abqy**, *ya`aqobh-'el*], and which therefore seems to show that in the earlier half of the 15th century BC (so Petrie, *Breasted*) there was a place (not a tribe; see W. M. Muller, *Asien und Europa*, 162 ff) in Central Palestine that bore a name in some way connected with "Jacob." Moreover, a Pharaoh of the Hyksos period bears a name that looks like *ya`aqobh-'el* (Spiegelberg, *Orientalische Literaturzeitung*, VII, 130).

**(c)** In the Jewish tractate *Pirke Abhoth*, iii.1, we read of a Jew named '*Aqabhyah*', which is a name composed of the same verbal root as that in Jacob, together with the Divine name Yahu (i.e. Yahweh) in its common abbreviated form. It should be noted that the personal names '*Aqqubh*' and *Ya`aqobhah* (accent on the penult) also occur in the Old Testament, the former borne by no less than 4 different persons; also that in the Palmyrene inscriptions we find a person named [**bq t** , *`ath`aqobh*], a name in which this same verb [**bq** , *`aqabh*] is

preceded by the name of the god `Ate, just as in `Aqabhyah it is followed by the name *Yahu*.

## *2. Etymology and Associations:*

Such being the form and distribution of the name, it remains to inquire: What do we know of its etymology and what were the associations it conveyed to the Hebrew ear?

The verb in all its usages is capable of deduction, by simple association of ideas, from the noun "heel." "To heel" might mean:

- (a) "to take hold of by the heel" (so probably ~~2813B~~ Hosea 12:3; compare ~~10736~~ Genesis 27:36);
- (b) "to follow with evil intent," "to supplant" or in general "to deceive" (so ~~10736~~ Genesis 27:36; ~~2004~~ Jeremiah 9:4, where the parallel, "go about with slanders," is interesting because the word so translated is akin to the noun "foot," as "supplant" is to "heel");
- (c) "to follow with good intent," whether as a slave (compare our English "to heel," of a dog) for service, or as a guard for protection, hence, "to guard" (so in Ethiopic), "to keep guard over", and thus "to restrain" (so ~~18704~~ Job 37:4);
- (d) "to follow," "to succeed," "to take the place of another" (so Arabic, and the Hebrew noun [bq[ e'eqebh], "consequence," "recompense," whether of reward or punishment).

Among these four significations, which most commends itself as the original intent in the use of this verb to form a proper name? The answer to this question depends upon the degree of strength with which the Divine name was felt to be the subject of the verb. As Jacob-el, the simplest interpretation of the name is undoubtedly, as Baethgen urges (*Beitrage zur sem. Religionsgeschichte*, 158), "God rewardeth" ((d) above), like Nathanael, "God hath given," etc. But we have already seen that centuries before the time when Jacob is said to have been born, this name was shortened by dropping the Divine subject; and in this shortened form it would be more likely to call up in the minds of all Semites who used it, associations with the primary, physical notion of its root ((a) above). Hence, there is no ground to deny that even in the patriarchal period, this

familiar personal name Jacob lay ready at hand — a name ready made, as it were — for this child, in view of the peculiar circumstances of its birth; we may say, indeed, one could not escape the use of it. (A parallel case, perhaps, is <sup>(~~Q838~~)</sup>Genesis 38:28,30, Zerah; compare Zerahiah.) The associations of this root in everyday use in Jacob's family to mean "to supplant" led to the fresh realization of its appropriateness to his character and conduct when he was grown ((b) above). This construction does not interfere with a connection between the patriarch Jacob and the "Jacob-els" referred to above (under 1, (b)), should that connection on other grounds appear probable. Such a longer form was perhaps for every "Jacob" an alternative form of his name, and under certain circumstances may have been used by or of even the patriarch Jacob.

## II. PLACE IN THE PATRIARCHAL SUCCESSION.

### *1. As the Son of Isaac and Rebekah:*

In the dynasty of the "heirs of the promise," Jacob takes his place, first, as the successor of Isaac. In Isaac's life the most significant single fact had been his marriage with Rebekah instead of with a woman of Canaan. Jacob therefore represents the first generation of those who are determinately separate from their environment. Abraham and his household were immigrants in Canaan; Jacob and Esau were natives of Canaan in the second generation, yet had not a drop of Canaanitish blood in their veins. Their birth was delayed till 20 years after the marriage of their parents. Rebekah's barrenness had certainly the same effect, and probably the same purpose, as that of Sarah: it drove Isaac to Divine aid, demanded of him as it had of Abraham that "faith and patience" through which they "inherited the promises" (<sup>(~~Q812~~)</sup>Hebrews 6:12), and made the children of this pair also the evident gift of God's grace, so that Isaac was the better able "by faith" to "bless Jacob and Esau even concerning things to come" (<sup>(~~Q811~~)</sup>Hebrews 11:20).

### *2. As the Brother of Esau:*

These twin brothers therefore share thus far the same relation to their parents and to what their parents transmit to them. But here the likeness ceases. "Being not yet born, neither having done anything good or bad, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth, it was said unto (Rebecca), The elder shall serve the younger" (<sup>(~~Q811~~)</sup>Romans 9:11,12). In the Genesis-narrative, without any



doctrinal assertions either adduced to explain it, or deduced from it, the fact is nevertheless made as clear as it is in Malachi or Romans, that Esau is rejected, and Jacob is chosen as a link in the chain of inheritance that receives and transmits the promise.

### *3. As Father of the Twelve:*

With Jacob the last person is reached who, for his own generation, thus sums up in a single individual “the seed” of promise. He becomes the father of 12 sons, who are the progenitors of the tribes of the “peculiar people.” It is for this reason that this people bears his name, and not that of his father Isaac or that of his grandfather Abraham. The “children of Israel,” the “house of Jacob,” are the totality of the seed of the promise. The Edomites too are children of Isaac. Ishmaelites equally with Israelites boast of descent from Abraham. But the twelve tribes that called themselves “Israel” were all descendants of Jacob, and were the only descendants of Jacob on the agnatic principle of family-constitution.

## **III. BIOGRAPHY.**

The life of a wanderer (<sup><1515></sup>Deuteronomy 26:5 the Revised Version, margin) such as Jacob was, may often be best divided on the geographical principle. Jacob’s career falls into the four distinct periods: that of his residence with Isaac in Canaan, that of his residence with Laban in Aram, that of his independent life in Canaan and that of his migration to Egypt.

### *1. With Isaac in Canaan:*

Jacob’s birth was remarkable in respect of

- (a) its delay for 20 years as noted above,
- (b) that condition of his mother which led to the Divine oracle concerning his future greatness and supremacy, and
- (c) the unusual phenomenon that gave him his name: “he holds by the heel” (see above, I, 2).

Unlike his twin brother, Jacob seems to have been free from any physical peculiarities; his smoothness (<sup><0271></sup>Genesis 27:11) is only predicated of him in contrast to Esau’s hairiness. These brothers, as they developed, grew apart in tastes and habits. Jacob, like his father in his quiet manner of life

and (for that reason perhaps) the companion and favorite of his mother, found early the opportunity to obtain Esau's sworn renunciation of his right of primogeniture, by taking advantage of his habits, his impulsiveness and his fundamental indifference to the higher things of the family, the things of the future (<sup><0252></sup>Genesis 25:32). It was not until long afterward that the companion scene to this first "supplanting" (<sup><0276></sup>Genesis 27:36) was enacted. Both sons meanwhile are to be thought of simply as members of Isaac's following, during all the period of his successive sojourns in Gerar, the Valley of Gerar and Beersheba (Genesis 26). Within this period, when the brothers were 40 years of age, occurred Esau's marriage with two Hittite women. Jacob, remembering his own mother's origin, bided his time to find the woman who should be the mother of his children. The question whether she should be brought to him, as Rebekah was to Isaac, or he should go to find her, was settled at last by a family feud that only his absence could heal. This feud was occasioned by the fraud that Jacob at Rebekah's behest practiced upon his father and brother, when these two were minded to nullify the clearly revealed purpose of the oracle (<sup><0253></sup>Genesis 25:23) and the sanctions of a solemn oath (<sup><0253></sup>Genesis 25:33). Isaac's partiality for Esau arose perhaps as much from Esau's resemblance to the active, impulsive nature of his mother, as from the sensual gratification afforded Isaac by the savory dishes his son's hunting supplied. At any rate, this partiality defeated itself because it overreached itself. The wife, who had learned to be eyes and ears for a husband's failing senses, detected the secret scheme, counterplotted with as much skill as unscrupulousness, and while she obtained the paternal blessing for her favorite son, fell nevertheless under the painful necessity of choosing between losing him through his brother's revenge or losing him by absence from home. She chose, of course, the latter alternative, and herself brought about Jacob's departure, by pleading to Isaac the necessity for obtaining a woman as Jacob's wife of a sort different from the Canaanitish women that Esau had married. Thus ends the first portion of Jacob's life.

## *2. To Aram and Back:*

It is no young man that sets out thus to escape a brother's vengeance, and perhaps to find a wife at length among his mother's kindred. It was long before this that Esau at the age of forty had married the Hittite women (compare <sup><0234></sup>Genesis 26:34 with 27:46). Yet to one who had hitherto spent his life subordinate to his father, indulged by his mother, in awe of a brother's physical superiority, and "dwelling in tents, a quiet (domestic)

man” (<sup><0257></sup>Genesis 25:27), this journey of 500 or 600 miles, with no one to guide, counsel or defend, was as new an experience as if he had really been the stripling that he is sometimes represented to have been. All the most significant chapters in life awaited him: self-determination, love, marriage, fatherhood, domestic provision and administration, adjustment of his relations with men, and above all a personal and independent religious experience.

Of these things, all were to come to him in the 20 years of absence from Canaan, and the last was to come first; for the dream of Jacob at Beth-el was of course but the opening scene in the long drama of God’s direct dealing with Jacob. Yet it was the determinative scene, for God in His latest and fullest manifestation to Jacob was just “the God of Beth-el” (<sup><0317></sup>Genesis 35:7; 48:3; 49:24).

With the arrival at Haran came love at once, though not for 7 years the consummation of that love. Its strength is naively indicated by the writer in two ways: impliedly in the sudden output of physical power at the well-side (<sup><0290></sup>Genesis 29:10), and expressly in the patient years of toil for Rachel’s sake, which “seemed unto him but a few days for the love he had to her” (<sup><0290></sup>Genesis 29:20). Jacob is not primarily to be blamed for the polygamy that brought trouble into his home-life and sowed the seeds of division and jealousy in the nation of the future. Although much of Israel’s history can be summed up in the rivalry of Leah and Rachel — Judah and Joseph — yet it was not Jacob’s choice but Laban’s fraud that introduced this cause of schism. At the end of his 7 years’ labor Jacob received as wife not Rachel but Leah, on the belated plea that to give the younger daughter before the elder was not the custom of the country. This was the first of the “ten times” that Laban “changed the wages” of Jacob (<sup><0307></sup>Genesis 31:7,41). Rachel became Jacob’s wife 7 days after Leah, and for this second wife he “served 7 other years.” During these 7 years were born most of the sons and daughters (<sup><0375></sup>Genesis 37:35) that formed the actual family, the nucleus of that large caravan that Jacob took back with him to Canaan. Dinah is the only daughter named; <sup><0321></sup>Genesis 30:21 is obviously in preparation for the story of Genesis 34 (see especially 34:31). Four sons of Leah were the oldest: Reuben, with the right of primogeniture, Simeon, Levi and Judah. Next came the 4 sons of Bilhah and Zilpah, the personal slaves of the two wives (compare ABRAHAM, IV, 2); the two pairs of sons were probably of about the same age (compare order in Genesis 49). Leah’s 5th and 6th sons were separated by an interval of uncertain length

from her older group. And Joseph, the youngest son born in Haran, was Rachel's first child, equally beloved by his mother, and by his father for her sake (33:2; compare 44:20), as well as because he was the youngest of the eleven (37:3).

Jacob's years of service for his wives were followed by 6 years of service rendered for a stipulated wage. Laban's cunning in limiting the amount of this wage in a variety of ways was matched by Jacob's cunning in devising means to overreach his uncle, so that the penniless wanderer of 20 years before becomes the wealthy proprietor of countless cattle and of the hosts of slaves necessary for their care (<sup>OE20</sup>Genesis 32:10). At the same time the apology of Jacob for his conduct during this entire period of residence in Haran is spirited (<sup>OE36</sup>Genesis 31:36-42); it is apparently unanswerable by Laban (<sup>OE48</sup>Genesis 31:43); and it is confirmed, both by the evident concurrence of Leah and Rachel (<sup>OE14</sup>Genesis 31:14-16), and by indications in the narrative that the justice (not merely the partiality) of God gave to each party his due recompense: to Jacob the rich returns of skillful, patient industry; to Laban rebuke and warning (<sup>OE05</sup>Genesis 31:5-13,24,29,42).

The manner of Jacob's departure from Haran was determined by the strained relations between his uncle and himself. His motive in going, however, is represented as being fundamentally the desire to terminate an absence from his father's country that had already grown too long (<sup>OE30</sup>Genesis 31:30; compare 30:25) — a desire which in fact presented itself to him in the form of a revelation of God's own purpose and command (<sup>OE08</sup>Genesis 31:3). Unhappily, his clear record was stained by the act of another than himself, who nevertheless, as a member of his family, entailed thus upon him the burden of responsibility. Rachel, like Laban her father, was devoted to the superstition that manifested itself in the keeping and consulting of teraphim, a custom which, whether more nearly akin to fetishism, totemism, or ancestor-worship, was felt to be incompatible with the worship of the one true God. (Note that the "teraphim" of <sup>OE19</sup>Genesis 31:19,34 f are the same as the "gods" of 31:30,32 and, apparently, of 35:2,4.) This theft furnished Laban with a pretext for pursuit. What he meant to do he probably knew but imperfectly himself. Coercion of some sort he would doubtless have brought to bear upon Jacob and his caravan, had he not recognized in a dream the God whom Jacob worshipped, and heard Him utter a word of warning against the use of violence. Laban failed to find his stolen gods, for his daughter was as crafty and ready-witted as he. The whole adventure ended in a

formal reconciliation, with the usual sacrificial and memorial token (~~0343~~Genesis 31:43-55).

After Laban, Esau. One danger is no sooner escaped than a worse threatens. Yet between them lies the pledge of Divine presence and protection in the vision of God's host at Mahanaim: just a simple statement, with none of the fanciful detail that popular story-telling loves, but the sober record of a tradition to which the supernatural was matter of fact. Even the longer passage that preserves the occurrence at Peniel is conceived in the same spirit. What the revelation of the host of God had not sufficed to teach this faithless, anxious, scheming patriarch, that God sought to teach him in the night-struggle, with its ineffaceable physical memorial of a human impotence that can compass no more than to cling to Divine omnipotence (~~0322~~Genesis 32:22-32). The devices of crafty Jacob to disarm an offended and supposedly implacable brother proved as useless as that bootless wrestling of the night before; Esau's peculiar disposition was not of Jacob's making, but of God's, and to it alone Jacob owed his safety. The practical wisdom of Jacob dictated his insistence upon bringing to a speedy termination the proposed association with his changeable brother, amid the difficulties of a journey that could not be shared by such divergent social and racial elements as Esau's armed host and Jacob's caravan, without discontent on the one side and disaster on the other. The brothers part, not to meet again until they meet to bury their father at Hebron (~~0329~~Genesis 35:29).

### *3. In Canaan Again:*

Before Jacob's arrival in the South of Canaan where his father yet lived and where his own youth had been spent, he passed through a period of wandering in Central Palestine, somewhat similar to that narrated of his grandfather Abraham. To any such nomad, wandering slowly from Aram toward Egypt, a period of residence in the region of Mt. Ephraim was a natural chapter in his book of travels. Jacob's longer stops, recorded for us, were

- (1) at Succoth, East of the Jordan near Peniel,
- (2) at Shechem and
- (3) at Beth-el.

Nothing worthy of record occurred at Succoth, but the stay at Shechem was eventful. Genesis 34, which tells the story of Dinah's seduction and her brother's revenge, throws as much light upon the relations of Jacob and the Canaanites, as does chapter 14 or chapter 23 upon Abraham's relations, or chapter 26 upon Isaac's relations, with such settled inhabitants of the land. There is a strange blending of moral and immoral elements in Jacob and his family as portrayed in this contretemps. There is the persistent tradition of separateness from the Canaanites bequeathed from Abraham's day (chapter 24), together with a growing family consciousness and sense of superiority (34:7,14,31). And at the same time there is indifference to their unique moral station among the envining tribes, shown in Dinah's social relations with them (34:1), in the treachery and cruelty of Simeon and Levi (34:25-29), and in Jacob's greater concern for the security of his possessions than for the preservation of his good name (verse 30).

It was this concern for the safety of the family and its wealth that achieved the end which dread of social absorption would apparently never have achieved — the termination of a long residence where there was moral danger for all. For a second time Jacob had fairly to be driven to Beth-el. Safety from his foes was again a gift of God (<sup><0375></sup>Genesis 35:5), and in a renewal of the old forgotten ideals of consecration (<sup><0372></sup>Genesis 35:2-8), he and all his following move from the painful associations of Shechem to the hallowed associations of Beth-el. Here were renewed the various phases of all God's earlier communications to this patriarch and to his fathers before him. The new name of Israel, hitherto so ill deserved, is henceforth to find realization in his life; his fathers' God is to be his God; his seed is to inherit the land of promise, and is to be no mean tribe, but a group of peoples with kings to rule over them like the nations round about (<sup><0370></sup>Genesis 35:9-12). No wonder that Jacob here raises anew his monument of stone — emblem of the "Stone of Israel" (<sup><0424></sup>Genesis 49:24) — and stamps forever, by this public act, upon ancient Luz (<sup><0376></sup>Genesis 35:6), the name of Beth-el which he had privately given it years before (<sup><0289></sup>Genesis 28:19).

Losses and griefs characterized the family life of the patriarch at this period. The death of his mother's Syrian nurse at Beth-el (<sup><0378></sup>Genesis 35:8; compare 24:59) was followed by the death of his beloved wife Rachel at Ephrath (<sup><0359></sup>Genesis 35:19; 48:7) in bringing forth the youngest of his 12 sons, Benjamin. At about the same time the eldest of the 12, Reuben, forfeited the honor of his station in the family by an act that showed all too

clearly the effect of recent association with Canaanites (~~0352~~Genesis 35:22). Finally, death claimed Jacob's aged father, whose latest years had been robbed of the companionship, not only of this son, but also of the son whom his partiality had all but made a fratricide; at Isaac's grave in Hebron the ill-matched brothers met once more, thenceforth to go their separate ways, both in their personal careers and in their descendants' history (~~0359~~Genesis 35:29).

Jacob now is by right of patriarchal custom head of all the family. He too takes up his residence at Hebron (~~0374~~Genesis 37:14), and the story of the family fortunes is now pursued under the new title of "the generations of Jacob" (~~0370~~Genesis 37:2). True, most of this story revolves about Joseph, the youngest of the family save Benjamin; yet the occurrence of passages like Genesis 38, devoted exclusively to Judah's affairs, or 46:8-27, the enumeration of Jacob's entire family through its secondary ramifications, or Genesis 49, the blessing of Jacob on all his sons — all these prove that Jacob, not Joseph, is the true center of the narrative until his death. As long as he lives he is the real head of his house, and not merely a superannuated veteran like Isaac. Not only Joseph, the boy of 17 (37:2), but also the self-willed elder sons, even a score of years later, come and go at his bidding (Genesis 42 through 45). Joseph's dearest thought, as it is his first thought, is for his aged father (43:7,27; 44:19; and especially 45:3,9,13,23, and 46:29).

#### *4. Last Years in Egypt:*

It is this devotion of Joseph that results in Jacob's migration to Egypt. What honors there Joseph can show his father he shows him: he presents him to Pharaoh, who for Joseph's sake receives him with dignity, and assigns him a home and sustenance for himself and all his people as honored guests of the land of Egypt (~~0407~~Genesis 47:7-12). Yet in Beersheba, while en route to Egypt, Jacob had obtained a greater honor than this reception by Pharaoh. He had found there, as ready to respond to his sacrifices as ever to those of his fathers, the God of his father Isaac, and had received the gracious assurance of Divine guidance in this momentous journey, fraught with so vast a significance for the future nation and the world (~~0440~~Genesis 46:1-4): God Himself would go with him into Egypt and give him, not merely the gratification of once more embracing his long-lost son, but the fulfillment of the covenant-promise (~~0453~~Genesis 15:13-16) that he and his were not turning their backs upon Canaan forever. Though

130 years of age when he stood before Pharaoh, Jacob felt his days to have been “few” as well as “evil,” in comparison with those of his fathers (<sup><0470></sup>Genesis 47:9). And in fact he had yet 17 years to live in Goshen (<sup><0478></sup>Genesis 47:28).

These last days are passed over without record, save of the growth and prosperity of the family. But at their close came the impartation of the ancestral blessings, with the last will of the dying patriarch. After adopting Joseph’s sons, Manasseh and Ephraim, as his own, Jacob blesses them, preferring the younger to the elder as he himself had once been preferred to Esau, and assigns to Joseph the “double portion” of the firstborn — that “preeminence” which he denies to Reuben (<sup><0482></sup>Genesis 48:22; 49:4). In poetry that combines with the warm emotion and glowing imagery of its style and the unsurpassed elevation of its diction, a lyrical fervor of religious sentiment which demands for its author a personality that had passed through just such course of tuition as Jacob had experienced, the last words of Jacob, in Genesis 49, mark a turning-point in the history of the people of God. This is a translation of biography into prophecy. On the assumption that it is genuine, we may confidently aver that it was simply unforgettable by those who heard it. Its auditors were its theme. Their descendants were its fulfillment. Neither the one class nor the other could ever let it pass out of memory.

It was “by faith,” we are well reminded, that Jacob “blessed” and “worshipped” “when he was dying” (<sup><8121></sup>Hebrews 11:21). For he held to the promises of God, and even in the hour of dissolution looked for the fulfillment of the covenant, according to which Canaan should belong to him and to his seed after him. He therefore set Joseph an example, by “giving commandment concerning his bones,” that they might rest in the burial-place of Abraham and Isaac near Hebron. To the accomplishment of this mission Joseph and all his brethren addressed themselves after their father’s decease and the 70 days of official mourning. Followed by a “very great company” of the notables of Egypt, including royal officials and representatives of the royal family, this Hebrew tribe carried up to sepulture in the land of promise the embalmed body of the patriarch from whom henceforth they were to take their tribal name, lamented him according to custom for 7 days, and then returned to their temporary home in Egypt, till their children should at length be “called” thence to become God’s son” (<sup><8110></sup>Hosea 11:1) and inherit His promises to their father Jacob.



#### IV. CHARACTER AND BELIEFS.

In the course of this account of Jacob's career the inward as well as the outward fortunes of the man have somewhat appeared. Yet a more comprehensive view of the kind of man he was will not be superfluous at this point. With what disposition was he endowed — the natural nucleus for acquired characteristics and habits? Through what stages did he pass in the development of his beliefs and his character? In particular, what attitude did he maintain toward the most significant thing in his life, the promise of God to his house? And lastly, what resemblances may be traced in Israel the man to Israel the nation, of such sort that the one may be regarded as "typical" of the other? These matters deserve more than a passing notice.

##### *1. Natural Qualities:*

From his father, Jacob inherited that domesticity and affectionate attachment to his home circle which appears in his life from beginning to end. He inherited shrewdness, initiative and resourcefulness from Rebekah — qualities which she shared apparently with her brother Laban and all his family. The conspicuous ethical faults of Abraham and Isaac alike are want of candor and want of courage. It is not surprising, therefore, to find the same failings in Jacob. Deceit and cowardice are visible again and again in the impartial record of his life. Both spring from unbelief. They belong to the natural man. God's transformation of this man was wrought by faith — by awakening and nourishing in him a simple trust in the truth and power of the Divine word. For Jacob was not at any time in his career indifferent to the things of the spirit, the things unseen and belonging to the future. Unlike Esau, he was not callous to the touch of God. Whether through inheritance, or as a fruit of early teaching, he had as the inestimable treasure, the true capital of his spiritual career, a firm conviction of the value of what God had promised, and a supreme ambition to obtain it for himself and his children. But against the Divine plan for the attainment of this goal by faith, there worked in Jacob constantly his natural qualities, the non-moral as well as the immoral qualities, that urged him to save himself and his fortunes by "works" — by sagacity, cunning, compromise, pertinacity — anything and everything that would anticipate God's accomplishing His purpose in His own time and His own way. In short, "the end justifies the means" is the program that, more than all others, finds illustration and rebuke in the character of Jacob.

## *2. Stages of Development:*

Starting with such a combination of natural endowments, social, practical, ethical, Jacob passed through a course of Divine tuition, which, by building upon some of them, repressing others and transfiguring the remainder, issued in the triumph of grace over nature, in the transformation of a Jacob into an Israel. This tuition has been well analyzed by a recent writer (Thomas, Genesis, III, 204 f) into the school of sorrow, the school of providence and the school of grace. Under the head of sorrow, it is not difficult to recall many experiences in the career just reviewed: long exile; disappointment; sinful passions of greed, anger, lust and envy in others, of which Jacob was the victim; perplexity; and, again and again, bereavement of those he held most dear.

But besides these sorrows, God's providence dealt with him in ways most remarkable, and perhaps more instructive for the study of such Divine dealings than in the case of any other character in the Old Testament. By alternate giving and withholding, by danger here and deliverance there, by good and evil report, now by failure of "best laid schemes" and now by success with seemingly inadequate means, God developed in him the habit — not native to him as it seems to have been in part to Abraham and to Joseph, — of reliance on Divine power and guidance, of accepting the Divine will, of realizing the Divine nearness and faithfulness.

And lastly, there are those admirably graded lessons in the grace of God, that were imparted in the series of Divine appearances to the patriarch, at Beth-el, at Haran, at Peniel, at Beth-el again and at Beersheba. For if the substance of these Divine revelations be compared, it will be found that all are alike in the assurance

- (1) that God is with him to bless;
- (2) that the changes of his life are ordained of God and are for his ultimate good; and
- (3) that he is the heir of the ancestral promises.

It will further be found that they may be arranged in a variety of ways, according as one or another of the revelations be viewed as the climax. Thus

(1), agreeing with the chronological order, the appearance at Beersheba may well be regarded as the climax of them all. Abraham had gone to Egypt to escape a famine (<sup><0120></sup>Genesis 12:10), but he went without revelation, and returned with bitter experience of his error. Isaac essayed to go to Egypt for the same cause (<sup><0230></sup>Genesis 26:1 f), and was prevented by revelation. Jacob now goes to Egypt, but he goes with the express approval of the God of his fathers, and with the explicit assurance that the same Divine providence which ordained this removal (<sup><0310></sup>Genesis 50:20) will see that it does not frustrate any of the promises of God. This was a crisis in the history of the “Kingdom of God” on a paragraph with events like the Exodus, the Exile, or the Return.

(2) In its significance for his personal history, the first of these revelations was unique. Beth-el witnessed Jacob’s choice, evidently for the first time, of his fathers’ God as his God. And though we find Jacob later tolerating idolatry in his household and compromising his religious testimony by sin, we never find a hint of his own unfaithfulness to this first and final religious choice. This is further confirmed by the attachment of his later revelations to this primary one, as though this lent them the significance of continuity, and made possible the unity of his religious experience. So at Haran it was the “God of Beth-el” who directed his return (<sup><0313></sup>Genesis 31:13); at Shechem it was to Beth-el that he was directed, in order that he might at length fulfill his Beth-el vow, by erecting there an altar to the God who had there appeared to him (<sup><0316></sup>Genesis 35:1); and at Beth-el finally the promise of former years was renewed to him who was henceforth to be Israel (<sup><0319></sup>Genesis 35:9-15).

(3) Though thus punctuated with the supernatural, the only striking bit of the marvelous in all this biography is the night scene at Peniel. And this too may justly be claimed as a climax in Jacob’s development. There he first received his new name, and though he deserved it as little in many scenes thereafter as he had deserved it before, yet the same could be said of many a man who has “seen the face of God,” but has yet to grasp, like Jacob, the lesson that the way to overcome is through the helpless but clinging importunity of faith.

(4) Rather than in any of the other scenes, however, it was at Beth-el the second time that the patriarch reached the topmost rung on the ladder of development. As already noticed, the substance of all the earlier revelations is here renewed and combined. It is no wonder that after this solemn

theophany we find Jacob, like Moses later, `enduring as seeing him who is invisible' (<sup><3117></sup>Hebrews 11:27), and "waiting for the salvation" (<sup><1498></sup>Genesis 49:18) of a God `who is not ashamed of him, to be called his God' (<sup><3116></sup>Hebrews 11:16), but is repeatedly called "the God of Jacob."

Finally, such a comparison of these revelations to Jacob reveals a variety in the way God makes Himself known. In the first revelation, naturally, the effort is made chiefly to impress upon its recipient the identity of the revealing God with the God of his fathers. And it has been remarked already that in the later revelations the same care is taken to identify the Revealer with the One who gave that first revelation, or else to identify Him, as then, with the God of the fathers. Yet, in addition to this, there is a richness and suitability in the Divine names revealed, which a mechanical theory of literary sources not only leaves unexplained but fails even to recognize. At Beth-el first it is Yahweh, the personal name of this God, the God of his fathers, who enters into a new personal relation with Jacob; now, of all times in his career, he needs to know God by the differential mark that distinguishes Him absolutely from other gods, that there may never be confusion as to Yahweh's identity. But this matter is settled for Jacob once for all. Thenceforth one of the ordinary terms for deity, with or without an attributive adjunct, serves to lift the patriarch's soul into communication with his Divine Interlocutor. The most general word of all in the Semitic tongues for deity is 'El, the word used in the revelations to Jacob at Haran in Genesis (31:13), at Shechem (35:1), at Beth-el the second time (35:11) and at Beersheba (46:3). But it is never used alone. Like Allah in the Arabic language (= the God), so 'El with the definite article before it serves to designate in Hebrew a particular divinity, not deity in general. Or else 'El without the article is made definite by some genitive phrase that supplies the necessary identification: so in Jacob's case, *El-beth-el* (35:7; compare 31:13) or *El-Elohe-Israel* (33:20). Or, lastly, there is added to 'El some determining title, with the force of an adjective, as Shaddai (translated "Almighty") in 35:11 (compare 43:3). In clear distinction from this word, 'El, with its archaic or poetic flavor, is the common Hebrew word for God, 'Elohim. But while 'Elohim is used regularly by the narrator of the Jacob-stories in speaking, or in letting his actors speak, of Jacob's God, who to the monotheistic writer is of course the God and his own God, he never puts this word thus absolutely into the mouth of the revealing Deity. Jacob can say, when he awakes from his dream, "This is the house of 'Elohim," but God says to him in the dream,

“I am the God (*‘Elohim*) of thy father” (28:17,13). At Mahanaim Jacob says, “This is the host of *‘Elohim*” (32:2), but at Beersheba God says to Jacob, “I am .... the God (*‘Elohim*) of thy father” (46:3). Such are the distinctions maintained in the use of these words, all of them used of the same God, yet chosen in each case to fit the circumstances of speaker, hearer and situation.

The only passage in the story of Jacob that might appear to be an exception does in fact but prove the rule. At Peniel the angel of God explains the new name of Israel by saying, “Thou hast striven with God (*‘Elohim*) and with men, and hast prevailed.” Here the contrast with “men” proves that *‘Elohim* without the article is just the right expression, even on the lips of Deity: neither Deity nor humanity has prevailed against Jacob (<sup>0328</sup>Genesis 32:28).

Throughout the entire story of Jacob, therefore, his relations with Yahweh his God, after they were once established (<sup>0283</sup>Genesis 28:13-16), are narrated in terms that emphasize the Divinity of Him who had thus entered into covenant-relationship with him: His Divinity — that is to say, those attributes in which His Divinity manifested itself in His dealings with Jacob.

### *3. Attitude toward the Promise:*

From the foregoing, two things appear with respect to Jacob’s attitude toward the promise of God. First, with all his faults and vices he yet was spiritually sensitive; he responded to the approaches of his God concerning things of a value wholly spiritual — future good, moral and spiritual blessings. And second, he was capable of progress in these matters; that is, his reaction to the Divine tuition would appear, if charted, as a series of elevations, separated one from another, to be sure, by low levels and deep declines, yet each one higher than the last, and all taken collectively lifting the whole average up and up, till in the end faith has triumphed over sight, the future over present good, a yet unpossessed but Divinely promised Canaan over all the comfort and honors of Egypt, and the aged patriarch lives only to “wait for Yahweh’s salvation” (<sup>0498</sup>Genesis 49:18).

The contrast of Jacob with Esau furnishes perhaps the best means of grasping the significance of these two facts for an estimate of Jacob’s attitude toward the promise. For in the first place, Esau, who possessed so much that Jacob lacked — directness, manliness, a sort of bonhomie, that made him superficially more attractive than his brother — Esau shows

nowhere any real “sense” for things spiritual. The author of Hebrews has caught the man in the flash of a single word, “profane” [βέβηλος, *bebelos*]) — of course, in the older, broader, etymological meaning of the term. Esau’s desires dwelt in the world of the non-sacred; they did not aspire to that world of nearness to God, where one must ‘put off the shoes from off his feet, because the place whereon he stands is holy ground.’ And in the second place, there is no sign of growth in Esau. What we see him in his father’s encampment, that we see him to the end — so far as appears from the laconic story. With the virtues as well as the vices of the man who lives for the present — forgiving when strong enough to revenge, condescending when flattered, proud of power and independent of parental control or family tradition — Esau is as impartially depicted by the sacred historian as if the writer had been an Edomite instead of an Israelite: the sketch is evidently true to life, both from its objectivity and from its coherence.

Now what Esau was, Jacob was not. His fault in connection with the promises of God, the family tradition, the ancestral blessing, lay not in despising them, but in seeking them in immoral ways. Good was his aim; but he was ready to “do evil that good might come.” He was always tempted to be his own Providence, and God’s training was clearly directed, both by providential leadings and by gracious disclosures, to this corresponding purpose: to enlighten Jacob as to the nature of the promise; to assure him that it was his by grace; to awaken personal faith in its Divine Giver; and to supplement his “faith” by that “patience” without which none can “inherit the promises.” The faith that accepts was to issue at length in the faith that waits.

#### *4. How Far a “Type” of Israel:*

A nation was to take its name from Jacob-Israel, and there are some passages of Scripture where it is uncertain whether the name designates the nation or its ancestor. In their respective relations to God and to the world of men and nations, there is a true sense in which the father was a “type” of the children. It is probably only a play of fancy that would discover a parallel in their respective careers, between the successive stages of life in the father’s home (Canaan), life in exile, a return, and a second exile. But it is not fanciful to note the resemblance between Jacob’s character and that of his descendants. With few exceptions the qualities mentioned above (IV, 2) will be found, *mutatis mutandis*, to be equally applicable to the nation of

Israel. And even that curriculum in which the patriarch learned of God may be viewed as a type of the school in which the Hebrew people — not all of them, nor even the mass, but the “remnant” who approximated to the ideal Israel of the prophets, the “servant of Yahweh” — were taught the lessons of faith and patience, of renunciation and consecration, that appear with growing clearness on the pages of Isaiah, of Habakkuk, of Jeremiah, of Malachi. This is apparently Hosea’s point of view in ~~(3012)~~ Hosea 12:2-4,12.

A word of caution, however, is needed at this point. There are limits to this equation. Even critics who regard Jacob under his title of Israel as merely the eponymous hero, created by legend to be the forefather of the nation (compare below, VI, 1), must confess that Jacob as Jacob is no such neutral creature, dressed only in the colors of his children’s racial qualities. There is a large residuum in Jacob, after all parallelisms have been traced, that refuses to fit the lines of Hebrew national character or history, and his typical relation in fact lies chiefly in the direction of the covenant-inheritance, after the fashion of Malachi’s allusion (~~(3002)~~ Malachi 1:2), interpreted by Paul (~~(4000)~~ Romans 9:10-13).

## V. REFERENCES OUTSIDE OF GENESIS.

Under his two names this personage Jacob or Israel is more frequently mentioned than any other in the whole of sacred history. Yet in the vast majority of cases the nation descended from him is intended by the name, which in the form of “Jacob” or “Israel” contains not the slightest, and in the form “children of Israel,” “house of Jacob” and the like, only the slightest, if any, allusion to the patriarch himself. But there still remain many passages in both Testaments where the Jacob or Israel of Genesis is clearly alluded to.

### *1. In the Old Testament:*

There is a considerable group of passages that refer to him as the last of the patriarchal triumvirate — Abraham, Isaac and Jacob: so particularly of Yahweh as the “God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob,” and of the covenant-oath as having been “sworn unto Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.” And naturally the nation that is known by his name is frequently called by some phrase, equivalent to the formal *bene yisra’el*, yet through its unusualness lending more significance to the idea of their derivation from him: so “seed of Jacob” and (frequently) “house of Jacob (Israel).” But there are a few Old Testament passages outside of Genesis in which so much of Jacob’s

history has been preserved, that from these allusions alone a fair notion might have been gathered concerning the Hebrews' tradition of their common ancestor, even if all the story in Genesis had been lost. These passages are: ~~<64B>~~ Joshua 24:3,4,32; ~~<9ASIO>~~ Psalm 105:10-23; ~~<8ICE>~~ Hosea 12:2-4,12; ~~<30ICE>~~ Malachi 1:2 f. Besides these, there are other allusions, scattered a word here and a sentence there, from all of which together we learn as follows. God gave to Isaac twin sons, Esau and Jacob, the latter at birth taking the former by the heel. God elected Jacob to be the recipient of the covenant-promise made to his father Isaac and to his grandfather Abraham; and this choice involved the rejection of Esau. Yahweh appeared to Jacob at Beth-el and told him the land of Canaan was to be his and his seed's after him forever. Circumstances not explained caused Jacob to flee from his home in Canaan to Aram, where he served as a shepherd to obtain a wife as his wage. He became the father of 12 sons. He strove with the angel of God and prevailed amid earnest supplication. His name was by Yahweh Himself changed to Israel. Under Divine protection as God's chosen one and representative, his life was that of a wanderer from place to place; once only he bought a piece of land, for a hundred pieces, near Shechem, from Hamor, the father of Shechem. A famine drove him down to Egypt, but not without providential preparation for the reception there of himself and all his family, through the remarkable fortunes of his son Joseph, sold, exiled, imprisoned, delivered, and exalted to a position where he could dispose of rulers and nations. In Egypt the children of Jacob multiplied rapidly, and at his death he made the sons of Joseph the heirs of the only portion of Canaanitish soil that he had acquired.

From this it appears, first, that not much that is essential in the biography of Jacob would have perished though Genesis had been lost; and, second, that the sum of the incidental allusions outside Genesis resemble the total impression of the narratives in Genesis — in other words, that the Biblical tradition is self-consistent. And it runs back to a date (Hosea, 8th century BC) little farther removed from the events recounted than the length of time that separates our own day from the Norman conquest, or the Fall of Constantinople from the Hegira, or Jesus Christ from Solomon.

## *2. In the New Testament:*

In the New Testament also there are, besides the references to Jacob simply as the father of his nation, several passages that recall events in his life or traits of his character. These are: ~~<60CB>~~ John 4:5,6,12; ~~<47D>~~ Acts 7:12,14-



16; ~~<800>~~ Romans 9:10-13; ~~<810>~~ Hebrews 11:9,20 f. In the conversation between Jesus and the Samaritan woman it appears that the Samaritans cherished the association of Jacob with the ground he bought near Shechem, and with the well he dug while sojourning there with his sons and his flocks; they prided themselves on its transmission to them through Joseph, not to the hated Jews through Judah, and magnified themselves in magnifying Jacob's "greatness" and calling him "our father." Stephen's speech, as Luke reports it, includes in its rapid historical flight a hint or two about Jacob beyond the bare fact of his place in the tribal genealogy. Moved by the famine prevailing in Egypt and Canaan, Jacob twice dispatches his sons to buy grain in Egypt, and the second time Joseph is made known to his brothers, and his race becomes manifest to Pharaoh. At Joseph's behest, Jacob and all the family remove to Egypt. There all remain until their death, but the "fathers" (Joseph and his brethren; compare Jerome, *Epistola cviii*, edition Migne) are buried in the family possession near Shechem. (Here emerges one of those divergences from the Old Testament tradition that are a notable feature of Stephen's speech, and that have furnished occasion for much speculation upon their origin, value and implications. See commentaries on Acts.) Paul's interest in Jacob appears in connection with his discussion of Divine election, where he calls attention to the oracle of ~~<023>~~ Genesis 25:23 and to the use already made of the passage by Malachi (1:2 f), and reminds his readers that this choice of Jacob and rejection of Esau was made by God even before these twin sons of Isaac and Rebecca were born. Finally, the author of He, when charting the heroes of faith, focuses his glass for a moment upon Jacob: first, as sharing with Abraham and Isaac the promise of God and the life of unworldly, expectant faith (~~<810>~~ Hebrews 11:9); and second, as receiving from Isaac, and at his death transmitting to his grandsons, blessings that had value only for one who worships and believes a God with power over "things to come" (~~<810>~~ Hebrews 11:20 f).

## VI. MODERN INTERPRETATIONS OF JACOB.

For those who see in the patriarchal narratives anything — myth, legend, saga — rather than true biography, there is, of course, a different interpretation of the characters and events portrayed in the familiar Genesis-stories, and a different value placed upon the stories themselves.

Apart from the allegorizing treatment accorded them by Philo the Jew and early Christian writers of like mind (see specimen in ABRAHAM), these

views belong to modern criticism. To critics who make Hebrew history begin with the settlement of Canaan by the nomad Israelites fresh from the desert, even the Mosaic age and the Egyptian residence are totally unhistorical — much more so these tales of a pre-Mosaic patriarchal age. Yet even those writers who admit the broad outlines of a residence of the tribes in Egypt, an exodus of some sort, and a founder of the nation named Moses, are for the most part skeptical of this cycle of family figures and fortunes in a remote age, with its nomads wandering between Mesopotamia and Canaan. and to and fro in Canaan, its circumstantial acquaintance with the names and relationships of each individual through those 4 long patriarchal generations, and its obvious foreshadowing of much that the later tribes were on this same soil to act out centuries later. This, we are told, is not history. Whatever else it may be, it is not a reliable account of such memorable events as compel their own immortality in the memories and through the written records of mankind.

### *1. Personification of the Hebrew Nation:*

The commonest view held, collectively of the entire narrative, specifically of Jacob, is that which sees here the precipitate from a pure solution of the national character and fortunes. Wellhausen, e.g., says (Prolegomena(6), 316): “The material here is not mythical, but national; therefore clearer (namely, than in Genesis 1 through 11) and in a certain sense historical. To be sure there is no historical knowledge to be gained here about the patriarchs, but only about the time in which the stories concerning them arose in the people of Israel; this later time with its inward and outward characteristics is here unintentionally projected into the gray antiquity and mirrored therein like a glorified phantasm .... (p. 318). Jacob is more realistically drawn than the other two (Abraham and Isaac).” In section IV, 4, above, we observed that, while many of Jacob’s personal qualities prefigured the qualities of the later Hebrew people, there were some others that did not at all fit this equation. Wellhausen himself remarks this, in regard to the contrast between warlike Israel and the peaceful ancestors they invented for themselves. In his attempt to account for this contrast, he can only urge that a nation condemned to eternal wars would naturally look back upon, as well as forward to, a golden age of peace. (An alternative explanation he states, only to reject.) He fails to observe that this plea does not in the least alter the fact — his plea is indeed but a restatement of the fact — that this phenomenon is absolutely at variance

with his hypothesis of how these stories of Jacob and the rest came to be what they are (see Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, 250 ff).

## *2. God and Demi-God:*

This general view, which when carried to its extreme implications (as by Steuernagel, *Die Einwanderung der israelitischen Stämme in Kanaan*, 1901) comes perilously near the *reductio ad absurdum* that is its own refutation, has been rejected by that whole group of critics, who, following Noldeke, see in Jacob, as in so many others of the patriarchs, an original deity (myth), first abased to the grade of a hero (heroic legend), and at last degraded to the level of a clown (tales of jest or marvel). Adherents of this trend of interpretation differ widely among themselves as to details, but Jacob is generally regarded as a Canaanitish deity, whose local shrine was at Shechem, Beth-el or Peniel, and whose cult was taken over by the Hebrews, their own object of worship being substituted for him, and the outstanding features of his personality being made over into a hero that Israel appropriated as their national ancestor, even to the extent of giving him the secondary name of Israel. Stade attempted a combination of this “mythical” view with the “national” view in the interest of his theory of primitive animism, by making the patriarch a “mythological figure revered as an eponymous hero.” This theory, in any form, requires the assumption, which there is nothing to support, that Jacob (or Jacob-el) is a name originally belonging to a deity and framed to fit his supposed character. At first, then, it meant “‘El deceives” or “‘El recompenses” (so B. Luther, *ZATW*, 1901, 60 ff; compare also the same writer, as well as Meyer himself, in the latter’s *Israeliten*, etc., 109 ff, 271 ff). Meyer proposes the monstrosity of a nominal sentence with the translation, “‘He deceives’ is ‘El.” Thus, the first element of the name Jacob came to be felt as the name itself (= “Jacob is God”), and it was launched upon its course of evolution into the human personage that Genesis knows. It suffices to say with regard to all this, that in addition to its being inherently improbable — not to say, unproved — it goes directly in the face of the archaeological evidence adduced under I, 1, above. The simple fact that Jacob(-el) was a personal name for men, of everyday occurrence in the 2nd-3rd millenniums BC, is quite enough to overthrow this whole hypothesis; for, as Luther himself remarks (*op. cit.*, 65), the above evolution of the name is essential to the “mythical” theory: “when this alteration took place cannot be told; yet it has to be postulated, since otherwise it remains inexplicable, how

personal names could arise out of these formations (like Jacob-el) by rejection of the 'El.'

### *3. Character of Fiction:*

The inadequacy of the two theories hitherto advanced to account for the facts of Genesis being thus evident, Gunkel and others have explicitly rejected them and enunciated a third theory, which may be called the saga-theory. According to Gunkel, "to understand the persons of Genesis as nations is by no means a general key to their interpretation"; and, "against the whole assumption that the principal patriarchal figures are originally gods is this fact first and foremost, that the names Jacob and Abraham are shown by the Babylonian to be customary personal names, and furthermore that the tales about them cannot be understood at all as echoes of original myths." In place of these discredited views Gunkel (compare also Gressmann, ZATW, 1910, 1 ff) makes of Jacob simply a character in the stories (marvelous, humorous, pathetic and the like) current in ancient Israel, especially on the lips of the professional story-teller. Whereas much of the material in these stories came to the Hebrews from the Babylonians, Canaanites or Egyptians, Jacob himself is declared to have belonged to the old Hebrew saga, with its flavor of nomadic desert life and sheep-raising. "The original Jacob may be the sly shepherd Jacob, who fools the hunter Esau; another tale, of the deceit of a father-in-law by his son-in-law, was added to it — the more naturally because both are shepherds; a third cycle, about an old man that loves his youngest son, was transferred to this figure, and that youngest son received the name of Joseph at a time when Jacob was identified with Israel's assumed ancestor 'Israel.' Thus our result is, that the most important patriarchs are creations of fiction" (Schriften des Altes Testament, 5te Lieferung, 42).

It is so obvious that this new attitude toward the patriarchs lends itself to a more sympathetic criticism of the narrative of Genesis, that critics who adopt it are at pains to deny any intention on their part of rehabilitating Jacob and others as historical figures. "Saga," we are told, "is not capable of preserving through so many centuries a picture" of the real character or deeds of its heroes, even supposing that persons bearing these names once actually lived; and we are reminded of the contrast between the Etzel of saga and the Attila of history, the Dietrich of saga and the Theodoric of history. But as against this we need to note, first, that the long and involved course of development through which, ex hypothesi, these stories

have passed before reaching their final stage (the Jahwist document (Jahwist), 9th century BC; Gunkel, op. cit., 8, 46) involves a very high antiquity for the earlier stages, and thus reduces to a narrow strip of time those “so many centuries” that are supposed to separate the actual Jacob from the Jacob of saga (compare ABRAHAM, VII, 4); and second, that the presuppositions as to the origin, nature and value of saga with which this school of criticism operates are, for the most part, only an elaborate statement of the undisputed major premise in a syllogism, of which the minor premise is: the Genesis-stories are saga. Against this last proposition, however, there lie many weighty considerations, that are by no means counterbalanced by those resemblances of a general sort which any student of comparative literature can easily discern (see also Baethgen, op. cit., 158).

*James Oscar Boyd*

## JACOB (2)

([**bqḏy**” , *ya`aqobh*]; [ **Ἰακώβ**, *Iakob*]):

- (1) The patriarch (see preceding article).
- (2) The father of Joseph the husband of Mary (~~4015~~ Matthew 1:15,16).
- (3) Patronymic denoting the Israelites (~~23021~~ Isaiah 10:21; 14:1; ~~2406~~ Jeremiah 10:16).

## JACOB, TESTAMENT OF

*See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.*

## JACOB’S WELL

([**πηγή τοῦ Ἰακώβ**, *pege tou Iakob*]):

### 1. POSITION OF WELL:

In ~~4015~~ John 4:3 ff we read that our Lord “left Judea, and departed again into Galilee. And he must needs pass through Samaria. So he cometh to a city of Samaria, called Sychar, near to the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph: and Jacob’s well was there.” When Jacob came to Shechem on his return from Paddanaram he encamped “before,” i.e. East of the city, and bought the land on which he had spread his tent

(<sup><01318></sup>Genesis 33:18 f). This is doubtless the “portion” (Hebrew *shekhem*) spoken of in <sup><01482></sup>Genesis 48:22; although there it is said to have been taken with sword and bow from the Amorites. Where the pass of Shechem opens to the East, near the northern edge of the valley, lies the traditional tomb of Joseph. On the other side of the vale, close to the base of Gerizim, is the well universally known as Bir Ya`qub, “the well of Jacob.” The position meets perfectly the requirements of the narrative. The main road from the South splits a little to the East, one arm leading westward through the pass, the other going more directly to the North. It is probable that these paths follow pretty closely the ancient tracks; and both would be frequented in Jesus’ day. Which of them He took we cannot tell; but, in any case, this well lay in the fork between them, and could be approached with equal ease from either.

See *SYCHAR*.

## 2. WHY DUG:

In the chapter quoted, it is said that Jacob dug the well (<sup><01482></sup>Genesis 48:12). The Old Testament says nothing of this. With the copious springs at `Ain `Askar and BalaTa, one might ask why a well should have been dug here at all. We must remember that in the East, very strict laws have always governed the use of water, especially when there were large herds to be considered. The purchase of land here may not have secured for Jacob such supplies as he required. There was danger of strife between rival herdsmen. The patriarch, therefore, may have dug the well in the interests of peace, and also to preserve his own independence.

## 3. CONSENSUS OF TRADITION:

Jew, Samaritan, Moslem and Christian agree in associating this well with the patriarch Jacob. This creates a strong presumption in favor of the tradition: and there is no good reason to doubt its truth. Standing at the brink of the well, over-shadowed by the giant bulk of Gerizim, one feels how naturally it would be spoken of as “this mountain.”

## 4. DESCRIPTION:

For long the well was unprotected, opening among the ruins of a vaulted chamber some feet below the surface of the ground. Major Anderson describes it (Recovery of Jerusalem, 465) as having “a narrow opening,

just wide enough to allow the body of a man to pass through with arms uplifted, and this narrow neck, which is about 4 ft. long, opens into the well itself, which is cylindrically shaped, and about 7 ft. 6 inches in diameter. The mouth and upper part of the well are built of masonry, and the well appears to have been sunk through a mixture of alluvial soil and limestone fragments, till a compact bed of mountain limestone was reached, having horizontal strata which could be easily worked; and the interior of the well presents the appearance of having been lined throughout with rough masonry." The depth was doubtless much greater in ancient times; but much rubbish has fallen into it, and now it is not more than 75 ft. deep. It is fed by no spring, nor is the water conducted to it along the surface, as to a cistern. Its supplies depend entirely upon rainfall and percolation. Possibly, therefore, the water may never have approached the brim. The woman says "the well is deep." Pege, "spring," does not, therefore, strictly apply to it, but rather "tank" or "reservoir," phrear, the word actually used in verses 11 f. The modern inhabitants of Nablus highly esteem the "light" water of the well as compared with the "heavy" or "hard" water of the neighboring springs. It usually lasts till about the end of May; then the well is dry till the return of the rain. Its contents, therefore, differ from the "living" water of the perennial spring.

From the narratives of the pilgrims we learn that at different times churches have been built over the well. The Moslems probably demolished the last of them after the overthrow of the Crusaders in 1187. A description of the ruins with drawings, as they were 30 years ago, is given in PEF, II, 174, etc. A stone found in 1881 may have been the original cover of the well. It measures 3 ft. 9 inches X 2 ft. 7 inches X 1 ft. 6 in. The aperture in the center is 13 in. in diameter; and in its sides are grooves worn by the ropes used in drawing up the water (PEFS, 1881, 212 ff).

## **5. PRESENT CONDITION:**

Some years ago the plot of ground containing the well was purchased by the authorities of the Greek church, and it has been surrounded by a wall. A chapel has been built over the well, and a large church building has also been erected beside it.

*W. Ewing*

## JACUBUS

<ja-ku'-bus> ([<sup>7</sup> **Ιάκουβος**, *Iakoubos*]; Codex Vaticanus reads [*Iarsouboos*]): In 1 Esdras 9:48 = “Akkub” in <sup><13026></sup>Nehemiah 8:7, a Levite who helped in the exposition of the law.

## JADA

<ja'-da> ([<sup>1</sup> **דַּי**, *yadha`*], “the knowing one”): Son of Onam and grandson of Jerahmeel by his wife Atarah (<sup><13026></sup>1 Chronicles 2:26,28,32).

## JADAU

<ja'-do>, <ja-da'-u> ([<sup>1</sup> **דַּי** *yiddo*], Kethibh; [<sup>1</sup> **דַּי** *y" y"* , *yadday*], Qere the King James Version; but the Revised Version (British and American) IDDO): In Ezr 10:43, one of those who had married foreign wives. the Revised Version margin has “Jaddai” (= “Edos,” 1 Esdras 9:35).

See IDDO.

## JADDAI

<jad'-i>, <jad'-a-i>.

See IDDO; JADAU.

## JADDUA

<jad'-u-a>, <ja-du'-a> ([<sup>1</sup> **דַּי** *yaddua`*], “known”):

(1) One of the “chiefs of the people” who with Nehemiah sealed the covenant, thus signifying their voluntary acceptance of the law and their solemn promise to submit to its yoke (<sup><16021></sup>Nehemiah 10:21 (Hebrew 22)).

(2) Son of Jonathan or Johanan, and great-grandson of Eliashib, the high priest in Nehemiah’s time (<sup><16021></sup>Nehemiah 12:11,22). He is the last of the high priests mentioned in the Old Testament, and held office during the reign of Darius the Persian, i.e. Darius III Codomannus, the last king of Persia (336-332 BC), who was overthrown by Alexander the Great. It is doubtless to him that Josephus refers in his romantic account of Alexander’s entrance into Jerusalem (Ant., XI, viii, 4 f; vii, 2; viii, 7).



*James Crichton*

## JADDUS

<jaḏ'-us> (Codex Vaticanus, [ ᾿Ιαδδούς, *Iaddous*]; Codex Alexandrinus, [ ᾿Ιοδδούς, *Ioddous*]): the King James Version has “Addus” = Barzillai (Ezr 2:61; <1076> Nehemiah 7:63). Jaddus was removed from the office of the priesthood because he could not prove his right to it after the return to Jerusalem under Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:38). He is called Barzillai in the Old Testament, because he married Augia, the daughter of Zorzelleus (Barzillai the Gileadite, in the Old Testament). Compare *BARZILLAI*.

## JADON

<ja'-don> ([ ʷɔy; *yadhon*], perhaps “he will judge” or “plead”): One who helped to rebuild the wall of Jerusalem in company with the men of Gibeon and of Mizpah (<1076> Nehemiah 3:7). He is called the “Meronothite,” and another Meronothite is referred to in <1373> 1 Chronicles 27:30, but there is no mention of a place Meronoth. Jadon is the name given by Josephus (*Ant.*, VIII, viii, 5; ix, 1) to “the man of God” from Judah who confronted Jeroboam as he burned incense at the altar in Bethel, and who was afterward deceived by the lie of the old prophet (1 Kings 13). Josephus may probably have meant Iddo the seer, whose visions concerning Jeroboam (<1076> 2 Chronicles 9:29) led to his being identified in Jewish tradition with “the man of God”, from Judah.

*James Crichton*

## JAEL

<ja'-el> ([I [ ʝ ya`el], “a wild or mountain goat,” as in <1048> Psalm 104:18; [ ᾿Ιαήλ, *Iael*]): The wife of Heber the Kenite and the slayer of Sisera (<1076> Judges 4:17-22; 5:2-31). Jael emerges from obscurity by this single deed, and by the kindest construction can hardly be said to have reached an enviable fame. The history of this event is clear. For years Jabin the king of Canaan had oppressed Israel. For twenty years the Israelites had been subject to him, and, in largest measure, the instrument of their subjugation had been Sisera, the king’s general, the “man of the iron chariots.” Deborah, a prophetess of Israel, by her passion for freedom, had roused the tribes of Israel to do battle against Sisera. They defeated him at “Taanach by the waters of Megiddo,” but Sisera sought in flight to save himself. He

came to the “oaks of the wanderers,” where the tribe of Heber lived. Here he sought, and was probably invited, to take shelter in the tent of Jael (<sup><JH17></sup>Judges 4:17-18). There are two accounts of the subsequent events — one a prose narrative (<sup><JH19></sup>Judges 4:19-22), the other a poetic one, found in Deborah’s song of triumph (<sup><JH24></sup>Judges 5:24-27). The two accounts are as nearly in agreement as could be expected, considering their difference in form.

It is evident that the tribe of Heber was regarded by both parties to the struggle as being neutral. They were descendants of Jethro, and hence, had the confidence of the Israelites. Though they had suffered somewhat at the hands of the Canaanites they had made a formal contract of peace with Jabin. Naturally Sisera could turn to the tents of Heber in Kadesh-naphtali with some confidence. The current laws of hospitality gave an added element of safety. Whether Jael met Sisera and urged him to enter her tent and rest (<sup><JH18></sup>Judges 4:18), or only invited him after his appeal for refuge, the fact remains that he was her guest, was in the sanctuary of her home, and protected by the laws of hospitality: She gave him milk to drink, a mantle for covering, and apparently acquiesced in his request that she should stand guard at the tent and deny his presence to any pursuers. When sleep came to the wearied fugitive she took a “tent-pin, and took a hammer in her hand, and went softly unto him, and smote the pin into his temples” (<sup><JH21></sup>Judges 4:21), and having murdered him, goes forth to meet Barak the Israelite general and claims the credit for her deed. Some critics suggest that Sisera was not asleep when murdered, and thus try to convert Jael’s treachery into strategy. But to kill your guest while he is drinking the milk of hospitality is little less culpable than to murder him while asleep. There is no evidence that Sisera offered Jael any insult or violence, and but little probability that she acted under any spiritual or Divine suggestion. It is really impossible to justify Jael’s act, though it is not impossible to understand it or properly to appreciate Deborah’s approval of the act as found in <sup><JH24></sup>Judges 5:24. The motive of Jael may have been a mixed one. She may have been a sympathizer with Israel and with the religion of Israel. But the narrative scarcely warrants the interpretation that she felt herself as one called to render “stern justice on an enemy of God” (Expositor’s Bible). Jael was unquestionably prudential. Sisera was in flight and Barak in pursuit. Probably her sympathy was with Barak, but certainly reflection would show her that it would not be wisdom to permit Barak to find Sisera in her tent. She knew, too, that death would be Sisera’s portion should he

be captured — therefore she would kill him and thus cement a friendship with the conqueror.

As to Deborah's praise of Jael (~~QREB~~ Judges 5:24), there is no call to think that in her hour of triumph she was either capable of or intending to appraise the moral quality of Jael's deed. Her country's enemy was dead and that too at the hand of a woman. The woman who would kill Sisera must be the friend of Israel. Deborah had no question of the propriety of meting out death to a defeated persecutor. Her times were not such as to raise this question. The method of his death mattered little to her, for all the laws of peace were abrogated in the times of war. Therefore Jael was blessed among women by all who loved Israel. Whether Deborah thought her also to be worthy of the blessing of God we may not tell. At any rate there is no need for us to try to justify the treachery of Jael in order to explain the words of Deborah.

*C. E. Schenk*

## JAGUR

<ja'-gur> ([rWgy; yaghur]): An unidentified town on the Edomite frontier of Judah in the South (~~QREB~~ Joshua 15:21).

## JAH

<ja>.

*See GOD, NAMES OF.*

## JAHATH

<ja'-hath> ([tj " y" , yachath], perhaps for [hTj j̃" , yachteh], [htj j̃" , yachatheh], "he (God) will snatch up"):

(1) Son of Reaiah, son of Shobal, a descendant of Judah, and father of Ahumai and Lahad, the families of the Zorathites (~~QREB~~ 1 Chronicles 4:2).

(2) A frequent name for a descendant of Levi:

(a) Son of Libni, son of Gershom, the eldest son of Levi (~~QREB~~ 1 Chronicles 6:20,43 (Hebrew 6:5,28), where "son of Libni" is omitted).

(b) Son of Shimei, son of Gershom (~~QREB~~ 1 Chronicles 23:10 f).

(c) One of the “sons” of Shelomoth, a descendant of Izhar, son of Kohath, the second son of Levi (~~1302~~ 1 Chronicles 24:22).

(d) A descendant of Merari, the third son of Levi, and an overseer in the repairing of the temple in the reign of Josiah (~~4412~~ 2 Chronicles 34:12).

*James Crichton*

## JHAZ

<ja'-haz> ([6h" y" , yahats], ~~23406~~ Isaiah 16:4; ~~24834~~ Jeremiah 48:34, [hxhÿ" , yahatsah], or [hxhÿ" , yahtsah], ~~40223~~ Numbers 21:23; ~~68122~~ Deuteronomy 2:32; ~~68318~~ Joshua 13:18; 21:36, the King James Version “Jahazah”; ~~71121~~ Judges 11:20; ~~24821~~ Jeremiah 48:21; ~~1358~~ 1 Chronicles 6:78, “Jahzah”): This is the place where in a great battle Israel overwhelmed Sihon king of the Amorites, and then took possession of all his territory (~~40223~~ Numbers 21:23, etc.). It is named along with Beth-baal-meon and Kedemoth (~~68318~~ Joshua 13:18), with Kedemoth (~~40237~~ Joshua 21:37) pointing to a position in the Southeast of the Amorite territory. It was given to Reuben by Moses, and was one of the cities in the portion of that tribe assigned to the Merarite Levites. Mesha (MS, ll. 18 if) says that the king of Israel dwelt in Jahaz when at war with him. Mesha drove him out, and the city passed into the hands of Moab. It is referred to as a city of Moab in ~~23574~~ Isaiah 15:4; ~~24821~~ Jeremiah 48:21,34. Cheyne thinks that either Jahaz or Kedemoth must be represented today by the important ruins of Umm er-Rcac, about 2 1/2 hours North of Dibon toward the desert (EB, under the word). No certain identification is possible.

*W. Ewing*

## JHAZIAH

<ja-ha-zi'-a>: the King James Version for *JAHZEIAH* (which see).

## JHAZIEL

<ja-ha'-zi-el> ([l aʒj ÿ" , yachazi'el], “God sees”):

(1) In ~~33204~~ 1 Chronicles 12:4 (Hebrew 5), one of David’s recruits at Ziklag, a Benjamite or maybe a Judean.

- (2) In <sup><316></sup>1 Chronicles 16:6, one of two priests appointed by David to sound trumpets before the ark on its journey to Jerusalem. The Septuagint's Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus, read "Uzziel."
- (3) In <sup><329></sup>1 Chronicles 23:19; 24:23, a Levite, "son" of Hebron, a Kohathite. Kittel, following the Septuagint, reads "Uzziel."
- (4) In <sup><414></sup>2 Chronicles 20:14, an Asaphite, son of Zechariah. He encouraged King Jehoshaphat of Judah and his subjects to fight against the Moabite and Ammonite invaders.
- (5) In Ezr 8:5, an ancestor of one of the families of the Restoration. Read probably "of the sons of Zattu, Sheconiah the son of Jahaziel," following 1 Esdras 8:32 (= Jezelus).

*David Francis Roberts*

## JAHD AI

<ja'-da-i>, <ja'-di> ([yD" hȳ" , yahday], "Yah leads" (?); Baer reads [yD" hȳ, yehday]): In <sup><134></sup>1 Chronicles 2:47, where six sons of Jahdai are mentioned. "The name has been taken as that of another wife or concubine of Caleb; more probably Jahdai is a descendant of Caleb, whose name, in the original connection, has fallen from the text" (Curtis, Chronicles, 96).

## JAHDIEL

<ja'-di-el> ([l aDj ȳ" , yachdi'el], "God gives joy"): In <sup><152></sup>1 Chronicles 5:24, head of a Manassite family.

## JAHD O

<ja'-do> ([wDj ȳ" , yachdo], meaning uncertain; Kittel suggests [yD" j ȳ" , yachday] = Jahdai): In <sup><154></sup>1 Chronicles 5:14, a Gileadite.

## JAHLEEL

<ja'-le-el> ([l aEj ȳ" , yachle'el], "wait for God!"): In <sup><144></sup>Genesis 46:14; <sup><103></sup>Numbers 26:26, a "son" (i.e. clan) of Zebulun.

## JAHLEELITES, THE

<ja'-le-el-its> ([yl ǎɛ] ʔ" h" , *hayachle'eli*), coll. with article): In <sup><1426></sup>Numbers 26:26, the descendants of the clan of Jahleel.

## JAHMAI

<ja'-ma-i>, <ja'-mi> ([ym" j ʔ" , *yachmay*], perhaps = [hym] ʔ" , *yachmeyah*], “may Yahweh protect!”): In <sup><1372></sup>1 Chronicles 7:2, head of a clan of Issachar.

## JAHWEH

<ya'-we>.

*See GOD, NAMES OF.*

## JAHZAH

<ja'-za>.

*See JAHAZ.*

## JAHZEEL AND JAHZIEL

<ja'-ze-el> ([l ǎɛ] ʔ" , *yachtse'el*], “God divides,” “apportions”): In <sup><1424></sup>Genesis 46:24; <sup><1458></sup>Numbers 26:48; and 23 manuscripts in <sup><13713></sup>1 Chronicles 7:13; ([l ǎɛxj ʔ" , *yachatsi'el*], same meaning as above): <sup><13713></sup>1 Chronicles 7:13, a “son” (clan) of Naphtali.

## JAHZEELITES, THE

<ja'-ze-el-its> ([yl ǎɛ] ʔ" h" , *hayachtse'eli*], coll. with article): In <sup><1458></sup>Numbers 26:48, descendants of the clan of Jahzeel.

## JAHZEIAH

<ja-ze'-ya>, <ja'-ze-ya> ([hyz] ʔ" , *yachzeyah*], “Yah sees”): In Ezr 10:15, son of Tikvah, and a contemporary of Ezra. It is disputed whether he and Jonathan opposed or supported Ezra in the matter of prosecuting those who had married foreign wives = Ezekias, 1 Esdras 9:14, or Ezias.

See *JONATHAN*, 9.

Two translations of the Hebrew phrase ([*taʔal* [*ʔdm*] ; *ʔamadh ʔal-zoʔth*]) are given:

(1) “stood over this matter,” i.e. supported Ezra; so the King James Version (“were employed in this matter”), and so Septuagint, 1 Esdras 9:14, the Revised Version margin. This is supported by 9:4, “Let now our princes be appointed for all the assembly,” where the same phrase is found.

(2) the Revised Version (British and American) “stood up against this matter,” so BDB, Gesenius, Bertheau, Stade. Both translations can be supported by parallels in Hebrew. The context is better suited by the former rendering.

*David Francis Roberts*

## JAHZERAH

<*jaʔ-ze-ra*>, <*ja-zeʔ-ra*> ([*hrzəj̥* , *yachzerah*], meaning unknown): In <sup><392></sup>1 Chronicles 9:12, an ancestor of Maasai and apparently = “Ahzai” of <sup><6113></sup>Nehemiah 11:13.

## JAHZIEL

<*jaʔ-zi-el*>.

See *JAHZEEL*.

## JAILOR

<*jalʔ-er*>.

See *PRISON*.

## JAIR

<*jaʔ-er*>:

(1) Jair ([*ryaj̥*; *yaʔir*], “he enlightens” or “one giving light”):

(a) Son, i.e. descendant of Manasseh (<sup><4634></sup>Numbers 32:41; <sup><884></sup>Deuteronomy 3:14; <sup><4630></sup>Joshua 13:30; <sup><1043></sup>1 Kings 4:13: <sup><3022></sup>1

Chronicles 2:22 f). According to <sup><1322></sup>1 Chronicles 2:21 f he was the son of ScRub, son of Hezron, a descendant of Judah, who married the daughter of Machir, son of Manasseh. He was thus descended both from Judah and Manasseh. At the time of the conquest he distinguished himself by taking the tent-villages *HAVVOTH-JAIR* (which see). The accounts of his exploit are difficult to harmonize (see ICC on above passages). Some would identify him with the Jair of <sup><0701B></sup>Judges 10:3, holding that Manasseh's settlement in Northern Gilead and Bashan took place, not before Israel's passage of the Jordan, but after the settlement of the tribe on the West. For a criticism of this view see HGHL, 577, note

**(b)** One of the judges. He is said to have had 30 sons, who rode on 30 ass colts, and who had as many cities, known as Havvoth-jair (<sup><0701B></sup>Judges 10:3,4). One tradition identifies (a) and (b). Others reconcile the two narratives by interpreting the word "son" in a non-literal sense.

**(c)** The father of Mordecai (<sup><1701B></sup>Esther 2:5). In the Apocrypha (Additions to Esther 11:2) his name is given as "Jairus" ([ ' *Ιάειρος*, *Iaeiros*]).

**(2)** Jair (Qere: [*ry*[*y*; *ya`ir*], "he arouses"; Kethibh: [*rW*[*y*; *ya`ur*]; a different name from (1) above): The father of Elhanan, the giant-slayer (<sup><1301B></sup>1 Chronicles 20:5). In the parallel passage (<sup><1219></sup>2 Samuel 21:19) his name is given as "Jaare-oregim," but the text should be corrected to Jair, "oregim" ('oreghim) having crept in from the line below through a copyist's error.

*James Crichton*

## JAIRITE

<sup><ja'-er-it></sup> ([*yräy*; *ya'iri*], "of Jair"): In <sup><1006></sup>2 Samuel 20:26, Ira the Jairite is "chief minister unto David." He was a descendant of Jair who was a Manassite (<sup><0634></sup>Numbers 32:41, etc.) and whose territory was in Gilead. Septuagint, Lucian, and Syriac suggest [*yrīy*" , *yattiri*], "Jattirite," i.e. a native of Jattir mentioned in <sup><0807></sup>1 Samuel 30:27 as one of the towns friendly to David when he was in Ziklag. It is not improbable that a native of Jattir would be given such a post by David.



See *IRA*, and compare <sup>ⲁⲓⲣⲱⲥ</sup>2 Samuel 23:38.

## JAIRUS (1)

<ja'-i-rus>, <ja-i'-rus> ([<sup>ⲓ</sup> ⲓⲁⲓⲣⲱⲥ, *Iaeiros*]; 1 Esdras 5:31; Additions to Esther 11:2).

See *AIRUS*; *JAIR*.

## JAIRUS (2)

<ja'-i-rus>, <ja-i'-rus> ([<sup>ⲓ</sup> ⲓⲁⲓⲣⲱⲥ, *Iaeiros*]): A ruler in a synagogue near Capernaum whose only daughter, aged about 12 years, was raised from the dead by Jesus (<sup>ⲁⲓⲣⲱⲥ</sup>Matthew 9:18-26; <sup>ⲁⲓⲣⲱⲥ</sup>Mark 5:22-43; <sup>ⲁⲓⲣⲱⲥ</sup>Luke 8:41-56). The accounts of the miracle are substantially the same, but vary in detail. According to Mark and Luke the arrival of Jairus in Capernaum fell immediately after the return of Jesus from Gadara, but according to Matthew the sequence of events was that Jesus had returned to Capernaum, had called Matthew, had joined the feast of the publicans, and had just finished His discourse on fasting when Jairus came to Him. Matthew and Mark both testify to the great faith of Jairus, who besought of Jesus that He should but lay His hand upon the maid and she should live. According to Matthew she was already dead when Jairus came to Capernaum; according to the others she was on the point of death; but all agree as to her death before the arrival of Jesus and His followers at her abode. Matthew implies that Jesus alone was present at the actual raising; Mark and Luke state that Peter, James, John and the parents were also there. The healing of the woman with the issue of blood by Jesus on the way is given by all.

*C. M. Kerr*

## JAKAN

<ja'-kan> ([<sup>ⲕⲁⲛ</sup>ⲓⲁⲛ, *ya`aqan*]).

See *JAAKAN*.

## JAKEH

<ja'-ke> ([<sup>ⲕⲁⲕⲉ</sup>ⲓⲁⲕⲉ, *yaqeh*], perhaps from Arabic root meaning “carefully religious”; [<sup>ⲁⲕⲕⲉ</sup>ⲓⲁⲕⲉ, *yaqe'*], as if from [<sup>ⲁⲕⲕⲉ</sup>ⲓⲁⲕⲉ *qi'*]): The father of Agur, the

author of the sayings recorded in ~~<300>~~Proverbs 30:1. Nothing is known of either Jakeh or Agur. The immediate connection in the Hebrew text of *ha-massa*’, “the prophecy” or “burden” (the King James Version “even the prophecy,” the Revised Version (British and American) “the oracle”) with *ne’um*, “oracle” (the King James Version “spake,” the Revised Version (British and American) “saith”) is quite exceptional, while the verse is unintelligible and the text, as the Septuagint shows, is evidently corrupt. The best emendation is that which changes *ha-massa*’, “the prophecy,” into *ha-massa’i*, “the Massaite,” or into *mimmassa*’, “of Massa” (Revised Version margin), Massa being the name of the country of an Ishmaelite tribe (compare ~~<0254>~~Genesis 25:14; ~~<0303>~~1 Chronicles 1:30; ~~<0300>~~Proverbs 31:1 the Revised Version margin).

*See AGUR.*

*James Crichton*

## JAKIM

~~<ja’-kim>~~ ([~~μ~~~~qj~~; *yaqim*], “he (God) lifteth Up”; compare ELIAKIM):

- (1) A Benjamite, a son of Shimei (~~<0309>~~1 Chronicles 8:19).
- (2) A priest, the head of the 12th of the 24 courses into which the priests were divided (~~<0302>~~1 Chronicles 24:12).

## JALAM

~~<ja’-lam>~~ ([~~μ~~ [~~j~~]” , *ya`lam*], according to BDB following Septuagint [ ~~Ἰεγλόμ~~, *Ieglom*], in Gen, from [~~μ~~ “ [~~j~~; `alam], meaning “to conceal”; according to Gunkel, Gen3, 390, from [~~l~~ [~~j~~ ~~g~~, *ya`el*], “mountain-goat”; see HPN, 90, note 5; King James Version Jaalam): In ~~<0305>~~Genesis 36:5,14,18; ~~<0305>~~1 Chronicles 1:35, a son of Esau, mentioned as the 2nd son by Oholibamah; probably an Edomite clan.

## JALON

~~<ja’-lon>~~ ([~~w~~~~Dy~~; *yalon*], meaning unknown): In ~~<0307>~~1 Chronicles 4:17, a son of Ezrah, a Judahite.

## JAMBRES

<jam'-brez>.

*See JANNES AND JAMBRES.*

## JAMBRI

<jam'-bri> ([οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰαμβρεῖν, *hoi huioi Iambrein*]; 1 Macc 9:36-41):

The sons of Jambri are said to have come out of Medeba (originally Med'ba), a city of the Moabites, and subsequently a possession of the Amorites, and to have carried off John, the brother of Jonathan, who succeeded Judas Maccabeus as leader of the Jews. The Israelites got possession of the place and assigned it to the tribe of Reuben. No mention is made elsewhere of the Jambri. In Josephus (*Ant.*, XIII, i, 2) they are called “sons of Amaraeus.”

## JAMES

<jamz> ([Ἰάκωβος, *Iacobos*]): English form of Jacob, and the name of 3 New Testament men of note:

(1) The Son of Zebedee, one of the Twelve Apostles ([ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, *ho tou Zebedaiou*):

### A) THE SON OF ZEBEDEE:

#### *I. In the New Testament.*

#### 1. Family Relations, etc.:

To the Synoptists alone are we indebted for any account of this James. He was the son of Zebedee and the brother of John (<sup><1019></sup>Matthew 4:21; <sup><1019></sup>Mark 1:19; <sup><1050></sup>Luke 5:10). As the Synoptists generally place the name of James before that of John, and allude to the latter as “the brother of James,” it is inferred that James was the elder of the two brothers. His mother’s name was probably Salome, the sister of the mother of Jesus (compare <sup><1276></sup>Matthew 27:56; <sup><1150></sup>Mark 15:40; <sup><1025></sup>John 19:25), but this is disputed by some (compare *BRETHREN OF THE LORD*). James was a fisherman by trade, and worked along with his father and brother (<sup><1025></sup>Matthew 4:21). According to Lk, these were partners with Simon (5:10), and this is also implied in Mark (1:19). As they owned several boats

and employed hired servants (~~<451>~~ Luke 5:11; ~~<4002>~~ Mark 1:20), the establishment they possessed must have been considerable.

## 2. First Call:

The call to James to follow Christ (~~<4048>~~ Matthew 4:18-22; ~~<4016>~~ Mark 1:16-20; ~~<4071>~~ Luke 5:1-11) was given by Jesus as He was walking by the sea of Galilee (~~<4048>~~ Matthew 4:18). There He saw “James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, in the boat with Zebedee their father, mending their nets; and he called them. And they straightway left the boat and their father, and followed him” (~~<4021>~~ Matthew 4:21,22). The account of Luke varies in part from those of Matthew and Mark, and contains the additional detail of the miraculous draught of fishes, at which James and John also were amazed. This version of Luke is regarded by some as an amalgamation of the earlier accounts with ~~<4200>~~ John 21:1-8.

## 3. Probation and Ordination:

As the above incident took place after the imprisonment of John the Baptist, when Jesus had departed into Galilee (~~<4042>~~ Matthew 4:12; ~~<4014>~~ Mark 1:14), and as there is no mention of James among those who received the preliminary call recorded by John (compare ~~<4035>~~ John 1:35-51; 3:24, and compare ANDREW), it is probable that while Peter and Andrew made the pilgrimage to Bethany, James and the other partners remained in Galilee to carry on the business of their trade. Yet, on the return of Peter and Andrew, the inquiries of James must have been eager concerning what they had seen and heard. His mind and imagination became filled with their glowing accounts of the newly found “Lamb of God” (~~<4036>~~ John 1:36) and of the preaching of John the Baptist, until he inwardly dedicated his life to Jesus and only awaited an opportunity to declare his allegiance openly. By this is the apparently abrupt nature of the call, as recorded by the Synoptists, to be explained. After a period of companionship and probationership with his Master, when he is mentioned as being present at the healing of Simon’s wife’s mother at Capernaum (~~<4029>~~ Mark 1:29-31), he was ordained one of the Twelve Apostles (~~<4002>~~ Matthew 10:2; ~~<4057>~~ Mark 3:17; ~~<4064>~~ Luke 6:14; ~~<4013>~~ Acts 1:13).

## 4. Apostleship:

From this time onward he occupied a prominent place among the apostles, and, along with Peter and John, became the special confidant of Jesus.

These three alone of the apostles were present at the raising of Jairus' daughter (<sup><4037></sup>Mark 5:37; <sup><4051></sup>Luke 8:51), at the Transfiguration (Mr 17:1-8; <sup><4002></sup>Mark 9:2-8; <sup><4003></sup>Luke 9:28-36), and at the Agony in the Garden of Gethsemane (<sup><4056></sup>Matthew 26:36-46; <sup><4142></sup>Mark 14:32-42). Shortly after the Transfiguration, when Jesus, having "stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem" (<sup><4051></sup>Luke 9:51), was passing through Samaria, the ire of James and John was kindled by the ill reception accorded to Him by the populace (<sup><4053></sup>Luke 9:53). They therefore asked of Jesus, "Lord, wilt thou that we bid fire to come down from heaven, and consume them?" (<sup><4054></sup>Luke 9:54). "But he turned, and rebuked them" (<sup><4055></sup>Luke 9:55). It was probably this hotheaded impetuosity and fanaticism that won for them the surname "Boanerges, which is, Sons of thunder," bestowed on them when they were ordained to the Twelve (<sup><4037></sup>Mark 3:17). Yet upon this last occasion, there was some excuse for their action. The impression left by the Transfiguration was still deep upon them, and they felt strongly that their Lord, whom they had lately beheld "in his glory" with "countenance altered" and "glistening raiment," should be subjected to such indignities by the Samaritans. Upon the occasion of Jesus' last journey to Jerusalem (<sup><4103></sup>Mark 10:32), the two brothers gave expression to this presumptuous impetuosity in a more selfish manner (<sup><4105></sup>Mark 10:35-45). Presuming on their intimacy with Jesus, they made the request of him, "Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and one on thy left hand, in thy glory" (<sup><4107></sup>Mark 10:37). In the account of Matthew (20:20-28), the words are put in the mouth of their mother. The request drew forth the rebuke of Jesus (<sup><4108></sup>Mark 10:38), and moved the ten with indignation (<sup><4100></sup>Mark 10:40); but by the words of their Lord peace was again restored (<sup><4102></sup>Mark 10:42-45). After the arrival of Jesus in Jerusalem, when He "sat on the mount of Olives over against the temple," James was one of the four who put the question to Him concerning the last things (<sup><4133></sup>Mark 13:3,1). He was also present when the risen Jesus appeared for the 3rd time to the disciples and the miraculous draught of fishes was made at the sea of Tiberias (<sup><4300></sup>John 21:1-14).

## 5. Death:

James was the first martyr among the apostles, being slain by King Herod Agrippa I about 44 AD, shortly before Herod's own death. The vehemence and fanaticism which were characteristic of James had made him to be feared and hated among the Jewish enemies of the Christians, and therefore when "Herod the king put forth his hands to afflict certain of the church ....

he killed James the brother of John with the sword” (ⲁⲓⲛⲁ Acts 12:1,2). Thus did James fulfill the prophecy of our Lord that he too should drink of the cup of his Master (ⲁⲓⲙⲁⲓ Mark 10:39).

## *II. In Apocryphal Literature.*

According to the “Genealogies of the Twelve Apostles” (compare Budge, *Contendings of the Apostles*, II, 49), “Zebedee was of the house of Levi, and his wife of the house of Judah. Now, because the father of James loved him greatly he counted him among the family of his father Levi, and similarly because the mother of John loved him greatly, she counted him among the family of her father Judah. And they were surnamed ‘Children of Thunder,’ for they were of both the priestly house and of the royal house.” The Acts of John, a heretical work of the 2nd century, referred to by Clement of Alexandria in his *Hypotyposis* and also by Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, III, 25), gives an account of the call of James and his presence at the Transfiguration, similar in part to that of the Gospels, but giving fantastic details concerning the supernatural nature of Christ’s body, and how its appearances brought confusion to James and other disciples (compare Itennecke, *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, 423-59). The Acts of James in India (compare Budge, II, 295-303) tells of the missionary journey of James and Peter to India, of the appearance of Christ to them in the form of a beautiful young man, of their healing a blind man, and of their imprisonment, miraculous release, and their conversion of the people. According to the *Martyrdom of James* (Budge, II, 304-8), James preached to the 12 tribes scattered abroad, and persuaded them to give their first-fruits to the church instead of to Herod. The accounts of his trial and death are similar to that in ⲁⲓⲛⲁ Acts 12:1-2.

**(1)** James is the patron saint of Spain. The legend of his preaching there, of his death in Judea, of the transportation of his body under the guidance of angels to Iria and of the part that his miraculous appearances played in the history of Spain, is given in Mrs. Jameson’s *Sacred and Legendary Art*, I, 230-41.

**(2)** James the son of Alphaeus ([ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, *ho tou Alphaiou*]; for etymology, etc., of James, see above): One of the Twelve Apostles (ⲁⲓⲙⲁⲓ Matthew 10:3; ⲁⲓⲙⲁⲓ Mark 3:18; ⲁⲓⲙⲁⲓ Luke 6:15; ⲁⲓⲙⲁⲓ Acts 1:13). By Matthew and Mark he is coupled with Thaddaeus, and by Luke and Acts with Simon Zelotes. As Matthew or Levi is also called the son of Alphaeus

(compare <sup><109></sup>Matthew 9:9; <sup><124></sup>Mark 2:14), it is possible that he and James were brothers. According to the Genealogies of the Apostles (compare Budge, *Contendings of the Apostles*, II, 50), James was of the house of Gad. The Martyrdom of James, the son of Alpheus (compare Budge, *ib*, 264-66) records that James was stoned by the Jews for preaching Christ, and was “buried by the Sanctuary In Jerusalem.”

This James is generally identified with James the Little or the Less, the brother of Joses and son of Mary (<sup><125></sup>Matthew 27:56; <sup><154></sup>Mark 15:40). In <sup><125></sup>John 19:25 this Mary is called the wife of Cleophas (the King James Version) or Clopas (Revised Version), who is thus in turn identified with Alpheus. There is evidence in apocryphal literature of a Simon, a son of Clopas, who was also one of the disciples (compare *NATHANAEL*). If this be the same as Simon Zelotes, it would explain why he and James (i.e. as being brothers) were coupled together in the apostolic lists of Luke and Acts. Some have applied the phrase “his mother’s sister” in <sup><125></sup>John 19:25 to Mary the wife of Clopas, instead of to a separate person, and have thus attempted to identify James the son of Alpheus with James the brother of our Lord. For a further discussion of the problem, *see BRETHREN OF THE LORD*.

(3) James, “the Lord’s brother” ([ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου, *ho adelphos tou Kuriou*):

## B) JAMES, “THE LORD’S BROTHER”:

### *I. New Testament References.*

#### 1. In the Gospels:

This James is mentioned by name only twice in the Gospels, i.e. when, on the visit of Jesus to Nazareth, the countrymen of our Lord referred in contemptuous terms to His earthly kindred, in order to disparage His preaching (<sup><135></sup>Matthew 13:55; <sup><108></sup>Mark 6:3). As James was one of “his brethren,” he was probably among the group of Christ’s relatives who sought to interview Him during His tour through Galilee with the Twelve (<sup><126></sup>Matthew 12:46). By the same reasoning, he accompanied Jesus on His journey to Capernaum (<sup><112></sup>John 2:12), and joined in attempting to persuade Him to depart from Galilee for Judea on the eve of the Feast of Tabernacles (<sup><108></sup>John 7:3). At this feast James was present (<sup><110></sup>John 7:10),

but was at this time a non-believer in Jesus (compare ~~<407>~~ John 7:5, “Even his brethren did not believe on him”).

## 2. In the Epistles:

Yet the seeds of conversion were being sown within him, for, after the crucifixion, he remained in Jerusalem with his mother and brethren, and formed one of that earliest band of believers who “with one accord continued stedfastly in prayer” (~~<4014>~~ Acts 1:14). While there, he probably took part in the election of Matthias to the vacant apostleship (~~<4015>~~ Acts 1:15-25). James was one of the earliest witnesses to the resurrection, for, after the risen Lord had manifested Himself to the five hundred, “he was seen of James” (~~<4017>~~ 1 Corinthians 15:7 the King James Version). By this his growing belief and prayerful expectancy received confirmation. About 37 or 38 AD, James, “the Lord’s brother” (~~<4019>~~ Galatians 1:19), was still in Jerusalem, and had an interview there for the first time with Paul, when the latter returned from his 3 years’ sojourn in Damascus to visit Cephas, or Peter (~~<4018>~~ Galatians 1:18,19; compare ~~<4026>~~ Acts 9:26). In several other passages the name of James is coupled with that of Peter. Thus, when Peter escaped from prison (about 44 AD), he gave instructions to those in the house of John Mark that they should immediately inform “James and the brethren” of the manner of his escape (~~<4027>~~ Acts 12:17). By the time of the Jerusalem convention, i.e. about 51 AD (compare ~~<4011>~~ Galatians 2:1), James had reached the position of first overseer in the church (compare ~~<4053>~~ Acts 15:13,19). Previous to this date, during Paul’s ministry at Antioch, he had dispatched certain men thither to further the mission, and the teaching of these had caused dissension among the newly converted Christians and their leaders (~~<4050>~~ Acts 15:1,2; ~~<4012>~~ Galatians 2:12). The conduct of Peter, over whom James seems to have had considerable influence, was the principal matter of contention (compare ~~<4021>~~ Galatians 2:11 if). However, at the Jerusalem convention the dispute was amicably settled, and the pillars of the church, James, John and Cephas, gave to Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship (~~<4019>~~ Galatians 2:9). The speech of James on this occasion (~~<4053>~~ Acts 15:13-29), his sympathy with the religious needs of the Gentileworld (~~<4057>~~ Acts 15:17), his desire that formalism should raise no barrier to their moral and spiritual advancement (~~<4059>~~ Acts 15:19,20,28,29), and his large-hearted tributes to the “beloved Barnabas and Paul” (~~<4055>~~ Acts 15:25,26), indicate that James was a leader in whom the church was blessed, a leader who loved peace more than faction, the spirit more than the law, and who perceived that religious communities



with different forms of observance might still live and work together in common allegiance to Christ. Once more (58 AD), James was head of the council at Jerusalem when Paul made report of his labors, this time of his 3rd missionary Journey (<sup><4217></sup>Acts 21:17 ff). At this meeting Paul was admonished for exceeding the orders he had received at the first council, in that he had endeavored to persuade the converted Jews also to neglect circumcision (<sup><4212></sup>Acts 21:21), and was commanded to join in the vow of purification (<sup><4213></sup>Acts 21:23-26). There is no Scriptural account of the death of James From <sup><4195></sup>1 Corinthians 9:5 it has been inferred that he was married. This is, however, only a conjecture, as the passage refers to those who “lead about a sister, a wife” (the King James Version), while, so far as we know, James remained throughout his life in Jerusalem.

This James has been regarded as the author of the Epistle of James, “a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ”; compare *JAMES, EPISTLE OF*. Also, for details concerning his relationship to Christ, compare *BRETHREN OF THE LORD*.

## *II. References in Apocryphal Literature.*

James figures in one of the miraculous events recorded in the Gnostic “Gospel of the Infancy, by Thomas the Israelite philosopher,” being cured of a snake-bite by the infant Jesus (compare Hennecke, *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, 73). According to the Gospel of the Hebrews (compare ib, 11-21), James had also partaken of the cup of the Lord, and refused to eat till he had seen the risen Lord. Christ acknowledged this tribute by appearing to James first. In the Acts of Peter (compare Budge, *Contendings of the Apostles*, II, 475), it is stated that “three days after the ascension of our Lord into heaven, James, whom our Lord called his ‘brother in the flesh,’ consecrated the Offering and we all drew nigh to partake thereof: and when ten days had passed after the ascension of our Lord, we all assembled in the holy fortress of Zion, and we stood up to say the prayer of sanctification, and we made supplication unto God and besought Him with humility, and James also entreated Him concerning the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Offering.” The Preaching of James the Just (compare Budge, II, 78-81) tells of the appointment of James to the bishopric of Jerusalem, of his preaching, healing of the sick and casting out of devils there. This is confirmed by the evidence of Clement of Alexandria (Euseb., *HE*, II, 1). In the Martyrdom of James the Just (compare Budge, II, 82-89), it is stated that J., “the

youngest of the sons of Joseph,” alienated, by his preaching, Piobsata from her husband Ananus, the governor of Jerusalem. Ananus therefore inflamed the Jews against James, and they hurled him down from off the pinnacle of the temple. Hegesippus, quoted by Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, II, 23), and Josephus (*Ant.*, XX, ix, 1), testify to the general truth of this. It is thus probable that James was martyred about 62 or 63 AD.

Besides the epistle which bears his name, James was also the reputed author of the *Protevangelium Jacobi*, a work which originated in the 2nd century and received later additions (compare Henn, NA, 47-63; also *JOSEPH, HUSBAND OF MARY*).

*C. M. Kerr*

## **JAMES, EPISTLE OF**

### **I. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EPISTLE.**

#### *1. Jewish:*

The Epistle of James is the most Jewish writing in the New Testament. The Gospel according to Matthew was written for the Jews. The Epistle to the Hebrews is addressed explicitly to them. The Apocalypse is full of the spirit of the Old Testament. The Epistle of Jude is Jewish too. Yet all of these books have more of the distinctively Christian element in them than we can find in the Epistle of James. If we eliminate two or three passages containing references to Christ, the whole epistle might find its place just as properly in the Canon of the Old Testament as in that of the New Testament, as far as its substance of doctrine and contents is concerned. That could not be said of any other book in the New Testament. There is no mention of the incarnation or of the resurrection., the two fundamental facts of the Christian faith. The word “gospel” does not occur in the epistle. There is no suggestion that the Messiah has appeared and no presentation of the possibility of redemption through Him. The teaching throughout is that of a lofty morality which aims at the fulfillment of the requirements of the Mosaic law. It is not strange therefore that Spitta and others have thought that we have in the Epistle of James a treatise written by an unconverted Jew which has been adapted to Christian use by the interpolation of the two phrases containing the name of Christ in 1:1 and 2:1. Spitta thinks that this can be the only explanation of the fact that we have here an epistle practically ignoring the life and work of Jesus and

every distinctively Christian doctrine, and without a trace of any of the great controversies in the early Christian church or any of the specific features of its propaganda. This judgment is a superficial one, and rests upon superficial indications rather than any appreciation of the underlying spirit and principles of the book. The spirit of Christ is here, and there is no need to label it. The principles of this epistle are the principles of the Sermon on the Mount. There are more parallels to that Sermon in this epistle than can be found anywhere else in the New Testament in the same space. The epistle represents the idealization of Jewish legalism under the transforming influence of the Christian motive and life. It is not a theological discussion. It is an ethical appeal. It has to do with the outward life for the most part, and the life it pictures is that of a Jew informed with the spirit of Christ. The spirit is invisible in the epistle as in the individual man. It is the body which appears and the outward life with which that body has to do. The body of the epistle is Jewish, and the outward life to which it exhorts is that of a profoundly pious Jew. The Jews familiar with the Old Testament would read this epistle and find its language and tone that to which they were accustomed in their sacred books. James is evidently written by a Jew for Jews. It is Jewish in character throughout. This is apparent in the following particulars:

- (1) The epistle is addressed to the 12 tribes which are of the Dispersion (11). The Jews were scattered abroad through the ancient world. From Babylon to Rome, wherever any community of them might be gathered for commercial or social purposes, these exhortations could be carried and read. Probably the epistle was circulated most widely in Syria and Asia Minor, but it may have gone out to the ends of the earth. Here and there in the ghettos of the Roman Empire, groups of the Jewish exiles would gather and listen while one of their number read this letter from home. All of its terms and its allusions would recall familiar home scenes.
- (2) Their meeting-place is called “your synagogue” (2:2).
- (3) Abraham is mentioned as “our father” (2:21).
- (4) God is given the Old Testament name, “the Lord of Sabaoth” (5:4).
- (5) The law is not to be spoken against nor judged, but reverently and loyally obeyed. It is a royal law to which every loyal Jew will be subject. It is a law of liberty, to be freely obeyed (2:8-12; 4:11).

(6) The sins of the flesh are not inveighed against in the epistle, but those sins to which the Jews were more conspicuously liable, such as the love of money and the distinction which money may bring (2:2-4), worldliness and pride (4:4-6), impatience and murmuring (5:7-11), and other sins of the temper and tongue (3:1-12; 4:11,12).

(7) The illustrations of faithfulness and patience and prayer are found in Old Testament characters, in Abraham (2:21), Rahab (2:25), Job (~~James~~ James 5:11), and Elijah (~~James~~ James 5:17,18). The whole atmosphere of the epistle is Jewish.

## *2. Authoritative:*

The writer of this epistle speaks as one having authority. He is not on his defense, as Paul so often is. There is no trace of apology in his presentation of the truth. His official position must have been recognized and unquestioned. He is as sure of his standing with his readers as he is of the absoluteness of his message.

No Old Testament lawgiver or prophet was more certain that he spoke the word of the Lord. He has the vehemence of Elijah and the assured meekness of Moses. He has been called “the Amos of the New Testament,” and there are paragraphs which recall the very expressions used by Amos and which are full of the same fiery eloquence and prophetic fervor. Both fill their writings with metaphors drawn from the sky and the sea, from natural objects and domestic experiences. Both seem to be countrybred and to be in sympathy with simplicity and poverty. Both inveigh against the luxury and the cruelty of the idle rich, and both abhor the ceremonial and the ritual which are substituted for individual righteousness. Malachi was not the last of the prophets. John the Baptist was not the last prophet of the Old Dispensation. The writer of this epistle stands at the end of that prophetic line, and he is greater than John the Baptist or any who have preceded him because he stands within the borders of the kingdom of Christ. He speaks with authority, as a messenger of God. He belongs to the goodly fellowship of the prophets and of the apostles. He has the authority of both. There are 54 imperatives in the 108 verses of this epistle.

## *3. Practical:*

The epistle is interested in conduct more than in creed. It has very little formulated theology, less than any other epistle in the New Testament; but

it insists upon practical morality throughout. It begins and it closes with an exhortation to patience and prayer. It preaches a gospel of good works, based upon love to God and love to man. It demands liberty, equality, fraternity for all. It enjoins humility and justice and peace. It prescribes singleness of purpose and steadfastness of soul. It requires obedience to the law, control of the passions, and control of the tongue. Its ideal is to be found in a good life, characterized by the meekness of wisdom. The writer of the epistle has caught the spirit of the ancient prophets, but the lessons that he teaches are taken, for the most part, from the Wisdom literature of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha. His direct quotations are from the Pentateuch and the Book of Proverbs; but it has been estimated that there are 10 allusions to the Book of Proverbs, 6 to the Book of Job, 5 to the Book of Wisdom, and 15 to the Book of Ecclesiasticus. This Wisdom literature furnishes the staple of his meditation and the substance of his teaching. He has little or nothing to say about the great doctrines of the Christian church.

He has much to say about the wisdom that cometh down from above and is pure, peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, without hypocrisy (~~James~~<sup>James</sup> 3:15-17). The whole epistle shows that the author had stored his mind with the rich treasure of the ancient wisdom, and his material, while offered as his own, is both old and new. The form is largely that of the Wisdom literature of the Jews. It has more parallels with Jesus the son of Sirach than with any writer of the sacred books.

The substance of its exhortation, however, is to be found in the Synoptics and more particularly in the Sermon on the Mount. Its wisdom is the wisdom of Jesus the son of Joseph, who is the Christ.

These are the three outstanding characteristics of this epistle. In form and on the surface it is the most Jewish and least Christian of the writings in the New Testament. Its Christianity is latent and not apparent. Yet it is the most authoritative in its tone of any of the epistles in the New Testament, unless it be those of the apostle John. John must have occupied a position of undisputed primacy in the Christian church after the death of all the other apostles, when he wrote his epistles. It is noteworthy that the writer of this epistle assumes a tone of like authority with that of John. John was the apostle of love, Paul of faith, and Peter of hope. This writer is the apostle of good works, the apostle of the wisdom which manifests itself in

peace and purity, mercy and morality, and in obedience to the royal law, the law of liberty. In its union of Jewish form, authoritative tone, and insistence upon practical morality, the epistle is unique among the New Testament books.

## II. AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE.

The address of the epistle states that the writer is “James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ” (~~<5010>~~James 1:1). The tradition of the church has identified this James with the brother of our Lord. Clement of Alexandria says that Peter and James and John, who were the three apostles most honored of the Lord, chose James, the Lord’s brother, to be the bishop of Jerusalem after the Lord’s ascension (Euscb., HE, II, 1). This tradition agrees well with all the notices of James in the New Testament books. After the death of James the brother of John, Peter was thrown into prison, and having been miraculously released, he asked that the news be sent to James and to the brethren (~~<41217>~~Acts 12:17). This James is evidently in authority in the church at this time. In the apostolical conference held at Jerusalem, after Peter and Paul and Barnabas had spoken, this same James sums up the whole discussion, and his decision is adopted by the assembly and formulated in a letter which has some very striking parallels in its phraseology to this epistle (~~<41516>~~Acts 15:6-29). When Paul came to Jerusalem for the last time he reported his work to James and all the elders present with him (~~<42118>~~Acts 21:18). In the Epistle to the Galatians Paul says that at the time of one of his visits to Jerusalem he saw none of the apostles save Peter and James the Lord’s brother (~~<40118>~~Galatians 1:18,19). At another visit he received the right hand of fellowship from James and Cephas and John (~~<41119>~~Galatians 2:9). At a later time certain who came from James to Antioch led Peter into backsliding from his former position of tolerance of the Gentiles as equals in the Christian church (~~<41212>~~Galatians 2:12).

All of these references would lead us to suppose that James stood in a position of supreme authority in the mother-church at Jerusalem, the oldest church of Christendom. He presides in the assemblies of the church. He speaks the final and authoritative word. Peter and Paul defer to him. Paul mentions his name before that of Peter and John. When he was exalted to this leadership we do not know, but all indications seem to point to the fact that at a very early period James was the recognized executive authority in the church at Jerusalem, which was the church of Pentecost and the church

of the apostles. All Jews looked to Jerusalem as the chief seat of their worship and the central authority of their religion. All Christian Jews would look to Jerusalem as the primitive source of their organization and faith, and the head of the church at Jerusalem would be recognized by them as their chief authority. The authoritative tone of this epistle comports well with this position of primacy ascribed to James.

All tradition agrees in describing James as a Hebrew of the Hebrews, a man of the most rigid and ascetic morality, faithful in his observance of all the ritual regulations of the Jewish faith. Hegesippus tells us that he was holy from his mother's womb. He drank no wine nor strong drink. He ate no flesh. He alone was permitted to enter with the priests into the holy place, and he was found there frequently upon his knees begging forgiveness for the people, and his knees became hard like those of a camel in consequence of his constantly bending them in his worship of God and asking forgiveness for the people (Euseb., HE, II, 23). He was called James the Just. All had confidence in his sincerity and integrity, and many were persuaded by him to believe on the Christ. This Jew, faithful in the observance of all that the Jews held sacred, and more devoted to the temple-worship than the most pious among them, was a good choice for the head of the Christian church. The blood of David flowed in his veins. He had all the Jew's pride in the special privileges of the chosen race. The Jews respected him and the Christians revered him. No man among them commanded the esteem of the entire population as much as he.

Josephus (Ant., XX, ix) tells us that Ananus the high priest had James stoned to death, and that the most equitable of the citizens immediately rose in revolt against such a lawless procedure, and Ananus was deposed after only three months' rule. This testimony of Josephus simply substantiates all that we know from other sources concerning the high standing of James in the whole community. Hegesippus says that James was first thrown from a pinnacle of the temple, and then they stoned him because he was not killed by the fall, and he was finally beaten over the head with a fuller's club; and then he adds significantly, "Immediately Vespasian besieged them" (Euseb., HE, II, 23). There would seem to have been quite a widespread conviction among both the Christians and the Jews that the afflictions which fell upon the holy city and the chosen people in the following years were in part a visitation because of the great crime of the murder of this just man. We can understand how a man with this reputation and character would write an epistle so Jewish in form and

substance and so insistent in its demands for a practical morality as is the Epistle of James. All the characteristics of the epistle seem explicable on the supposition of authorship by James the brother of the Lord. We accept the church tradition without hesitation.

### III. THE STYLE OF THE EPISTLE.

#### *1. Plainness:*

The sentence construction is simple and straightforward. It reminds us of the English of Bunyan and DeFoe. There is usually no good reason for misunderstanding anything James says. He puts his truth plainly, and the words he uses have no hidden or mystical meanings. His thought is transparent as his life.

#### *2. Good Greek:*

It is somewhat surprising to find that the Greek of the Epistle of James is better than that of the other New Testament writers, with the single exception of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Of course this may be due to the fact that James had the services of an amanuensis who was a Greek scholar, or that his own manuscript was revised by such a man; but, although unexpected, it is not impossible that James himself may have been capable of writing such Greek as this.

It is not the good Greek of the classics, and it is not the poor and provincial Greek of Paul. There is more care for literary form than in the uncouth periods of the Gentile apostle, and the vocabulary would seem to indicate an acquaintance with the literary as well as the commercial and the conversational Greek "Galilee was studded with Greek towns, and it was certainly in the power of any Galilean to gain a knowledge of Greek .... We may reasonably suppose that our author would not have scrupled to avail himself of the opportunities within his reach, so as to master the Greek language, and learn something of Greek philosophy. This would be natural, even if we think of James as impelled only by a desire to gain wisdom and knowledge for himself; but if we think of him also as the principal teacher of the Jewish believers, many of whom were Hellenists, instructed in the wisdom of Alexandria, then the natural bent would take the shape of duty: he would be a student of Greek in order that he might be a more effective instructor to his own people" (Mayor, *The Epistle of James*, ccxxxvi). The Greek of the epistle is the studied Greek of one who was not a native to it,



but who had familiarized himself with its literature. James could have done so and the epistle may be proof that he did.

### *3. Vividness:*

James is never content to talk in abstractions. He always sets a picture before his own eyes and those of his readers. He has the dramatic instinct. He has the secret of sustained interest. He is not discussing things in general but things in particular. He is an artist and believes in concrete realities. At the same time he has a touch of poetry in him, and a fine sense of the analogies running through all Nature and all life. The doubting man is like the sea spume (1:6). The rich man fades away in his goings, even as the beauty of the flower falls and perishes (1:11). The synagogue scene with its distinction between the rich and the poor is set before us with the clear-cut impressiveness of a cameo (2:1-4). The Pecksniffian philanthropist, who seems to think that men can be fed not by bread alone but by the words that proceed magnificently from his mouth, is pilloried here for all time (2:15,16). The untamable tongue that is set on fire of hell is put in the full blaze of its world of iniquity, and the damage it does is shown to be like that of a forest fire (3:1-12). The picture of the wisdom that comes from above with its sevenfold excellences of purity, peaceableness, gentleness, mercy, fruitfulness, impartiality, sincerity, is worthy to hang in the gallery of the world's masterpieces (3:17). The vaunting tradesmen, whose lives are like vanishing vapor, stand there before the eyes of all in Jerusalem (4:13-16). The rich, whose luxuries he describes even while he denounces their cruelties and prophesies their coming day of slaughter, are the rich who walk the streets of his own city (5:1-6). His short sentences go like shots straight to the mark. We feel the impact and the impress of them. There is an energy behind them and a reality in them that makes them live in our thought. His abrupt questions are like the quick interrogations of a cross-examining lawyer (2:4-7,14,16; 3:11,12; 4:1,4,5,12,14). His proverbs have the intensity of the accumulated and compressed wisdom of the ages. They are irreducible minimums. They are memorable sayings, treasured in the speech of the world ever since his day.

### *4. Duadiplosis:*

Sometimes James adds sentence to sentence with the repetition of some leading word or phrase (1:1-6,19-24; 3:2-8). It is the painful style of one

who is not altogether at home with the language which he has chosen as the vehicle of his thought. It is the method by which a discussion could be continued indefinitely. Nothing but the vividness of the imagery and the intensity of the thought saves James from fatal monotony in the use of this device.

### *5. Figures of Speech:*

James has a keen eye for illustrations. He is not blind to the beauties and wonders of Nature. He sees what is happening on every hand, and he is quick to catch any homiletical suggestion it may hold. Does he stand by the seashore? The surge that is driven by the wind and tossed reminds him of the man who is unstable in all his ways, because he has no anchorage of faith, and his convictions are like driftwood on a sea of doubt (1:6). Then he notices that the great ships are turned about by a small rudder, and he thinks how the tongue is a small member, but it accomplishes great things (3:4,5). Does he walk under the sunlight and rejoice in it as the source of so many good and perfect gifts? He sees in it an image of the goodness of God that is never eclipsed and never exhausted, unvarying for evermore (1:17). He uses the natural phenomena of the land in which he lives to make his meaning plain at every turn: the flower of the field that passes away (1:10,11), the forest fire that sweeps the mountain side and like a living torch lights up the whole land (3:5), the sweet and salt springs (3:11), the fig trees and the olive trees and the vines (3:12), the seed-sowing and the fruit-bearing (3:18), the morning mist immediately lost to view (4:14), the early and the latter rain for which the husbandman waiteth patiently (5:7).

There is more of the appreciation of Nature in this one short epistle of James than in all the epistles of Paul put together. Human life was more interesting to Paul than natural scenery. However, James is interested in human life just as profoundly as Paul. He is constantly endowing inanimate things with living qualities. He represents sin as a harlot, conceiving and bringing forth death (1:15). The word of truth has a like power and conceives and brings forth those who live to God's praise (1:18). Pleasures are like joyful hosts of enemies in a tournament, who deck themselves bravely and ride forth with singing and laughter, but whose mission is to wage war and to kill (4:1,2). The laborers may be dumb in the presence of the rich because of their dependence and their fear, but their wages, fraudulently withheld, have a tongue, and cry out to high heaven for

vengeance (5:4). What is friendship with the world? It is adultery, James says (4:4). The rust of unjust riches testifies against those who have accumulated them, and then turns upon them and eats their flesh like fire (5:3). James observed the man who glanced at himself in the mirror in the morning, and saw that his face was not clean, and who went away and thought no more about it for that whole day, and he found in him an illustration of the one who heard the word and did not do it (1:23,14). The epistle is full of these rhetorical figures, and they prove that James was something of a poet at heart, even as Jesus was. He writes in prose, but there is a marked rhythm in all of his speech. He has an ear for harmony as he has an eye for beauty everywhere.

### *6. Unlikeness to Paul:*

The Pauline epistles begin with salutations and close with benedictions. They are filled with autobiographical touches and personal messages. None of these things appear here. The epistle begins and ends with all abruptness. It has an address, but no thanksgiving. There are no personal messages and no indications of any intimate personal relationship between the author and his readers. They are his “beloved brethren.” He knows their needs and their sins, but he may never have seen their faces or visited their homes. The epistle is more like a prophet’s appeal to a nation than a personal letter.

### *7. Likeness to Jesus:*

Both the substance of the teaching and the method of its presentation remind us of the discourses of Jesus. James says less about the Master than any other writer in the New Testament, but his speech is more like that of the Master than the speech of any one of them. There are at least ten parallels to the Sermon on the Mount in this short epistle, and for almost everything that James has to say we can recall some statement of Jesus which might have suggested it. When the parallels fail at any point, we are inclined to suspect that James may be repeating some unrecorded utterance of our Lord. He seems absolutely faithful to his memory of his brother’s teaching. He is the servant of Jesus in all his exhortation and persuasion.

Did the Master shock His disciples’ faith by the loftiness of the Christian ideal He set before them in His great sermon, “Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect” (~~4058~~ Matthew 5:48)? James sets the same high standard in the very forefront of his ep.: “Let patience have

its perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, lacking in nothing” (1:4). Did the Master say, “Ask, and it shall be given you” (~~4007~~ Matthew 7:7)? James says, “If any of you lacketh wisdom, let him ask of God ....; and it shall be given him” (1:5). Did the Master add a condition to His sweeping promise to prayer and say, “Whosoever .... shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that what he faith cometh to pass; he shall have it” (~~41123~~ Mark 11:23)? James hastens to add the same condition, “Let him ask in faith, nothing doubting: for he that doubteth is like the surge of the sea driven by the wind and tossed” (1:6). Did the Master close the great sermon with His parable of the Wise Man and the Foolish Man, saying, “Every one that heareth these words of mine, and doeth them, shall be likened unto a wise man. And every one that heareth these words of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man” (~~41024~~ Matthew 7:24,26)? James is much concerned about wisdom, and therefore he exhorts his readers, “Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deluding your own selves” (1:22). Had the Master declared, “If ye know these things, blessed are ye if ye do them” (~~4817~~ John 13:17)? James echoes the thought when he says, “A doer that worketh, this man shall be blessed in his doing” (1:25). Did the Master say to the disciples, “Blessed are ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God” (~~4161~~ Luke 6:20)? James has the same sympathy with the poor, and he says, “Hearken, my beloved brethren; did not God choose them that are poor as to the world to be rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he promised to them that love him?” (2:5). Did the Master inveigh against the rich, and say, “Woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation. Woe unto you, ye that are full now! for ye shall hunger. Woe unto you, ye that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep” (~~4164~~ Luke 6:24,25)? James bursts forth into the same invective and prophesies the same sad reversal of fortune, “Come now, ye rich, weep and howl for your miseries that are coming upon you” (5:1). “Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye doubleminded. Be afflicted, and mourn, and weep: let your laughter be turned to mourning, and your joy to heaviness” (4:8,9). Had Jesus said, “Judge not, that ye be not judged” (~~4106~~ Matthew 7:1)? James repeats the exhortation, “Speak not one against another, brethren. He that .... judgeth his brother .... judgeth the law: .... but who art thou that judgest thy neighbor?” (4:11,12). Had Jesus said, “Whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted” (~~4212~~ Matthew 23:12)? We find the very words in James, “Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall exalt you” (4:10). Had Jesus said, “I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by the heaven, for it is

the throne of God; nor by the earth, for it is the footstool of his feet. .... But let your speech be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: and whatsoever is more than these is of the evil one" (~~4154~~ Matthew 5:34-37)? Here in James we come upon the exact parallel: "But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by the heaven, nor by the earth, nor by any other oath; but let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay; that ye fall not under judgment" (5:12).

We remember how the Master began the Sermon on the Mount with the declaration that even those who mourned and were persecuted and reviled and reproached were blessed, in spite of all their suffering and trial. Then we notice that James begins his epistle with the same paradoxical putting of the Christian faith, "Count it all joy, my brethren, when ye fall into manifold trials" (1:12, the American Revised Version margin). We remember how Jesus proceeded in His sermon to set forth the spiritual significance and the assured permanence of the law; and we notice that James treats the law with the same respect and puts upon it the same high value. He calls it "the perfect law" (1:25), "the royal law" (2:8), the "law of liberty" (2:12). We remember what Jesus said about forgiving others in order that we ourselves may be forgiven; and we know where James got his authority for saying, "Judgment is without mercy to him that hath showed no mercy" (2:13). We remember all that the Master said about good trees and corrupt trees being known by their fruits, "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" (~~4176~~ Matthew 7:16-20). Then in the Epistle of James we find a like question, "Can a fig tree, my brethren, yield olives, or a vine figs?" (3:12). We remember that the Master said, "Know ye that he is nigh, even at the doors" (~~4243~~ Matthew 24:33). We are not surprised to find the statement here in James, "Behold, the judge standeth before the doors" (5:9). These reminiscences of the sayings of the Master meet us on every page. It may be that there are many more of them than we are able to identify. Their number is sufficiently large, however, to show us that James is steeped in the truths taught by Jesus, and not only their substance but their phraseology constantly reminds us of Him.

#### IV. DATE OF THE EPISTLE.

There are those who think that the Epistle of James is the oldest epistle in the New Testament. Among those who favor an early date are Mayor, Plumptre, Alford, Stanley, Renan, Weiss, Zahn, Beyschlag, Neander, Schneckenburger, Thiersch, and Dods.

The reasons assigned for this conclusion are:

- (1) the general Judaic tone of the ep., which seems to antedate admission of the Gentiles in any alarming numbers into the church; but since the epistle is addressed only to Jews, why should the Gentiles be mentioned in it, whatever its date? and
- (2) the fact that Paul and Peter are supposed to have quoted from James in their writing; but this matter of quotation is always an uncertain one, and it has been ably argued that the quotation has been the other way about.

Others think that the epistle was written toward the close of James's life. Among these are Kern, Wiesinger, Schmidt, Bruckner, Wordsworth, and Farrar.

These argue

- (1) that the epistle gives evidence of a considerable lapse of time in the history of the church, sufficient to allow of a declension from the spiritual fervor of Pentecost and the establishment of distinctions among the brethren; but any of the sins mentioned in the epistle in all probability could have been found in the church in any decade of its history.
- (2) James has a position of established authority, and those to whom he writes are not recent converts but members in long standing; but the position of James may have been established from a very early date, and in an encyclical of this sort we could not expect any indication of shorter or longer membership in the church. Doubtless some of those addressed were recent converts, while others may have been members for many years.
- (3) There are references to persecutions and trials which fit the later rather than the earlier date; but all that is said on this subject might be suitable in any period of the presidency of James at Jerusalem.
- (4) There are indications of a long and disappointing delay in the Second Coming of the Lord in the repeated exhortation to patience in waiting for it; but on the other hand James says, "The coming of the Lord is at hand," and "The judge standeth before the doors" (5:7-9). The same passage is cited in proof of a belief that the immediate

appearance of the Lord was expected, as in the earliest period of the church, and in proof that there had been a disappointment of this earlier belief and that it had been succeeded by a feeling that there was need of patience in waiting for the coming so long delayed.

It seems clear to us that there are no decisive proofs in favor of any definite date for the epistle. It must have been written before the martyrdom of James in the year 63 AD, and at some time during his presidency over the church at Jerusalem; but there is nothing to warrant us in coming to any more definite conclusion than that Davidson, Hilgenfeld, Baur, Zeller, Hausrath, von Soden, Julicher, Harnack, Bacon and others date the epistle variously in the post-Pauline period, 69-70 to 140-50 AD. The arguments for any of these dates fall far short of proof, rest largely if not wholly upon conjectures and presuppositions, and of course are inconsistent with any belief in the authorship by James.

## V. HISTORY OF THE EPISTLE.

Eusebius classed James among those whose authenticity was disputed by some. "James is said to be the author of the first of the so-called Catholic Epistles. But it is to be observed that it is disputed; at least, not many of the ancients have mentioned it, as is the case likewise with the epistle that bears the name of Jude, which is also one of the seven so-called Catholic Epistles. Nevertheless, we know that these also, with the rest, have been read publicly in most churches" (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, II, 23). Eusebius himself, however, quotes <sup><3041></sup>James 4:11 as Scripture and <sup><3063></sup>James 5:13 as spoken by the holy apostle. Personally he does not seem disposed to question the genuineness of the epistle. There are parallels in phraseology which make it possible that the epistle is quoted in Clement of Rome in the 1st century, and in Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, the Epistle to Diognetus, Irenaeus, and Hermas in the 2nd century. It is omitted in the canonical list of the Muratorian Fragment and was not included in the Old Latin version. Origen seems to be the first writer to quote the epistle explicitly as Scripture and to assert that it was written by James the brother of the Lord. It appears in the Peshitta version and seems to have been generally recognized in the East. Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzus, Ephraem of Edessa, Didymus of Alexandria, received it as canonical. The 3rd Council of Carthage in 397 AD finally settled its status for the Western church, and from that date in both the East and the West its canonicity was unquestioned until the time of the Reformation.

Erasmus and Cajetan revived the old doubts concerning it. Luther thought it contradicted Paul and therefore banished it to the appendix of his Bible. "James," he says, "has aimed to refute those who relied on faith without works, and is too weak for his task in mind, understanding, and words, mutilates the Scriptures, and thus directly contradicts Paul and all Scriptures, seeking to accomplish by enforcing the law what the apostles successfully effect by love. Therefore, I will not place his Epistle in my Bible among the proper leadingbooks" (Werke, XIV, 148). He declared that it was a downright strawy epistle, as compared with such as those to the Romans and to the Galatians, and it had no real evangelical character. This judgment of Luther is a very hasty and regrettable one. The modern church has refused to accept it, and it is generally conceded now that Paul and James are in perfect agreement with each other, though their presentation of the same truth from opposite points of view brings them into apparent contradiction. Paul says, "By grace have ye been saved through faith .... not of works, that no man should glory" (~~ROM~~ Ephesians 2:8,9). "We reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law" (~~ROM~~ Romans 3:28). James says, "Faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself" (2:17). "Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith (2:24). With these passages before him Luther said, "Many have toiled to reconcile Paul with James .... but to no purpose, for they are contrary, 'Faith justifies'; 'Faith does not justify'; I will pledge my life that no one can reconcile those propositions; and if he succeeds he may call me a fool" (Colloquia, II, 202).

It would be difficult to prove Luther a fool if Paul and James were using these words, faith, works, and justification, in the same sense, or even if each were writing with full consciousness of what the other had written. They both use Abraham for an example, James of justification by works, and Paul of justification by faith. How can that be possible? The faith meant by James is the faith of a dead orthodoxy, an intellectual assent to the dogmas of the church which does not result in any practical righteousness in life, such a faith as the demons have when they believe in the being of God and simply tremble before Him. The faith meant by Paul is intellectual and moral and spiritual, affects the whole man, and leads him into conscious and vital union and communion with God. It is not the faith of demons; it is the faith that redeems. Again, the works meant by Paul are the works of a dead legalism, the works done under a sense of compulsion or from a feeling of duty, the works done in obedience to a law which is a



taskmaster, the works of a slave and not of a son. These dead works, he declares, can never give life. The works meant by James are the works of a believer, the fruit of the faith and love born in every believer's heart and manifest in every believer's life. The possession of faith will insure this evidence in his daily conduct and conversation; and without this evidence the mere profession of faith will not save him. The justification meant by Paul is the initial justification of the Christian life. No doing of meritorious deeds will make a man worthy of salvation. He comes into the kingdom, not on the basis of merit but on the basis of grace. The sinner is converted not by doing anything, but by believing on the Lord Jesus Christ. He approaches the threshold of the kingdom and he finds that he has no coin that is current there. He cannot buy his way in by good works; he must accept salvation by faith, as the gift of God's free grace. The justification meant by James is the justification of any after-moment in the Christian life, and the final justification before the judgment throne. Good works are inevitable in the Christian life. There can be no assurance of salvation without them.

Paul is looking at the root; James is looking at the fruit. Paul is talking about the beginning of the Christian life; James is talking about its continuance and consummation. With Paul, the works he renounces precede faith and are dead works. With James, the faith he denounces is apart from works and is a dead faith.

Paul believes in the works of godliness just as much as James. He prays that God may establish the Thessalonians in every good work (~~2~~ Thessalonians 2:17). He writes to the Corinthians that "God is able to make all grace abound unto" them; that they, "having always all sufficiency in everything, may abound unto every good work" (~~2~~ 2 Corinthians 9:8). He declares to the Ephesians that "we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk in them" (~~2~~ Ephesians 2:10). He makes a formal statement of his faith in Romans: God "will render to every man according to his works: to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life: but unto them that are factious, and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Greek; but glory and honor and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek" (~~2~~ Romans 2:6-

10). This is the final justification discussed by James, and it is just as clearly a judgment by works with Paul as with him.

On the other hand James believes in saving faith as well as Paul. He begins with the statement that the proving of our faith works patience and brings perfection (1:3,1). He declares that the prayer of faith will bring the coveted wisdom (1:6). He describes the Christian profession as a holding

“the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory” (2:1). He says that the poor as to the world are rich in faith, and therefore heirs to the kingdom (2:5). He quotes the passage from Genesis, “Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness” (2:23), and he explicitly asserts that Abraham’s “faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect” (2:22). The faith mentioned in all these passages is the faith of the professing Christian; it is not the faith which the sinner exercises in accepting salvation. James and Paul are at one in declaring that faith and works must go hand in hand in the Christian life, and that in the Christian’s experience both faith without works is dead and works without faith are dead works. They both believe in faith working through love as that which alone will avail in Christ Jesus (~~4:16~~ Galatians 5:6). Fundamentally they agree. Superficially they seem to contradict each other. That is because they are talking about different things and using the same terms with different meanings for those terms in mind.

## **VI. MESSAGE OF THE EPISTLE TO OUR TIMES.**

### *1. To the Pietist:*

There are those who talk holiness and are hypocrites; those who make profession of perfect love and yet cannot live peaceably with their brethren; those who are full of pious phraseology but fail in practical philanthropy. This epistle was written for them. It may not give them much comfort, but it ought to give them much profit. The mysticism that contents itself with pious frames and phrases and comes short in actual sacrifice and devoted service will find its antidote here. The antinomianism that professes great confidence in free grace, but does not recognize the necessity for corresponding purity of life, needs to ponder the practical wisdom of this epistle. The quietists who are satisfied to sit and sing themselves away to everlasting bliss ought to read this epistle until they catch its bugle note of inspiration to present activity and continuous good deeds. All who are long on theory and short on practice ought to steep themselves in the spirit of

James; and since there are such people in every community and in every age, the message of the epistle will never grow old.

## *2. To the Sociologist:*

The sociological problems are to the front today. The old prophets were social reformers, and James is most like them in the New Testament. Much that he says is applicable to present-day conditions. He lays down the right principles for practical philanthropy, and the proper relationships between master and man, and between man and man. If the teachings of this epistle were put into practice throughout the church it would mean the revitalization of Christianity. It would prove that the Christian religion was practical and workable, and it would go far to establish the final brotherhood of man in the service of God.

## *3. To the Student of the Life and Character of Jesus:*

The life of our Lord is the most important life in the history of the race. It will always be a subject of the deepest interest and study. Modern research has penetrated every contributory realm for any added light upon the heredity and the environment of Jesus. The people and the land, archaeology and contemporary history, have been cultivated intensively and extensively for any modicum of knowledge they might add to our store of information concerning the Christ. We suggest that there is a field here to which sufficient attention has not yet been given. James was the brother of the Lord. His epistle tells us much about himself. On the supposition that he did not exhort others to be what he would not furnish them an example in being, we read in this epistle his own character writ large. He was like his brother in so many things. As we study the life and character of James we come to know more about the life and character of Jesus.

Jesus and James had the same mother. From her they had a common inheritance. As far as they reproduced their mother's characteristics they were alike. They had the same home training. As far as the father in that home could succeed in putting the impress of his own personality upon the boys, they would be alike. It is noticeable in this connection that Joseph is said in the Gospel to have been "a just man" (~~and~~ Matthew 1:19 the King James Version), and that James came to be known through all the early church as James the Just, and that in his epistle he gives this title to his brother, Jesus, when he says of the unrighteous rich of Jerusalem, "Ye have condemned and killed the just" man (5:6 the King James Version). Joseph

was just, and James was just, and Jesus was just. The brothers were alike, and they were like the father in this respect. The two brothers seem to think alike and talk alike to a most remarkable degree. They represent the same home surroundings and human environment, the same religious training and inherited characteristics. Surely, then, all that we learn concerning James will help us the better to understand Jesus.

They are alike in their poetical insight and their practical wisdom. They are both fond of figurative speech, and it seems always natural and unforced. The discourses of Jesus are filled with birds and flowers and winds and clouds and all the sights and sounds of rural life in Palestine. The writings of James abound in reference to the field flowers and the meadow grass and the salt fountains and the burning wind and the early and the latter rain. They are alike in mental attitude and in spiritual alertness. They have much in common in the material equipment of their thought. James was well versed in the apocryphal literature. May we not reasonably conclude that Jesus was just as familiar with these books as he? James seems to have acquired a comparative mastery of the Greek language and to have had some acquaintance with the Greek philosophy. Would not Jesus have been as well furnished in these lines as he?

What was the character of James? All tradition testifies to his personal purity and persistent devotion, commanding the reverence and the respect of all who knew him. As we trace the various elements of his character manifesting themselves in his anxieties and exhortations in this epistle, we find rising before us the image of Jesus as well as the portrait of James. He is a single-minded man, steadfast in faith and patient in trials. He is slow to wrath, but very quick to detect any sins of speech and hypocrisy of life. He is full of humility, but ready to champion the cause of the oppressed and the poor. He hates all insincerity and he loves wisdom, and he believes in prayer and practices it in reference to both temporal and spiritual good. He believes in absolute equality in the house of God. He is opposed to anything that will establish any distinctions between brethren in their place of worship. He believes in practical philanthropy. He believes that the right sort of religion will lead a man to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world. A pure religion in his estimation will mean a pure man. He believes that we ought to practice all that we preach.

As we study these characteristics and opinions of the younger brother, does not the image of his and our Elder Brother grow ever clearer before our eyes?

## LITERATURE.

Works on Introduction: by Zahn, Weiss, Julicher, Salmon, Dods, Bacon, Bennett and Adeney; MacClymont, The New Testament and Its Writers; Farrar, The Messages of the Books, and Early Days of Christianity; Fraser, Lectures on the Bible; Godet, Biblical Studies. Works on the Apostolic Age: McGiffert, Schaff, Hausrath, Weizsacker. Commentaries: Mayor, Hort, Beyschlag, Dale, Huther, Plummer, Plumptre, Stier.

*Doremus Almy Hayes*

## JAMES, PROTEVANGELIUM OF

<pro-te-van-jel'-i-um> ,

*See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.*

## JAMIN

<ja'-min> ([<sup>ˈ</sup>ymɪ̯; yamin], “right hand”):

(1) In <sup>[1430]</sup>Genesis 46:10; Exodus 6:15; <sup>[0932]</sup>Numbers 26:12; <sup>[1302]</sup>1 Chronicles 4:24, a “son” (clan) of Simeon.

(2) In <sup>[1327]</sup>1 Chronicles 2:27, a Judahite, “son” of Ram and grandson of Jerahmeel.

(3) In <sup>[1687]</sup>Nehemiah 8:7, a Levite (?), one of those who “caused the people to understand” the Torah when Ezra enforced it = “Iadinus” in 1 Esdras 9:48.

## JAMINITES

<ja'-min-its> ([ynɪ̯mɪ̯h" , ha-yamini], coll. with article): In <sup>[0932]</sup>Numbers 26:12, descendants of Jamin ((1) above).

## JAMLECH

<jam'-lek> ([**Ē** **ṁ**ḃ" , *yamlekh*], “may he (God) cause to reign”): A “prince” or chief of the tribe of Simeon (~~1306~~ 1 Chronicles 4:34). If 4:41 refers to the preceding list, he lived in the time of Hezekiah.

## JAMNIA

<jam'-ni-a>.

See *JABNEEL*.

## JAMNITES

<jam'-nits> ([**᾽** **Ιαμνῖται**, *Iamnitai*): The inhabitants (2 Macc 12:9) of Jamnia, the ancient Jabneel, a town on the northern border of Judah near the sea. Its port and navy were burned by Judas Maccabeus (loc. cit.).

## JANAI

<ja'-na-i>, <ja'-ni> ([**yn**" [**ḃ**"] , *ya`nay*], “he answers”; as to whether final “y” is the third radical (letter), or may be taken as equivalent to the Divine name Yah, see HPN, 149-51): A chief of a family descended from Gad (~~1302~~ 1 Chronicles 5:12, the King James Version “Jaanai”).

## JANGLING

<jan'-gling> ([**ματαιολογία**, *mataiologia*], “vain discourse” “babbling”): This word is not found in the American Standard Revised Version; once only in the King James Version (~~5006~~ 1 Timothy 1:6). The American Standard Revised Version has “vain talking,” instead of “vain jangling,” and evidently means proud, self-conceited talking against what God has revealed and against God Himself.

## JANIM

<ja'-nim> ([**μynῖ**, *yanim*]; the King James Version Janum): A place in the Hebron uplands named with Eshan and Beth-tappuah (~~0655~~ Joshua 15:53); unidentified.

## JANNAI

<jan'-a-i> ([ ' *Ἰανναί*, *Iannai*], Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek; [ ' *Ἰαννά*, *Ianna*], Textus Receptus of the New Testament; the King James Version Janna); An ancestor of Jesus in Luke's genealogy, the 5th before Joseph, the husband of Mary (~~<Ἰανναῖς>~~ Luke 3:24).

## JANNES AND JAMBRES

<jan'-ez>, <jam'-brez> ([ ' *Ἰαννῆς καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς*, *Iannes kai Iambres*], ~~<Ἰαννῆς καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς>~~ 2 Timothy 3:8):

### 1. EGYPTIAN MAGICIANS:

These are the names of two magicians in ancient Egypt, who withstood Moses before Pharaoh. This is the only place where the names occur in the New Testament, and they are not mentioned in the Old Testament at all. In Exodus 7:11,22 Egyptian magicians are spoken of, who were called upon by Pharaoh to oppose Moses and Aaron: "Then Pharaoh also called for the wise men and the sorcerers: and they also, the magicians of Egypt, did in like manner with their enchantments." Jannes and Jambres were evidently two of the persons referred to in this passage. It should be observed that the word translated here "magicians" occurs also in ~~<ἰαῖμας>~~ Genesis 41:8 in connection with Pharaoh's dreams: Pharaoh "sent and called for all the magicians of Egypt, and all the wise men thereof." the Revised Version margin reads for "magicians" "or sacred scribes." The Hebrew word is *charTummim*, and means sacred scribes who were skilled in the sacred writing, that is in the hieroglyphics; they were a variety of Egyptian priests. Jannes and Jambres were doubtless members of one or other of the various classes spoken of in the passages in Exodus and Genesis, the wise men, the sorcerers, and the magicians or sacred scribes.

### 2. MENTIONED BY PLINY AND OTHERS:

Jannes and Jambres, one or both, are also mentioned by Pliny (23-79 AD), by Apuleius (circa 130 AD), both of whom speak of Moses and Jannes as famous magicians of antiquity. The Pythagorean philosopher Numenius (2nd century AD) speaks of Jannes and Jambres as Egyptian [*hierogrammateis*], or sacred scribes.

### 3. TRADITIONS:

There are many curious Jewish traditions regarding Jannes and Jambres. These traditions, which are found in the Targum and elsewhere, are full of contradictions and impossibilities and anachronisms. They are to the effect that Jannes and Jambres were sons of Balaam, the soothsayer of Pethor. Notwithstanding this impossibility in the matter of date, they were said to have withstood Moses 40 years previously at the court of Pharaoh, to whom it was also said, they so interpreted a dream of that king, as to foretell the birth of Moses and cause the oppression of the Israelites. They are also said to have become proselytes, and it is added that they left Egypt at the Exodus, among the mixed multitude. They are reported to have instigated Aaron to make the golden calf. The traditions of their death are also given in a varying fashion. They were said to have been drowned in the Red Sea, or to have been put to death after the making of the golden calf, or during the slaughter connected with the name of Phinehas.

### 4. ORIGEN'S STATEMENT:

According to Origen (Comm. on <sup>4178</sup>Matthew 27:8) there was an apocryphal book — not yet rediscovered — called “The Book of Jannes and Jambres.” Origen’s statement is that in <sup>5188</sup>2 Timothy 3:8 Paul is quoting from that book.

### 5. DERIVATION:

In the Targumic literature “Mambres” occurs as a variant reading instead of “Jambres.” It is thought that Jambres is derived from an Aramaic root, meaning “to oppose,” the participle of which would be Mambres. The meaning of either form is “he who opposes.” Jannes is perhaps a corruption of Ioannes or Iohannes (John).

*John Rutherford*

## JANNES AND JAMBRES, BOOK OF

An apocryphal work condemned by Pope Gelasius.

*See preceding article, JANNES AND JAMBRES.*



## JANOAH

<ja-no'-a> ([j " wɔy; yanoach], “resting-place”):

(1) A place named on the eastern boundary of Ephraim (<sup><0616></sup>Joshua 16:6 f; the King James Version “Janohah”). Eusebius, *Onomasticon* (s.v. “Jano”) places it in Akrabattine, 12 Roman miles East of Neapolis (Nablus). This points definitely to Khirbet Yanun. On a hill near by, the Moslems show the Maqam of Neby Nun, the father of Joshua.

(2) A town in the uplands of Naphtali, mentioned as having been captured and depopulated by Tiglathpileser. It is named with Abel-beth-maacah and Kedesh (<sup><1259></sup>2 Kings 15:29). It may be identical with Yanuch, a village about 6 miles East of Tyre.

*W. Ewing*

## JANUM

<ja'-num> (Qere, [μwɔny; yanum], Kethibh [μynj; yanim]).

*See JANIM.*

## JAPHETH (1)

<ja'-feth> ([tɔpy, yepheth]; [tɔpy}yapheth]; [ ' Iάφεθ, Iapheth]):

### 1. ETYMOLOGIES OF JAPHETH:

This name, in <sup><0832></sup>Genesis 9:27, seems to be explained by the phrase “may God make wide (*yapht*, the American Standard Revised Version “enlarge”) for Japheth,” where *yapht* and Japheth are represented by the same consonants, but with different vowel-points. The root of *yapht* is *pathach*, “to make wide.” This etymology, however, is not universally accepted, as the word-play is so obvious, and the association of Japheth with Shem (“dark”) and Ham (“black”) suggests a name on similar lines — either gentilic, or descriptive of race. Japheth has therefore been explained as meaning “fair,” from *yaphah*, the non-Sem and non-Hamitic races known to the Jews being all more or less whiteskinned. The Targum of Onkelos agrees with the English Versions of the Bible, but that of Jonathan has “God shall beautify Japheth,” as though from *yaphah*.

## 2. HIS DESCENDANTS:

The immediate descendants of Japheth were seven in number, and are represented by the nations designated Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Mesech, and Tiras; or, roughly, the Armenians, Lydians, Medes, Greeks, Tibarenians, and Moschians, the last, Tiras, remaining still obscure. The sons of Gomer (Ashkenaz, Riphath and Togarmah) were all settled in the West Asian tract; while the sons of Javan (Elisah, Tarshish, Kittim and Dodanim or Rodanim) occupied the Mediterranean coast and the adjacent islands.

## 3. HIS PLACE AMONG THE SONS OF NOAH:

In <sup><0027></sup>Genesis 9:27, as in other passages, Japheth occupies the 3rd place in the enumeration of the sons of Noah, but he is really regarded as the 2nd son, Ham being the youngest. In the genealogical table, however (<sup><000E></sup>Genesis 10:1 ff), the descendants of Japheth are given first, and those of Shem last, in order to set forth Semitic affinities at greater length. Though this would seem to indicate that the fair races were the least known to the Jews, it implies that the latter were well disposed toward them, for Japheth was (ultimately) to dwell in the tents of Shem, and therefore to take part in Shem's spiritual privileges.

## 4. JAPHETH AND IAPETOS:

It seems unlikely that the Greek giant-hero, Iapetos, father of Prometheus, who was regarded by the Greeks as the father of the human race, has any connection with the Hebrew *Japheth*. The original of the Hebrew record probably belongs to a date too early to admit borrowing from the Greek, and if the name had been borrowed by the Greeks from the Hebrews, a nearer form might be expected.

*See SHEM; HAM; TABLE OF NATIONS.*

*T. G. Pinches*

## JAPHETH (2)

<sup><ja'-feth></sup> ([<sup>'</sup> <sup>Iάφεθ</sup>, *Iapheth*]): A region mentioned only in Judith 2:25, where no particulars are given which may lead to its identification. Holofernes "came unto the borders of Japheth, which were toward the south, over against Arabia."

## JAPHIA (1)

<ja-fi'-a>, <jaf'-i-a> ([yɸy; *yaphia*], perhaps “tall”; compare Arabic;  
'Ιέφθα, *Iephtha*):

**(1)** King of Lachish, one of the 5 “kings of the Amorites” who allied themselves together in an expedition against Gibeon on account of its treaty with the Israelites (~~Gen~~ Joshua 10:3-5). After their discomfiture by Joshua in the battle of Beth-horon (10:10), “one of the most important in the history of the world” (Stanley), they fled and hid themselves in the cave at Makkedah (10:16). As Joshua passed, he was informed of this, but, unwilling to delay his pursuit of the fugitives, he ordered great stones to be rolled unto the mouth of the cave, leaving a guard in charge (10:17 f). On the completion of his victory, Joshua returned to Makkedah and commanded the Israelites to bring forth the imprisoned kings, and summoned the chiefs of his army to plant their feet upon their necks. Then he put them to death; and after he had hung their bodies on 5 trees, he ordered the Israelites in the evening to take them down and cast them into the cave (10:22-27).

**(2)** Septuagint [ <sup>7</sup>Ἰεφιάς, *Iephies*], [ <sup>7</sup>Ἰαφιά, *Iaphie*]): One of the sons of David who were born to him at Jerusalem (~~1055~~ 2 Samuel 5:15; ~~1380~~ 1 Chronicles 3:7; 14:6).

*James Crichton*

## JAPHIA (2)

<*ja-fi'-a*>, <*jaf"-i-a*> ([*ypj*; *yaphia`*]): A town on the southern boundary of Zebulun named with Chisloth-tabor and Daberath (~~19:12~~ Joshua 19:12). It is represented by the modern [Yafa], about 1 1/2 miles Southwest of Nazareth, near the foot of the hills. It was one of the places fortified by Josephus (Vita, 45; BJ, II, xx, 6).

# JAPHLET

<jaf'-let> ([fɪ ɒj', yaphleT], “he escapes”(?): In ~~1~~ 1 Chronicles 7:32,33, a “son” of Heber, an Asherite.

## JAPHLETI

<jaf'-le-ti>, <jaf-le'-ti>: the King James Version in <sup><1616></sup>Joshua 16:3, where Hebrew is [yfl pʕh" , ha-yaphleTi], “the Japhletites,” the Revised Version (British and American), a clan said to border on the territory of Joseph, but not mentioned elsewhere.

## JAPHO

<ja'-fo>: the King James Version and the American Revised Version margin in <sup><1696></sup>Joshua 19:46 for JOPPA (which see).

## JAR

<jar>.

See *BARREL*.

## JARAH

<ja'-ra> ([hr[ʔ, ya`rah], “honey-comb” (?)): A descendant of King Saul (<sup><1392></sup>1 Chronicles 9:42); but the Septuagint’s Codices Vaticanus and Alexandrinus, have [ʾΙαδά, Iada] = [hD[ʔ, ya`dah], a name found in Septuagint of <sup><1386></sup>1 Chronicles 8:36, where Massoretic Text has [hD[ wby] yeho`addah], Jehoaddah. Some Hebrew manuscripts have ya`dah in 9:42, and it should probably be accepted as the correct reading there, for ya`dah = Jehoaddah yeho`addah, linguistically; compare Jonathan and Jehonathan, etc.

## JAREB

<ja'-reb>, <jar'-eb> ([brɛ, yarebh], “let him contend”; Septuagint [ʾΙαρείμ, Iareim]):

### 1. OBSCURITY OF THE NAME:

Is mentioned twice in Hosea (5:13; 10:6) as an Assyrian king who received tribute from Israel. We do not, however, know of an Assyrian king of that name, or of such a place as is indicated by “the king of Jareb” (5:13 King James Version, margin). Sayce (HCM, 417) thinks Jareb may possibly be the earlier name of Sargon who took Samaria in 722 BC, as the passages in

which it appears seem to relate to the last struggles of the Northern Kingdom. This conjecture he bases on the probability that the successor of Shalmaneser IV, following the example of other usurpers of the Assyrian throne before him, assumed the name of Sargon. Those who hold that Hosea's prophecies are probably not later than 734 BC reject this view.

## 2. MEANING OF THE WORD:

If we take the Hebrew text in <sup><2613></sup>Hosea 5:13 as it stands (*melekh yarebh*), Jareb cannot be regarded as the name of a person, owing to the absence of the article before *melekh*, "king," which is always inserted in such a case. It is probably an epithet or nickname applied to the Assyrian king, as is suggested by the Revised Version margin ("a king that should contend") and the King James Version margin ("the king that should plead"), being derived from the *ribh*, "to strive." The rendering would then be "King Combat," "King Contentious," indicating Assyria's general hostility to Israel and the futility of applying for help to that quarter against the will of Yahweh. Some suggest that for *melekh yarebh* we should read *malki rabh* (i being the old nominative termination), or *melekh rabh*, "Great King," a title frequently applied to Assyrian monarchs. Others, following the Septuagint, would read *melekh ram*, "High King."

## 3. HISTORICAL REFERENCE:

The historical reference, if it be to any recorded incident, may be to the attempt of Menahem, king of Israel in 738 BC, to gain over the Assyrians by a large subsidy to Pul, who assumed the name of Tiglath-pileser (<sup><2159></sup>2 Kings 15:19). In this case, as both Ephraim and Judah are mentioned in the protasis, we should have to suppose that Ephraim made application on behalf of both kingdoms. If "Judah" be inserted before "sent" to complete the parallel, then the clause would be interpreted of Ahaz, king of Judah, who offered a heavy bribe to Tiglath-pileser to help him to withstand the combined attack of Rezin of Syria and Pekah of Israel (<sup><12417></sup>2 Kings 16:7 f). But perhaps there may be no particular allusions in the two clauses of the apodosis, but only a reference to a general tendency on the part of both kingdoms to seek Assyrian aid.

## 4. OTHER VIEWS:

Cheyne would make a violent change in the verse. He would substitute "Israel" for "Judah" as warranted by <sup><8120></sup>Hosea 12:2, insert "Israel" before

“sent,” change ‘*ashshur*,” Assyria,” into *mitstsur*, the North Arabian land of *Mucri*, “references to which underlie many passages in the Old Testament,” and for *melekh yarebh*, he would read *melekh `arabhi*, “king of Arabia.” For other views see ICC.

*James Crichton*

## JARED

<*ja'-red*> ([*dry*, *yeredh*], “descent”; pausal form, [*dry*, *yaredh*], in ~~<OGIS>~~ Genesis 5:15; ~~<BOCD>~~ 1 Chronicles 1:2, hence, English Versions of the Bible “Jared” for “Jered”; [*Ἰαρέδ*, *Iared*]): In ~~<OGIS>~~ Genesis 5:15-20; ~~<BOCD>~~ 1 Chronicles 1:2; ~~<QBS>~~ Luke 3:37, son of Mahalaleel and father of Enoch. The King James Version has “Jered” in ~~<BOCD>~~ 1 Chronicles 1:2.

The name is supposed by Budde to denote a degeneration of the human race, the first five generations being righteous, their successors not, except Enoch and Noah. The name has been identified with that of Irad ([*dry*[*i iradh*]), ~~<OGIS>~~ Genesis 4:18. See Skinner, Gen, 117, 129, 131.

## JARESIAH

<*jar-e-si'-a*>: the King James Version for *JAARESHIAH* (which see).

## JARHA

<*jar'-ha*> ([*j rȳ*, *yarcha`*], meaning unknown): An Egyptian slave of Shesham, about Eli’s time (compare HPN, 235), who married his master’s daughter, and became the founder of a house of the Jerahmeelites (~~<REB>~~ 1 Chronicles 2:34 ff).

## JARIB

<*ja'-rib*>, <*jar'-ib*> ([*byry*, *yaribh*], “he contends,” or “takes (our) part,” or “conducts (our) case”):

(1) In ~~<BOCD>~~ 1 Chronicles 4:24, a “son” (clan) of Simeon = “Jachin” of ~~<OGIS>~~ Genesis 46:10; Exodus 6:15; ~~<OGIS>~~ Numbers 26:12.

(2) In Ezr 8:16, one of the “chief men” for whom Ezra sent, and dispatched by him to Casiphia to fetch ministers for God’s house = “Joribus” (1 Esdras 8:44).

(3) In Ezr 10:18, a priest who had married a foreign wife = “Joribus” (1 Esdras 9:19).

## JARIMOTH

<jar’-i-moth> ([<sup>1</sup> Ιαριμώθ, *Iarimoth*]): 1 Esdras 9:28; called “Jeremoth” in Ezr 10:27.

## JARMUTH

<jar’-muth> ([<sup>tWmrʾy</sup>, *yarmuth*):

(1) A city of the Canaanites in the Shephelah (<sup>0655</sup>Joshua 15:35) of Judah whose “king,” Piram, joined the league of the “five kings” against Joshua (<sup>0608</sup>Joshua 10:3-5), was defeated at Gibeon and slain at Makkedah (10:23). One of the 31 “kings” defeated in Joshua’s campaign (<sup>0621</sup>Joshua 12:11). In <sup>0658</sup>Joshua 15:35 it is mentioned in conjunction with Adullam, Socoh and Azekah, and in <sup>0619</sup>Nehemiah 11:29 with Zorah, Zanoah and Adullam. Cheyne (Encyclopedia Biblica) suggests that the “Maroth” of <sup>0300</sup>Micah 1:12 may be a copyist’s error for Jarmuth. In Eusebius, Onomasticon (OS2 132 31; 266 38) mention is made of a [<sup>1</sup> Ιερμοχός, *Iermochos*], or Jermucha, 10 Roman miles Northeast of Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrin). The site of this once important place is Khirbet el Yarmuk, a ruin, with many old walls and cisterns, on the top of a hill 1,465 ft. above sealevel. It is nearly 2 miles Northwest of Belt Nattif, from which it is visible, and 8 1/2 miles, as measured on map, N.N.E. of Belt Jibrin. Compare PEF, III, 128, Sh XVIII.

(2) A city of Issachar belonging to the “children of Gershon, of the families of the Levites” (<sup>0619</sup>Joshua 21:29); in the duplicate list in <sup>0367</sup>1 Chronicles 6:73 we have Ramoth, while in the Septuagint version of <sup>0619</sup>Joshua 21:29 we have, in different VSS, Rhemmath or Iermoth. In <sup>0621</sup>Joshua 19:21 “Remeth” occurs (in Hebrew) in the lists of cities of Issachar; in the Septuagint Rhemmas or Rhamath. The name was probably “Remeth” or “Ramoth,” but the place has never been identified with any certainty.

See RAMOTH.

*E. W. G. Masterman*

## JAROA

<ja-ro'-a> ([j " wθy; yaroach], meaning unknown): A Gadite chief (<1354>1 Chronicles 5:14). But the text is doubtful; see Curtis, Chronicles, 124.

## JASAELOS; JASAE

<jas-a-e'-lus> , <ja'-sa-el> ([ ' Ιασάηλος, Iasaelos]; Codex Vaticanus, [Asaelos]; the King James Version (1 Esdras 9:30)): Called "Sheal" in Ezr 10:29.

## JASHAR, BOOK OF

<ja'-sar> , <jash'-ar> ([rpsɛcepher ha-yashar]; the King James Version Book of Jasher, margin "the book of the upright"): The title of an ancient Hebrew national song-book (literally, "book of the righteous one") from which two quotations are made in the Old Testament:

(1) <6002> Joshua 10:12-14, the command of Joshua to the sun and moon, "Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon. .... Is not this written in the book of Jasher?" (see **BETH-HORON**; Septuagint in this place omits the reference to Jasher); and

(2) <1008> 2 Samuel 1:8 ff, "the song of the bow," or lament of David over Saul and Jonathan.

(3) Some conjecture a third extract in <1082> 1 Kings 8:12, "Then spake Solomon, Yahweh hath said that he would dwell in the thick darkness." The words of Yahweh are quoted by Septuagint in 8:53 as "written in the book of the song" (*en biblio tes odes*), and it is pointed out that the words "the song" (in Hebrew [ryVb" , ha-shir]) might easily be a corruption of [rvYh" , ha-yashar]. A similar confusion ("song" for "righteous") may explain the fact that the Peshitta Syriac of Joshua has for a title "the book of praises or hymns." The book evidently was a well-known one, and may have been a gradual collection of religious and national songs. It is conjectured that it may have included the Song of Deborah (Judges 5), and older pieces now found in the Pentateuch (e.g. <1002> Genesis 4:23,14; 9:25-27; 27:27-29); this, however, is uncertain. On the curious theories and speculations of the rabbis and others about the book (that it was the Book of the Law, of Genesis,



etc.), with the fantastic reconstructive theory of Dr. Donaldson in his Jasbar, see the full article in HDB.

*James Orr*

## JASHEN

<ja'-shen>, <jash'-en> ([<sup>ˈ</sup>vʃɹ̩ yashen], “asleep”(?)): Seemingly the father of some of David's thirty valiant men (<sup><1032></sup>2 Samuel 23:32 f). The Massoretic Text reads “Eliabha the Shaalbonite, the sons of Jashen, Jonathan, Shammah the Hararite, ....” <sup><1113></sup>1 Chronicles 11:33 f has Eliabha the Shaalbonite, the sons of Hashem the Gizonite, Jonathan the son of Shagee the Hararite .... “It is clear that “sons of” are a dittography of the last three consonants of the previous word. Septuagint, Lucian in 2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles has [ὁ Γουνί, *ho Gouni*], “the Gunite,” for “the Gizonite,” perhaps correctly (compare <sup><1434></sup>Genesis 46:24; <sup><1568></sup>Numbers 26:48 for “Guni,” “Gunite”). So <sup><1032></sup>2 Samuel 23:32 may be corrected thus: “Eliabha the Shaalbonite, Jashen the Gunite, Jonathan the son of Shammah the Hararite.” Jashen then becomes one of the thirty = “Hashem” of <sup><1113></sup>1 Chronicles 11:34.

*David Francis Roberts*

## JASHER, BOOK OF

<ja'-sher>, <jash'-er>: the King James Version for **JASHAR** (which see), and see **BETH-HORON, BATTLE OF**.

## JASHOBEAM

<ja-sho'-be-am> ([<sup>ˈ</sup>ʃɒbɪjə yashobh`am], probably “people will return”; see discussion of names compounded with [<sup>ˈ</sup>ʃɒbɪjə, `am], in HPN, 41-59): Jashobeam is mentioned in three passages (<sup><1111></sup>1 Chronicles 11:11; 12:6 (Hebrew 7); 27:2 f), but opinions vary as to the number of persons erred to. In <sup><1111></sup>1 Chronicles 11:11 he is called “the son of a Hachmonite” (reference unknown) and “the chief of the three” (“three,” the best reading; the Revised Version (British and American) “thirty”; the King James Version, the Revised Version margin “captains”), mighty men of David. He is said to have slain 300 (800 in <sup><1038></sup>2 Samuel 23:8) at one time, i.e. one after another.

The gibborim, or heroes, numbered 600 and were divided into bands of 200 each and subdivided into smaller bands of 20 each, with a captain for each company large and small. Jashobeam had command of the first of the three bands of 200 (see Ewald, HI, III, 140 f; Stanley, HJC, II, 78). From the indefiniteness of the description, “three of the thirty chief,” he can hardly be regarded as one of the three mighty men who broke through the ranks of the Philistines, and brought water from the well of Bethlehem to David on the hill-fortress of Adullam (<sup><13115></sup>1 Chronicles 11:15-17), and the fact that “the thirty” have not yet been mentioned would seem to indicate that this story is not in its proper place. But “Jashobe am” here (<sup><13111></sup>1 Chronicles 11:11) is probably an error for “Ishbaal,” the reading of many of the manuscripts of the Septuagint (HPN, 46, note).

In the parallel passage (<sup><13118></sup>2 Samuel 23:8) he is called “Joshebbasshebeth, a Tahchemonite.” This verse, however, is probably corrupt (Revised Version margin), and the text should be corrected in accordance with Chronicles to “Ishbaal, the Hachmonite.” In <sup><13120></sup>1 Chronicles 27:2 f Jashobeam is said to have been “the son of Zabdiel,” of the family of Perez, and the commander-in-chief of the division of David’s army which did duty the first month. The army consisted of 12 divisions of 24,000 each, each division serving a month in turn. In <sup><13126></sup>1 Chronicles 12:6 (Hebrew 7) Jashobeam is mentioned among those who joined David at Ziklag in the time of Saul, and is described as a Korahite, probably one belonging to a family of Judah (compare 2:43).

*James Crichton*

## JASHUB

<sup><ja'-shub></sup>, <sup><jash'-ub></sup> ([<sup>bWvy</sup>; yashubh]; [<sup>byvj</sup>; yashibh], in Chronicles, but Qere, [<sup>bWvy</sup>; yashubh], “he returns”):

- (1) In <sup><13124></sup>Numbers 26:24; <sup><13101></sup>1 Chronicles 7:1, a “son” (clan) of Issachar. <sup><13143></sup>Genesis 46:13 has incorrectly Iob, but Septuagint Jashub.
- (2) In Ezr 10:29, one of those who had married foreign wives = “Jasubus” in 1 Esdras 9:30.
- (3) In <sup><13108></sup>Isaiah 7:3, part of the name SHEAR-JASHUB (which see).

## JASHUBI-LEHEM

<*ja-shoo-bi-le'-hem*> ([ybiʃuβi l , *yashubhi-lechem*): A name in <sup><102></sup>1 Chronicles 4:22 where commentators insert [tyβēbeth], between the two words and translate “(and) returned to Bethlehem.”

## JASHUBITES, THE

<*ja'-shub-its*>, <*jash'-ub-its*> ([ybiʃuθ" , *ha-yashubhi*], coll. with article): In <sup><103></sup>Numbers 16:24, descendants of JASHUB (q.v. **(1)**).

## JASIEL

<*ja'-si-el*>, <*jas'-i-el*> ([l aβc[ʃy', *ya`asi'el*], “God is maker,” <sup><104></sup>1 Chronicles 11:47 the King James Version).

*See JAASIEL.*

## JASON (1)

<*ja'-sun*> ([ʼ l áβwv, *Iason*): A common name among the Hellenizing Jews who used it for Jesus or Joshua, probably connecting it with the Greek verb [*iasynthai*] (“to heal”).

**(1)** Son of Eleazar, sent (161 BC) by Judas Maccabeus with other deputies to Rome “to make a league of amity and confederacy” (1 Macc 8:17; Josephus, Ant, XII, x, 6), and perhaps to be identified with **(2)**.

**(2)** The father of Antipater who went as ambassador of Jonathan to Rome in 144 BC (1 Macc 12:16; 14:22; Ant, XIII, v, 8).

**(3)** Jason of Cyrene, a Jewish historian, who is known only from what is told of him in 2 Macc 2:19-23. 2 Macc is in fact simply an abridgment in one book of the 5 books written by Jason on the Jewish wars of liberation. He must have written after 162 BC, as his books include the wars under Antiochus Eupator.

**(4)** Jason the high priest, second son of Simon II and brother of Onias III. The change of name from Jesus (Josephus, Ant, XII, v) was part of the Hellenizing policy favored by Antiochus Epiphanes from whom he purchased the high-priesthood by a large bribe, thus excluding his elder brother from the office (2 Macc 4:7-26). He did everything in his power to

introduce Greek customs and Greek life among the Jews. He established a gymnasium in Jerusalem, so that even the priests neglected the altars and the sacrifices, and hastened to be partakers of the “unlawful allowance” in the palaestra. The writer of 2 Macc calls him “that ungodly wretch” and “vile” Jason. He even sent deputies from Jerusalem to Tyre to take part in the worship of Hercules; but what he sent for sacrifices, the deputies expended on the “equipment of galleys.” After 3 years of this Hellenizing work he was supplanted in 172 BC in the favor of Antiochus by Menelaus who gave a large bribe for the high priest’s office. Jason took refuge with the Ammonites; on hearing that Antiochus was dead he tried with some success to drive out Menelaus, but ultimately failed (2 Macc 5:5 ff). He took refuge with the Ammonites again, and then with Aretas, the Arabian, and finally with the Lacedaemonians, where he hoped for protection “as being connected by race,” and there “perished-miserably in a strange land.”

(5) A name mentioned in ~~417B~~ Acts 17:5-9 and in ~~61C1~~ Romans 16:21. See following article.

*J. Hutchison*

## **JASON (2)**

*<ja'-sun>* ([<sup>1</sup> **Ἰάσων**, *Iason*]): A Greek name assumed by Jews who bore the Hebrew name Joshua. This name is mentioned twice in the New Testament. (See also preceding article.)

(1) Jason was the host of Paul during his stay in Thessalonica, and, during the uproar organized by the Jews, who were moved to jealousy by the success of Paul and Silas, he and several other “brethren” were severely handled by the mob. When the mob failed to find Paul and Silas, they dragged Jason and “certain brethren” before the politarchs, accusing Jason of treason in receiving into his house those who said “There is another king, one Jesus.” The magistrates, being troubled, took security from them, and let them go.

There are various explanations of the purpose of this security. “By this expression it is most probably meant that a sum of money was deposited with the magistrates, and that the Christian community of the place made themselves responsible that no attempt should be made against the supremacy of Rome, and that peace should be maintained in Thessalonica itself” (Conybeare and Howson, Paul). Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler)

thinks that the security was given to prevent Paul from returning to Thessalonica and that Paul refers to this in ~~<112>~~1 Thessalonians 2:18.

The immediate departure of Paul and Silas seems to show the security was given that the strangers would leave the city and remain absent (~~<417>~~ Acts 17:5-9).

(2) Jason is one of the companions of Paul who unite with him in sending greetings to the Roman Christians (~~<512>~~ Romans 16:21). He is probably the same person as (1). Paul calls him a kinsman, which means a Jew (compare ~~<418>~~ Romans 9:3; 16:11,21).

*S. F. Hunter*

## **JASPER; JASPIS**

*<jas'-per>, <jas'-pis>.*

*See STONES, PRECIOUS.*

## **JASUBUS**

*<ja-su'-bus>* ([<sup>ʾ</sup> *Ἰάσουβος*, *Iasoubos*]): An Israelite who in the time of Ezra had to put away his foreign wife (1 Esdras 9:30); called “Jashub” in Ezr 10:29.

## **JATAL**

*<ja'-tal>* (1 Esdras 5:28).

*See ATAR.*

## **JATHAN**

*<ja'-than>* ([<sup>ʾ</sup> *Ἰαθάβ*, *Iathan*]; [*a*, *Nathan*]): For “Jonathas” in the King James Version, which is the Latin form for the Hebrew “Jonathan.” Jonathan was brother of Ananias and “son of that great Sammaias” (Tobit 5:13).

## **JATHBATH**

*<jath'-bath>.*

*See JOTBATHAH.*

## JATHNIEL

<jath'-ni-el> ([<sup>1</sup>aynity', yathni'el], "God lives"): Fourth "son" of Meshelemiah, a Korahite (<1341> 1 Chronicles 26:2).

## JATTIR

<jat'-er> ([<sup>1</sup>ryTiy', yattir], and [<sup>1</sup>rTiy', yattir]): A town in the hill country of Judah, mentioned in conjunction with Shamir and Socoh (<1658> Joshua 15:48); one of the cities given to the "children of Aaron the priest" (<16214> Joshua 21:14; <13167> 1 Chronicles 6:57). David after his victory over the Amalekites sent a present of the spoil from Ziklag "to them that were in Jattir" (<18177> 1 Samuel 30:27).

It is now Khirbet `Attir, an important ruin, in the extreme South of the hill country, 5 miles Southeast of edh Dhariyeh and 20 miles Southeast of Beit Jibrin. This must Correspond to the "very large village Jethira" which is mentioned in Eusebius, Onomasticon (119 27; 133 3; 134 24, etc.) as 20 miles Southeast of Eleutheropolis (i.e. Beit Jibrin). The site is full of caves. See PEF, III, 408, Sh XXV.

*E. W. G. Masterman*

## JAVAN

<ja'-van> ([<sup>1</sup>wy; yawan], meaning unknown):

(1) In <11112> Genesis 10:2,4 = <13165> 1 Chronicles 1:5,7 Septuagint [<sup>1</sup>Ιουάν, Iouan]); <2669> Isaiah 66:19; <2673> Ezekiel 27:13 Septuagint [<sup>1</sup>Ελλάς, Hellas], Greece); <21821> Daniel 8:21 m; 10:20; 11:2; Zec 9:13; <24167> Joel 3:6 (Hebrew 4:6) Septuagint [οἱ Ἕλληνες, hoi Hellenes], i.e. "Greeks"), "son" of Japheth, and "father" of Elisha, Tars, Kittim, and Rodarim, i.e. Rhodes (incorrectly "Dodanim" in <11112> Genesis 10:4). Javan is the Greek [Ιάων, Iaon] or [<sup>1</sup>Ιά(ρ)ων, Ia(v)on], and in Genesis and 1 Chronicles = the Ionian Greeks of Asia Minor, probably here = Cyprus. The reference in <2673> Ezekiel 27:13 (from which that in <2669> Isaiah 66:19 is copied) is the country personified. In Joel the plural [<sup>1</sup>μυνίω] yewanim], is found. In Daniel the name is extended to the Greeks generally. Corroboration of the name is found in Assyrian (Schrader, editor, Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, II, 43). "The Persian Yauna occurs in the same double reference from the time of Darius; compare Aesch. Persian., 176, 562" (Skinner, Gen, 198). In

Egyptian the word is said to be yevan-(n)a; in the Tell el-Amarna Letters Yivana is mentioned as being in the land of Tyre. See HDB, II, 552b.

(2) Place (<sup><3779></sup>Ezekiel 27:19); the name is missing in Septuagint.

*David Francis Roberts*

## JAVELIN

<jav'-lin>, <jav'-e-lin>.

See *ARMOR; ARMS*.

## JAW; JAWBONE; JAW TEETH

<jo>, <jo'-bon> ([**lj** **l**] *lechi*), “cheek (bone),” “jaw (bone)”: In <sup><8402></sup>Job 41:2, the Revised Version (British and American) gives “pierce his jaw through with a hook” for the King James Version “bore his jaw through with a thorn” (see *HOOK; LEVIATHAN*). <sup><9215></sup>Psalms 22:15, “My tongue cleaveth to my jaws (*malqoach*),” is descriptive of the effect of a fever or physical torture, a dryness and a horrible clamminess. *Malqochayim* is an ancient dual form meaning the two jaws, and, metaphorically, *malqoach* indicates that which is caught between the jaws, booty, prey, including captives (<sup><9811></sup>Numbers 31:11,26,32; <sup><2302></sup>Isaiah 49:24 f).

Figurative:

(1) Of the power of the wicked, with a reference to Divine restraint and discipline: “I brake the jaws (Hebrew “great teeth”) of the unrighteous” (<sup><8297></sup>Job 29:17; <sup><1804></sup>Proverbs 30:14); compare <sup><8806></sup>Psalms 58:6, “Break out the great teeth (*malta`oth*, “jaw teeth”) of the young lions, O Yahweh.” Let the wicked be deprived of their ability for evil; let them at least be disabled from mischief. Septuagint reads “God shall break,” etc. (Compare Edmund Prys’s Metrical Paraphrase of the Psalms, in the place cited.) “A bridle .... in the jaws of the peoples” (<sup><2308></sup>Isaiah 30:28; compare <sup><2938></sup>2 Kings 19:28) is descriptive of the ultimate check of the Assyrian power at Jerusalem, “as when a bridle or lasso is thrown upon the jaws of a wild animal when you wish to catch and tame him” (G.A. Smith Isa, I, 235). Compare <sup><2504></sup>Ezekiel 29:4 (concerning Pharaoh); 38:4 (concerning Gog), “I will put hooks in (into) thy jaws.”

(2) Of human labor and trials, with a reference to the Divine gentleness: “I was to them as they that lift up the yoke on their jaws” (<sup><2104></sup>Hosea 11:4), or ‘take the yoke off their jaws,’ as the humane driver eased the yoke with his hands or ‘lifted it forward from neck to the jaws’; or it may perhaps refer to the removal of the yoke in the evening, when work is over.

## JAWBONE

(<sup><0715></sup>Judges 15:15 ff).

See *RAMATH-LEHI*.

*M. O. Evans*

## JAZER

<sup><ja'-zer></sup> ([<sup><rzēy></sup>, ya`zer] or [<sup><ryzēy></sup>, ya`zeyr]; Septuagint [<sup><Ιαζήν></sup>, *Iazen*] in Codex Alexandrinus; [<sup><a></sup>, *Iazer*]): In some cases, e.g. <sup><0213></sup>Numbers 21:32, the King James Version reads “Jaazer.” This was a city of the Amorites East of the Jordan taken, along with its towns, by Moses, and occupied by the tribe of Gad (<sup><0213></sup>Numbers 21:32; 32:35). The country was very fertile, and its spacious pasture-lands attracted the flock-masters of Gad (<sup><0611></sup>Numbers 32:1), the southern border of whose territory it marked (<sup><0613></sup>Joshua 13:25). It was assigned to the Merarite Levites (<sup><0613></sup>Joshua 21:39; <sup><1308></sup>1 Chronicles 6:81). The place was reached by Joab when taking the census (<sup><1045></sup>2 Samuel 24:5). In the 40th year of King David mighty men of valor were found here to whom he entrusted the oversight in Reuben and Gad “for every matter pertaining to God, and run the affairs of the king” (<sup><1332></sup>1 Chronicles 26:32 f). The fruitfulness of the country is alluded to in <sup><2318></sup>Isaiah 16:8 f; <sup><2482></sup>Jeremiah 48:32. (Note: “Sea of” Jazer in this verse has arisen through accidental repetition of *yam*, “sea,” from the preceding clause.) The city was taken from the Ammonites by Judas Maccabeus, and burned (1 Macc 5:7,8; Ant, XII, viii, 1).

Onomasticon places Jazer 10 Roman miles West of Philadelphia (Amman), and about 15 miles from Heshbon, where a great stream rises, which flows into the Jordan. Many would identify it with Khirbet Car, on the South of Wady Cir, about 5 miles West of Amman. The perennial stream from Wady Cir reaches the Jordan by Wady el-Kefrein. Cheyne (EB, under the word) suggests Yajuz on Wady Zorby, tributary of the



Jabbok, with extensive Roman remains. It lies a little way to the East of el Jubeihat (“Jogbehah,” <sup><0625></sup>Numbers 32:35). It is situated, however, to the North and not to the West of `Amman, where Eusebius, *Onomasticon*, places it. Neither identification is certain.

*W. Ewing*

## JAZIZ

<sup><jel'-ziz></sup> ([<sup><zyz̥></sup> *yaziz*], meaning uncertain): The Hagrite who was over David's flocks (<sup><3273></sup>1 Chronicles 27:30 (Hebrew 31)).

## JEALOUSY

<sup><jel'-us-i></sup> ([<sup><hanʃi></sup> *qin'ah*]; [<sup><ζῆλος></sup> *zelos*]): Doubtless, the root idea of both the Greek and the Hob translated “jealousy” is “warmth,” “heat.” Both are used in a good and a bad sense — to represent right and wrong passion.

When jealousy is attributed to God, the word is used in a good sense. The language is, of course, anthropomorphic; and it is based upon the feeling in a husband of exclusive right in his wife. God is conceived as having wedded Israel to Himself, and as claiming, therefore, exclusive devotion. Disloyalty on the part of Israel is represented as adultery, and as provoking God to jealousy. See, e.g., <sup><6326></sup>Deuteronomy 32:16,21; <sup><1142></sup>1 Kings 14:22; <sup><9788></sup>Psalms 78:58; <sup><3188></sup>Ezekiel 8:3; 16:38,42; 23:25; 36:5; 38:19.

When jealousy is attributed to men, the sense is sometimes good, and sometimes bad. In the good sense, it refers to an ardent concern for God's honor. See, e.g., <sup><0251></sup>Numbers 25:11 (compare <sup><1190></sup>1 Kings 19:10; <sup><1206></sup>2 Kings 10:16); <sup><4710></sup>2 Corinthians 11:2 (compare <sup><5102></sup>Romans 10:2). In the bad sense it is found in <sup><4109></sup>Acts 7:9; <sup><5133></sup>Romans 13:13; <sup><4188></sup>1 Corinthians 3:3; <sup><4721></sup>2 Corinthians 12:20; <sup><5084></sup>James 3:14,16.

The “law of jealousy” is given in <sup><0051></sup>Numbers 5:11-31. It provided that, when a man suspected his wife of conjugal infidelity, an offering should be brought to the priest, and the question of her guilt or innocence should be subjected to a test there carefully prescribed. The test was intended to be an appeal to God to decide the question at issue.

*See ADULTERY; SACRIFICE.*

**JEALOUSY, IMAGE OF**

*See IMAGES.*

**JEALOUSY, WATER OF**

*See ADULTERY, (2).*

**JEARIM, MOUNT**

<je'-a-rim>, <je-a'-rim> ([pyrɪʔyArh" , har-ye`arim]): A mountain by the side of which passed the border of Judah (<sup><0650></sup>Joshua 15:10). It is mentioned here only, and is identical with *CHESALON* (which see).

**JEATHERAI; JEATERAI**

<je-ath'-e-ri>, <jeat'-e-ri> (Revised Version (British and American)), (the King James Version) ([yr" tɰy] ye'atheray], meaning unknown): A descendant of Gershom, "son" of Levi (<sup><102></sup>1 Chronicles 6:21 (Hebrew 6)), and probably an ancestor of Asaph (so commentators); in 6:39-43 the corresponding name is "Ei." The difference in the Hebrew words is not great.

**JEBERECHIAH**

<je-ber-e-ki'-a> ([Whykɰby] yebherekhyahu], "Yah blesses"): The father of the Zechariah whom Isaiah (8:2) took as a witness of his prophecy against Syria and Ephraim (circa 734 BC).

**JEBUS**

<je'-bus> ([sWby] yebhuc]; [ 'Ieβoús, Iebous]): In <sup><0790></sup>Judges 19:10,11, "Jebus (the same is Jerusalem)"; <sup><100></sup>1 Chronicles 11:4,5, "Jerusalem (the same is Jebus)." It was once thought that this was the first name of Jerusalem, as indeed might be suggested by the Biblical references, but it is now known from the Tell el-Amarna Letters that Urusa-lem was a name used centuries before the time of David (*see JERUSALEM*, I). It would appear probable that the name "Jebus" was evolved by the Hebrews as an alternate name, and possibly they may have imagined an earlier name, for

Jerusalem from JESUSITE (which see), the name of the local tribe who owned the district in the first centuries of Israel's occupation of Canaan.

*E. W. G. Masterman*

## **JEBUS; JEBUSI; JEBUSITE**

<je'-bus>, <jeb'-u-si>, <jeb'-u-zit> ([sWby] yebhuc, [ysWbyh" , ha-yebhuci]): "Jebus" is an old name for Jerusalem (<0790> Judges 19:10,11; <1346> 1 Chronicles 4:5 parallel <0086> 2 Samuel 5:6-9, "the same is Jerus"; see preceding article). "Jebusi" (literally, "Jebusite") is also used as a name for the city in the King James Version (<0686> Joshua 18:16,28; compare 15:8); the Revised Version (British and American) correctly renders "Jebusite" (see *JERUSALEM*). "Jebusites," for the people (in the King James Version <0152> Genesis 15:21; Exodus 3:8,17, etc.), does not occur in Hebrew in the plural; hence, in the Revised Version (British and American) is always rendered in the singular, "Jebusite." The "Jebusite" is said in <0006> Genesis 10:16; <1346> 1 Chronicles 1:14 to be the 3rd son of Canaan, i.e. of the country of Canaan. Elsewhere he represents a tribe separate from the Canaanites. He stands between Heth and the Amorite (compare <0439> Numbers 13:29; <0608> Joshua 11:3; <2608> Ezekiel 16:3,15). In the lists of the peoples inhabiting Palestine the "Jebusite" is always placed last, a fact indicative, probably, of their smaller number.

To what race the Jebusites belonged is doubtful. Their name does not seem Semitic, and they do not make their appearance till after the patriarchal period.

The original name of Jerusalem was Babylonian, Uru-Salim, "the city of Salim," shortened into Salem in <0448> Genesis 14:18 and in the inscriptions of the Egyptian kings Ramses II and Ramses III. In the Tell el-Amarna Letters (1400 BC) Jerusalem is still known as Uru-Salim, and its king bears a Hittite name, implying that it was at the time in the possession of the Hittites. His enemies, however, were closing around him, and one of the tablets shows that the city was eventually captured and its king slain. These enemies would seem to have been the Jebusites, since it is after this period that the name "Jebus" makes its appearance for the first time in the Old Testament (<0790> Judges 19:10,11).

The Jebusite king at the time of the conquest was Adoni-zedek, who met his death at Beth-boron (<0608> Joshua 10:1 ff; in 10:5 the word "Amorite" is

used in its Babylonian sense to denote the inhabitants of Canaan generally). The Jebusites were a mountain tribe (<sup><0439></sup>Numbers 13:29; <sup><0408></sup>Joshua 11:3). Their capital “Jebus” was taken by the men of Judah and burned with fire (Judges 18), but they regained possession of, and held, the fortress till the time of David (<sup><0186></sup>2 Samuel 5:6 ff).

When Jerusalem was taken by David, the lives and property of its Jebusite inhabitants were spared, and they continued to inhabit the temple-hill, David and his followers settling in the new City of David on Mt. Zion (<sup><0458></sup>Joshua 15:8,63; <sup><0702></sup>Judges 1:21; 19:11). And as Araunah is called “king” (<sup><0182></sup>2 Samuel 24:23), we may conclude that their last ruler also had been lowed to live. His name is non-Sem, and the various spellings of it (compare <sup><0215></sup>1 Chronicles 21:15, “Ornan”) indicate that the Hebrew writers had some difficulty in pronouncing it. The Jebusites seem ultimately to have blended with the Israelite population.

*James Orr*

## JECAMIAH

<jek-a-mi’-a>: the King James Version for *JEKAMIAH* (which see).

## JECHILIAH

<jek-i-li’-a> ([<sup>hy</sup>l <sup>ky</sup>] yekhilyah). *See JECHOLIAH*; Kethibh and <sup><0408></sup>2 Chronicles 26:3 the Revised Version (British and American), where Qere is [<sup>hy</sup>l <sup>ky</sup>] yekholyah] = “Jecoliah” (the King James Version).

## JECHOLIAH

<jek-o-li’-a> ([<sup>why</sup>l <sup>ky</sup>] yekholyahu]; <sup><0290></sup>2 Kings 15:2 the King James Version = [<sup>hy</sup>l <sup>ky</sup>] yekholyah], Qere in <sup><0408></sup>2 Chronicles 26:3, “Yah is able” or “Yah has been able”): The mother of King Uzziah (Azariah) of Judah. The Revised Version (British and American) has “Jecoliah” in 2 Kings and so the King James Version in 2 Ch.

## JECHONIAS

<jek-o-ni’-as> ([<sup>’</sup> <sup>lexoví</sup>ας, *Iechonias*], the King James Version; Greek form of “Jechoniah,” the Revised Version (British and American)):

- (1) The altered form of Jehoiachin (Additions to Esther 11:4; Baruch 1:3,9; ~~<011>~~ Matthew 1:11,12). The last but one of the kings of Judah.
- (2) The son of Zeelus (1 Esdras 8:92), called “Shecaniah” in Ezr 10:2.

## JECOLIAH

*<jek-o-li’-a>*: ~~<219D>~~ 2 Kings 15:2; ~~<431B>~~ 2 Chronicles 26:3 the King James Version; *see JECHILIAH; JECHOLIAH*.

## JECONIAH

*<jek-o-ni’-a>*.

*See JEHOACHIN*.

## JECONIAS

*<jek-o-ni-as>* ([<sup>’</sup> *Ιεχονίας*, *Iechonias*]):

- (1) One of the chiliarchs who made great gifts of sheep and calves at the Passover of Josiah (1 Esdras 1:9); called “Conaniah” in ~~<481D>~~ 2 Chronicles 35:9.
- (2) One reading makes Jeconias (not Joachaz) son of Josiah in 1 Esdras 1:34 margin.

## JEDAIAH

*<je-da’-ya>*, *<je-di’-a>*:

- (1) ([*hy*[*ð*” *y*] *yedha`yah*], “Yah knows”):
- (a) A priest in Jerusalem (~~<139D>~~ 1 Chronicles 9:10; 24:7).
  - (b) Ezr 2:36 = ~~<417B>~~ Nehemiah 7:39, where “children of Jedaiah” are mentioned = “Jeddu” in 1 Esdras 5:24.
  - (c) Jedaiah is among “the priests and the Levites” that returned with Zerubbabel (~~<611D>~~ Nehemiah 11:10; 12:6,19).
  - (d) Another priest of the same name (~~<612D>~~ Nehemiah 12:7,21).

(e) One of the exiles whom Zechariah was commanded to send with silver and gold to Jerusalem. Septuagint does not take the word as a proper name (Zec 6:10,14)

(2) ([**hydy**] *yedhayah*), “Yah throws” (?):

(a) Father of a Simeonite prince (<<sup>13037</sup>> 1 Chronicles 4:37).

(b) One of the repairers of the wall of Jerusalem (<<sup>13180</sup>> Nehemiah 3:10).

*David Francis Roberts*

## JEDDU

<*je-de'-oo*> ([<sup>1</sup> **ἰέδδου**, *Ieddou*]): Called **JEDIAIAH** (which see 1, (b)) in canonical books (1 Esdras 5:24).

## JEDEUS

<*je-de'-us*> ([<sup>1</sup> **ἰεδαῖος**, *Iedaios*]): Called **ADAIAH** (which see) in Ezr 10:29 (1 Esdras 9:30).

## JEDIAEL

<*je-di'-a-el*> ([**ἰ αἰῃδῃ**] *yedhi`a'-el*), “God makes known” (?):

(1) A “son” of Benjamin or probably of Zebulun (<<sup>13076</sup>> 1 Chronicles 7:6,10,11). See Curtis, Chronicles, 145-49, who suggests emending the name to [**ἰ αἰῃ**] *y*, *yachle'el*, Jahleel, in agreement with <<sup>13124</sup>> Genesis 46:24.

(2) One of David’s mighty men (<<sup>13145</sup>> 1 Chronicles 11:45), probably = the Manassite who deserted to David at Ziklag (<<sup>13120</sup>> 1 Chronicles 12:20 (Hebrew 21)).

(3) A Korahite doorkeeper in David’s reign (<<sup>13162</sup>> 1 Chronicles 26:2).

## JEDIDAH

<*je-di'-da*> ([**ἡδῃδῃ**] *yedhidhah*), “beloved”): Mother of King Josiah of Judah, daughter of Adaiah of Bozkath (<<sup>12201</sup>> 2 Kings 22:1).

## JEDIDIAH

<jed-i-di'-a> ([~~hy~~~~d~~~~idj~~] yedhidh-yah], “the beloved of Yah”): The name conferred by God through Nathan upon Solomon at his birth (~~1025~~ 2 Samuel 12:25).

## JEDUTHUN

<je-du'-thun>.

See *ASAPH*.

## JEELI

<je-e'-li> ([<sup>ʾ</sup>Ιειηλί, *Iieli*): Called “Jaalah” in Ezr 2:56 and “Jaala” in ~~4188~~ Nehemiah 7:58 (1 Esdras 5:33).

## JEELUS

<je-e'-lus> ([<sup>ʾ</sup>Ιεήλος, *Ielos*): Called “Jehiel” in Ezr 10:2 (1 Esdras 8:92).

## JEEZER

<je-e'-zer> (the King James Version) ([~~rz~~~~lai~~ 'i`ezer]; the Revised Version (British and American) IEZER): The name of a elan of Gilead (~~0450~~ Numbers 26:30), but read [~~rz~~~~yba~~] " , *la-'abhi`ezer*], i.e. “of Abiezer” (compare ~~4670~~ Joshua 17:2).

See *ABIEZER*.

## JEEZERITES

<je-e'-zer-its>.

See *ABIEZER*.

## JEGAR-SAHA-DUTHA

<je-gar-sa-ha-du'-tha> ([~~at~~~~wdh~~~~c~~; ~~rgy~~] yeghar sahadhutha’]; Septuagint [~~Βουνός~~ ~~μαρτυρεῖ~~, *Bounos marturei*], “(the) mound witnesses”): The name given by the Aramean, Laban, to the “cairn of witness,” called by

Jacob *GALEED* (which see) (<sup><01347></sup>Genesis 31:47). The rest of the second part of this name appears again in <sup><01619></sup>Job 16:19, where [ydh<sup>h</sup>; *sahadhi*], should be rendered with the Revised Version (British and American), “he that voucheth for me,” i.e. “my witness.”

## JEHALLELEL; JHALELEEL

<*je-hal'-e-lel*> (Revised Version (British and American)), <*je-ha-le'-le-el*> (the King James Version) ([l a<sup>h</sup>l<sup>h</sup>" y] *yehallel'el*], “he shall praise God”):

- (1) A Judahite (<sup><13416></sup>1 Chronicles 4:16).
- (2) A Levite, a descendant of Merari (<sup><14912></sup>2 Chronicles 29:12).

## JEHDEIAH

<*je-de'-ya*>, <*ja'-de-ya*> ([WhyD] y, *yechdeyahu*], “may Yahweh give joy!”):

- (1) A Levite, head of the family of Shubael (<sup><13910></sup>1 Chronicles 24:20).
- (2) An officer of David “over the asses” (<sup><13731></sup>1 Chronicles 27:30).

## JEHEZKEL; JEHEZEKEL

<*je-hez'-kel*> (Revised Version (British and American)), <*je-hez'-e-kel*> (the King James Version) ([l aq<sup>h</sup> y] *yechezqe'l*] “God strengthens”):

- (1) A priest of David’s time (<sup><13916></sup>1 Chronicles 24:16).
- (2) Jehezkel in <sup><16008></sup>Ezekiel 1:3 King James Version margin, for *EZEKIEL* (which see).

## JEHIAH

<*je-hi'-a*> ([hwj y] *yechiyah*], “may Yahweh live!”): Keeper of the ark with Obed-edom (<sup><13524></sup>1 Chronicles 15:24), but in verse 18 the name is [l a<sup>h</sup> y] *ye`i`el*], IEIEL (which see)



## JEHIEL; JEHIELI

<je-hi'-el>, <je-hi'-e-li> ([l aʝ j] yechi'el], “may God live!”):

- (1) A Levite, one of the musicians appointed to play upon instruments at the bringing up of the ark by David (<sup><1518></sup>1 Chronicles 15:18,20; 16:5); ([l aʝ j] yechi'eli]: A patronymic of this name (<sup><1321></sup>1 Chronicles 26:21,22), but Curtis (Chronicles, 286-87) reads “Jehiel (<sup><1321></sup>1 Chronicles 26:21) and he is brethren Zetham and Joel” (<sup><1322></sup>1 Chronicles 26:22); compare <sup><1328></sup>1 Chronicles 23:8, where the three seem to be brothers. See (2) above.
- (2) A Gershonite, head of a Levitical house (<sup><1328></sup>1 Chronicles 23:8; 29:8).
- (3) Son of a Hachmonite; he was “with the king’s (David’s) sons,” i.e. their tutor (<sup><1373></sup>1 Chronicles 27:32).
- (4) A son of King Jehoshaphat (<sup><1402></sup>2 Chronicles 21:2).
- (5) In <sup><1414></sup>2 Chronicles 29:14 the King James Version, where Qere is [l aʝ j] yechu'el], the Revised Version (British and American) “Jehuel,” a Hermanite Levite who took part in cleansing the temple in Hezekiah’s reign.
- (6) An overseer in Hezekiah’s reign (<sup><1413></sup>2 Chronicles 31:13).
- (7) One of the three “rulers” of the temple in Hezekiah’s reign (<sup><1418></sup>2 Chronicles 35:8).
- (8) Father of Obadiah, a returned exile (Ezr 8:9) = “Jezelus” of 1 Esdras 8:35.
- (9) Father of Shecaniah (Ezr 10:2) = “Jeelus” of 1 Esdras 8:92. He was a “son” of Elam, and so probably the same as “Jehiel” in Ezr 10:26, one of those who had married foreign wives = “Jezrielus” of 1 Esdras 9:27.
- (10) A “son” of Harim, and one of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:21) = “Hiereel” of 1 Esdras 9:21.
- (11) The King James Version in <sup><1395></sup>1 Chronicles 9:35 = JEIEL (q.v. (2)).
- (12) The King James Version in <sup><13144></sup>1 Chronicles 11:44 = JEIEL (q.v. (3)).

*David Francis Roberts*

## JEHIZKIAH

<je-hiz-ki'-a> ([ʰhʲqʒ̞ j̞] yechizqiyahu], “Yah strengthens”): One of the Ephraimite chiefs (<sup><1382></sup>2 Chronicles 28:12) who with Obed are said to have opposed the enslavement of the Judahites taken captive by Pekah in his war against Ahaz (circa 734 BC).

## JEHOADDAH; JEHOADAH

<je-ho-ad'-a> (Revised Version (British and American)), <je-ho'-a-da> (the King James Version) ([hD[ʰDy] yeho`addah], “Yah has deposed” or “numbered”): A descendant of King Saul (<sup><1385></sup>1 Chronicles 8:36), called “Jarah” in <sup><1390></sup>1 Chronicles 9:42, where the Septuagint has [ʰʰδά, *Iada*] = [hD[ʰy] ya`dah].

*See JARAH.*

## JEHOADDAN

<je-ho-ad'-an> ([ʰD[ʰDy] yeho`addan], meaning unknown): In <sup><1420></sup>2 Chronicles 25:1; and Qere, the King James Version in <sup><1442></sup>2 Kings 14:2, where Kethibh and the Revised Version (British and American) are “Jehoaddin” ([ʰyD[ʰDy] yeho`addin]), the mother of King Amaziah of Judah.

## JEHOADDIN

<je-ho-ad'-in>.

*See JEHOADDAN.*

## JEHOAHAZ

<je-ho'-a-haz>, <je-ho-a'-haz> ([zj aʰDy] yeho`achaz], “Yah has grasped”; [ʰʰαχάς, *Ioachas*]; <sup><1230></sup>2 Kings 13:1-9):

**(1)** Son of Jehu, and 11th king of Israel. He is stated to have reigned 17 years.

## 1. CHRONOLOGY OF REIGN:

Josephus was already aware (Ant., IX, viii, 5) of the chronological difficulty involved in the cross-references in ~~<2K3>~~ 2 Kings 13:1 and 10, the former of which states that Jehoahaz began to reign in the 23rd year of Jehoash of Jerusalem, and reigned 17 years; while the latter gives him a successor in Jehoash's 37th year, or 14 years later. Josephus alters the figure of 13:1 to 21; and, to meet the same difficulty, the Septuagint (Aldine edition) changes 37 to 39 in 13:10. The difficulty may be met by supposing that Jehoahaz was associated with his father Jehu for several years in the government of the country before the death of the latter, and that these years were counted as a part of his reign. This view has in its favor the fact that Jehu was an old man when he died, and may have been incapacitated for the full discharge of administrative duties before the end came. The accession of Jehoahaz as sole ruler may be dated about 825 BC.

## 2. LOW CONDITION OF THE KINGDOM:

When Jehoahaz came to the throne, he found a discouraged and humiliated people. The territory beyond Jordan, embracing 2 1/2 tribes, or one-fourth of the whole kingdom, had been lost in warfare with the Syrian king, Hazael (~~<2K3>~~ 2 Kings 10:32,33). A heavy annual subsidy was still payable to Assyria, as by his father Jehu. The neighboring kingdom of Judah was still unfriendly to any member of the house of Jehu. Elisha the prophet, though then in the zenith of his influence, does not seem to have done anything toward the stability of Jehu's throne.

## 3. ISRAEL AND SYRIA:

Specially did Israel suffer during this reign from the continuance of the hostility of Damascus (~~<2K3>~~ 2 Kings 13:3,4,22). Hazael had been selected, together with Jehu, as the instrument by which the idolatry of Israel was to be punished (~~<1K16>~~ 1 Kings 19:16). Later the instruments of vengeance fell out. On Jehu's death, the pressure from the east on Hazael was greatly relieved. The great conqueror, Shalmaneser II, had died, and his son Samsi-Ramman IV had to meet a revolt within the empire, and was busy with expeditions against Babylon and Media during the 12 years of his reign (824-812 BC). During these years, the kingdoms of the seaboard of the Mediterranean were unmolested. They coincide with the years of

Jehoahaz, and explain the freedom which Hazael had to harass the dominions of that king.

#### 4. THE ELISHA EPISODES:

Particulars of the several campaigns in which the troops of Damascus harassed Israel are not given. The life of Elisha extended through the 3 reigns of Jehoram (12 years), Jehu (28 years) and Jehoahaz (12 or 13 years), into the reign of Joash (~~<1231>~~ 2 Kings 13:1). It is therefore probable that in the memorabilia of his life in 2 Kings 4 through 8, now one and now another king of Israel should figure, and that some of the episodes there recorded belong to the reign of Jehoahaz. There are evidences that strict chronological order is not observed in the narrative of Elisha, e.g. Gehazi appears in waiting on the king of Israel in 8:5, after the account of his leprosy in 5:27. The terrible siege of Samaria in 2 Kings 7 is generally referred to the reign of Jehoram; but no atmosphere is so suitable to it as that of the reign of Jehoahaz, in one of the later years of whom it may have occurred. The statement in 13:7 that “the king of Syria destroyed them, and made them like the dust in threshing,” and the statistics there given of the depleted army of Jehoahaz, would correspond with the state of things that siege implies. In this case the Ben-hadad of ~~<1161>~~ 2 Kings 6:24 would be the son of Hazael (13:3).

#### 5. HIS IDOLATRY:

Jehoahaz, like his father, maintained the calf-worship in Bethel and Dan, and revived also the cult of the Asherah, a form of Canaanitish idolatry introduced by Ahab (~~<1163>~~ 1 Kings 16:33). It centered round a sacred tree or pole, and was probably connected with phallic worship (compare 1 K 15:13, where Maacah, mother of Asa, is said to have “made an abominable image for an Asherah” in Jerusalem).

#### 6. PARTIAL REFORM:

The close of this dark reign, however, is brightened by a partial reform. In his distress, we are told, “Jehoahaz besought Yahweh, and Yahweh hearkened unto him” (~~<1234>~~ 2 Kings 13:4). If the siege of Samaria in 2 Kings 6 belongs to his reign, we might connect this with his wearing “sackcloth within upon his flesh” (6:30) — an act of humiliation only accidentally discovered by the rending of his garments. ~~<1265>~~ 2 Kings 6:5 goes on to say that “Yahweh gave Israel a saviour, so that they went out from under the

hand of the Syrians.” The “saviour” may refer to Joash, under whom the deliverance began (13:25), or to Jeroboam II, of whom it is declared that by him God “saved” Israel (14:27). Others take it to refer to Ramman-nirari III, king of Assyria, whose conquest of Damascus made possible the victories of these kings.

*See JEHOASH.*

### *W. Shaw Caldecott*

**(2)** A king of Judah, son and successor of Josiah; reigned three months and was deposed, 608 BC. Called “Shallum” in <sup><2421></sup>Jeremiah 22:11; compare <sup><1385></sup>1 Chronicles 3:15. The story of his reign is told in <sup><1233></sup>2 Kings 23:30-35, and in a briefer account in <sup><4801></sup>2 Chronicles 36:1-3. The historian of 2 Kings characterizes his reign as evil; 2 Chronicles passes no verdict upon him. On the death of his father in battle, which threw the realm into confusion, he, though a younger son (compare <sup><1233></sup>2 Kings 23:31 with 23:36; <sup><1385></sup>1 Chronicles 3:15 makes him the fourth son of Josiah), was raised to the throne by “the people of the land,” the same who had secured the accession to his father; see under *JOSIAH*. Perhaps, as upholders of the sterling old Davidic idea, which his father had carried out so well, they saw in him a better hope for its integrity than in his elder brother Jehoiakim (Eliakim), whose tyrannical tendencies may already have been too apparent. The prophets also seem to have set store by him, if we may judge by the sympathetic mentions of him in <sup><2421></sup>Jeremiah 22:11 and <sup><2408></sup>Ezekiel 1:3,4. His career was too short, however, to make any marked impression on the history of Judah.

Josiah’s ill-advised meddling with the designs of Pharaoh-necoh (see under *JOSIAH*) had had, in fact, the ill effect of plunging Judah again into the vortex of oriental politics, from which it had long been comparatively free. The Egyptian king immediately concluded that so presumptuous a state must not be left in his rear unpunished. Arrived at Riblah on his Mesopotamian expedition, he put Jehoahaz in bonds, and later carried him prisoner to Egypt, where he died; raised his brother Jehoiakim to the throne as a vassal king; and imposed on the realm a fine of a hundred talents of silver and a talent of gold. So the fortunes of the Judean state, so soon after Josiah’s good reign, began their melancholy change for the worse.

*John Franklin Genung*

(3) In <sup><4217></sup>2 Chronicles 21:17; 25:23 = **AHAZIAH**, king of Judah (which see) (<sup><4185></sup>2 Kings 8:25 ff; <sup><4216></sup>2 Chronicles 22:1 ff).

## JEHOASH; JOASH

<sup><je-ho'-ash></sup>, the uncontracted form of ([<sup>vawdy</sup>] yeho'ash], [<sup>vawo</sup> yo'ash], “Yahweh has bestowed”; compare <sup><4216></sup>2 Kings 11:2,21; 12:1,19; <sup><4216></sup>2 Chronicles 24:1, etc.; [<sup>Ἰωάς</sup>, *Ioas*]):

(1) The 9th king of Judah; son of Ahaziah and Zibiah, a woman of Beersheba (2 Kings 11 through 12; <sup><4220></sup>2 Chronicles 22:10 through 24:27). Jehoash was 7 years old at his accession, and reigned 40 years. His accession may be placed in 852 BC. Some include in the years of his reign the 6 years of Athaliah's usurpation.

### I. NINTH KING OF JUDAH

#### 1. His Early Preservation:

When, on Athaliah's usurpation of the throne, she massacred the royal princes, Jehoash was saved from her unnatural fury by the action of his aunt Jehosheba, the wife of Jehoiada, the high priest (<sup><4210></sup>2 Kings 11:1,2; <sup><4210></sup>2 Chronicles 22:10,11). During 6 years he was concealed in the house of Jehoiada, which adjoined the temple; hence, is said to have been “hid in the house of Yahweh” — a perfectly legitimate use of the phrase according to the idiom of the time.

#### 2. The Counter-Revolution:

During these formative years of Jehoash's early life, he was under the moral and spiritual influence of Jehoiada — a man of lofty character and devout spirit. At the end of 6 years, a counter-revolution was planned by Jehoiada, and was successfully carried out on a Sabbath, at one of the great festivals. The accounts of this revolution in Kings and Chronicles supplement each other, but though the Levitical interest of the Chronicler is apparent in the details to which he gives prominence, the narratives do not necessarily collide, as has often been represented. The event was prepared for by the young king being privately exhibited to the 5 captains of the “executioners” (the Revised Version (British and American) “Carites”) and “runners” (<sup><4210></sup>2 Kings 11:4; <sup><4210></sup>2 Chronicles 23:1). These entered into covenant with Jehoiada, and, by his direction, summoned the

Levites from Judah (<sup><423></sup>2 Chronicles 23:2), and made the necessary arrangements for guarding the palace and the person of the king. In these dispositions both the royal body-guard and the Levites seem to have had their parts. Jehoash next appears standing on a platform in front of the temple, the law of the testimony in his hand and the crown upon his head. Amid acclamations, he is anointed king. Athaliah, rushing on the scene with cries of “treason” (*see* **ATHALIAH**), is driven forth and slain. A new covenant is made between Yahweh and the king and people, and, at the conclusion of the ceremony, a great procession is formed, and the king is conducted with honor to the royal house (<sup><1219></sup>2 Kings 11:19; <sup><4230></sup>2 Chronicles 23:20). Thus auspiciously did the new reign begin.

### *3. Repair of the Temple:*

Grown to manhood (compare the age of his son Amaziah, <sup><1245></sup>2 Kings 14:25), Jehoash married two wives, and by them had sons and daughters (<sup><4243></sup>2 Chronicles 24:3). His great concern at this period, however, was the repair of the temple — the “house of Yahweh” — which in the reign of Athaliah had been broken up in many places, plundered, and allowed to become dilapidated (<sup><1215></sup>2 Kings 12:5,12; <sup><4247></sup>2 Chronicles 24:7). To meet the expense of its restoration, the king gave orders that all moneys coming into the temple, whether dues or voluntary offerings, should be appropriated for this purpose (<sup><1214></sup>2 Kings 12:4), and from the account in Chronicles would seem to have contemplated a revival of the half-shekel tax appointed by Moses for the construction of the tabernacle (<sup><4245></sup>2 Chronicles 24:5,6; compare Exodus 30:11-16; 38:25). To enforce this impost would have involved a new census, and the memory of the judgments which attended David’s former attempt of this kind may well have had a deterrent effect on Jehoiada and the priesthood. “The Levites hastened it not,” it is declared (<sup><4245></sup>2 Chronicles 24:5).

### *4. A New Expedient:*

Time passed, and in the 23rd year of the king’s reign (his 30th year), it was found that the breaches of the house had still not been repaired. A new plan was adopted. It was arranged that a chest with a hole bored in its lid should be set up on the right side of the altar in the temple-court, under the care of two persons, one the king’s scribe, the other an officer of the high priest, and that the people should be invited to bring voluntarily their half-shekel tax or other offerings, and put it in this box (<sup><1219></sup>2 Kings 12:9; <sup><4248></sup>2

Chronicles 24:8,9). Gifts from worshippers who did not visit the altar were received by priests at the gate, and brought to the box. The expedient proved brilliantly successful. The people cheerfully responded, large sums were contributed, the money was honestly expended, and the temple was thoroughly renovated. There remained even a surplus, with which gold and silver vessels were made, or replaced, for the use of the temple. Jehoiada's long and useful life seems to have closed soon after.

### *5. The King's Declension:*

With the death of this good man, it soon became evident that the strongest pillar of the state was removed. It is recorded that "Jehoash did that which was right in the eyes of Yahweh all his days wherein Jehoiada the priest instructed him" (~~1217~~2 Kings 12:2), but after Jehoiada had been honorably interred in the sepulchers of the kings (~~1246~~2 Chronicles 24:16), a sad declension became manifest. The princes of Judah came to Jehoash and expressed their wish for greater freedom in worship than had been permitted them by the aged priest. With weak complaisance, the king "hearkened unto them" (~~1417~~2 Chronicles 24:17). Soon idols and Asherahs began to be set up in Jerusalem and the other cities of Judah. Unnamed prophets raised their protests in vain. The high priest Zechariah, a worthy son of Jehoiada, testified in his place that as the nation had forsaken Yahweh, he also would forsake it, and that disaster would follow (~~1421~~2 Chronicles 24:20). Wrathful at the rebuke, the king gave orders that Zechariah should be stoned with stones in the temple-court (~~1421~~2 Chronicles 24:21). This was done, and the act of sacrilege, murder, and ingratitude was perpetrated to which Jesus seems to refer in ~~1735~~Matthew 23:35; ~~2151~~Luke 11:51 ("son of Barachiah" in the former passage is probably an early copyist's gloss through confusion with the prophet Zechariah).

### *6. Calamities and Assassination:*

The high priest's dying words, "Yahweh look upon it, and require it," soon found an answer. Within a year of Zechariah's death, the armies of Hazael, the Syrian king, were ravaging and laying waste Judah. The city of Gath fell, and a battle, the place of which is not given, placed Jerusalem at the mercy of the foe (~~1217~~2 Kings 12:17; ~~1423~~2 Chronicles 24:23,24). To save the capital from the indignity of foreign occupation, Jehoash, then in dire sickness, collected all the hallowed things of the temple, and all the gold of



the palace, and sent them to Hazael (<sup><1217></sup>2 Kings 12:17,18). This failure of his policy, in both church and state, excited such popular feeling against Jehoash, that a conspiracy was formed to assassinate him. His physical sufferings won for him no sympathy, and two of his own officers slew him, while asleep, in the fortress of Millo, where he was paying a visit (<sup><1220></sup>2 Kings 12:20). He was buried in the city of David, but not in the royal sepulchers, as Jehoiada had been (<sup><1225></sup>2 Chronicles 24:25).

Jehoash is mentioned as the father of Amaziah (<sup><1241></sup>2 Kings 14:1; <sup><1255></sup>2 Chronicles 25:25). His contemporaries in Israel were Jehoahaz (<sup><1231></sup>2 Kings 13:1) and Jehoash (<sup><1230></sup>2 Kings 13:10).

(2) The son of Jehoahaz, and 12th king of Israel (<sup><1230></sup>2 Kings 13:10-25; 14:8-16; <sup><1257></sup>2 Chronicles 25:17-24).

## II. TWELVETH KING OF ISRAEL

### *1. Accession and Reign:*

Jehoash reigned for 16 years. His accession may be placed in 813 BC. There were almost simultaneous changes in the sovereignties of Judah and of Assyria — Amazih succeeding to the throne of Judah in the 2nd year of Jehoash, and Ramman-nirari III coming to the throne of Assyria in 811 BC — which had important effects on the history of Israel in this reign.

### *2. Elisha and Jehoash:*

During the three previous reigns, for half a century, Elisha had been the prophet of Yahweh to Israel. He was now aged and on his deathbed. Hearing of his illness, the young king came to Dothan, where the prophet was, and had a touching interview with him. His affectionate exclamation, “My father, my father, the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof” (<sup><1234></sup>2 Kings 13:14; compare 2:12), casts a pleasing light upon his character. On his lips the words had another meaning than they bore when used by Elisha himself at Elijah’s translation. Then they referred to the “appearance” which parted Elisha from his master; now they referred to the great service rendered by the prophet to the kingdom. Not only had Elisha repeatedly saved the armies of Israel from the ambushes prepared for them by the Syrians (<sup><1218></sup>2 Kings 6:8-23), but he had given assurance of the relief of the capital when it was at its worst extremity (<sup><1214></sup>2 Kings 6:24 ff). To Jehoash, Elisha’s presence was indeed in place of chariots and horse. The truth was anew demonstrated by the promise which the dying prophet now

made to him. Directing Jehoash in the symbolical action of the shooting of certain arrows, he predicted three victories over the Syrians — the first at Aphek, now Fik, on the East of the Lake of Galilee — and more would have been granted, had the faith of the king risen to the opportunity then afforded him (~~1216~~2 Kings 6:15-19).

### *3. Assyria and Damascus:*

An interesting light is thrown by the annals of Assyria on the circumstances which may have made these victories of Jehoash possible. Ramman-nirari III, who succeeded to the throne in 811 BC, made an expedition against Damascus, Edom and Philistia, in his account of which he says: "I shut up the king (of Syria) in his chief city, Damascus. .... He clasped my feet, and gave himself up. .... His countless wealth and goods I seized in Damascus." With the Syrian power thus broken during the remainder of this ruler's reign of 27 years, it may be understood how Jehoash should be able to recover, as it is stated he did, the cities which Ben-hadad had taken from his father Jehoahaz (~~1213~~2 Kings 13:25). Schrader and others see in this Assyrian ruler the "saviour" of Israel alluded to in ~~1213~~2 Kings 13:5; more usually the reference is taken to be to Jehoash himself, and to Jeroboam II (compare ~~1217~~2 Kings 14:27).

### *4. War With Judah:*

The epitome of Jehoash's reign is very brief, but the favorable impression formed of him from the acts of Elisha is strengthened by another gained from the history of Amaziah of Judah (~~1248~~2 Kings 14:8-16; ~~1457~~2 Chronicles 25:17-24). For the purpose of a southern campaign Amaziah had hired a large contingent of troops from Samaria. Being sent back unemployed, these mercenaries committed ravages on their way home, for which, apparently, no redress was given. On the first challenge of the king of Judah, Jehoash magnanimously refused the call to arms, but on Amaziah persisting, the peace established nearly 80 years before by Jehoshaphat (~~1224~~1 Kings 22:44) was broken at the battle of Beth-shemesh, in which Amaziah was defeated and captured. Jerusalem opened its gates to the victor, and was despoiled of all its treasure, both of palace and temple. A portion of the wall was broken down, and hostages for future behavior were taken to Samaria (~~1243~~2 Kings 14:13,14).

### 5. Character:

Jehoash did not long survive his crowning victory, but left a resuscitated state, and laid the foundation for a subsequent rule which raised Israel to the zenith of its power. Josephus gives Jehoash a high character for godliness, but, like each of his predecessors, he followed in the footsteps of Jeroboam I in permitting, if not encouraging, the worship of the golden calves. Hence, his conduct is pronounced “evil” by the historian (<sup><1231></sup>2 Kings 13:11). He was succeeded by his son Jeroboam II.

*W. Shaw Caldecott*

## JEHOHANAN

<sup><je-ho-ha'-nan></sup> ([<sup>ˈnj</sup> w<sup>ɔy</sup>] *yehochanan*), “Yahweh is (or has been) gracious”):

(1) A Korahite doorkeeper in David’s reign, “son” of Meshelemiah (<sup><1318></sup>1 Chronicles 26:3). Septuagint, Luc, has “Jehonathan.”

(2) One of the five captains over King Jehoshaphat’s army (<sup><1471></sup>2 Chronicles 17:15), probably father of Ishmael, “son of Jehohanan” (<sup><1421></sup>2 Chronicles 23:1).

(3) Ezr 10:6 (the King James Version has “Johnnan”) = “Johanan” of <sup><1622></sup>Nehemiah 12:22,23 = “Jonathan” of <sup><1621></sup>Nehemiah 12:11, “son” of Eliashib (Ezr 10:6; but “grandson” in <sup><1621></sup>Nehemiah 12:11). He was high priest in Ezra’s time = “Jonas” in 1 Esdras 9:1 (the King James Version “Joanan”).

(4) One of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:28) = “Joannes” the Revised Version (British and American), “Johannes” the King James Version (1 Esdras 9:29).

(5) Son of Tobiah, the Ammonite, Nehemiah’s opponent (<sup><1618></sup>Nehemiah 6:18, the King James Version “Johanan”).

(6) Head of the priestly family of Amariah (<sup><1623></sup>Nehemiah 12:13).

(7) A priest present at the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem (<sup><1624></sup>Nehemiah 12:42).

(8) The name in the Hebrew of <sup><1482></sup>2 Chronicles 28:12.

See *JOHANAN*, (7).

*David Francis Roberts*

## JEHOIACHIN

<je-hoi'-a-kin> ([<sup>ˈ</sup>ykywɔy] yehoyakhin), “Yahweh will uphold”; called also “Jeconiah” in <sup><1386></sup>1 Chronicles 3:16; <sup><2801></sup>Jeremiah 24:1; [<sup>hynky</sup>] yekhonyah], “Yahweh will be steadfast,” and “Coniah” in <sup><2024></sup>Jeremiah 22:24,28; [<sup>WhynK</sup>; konyahu], “Yahweh has upheld him”; [<sup>’</sup>Ιωακείμ, Ioakeim]): A king of Judah; son and successor of Jehoiakim; reigned three months and surrendered to Nebuchadnezzar; was carried to Babylon, where, after being there 37 years a prisoner, he died.

### 1. SOURCES:

The story of his reign is told in <sup><1248></sup>2 Kings 24:8-16, and more briefly in <sup><4819></sup>2 Chronicles 36:9-10. Then, after the reign of his successor Zedekiah and the final deportation are narrated, the account of his release from prison 37 years afterward and the honor done him is given as the final paragraph of 2 Kings (25:27-30). The same thing is told at the end of the Book of Jeremiah (52:31-34). Neither for this reign nor for the succeeding is there the usual reference to state annals; these seem to have been discontinued after Jehoiakim. In <sup><2024></sup>Jeremiah 22:24-30 there is a final pronouncement on this king, not so much upon the man as upon his inevitable fate, and a prediction that no descendant of his shall ever have prosperous rule in Judah.

### 2. HIS REIGN:

Of the brief reign of Jehoiachin there is little to tell. It was rather a historic landmark than a reign; but its year, 597 BC, was important as the date of the first deportation of Jewish captives to Babylon (unless we except the company of hostages carried away in Jehoiakim's 3rd (4th) year, <sup><2000></sup>Daniel 1:1-7). His coming to the throne was just at or near the time when Nebuchadnezzar's servants were besieging Jerusalem; and when the Chaldean king's arrival in person to superintend the siege made apparent the futility of resistance, Jehoiachin surrendered to him, with all the royal household and the court. He was carried prisoner to Babylon, and with him ten thousand captives, comprising all the better and sturdier element of the people from prince to craftsman, leaving only the poorer sort to constitute

the body of the nation under his successor Zedekiah. With the prisoners were carried away also the most valuable treasures of the temple and the royal palace.

### 3. THE TWO ELEMENTS:

Ever since Isaiah fostered the birth and education of a spiritually-minded remnant, for him the vital hope of Israel, the growth and influence of this element in the nation has been discernible, as well in the persecution it has roused (see under *MANASSEH*), as in its fiber of sound progress. It is as if a sober sanity of reflection were curing the people of their empty idolatries. The feeling is well expressed in such a passage as <sup><3718></sup>Habakkuk 2:18-20. Hitherto, however, the power of this spiritual Israel has been latent, or at best mingled and pervasive among the various occupations and interests of the people. The surrender of Jehoiachin brings about a segmentation of Israel on an unheard-of principle: not the high and low in wealth or social position, but the weight and worth of all classes on the one side, who are marked for deportation, and the refuse element of all classes on the other, who are left at home. With which element of this strange sifting Jeremiah's prophetic hopes are identified appears in his parable of the Good and Bad Figs (Jeremiah 24), in which he predicts spiritual integrity and upbuilding to the captives, and to the home-staying remainder, shame and calamity. Later on, he writes to the exiles in Babylon, advising them to make themselves at home and be good citizens (<sup><3201></sup>Jeremiah 29:1-10). As for the hapless king, "this man Coniah," who is to be their captive chief in a strange land, Jeremiah speaks of him in a strain in which the stern sense of Yahweh's inexorable purpose is mingled with tender sympathy as he predicts that this man shall never have a descendant on David's throne (<sup><3224></sup>Jeremiah 22:24-30). It is as if he said, All as Yahweh has ordained, but — the pity of it!

### 4. THIRTY-SEVEN YEARS LATER:

In the first year of Nebuchadnezzar's successor, perhaps by testamentary edict of Nebuchadnezzar himself, a strange thing occurred. Jehoiachin, who seems to have been a kind of hostage prisoner for his people, was released from prison, honored above all the other kings in similar case, and thenceforth to the end of his life had his portion at the royal table (<sup><1257></sup>2 Kings 25:27-30; <sup><3531></sup>Jeremiah 52:31-34). This act of clemency may have been due to some such good influence at court as is described in the Book

of Daniel; but also it was a tribute to the good conduct of that better element of the people of which he was hostage and representative. It was the last event of Judean royalty; and suggestive for the glimpse it seems to afford of a people whom the Second Isaiah could address as redeemed and forgiven, and of a king taken from durance and judgment (compare <sup><2518></sup>Isaiah 53:8), whose career makes strangely vivid the things that are said of the mysterious “Servant of Yahweh.”

*John Franklin Genung*

## JEHOIADA

<sup><je-hoi'-a-da></sup> ([<sup><dywby></sup>yehoyadha`], “Yahweh knows”; [<sup><Iωδᾱε, Iodae></sup>]):

**(1)** Father of Benaiah, the captain of David’s body-guard (<sup><1088></sup>2 Samuel 8:18; 20:23; 23:20,22; <sup><1008></sup>1 Kings 1:8, etc.). Jehoiada was “the son of a valiant man of Kabzeel” (<sup><1031></sup>2 Samuel 23:20), but commentators read with Septuagint and Ewald, “Benaiah (the son of Jehoiada) a man of valor.” Kabzeel was a town belonging to Judah on the border of Edom in the South (<sup><1652></sup>Joshua 15:21). In <sup><1376></sup>1 Chronicles 27:5, we read “Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada the priest, chief,” the Revised Version (British and American), but the Revised Version margin has “chief minister” wrongly. Yet Jehoiada is nowhere else called a priest or even a Levite, though in <sup><3127></sup>1 Chronicles 12:27 (Hebrew, verse 28) a Jehoiada is mentioned as a military “leader of the house of Aaron,” who came to David to Hebron with other members of the house of Levi. In <sup><1374></sup>1 Chronicles 27:34 there is named among David’s counselors, “Jehoiada the son. of Benaiah,” where some commentators would read with two manuscripts, “Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada” though Curtis, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles, 295, keeps the Massoretic Text.

**(2)** Priest in the reigns of Ahaziah, Queen Athaliah, and Jehoash (Joash) of Judah (<sup><12104></sup>2 Kings 11:4-12:16 (Hebrew 17) = <sup><4231></sup>2 Chronicles 23:1 through 24:14; <sup><4211></sup>2 Chronicles 22:11; 24:14-16,17-20,22,25). In <sup><1220></sup>2 Kings 12:10 (Hebrew, verse 11) he is called “high priest,” and is the first to be given that title, but as the priest lived in the temple, there is no meaning in saying that he “came up,” so commentators omit the words, “and the chief priest.” According to <sup><4211></sup>2 Chronicles 22:11, he had married Jehoshabeath (= Jehosheba), the daughter of the king, i.e. Jehoram.

## 1. JEHOIADA AND THE REVOLT AGAINST ATHALIAH:

(a) The account in <sup><1231></sup>2 Chronicles 23:1-21 differs in many respects from that in <sup><12104></sup>2 Kings 11:4-20, but even the latter has its problems, and Stade (ZATW, 1885, 280 ff) pointed out two sources in it. This view is accepted by many. A reader is struck at once by the double reference to the death of Athaliah (<sup><12116></sup>2 Kings 11:16,20), and the construction of the Hebrew for “making a covenant” is different in <sup><12104></sup>2 Kings 11:4 from that in 11:17. Stade holds that there is one narrative in 11:4-12,18b-20 and another in 11:13-18a.

In the first, Jehoiada makes an agreement with the captains of the foreign body-guard, and arranges that both the incoming and outgoing temple-guard shall be kept in the temple at the time when the guard should be changed on the Sabbath, and also that the young prince, Jehoash, who had been kept in hiding, shall be proclaimed. The captains do this, and the prince is crowned and proclaimed (<sup><12104></sup>2 Kings 11:4-12). Then officers are set up in the temple, and Jehoash is taken to the royal palace and enthroned. The revolt proves popular with the people of Jerusalem and those of the district, and Athaliah is slain in the palace.

But there are difficulties in this narrative, though the above gives the trend of events; <sup><12106></sup>2 Kings 11:5 refers to a third of the guard who “came in on the sabbath,” and 11:7 to two companies who “go forth on the sabbath”; the Hebrew is, “they that enter the sabbath” and “they that go out of the sabbath.” <sup><12109></sup>2 Kings 11:9 makes clear the connection between 11:5 and 7. But 11:6 introduces a difficulty: it seems to denote a division of those who “enter” into three divisions, i.e. the two in 11:6 and one in 11:5. If 11:6 be omitted, as is proposed by many, this difficulty vanishes. But there still remains the question of the change of guards. Commentators say that “they who enter the sabbath” are those who leave the temple and enter their quarters at the beginning of the Sabbath, presumably, while “those who go out” are those who leave their quarters to mount guard. This is not impossible as an explanation of the Hebrew. It is further believed that the guard at the temple on the Sabbath was double that on other days. The other explanation, held by older commentators is that on the Sabbath the guard was only half its usual size; this gives another meaning to the Hebrew phrases. On the other hand, it may be held that the revolt took place at the close of the Sabbath, and that the double-sized guard was kept by Jehoiada even after the usual-sized one had come to take their place. It

should be added that Wellhausen proposed to read ([~~t~~~~w~~0[~~x~~] *tse`adhoth*]), “armlets” (compare ~~2389~~ Isaiah 3:19), for ([~~t~~~~w~~d[~~e~~edhuth]), “testimony,” in ~~12112~~ 2 Kings 11:12; and in 11:19 the words “and all the people of the land” are held to be an addition.

**(b)** The 2nd narrative (~~12113~~ 2 Kings 11:13-18a) begins suddenly. Presumably, its earlier part was identical with the earlier part of the 1st narrative, unless ~~12106~~ 2 Kings 11:6 was a part originally of this 2nd account. Athaliah hears the noise of the people (11:13, where “the guard” is a gloss and so to be omitted), and comes to the temple, where she witnesses the revolt and cries, “Treason! treason!” Jehoiada orders her to be put forth (omit “between the ranks” in 11:15), so that she should not be slain in the temple, and she is murdered at one of the palace entrances (11:16, where the Revised Version (British and American), following Septuagint of ~~14235~~ 2 Chronicles 23:15, translates the first sentence wrongly: it should be “So they laid hands on her”). Jehoiada then makes the king and the people enter into a solemn covenant to be Yahweh’s people, and the result is the destruction of the temple of Baal, and the death of Mattan, its priest (~~11117~~ 1 Kings 11:17, 18a). This 2nd narrative gives a religious significance to the revolt, but it is incomplete. The other narrative presents a very natural course of events, for it was absolutely necessary for Jehoiada to secure the allegiance of the royal foreign body-guard.

**(c)** The account in ~~14230~~ 2 Chronicles 23:1-21, though following that of 2 Kings in the main, differs from it considerably. The guard is here composed of Levites; it does not mention the foreign body-guard, and relates how the revolt was planned with the Levites of the cities of Judah — a method which would have become known to Athaliah and for which she would have made preparations, no doubt. Chronicles makes it a wholly religious movement, while 2 Kings gives two points of view. The value of the Chronicler’s account depends largely on one’s estimate of the Books of Chronicles and one’s views as to the development of the Jewish priestly system. A. Van Hoonacker, *Lesacerdoce levitique dans la loi et dans l’histoire des Hebreux*, 93-100, defends the account in 2 Chronicles.



## 2. JEHOIADA AND THE RESTORATION OF THE TEMPLE:

The part which Jehoiada played in the restoration of the temple buildings is described in ~~2Kings~~ 2 Kings 11:21 through 12:16 (Hebrew 12:1-17) parallel ~~2Chron~~ 2 Chronicles 24:1-14. Here again the narratives of 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles differ to a large extent.

**(a)** According to 2 Kings,

**(i)** the priests are commanded by Jehoash to devote the dues or free-will offerings of the people to repairing the breaches in the temple. They fail to do so, and

**(ii)** Jehoiada is summoned by the king and rebuked. Then

**(iii)** a new regulation is put into force: the offerings, except the guilt offerings and sin offerings, are no longer to be given to the priests, but to be put into a chest provided in the temple for the purpose.

**(iv)** The money got in this way is devoted to repairing the temple, but

**(v)** none of it is used to provide temple vessels.

**(b)** Chronicles, on the other hand,

**(i)** relates that the priests and Levites are commanded to go through Judah to collect the necessary money. They “hastened it not.” Then

**(ii)** Jehoiada is summoned to account for this disobedience, and

**(iii)** a chest is put outside the temple to receive the tax commanded by Moses.

**(iv)** This the people pay willingly, and the temple is repaired. There is such a surplus that

**(v)** there is money also to provide vessels for the temple.

It is at least questionable whether the additions in 2 Chronicles are trustworthy; the contradictions against 2 Kings are clear, and the latter gives the more likely narrative, although Van Hoonacker (op. cit., 10114) defends the former.

According to ~~2Chron~~ 2 Chronicles 24:15, Jehoiada lived to be 130 years old, and was buried among the kings — a unique distinction.

- (3) The King James Version in <sup><1616></sup>Nehemiah 3:6 = **JOIADA** (which see).  
 (4) There is a Jehoiada, the priest mentioned in <sup><228></sup>Jeremiah 29:26, in whose stead Zephaniah was declared priest by Shemaiah in a letter.

Giesebrecht takes him to be the same as the priest of Athaliah's time (see (2) above), but Duhm says that nothing is known of him. In any case, Zephaniah could not have been the direct successor of the well-known Jehoiada, and so the reference can scarcely be to him if it is to have any meaning.

*David Francis Roberts*

## **JEHOIAKIM**

<sup><je-hoi'-a-kim></sup> ([<sup>μ</sup><sup>υ</sup><sup>q</sup><sup>j</sup><sup>ω</sup><sup>δ</sup>], yehoyaqim], “Yahweh will establish”; [<sup>Ι</sup><sup>ω</sup><sup>α</sup><sup>κ</sup><sup>ε</sup><sup>ι</sup><sup>μ</sup>, Ioakeim]): The name given him by Pharaoh-necoh, who raised him to the throne as vassal king in place of his brother Jehoahaz, is changed from Eliakim ([<sup>μ</sup><sup>υ</sup><sup>q</sup><sup>i</sup><sup>y</sup>;l]a., `elyaqim], “God will establish”). The change compounds the name, after the royal Judean custom, with that of Yahweh; it may also imply that Necoh claims Yahweh's authorization for his act, as in a similar way Sennacherib had claimed it for his invasion of Judah (<sup><1285></sup>2 Kings 18:25). He has represented the campaign with which Josiah interfered as undertaken by Divine command (‘El, <sup><1452></sup>2 Chronicles 35:21); this episode of it merely translates the authorization, rather arrogantly, into the conquered nation's dialect.

A king of Judah, elder (half-) brother and successor of Jehoahaz; reigned 11 years from 608 BC.

## **I. SOURCES FOR HIS LIFE AND TIME.**

### *1. Annalistic:*

The circumstances of his accession and raising of the indemnity to Pharaoh-necoh, followed by a brief resume of his reign, are narrated in <sup><1234></sup>2 Kings 23:34 through 24:6. The naming of the source for “the rest of his acts” (24:5) is the last reference we have to “the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah.” The account in <sup><1436></sup>2 Chronicles 36:5-8, though briefer still, mentions Nebuchadnezzar's looting of the temple at some uncertain date in his reign. Neither account has any good to say of Jehoiakim; to the writer of 2 Kings, however, his ill fortunes are due to

Yahweh's retributive justice for the sins of Manasseh; while to the Chronicler the sum of his acts, apparently connected with the desecration of the sanctuary, is characterized as "the abominations which he did." For "the rest of his acts" we are referred, also for the last time, to the "book of the kings of Israel and Judah."

## *2. Prophetic:*

For the moral and spiritual chaos of the time, and for prophecies and incidents throwing much light on the king's character, Jeremiah has a number of extended passages, not, however, in consecutive order.

The main ones clearly identifiable with this reign are: ~~12213~~ 2 Kings 22:13-19, inveighing against the king's tyrannies and predicting his ignominious death; 2 Kings 26, dated in the beginning of his reign and again predicting (as had been predicted before in 7:2-15) the destruction of the temple; 2 Kings 25, dated in his 4th year and predicting the conquest of Judah and surrounding nations by Nebuchadnezzar; 2 Kings 36, dated in the 4th and 5th years, and telling the story of the roll of prophecy which the king destroyed; 2 Kings 45, an appendix from the 4th year, reassuring Baruch the scribe, in terms of the larger prophetic scale, for his dismay at what he had to write; 2 Kings 46, also an appendix, a reminiscence of the year of Carchemish, containing the oracle then pronounced against Egypt, and giving words of the larger comfort to Judah. The Book of the prophet Habakkuk, written in this reign, gives expression to the prophetic feeling of doubt and dismay at the unrequited ravages of the Chaldeans against a people more righteous than they, with a sense of the value of steadfast faith and of Yahweh's world-movement and purpose which explains the seeming enormity.

## **II. CHARACTER AND EVENTS OF HIS REIGN.**

### *1. The Epoch:*

The reign of Jehoiakim is not so significant for any personal impress of his upon his time as for the fact that it fell in one of the most momentous epochs of ancient history. By the fall of Nineveh in 606 to the assault of Nebuchadnezzar, then crown prince of the rising Babylonian empire, Assyria, "the rod of (Yahweh's) anger" (~~23105~~ Isaiah 10:5), ended its arrogant and inveterate sway over the nations. Nebuchadnezzar, coming soon after to the Chaldean throne, followed up his victory by a vigorous campaign

against Pharaoh-necoh, whom we have seen at the end of Josiah's reign (see under JOSIAH) advancing toward the Euphrates in his attempt to secure Egyptian dominion over Syria and Mesopotamia. The encounter took place in 605 at Carehemish on the northern Euphrates, where Necoh was defeated and driven back to the borders of his own land, never more to renew his aggressions (<sup><1247></sup>2 Kings 24:7). The dominating world-empire was now in the hands of the Chaldeans, "that bitter and hasty nation" (<sup><3006></sup>Habakkuk 1:6); the first stage of the movement by which the world's civilization was passing from Semitic to Aryan control. With this world-movement Israel's destiny was henceforth to be intimately involved; the prophets were already dimly aware of it, and were shaping their warnings and promises, as by a Divine instinct, to that end. It was on this larger scale of things that they worked; it had all along been their endeavor, and continued with increasing clearness and fervor, to develop in Israel a conscience and stamina which should be a leavening power for good in the coming great era (compare <sup><3185></sup>Isaiah 2:2-4; <sup><3406></sup>Micah 4:1-3).

## *2. The King's Perverse Character:*

Of all these prophetic meanings, however, neither the king nor the ruling classes had the faintest realization; they saw only the political exigencies of the moment. Nor did the king himself, in any patriotic way, rise even to the immediate occasion. As to policy, he was an unprincipled opportunist: vassal to Necoh to whom he owed his throne, until Necoh himself was defeated; enforced vassal to Nebuchadnezzar for 3 years along with the other petty kings of Western Asia; then rebelling against the latter as soon as he thought he could make anything by it. As to responsibility of administration, he had simply the temper of a despotic self-indulgent Oriental. He raised the immense fine that Necoh imposed upon him by a direct taxation, which he farmed out to unscrupulous officials. He indulged himself with erecting costly royal buildings, employing for the purpose enforced and unpaid labor (<sup><3213></sup>Jeremiah 22:13-17); while all just interests of his oppressed subjects went wholly unregarded. As to religion, he let matters go on as they had been under Manasseh, probably introducing also the still more strange and heathenish rites from Egypt and the East of which we see the effects in <sup><3185></sup>Ezekiel 8:5-17. And meanwhile the reformed temple-worship which Josiah had introduced seems to have become a mere formal and perfunctory matter, to which, if we may judge by his conspicuous absence from fast and festal occasions (e.g. Jeremiah 26; 36), the king paid no attention. His impious act of cutting up and

burning Jeremiah's roll (~~2823~~ Jeremiah 36:23), as also his vindictive pursuit and murder of Uriah for prophesying in the spirit of Jeremiah (26:20-23), reveal his antipathy to any word that does not prophesy "smooth things" (compare ~~2310~~ Isaiah 30:10), and in fact a downright perversity to the name and will of Yahweh.

### *3. The Prophetic Attitude:*

With the onset of the Chaldean power, prophecy, as represented in the great seers whose words remain to us, reached a crisis which only time and the consistent sense of its larger issues could enable it to weather. Isaiah, in his time, had stood for the inviolability of Zion, and a miraculous deliverance had vindicated his sublime faith. But with Jeremiah, conditions had changed. The idea thus engendered, that the temple was bound to stand and with it Jerusalem, an idea confirmed by Josiah's centralizing reforms, had become a superstition and a presumption (compare ~~2470~~ Jeremiah 7:4); and Jeremiah had reached the conviction that it, with its wooden rites and glaring abuses, must go: that nothing short of a clean sweep of the old religious fetishes could cure the inveterate unspirituality of the nation. This conviction of his must needs seem to many like an inconsistency — to set prophecy against itself. And when the Chaldean appeared on the scene, his counsel of submission and prediction of captivity would seem a double inconsistency; not only a traversing of a tested prophecy, but treason to the state. This was the situation that he had to encounter; and for it he gave his tender feelings, his liberty, his life. It is in this reign of Jehoiakim that, for the sake of Yahweh's word and purpose, he is engulfed in the deep tragedy of his career. And in this he must be virtually alone. Habakkuk is indeed with him in sympathy; but his vision is not so clear; he must weather disheartening doubts, and" cherish the faith of the righteous (~~2310~~ Habakkuk 2:4), and wait until the vision of Yahweh's secret purpose clears (~~2310~~ Habakkuk 2:1-3). If the prophets themselves are thus having such an equivocal crisis, we can imagine how forlorn is the plight of Yahweh's "remnant," who are dependent on prophetic faith and courage to guide them through the depths. The humble nucleus of the true Israel, which is some day to be the nation's redeeming element, is undergoing a stern seasoning.

#### 4. Harassing and Death:

After Syria fell into Nebuchadnezzar's power, he seems to have established his headquarters for some years at Riblah; and after Jehoiada attempted to revolt from his authority, he sent against him guerrilla bands from the neighboring nations, and detachments from his Chaldean garrisons, who harassed him with raids and depredations. In <sup><14816></sup>2 Chronicles 36:6,7, it is related that Nebuchadnezzar carried some of the vessels of the temple to Babylon and bound the king in fetters to carry him also to Babylon — the latter purpose apparently not carried out. This was in Jehoiada's 4th year. In <sup><20016></sup>Daniel 1:1,2, though ascribed to Jehoiakim's 3rd year, this same event is related as the result of a siege of Jerusalem. It is ambiguously intimated also that the king was deported; and among "the seed royal and of the nobles" who were of the company were Daniel and his three companions (<sup><20016></sup>Daniel 1:3,6). The manner of Jehoiakim's death is obscure. It is merely said (<sup><12416></sup>2 Kings 24:6) that he "slept with his fathers"; but Josephus (Ant., X, vi, 3) perhaps assuming that Jeremiah's prediction (<sup><24216></sup>Jeremiah 22:19) was fulfilled, states that Nebuchadnezzar slew him and cast his body outside the walls unburied.

*John Franklin Genung*

### JEHOIARIB

<sup><je-hoi'-a-rib></sup> ([<sup><byrjwby></sup>yehoyaribh], "Yahweh pleads" or "contends"): A priest in Jerusalem (<sup><13910></sup>1 Chronicles 9:10); the name occurs again in <sup><13216></sup>1 Chronicles 24:7 as the name of a family among the 24 courses of priests = the family Joiarib ([<sup><byrjwQ></sup>yoyaribh], same meaning as above, <sup><16102></sup>Nehemiah 1:2,6), the head of which is Matrenai in <sup><16129></sup>Nehemiah 12:19. In <sup><16110></sup>Nehemiah 11:10 we should probably read "'Jedaiah and Joiarib" for "Jedaiah the son of Joiarib" (compare <sup><13910></sup>1 Chronicles 9:10). Jehoiarib = Joarib in 1 Macc 2:1.

### JEHONADAB

<sup><je-hon'-a-dab></sup> ([<sup><bdnwby></sup>yehonadhabh], either "Yahweh is noble" or "liberal," or "Yahweh has impelled") = Jonadab ([<sup><bdnwQ></sup>yonadhabh], same meaning):

(1) Jehonadab in the Hebrew of <sup><10135></sup>2 Samuel 13:5; but Jonadab in English Versions of the Bible, and in Hebrew and English Versions of the Bible of

13:3,12,35; son of Shimeah, King David's brother. He was friendly with Amnon his cousin, and is said to be "a very shrewd (the Revised Version (British and American) "subtle") man." He planned to get Tamar to wait upon Amnon. Two years after, when Absalom had murdered Amnon, and David had heard that all the king's sons were assassinated, Jehonadab assured him that only Amnon was killed; and his reassuring tone is justified (~~<1035>~~2 Samuel 13:35); possibly he knew of Absalom's intentions. Septuagint, Lucian, has "Jonathan" in ~~<1038>~~2 Samuel 13:3 ff; and in ~~<1021>~~2 Samuel 21:21 parallel ~~<1307>~~1 Chronicles 20:7, there is mentioned a son of Shimei (= "Shimca," ~~<1017>~~1 Chronicles 2:7 = "Shammah," ~~<0949>~~1 Samuel 16:9), whose name is Jonathan.

*See JONATHAN, (4).*

(2) Jehonadab in ~~<1205>~~2 Kings 10:15,23; in Hebrew of ~~<2878>~~Jeremiah 35:8,14,16,18 = Jonadab in ~~<2876>~~Jeremiah 35:6,10,19, and English Versions of the Bible of 35:8,14,16,18, "son" of Rechab, of the Kenite clan (~~<1325>~~1 Chronicles 2:55). Jehonadab is described in 2 Kings 10 as an ally of Jehu in the olition of Baal-worship in Samaria. Jehu met him after slaying the son of Ahab (10:15); the second part of the verse should probably be translated "And he greeted him and said to him, Is thy heart upright (with me) as my heart is with thee? And Jehonadab answered, Yes. Then spake Jehu (so the Septuagint), If so, give me thy hand. In Jeremiah 35 (where English Versions of the Bible has Jonadab throughout), he is called the "father" of the Rechabites, who derived from him their ordinances for their nomadic life and abstention from wine.

*See RECHAB, RECHABITES.*

*David Francis Roberts*

## JEHONATHAN

~~<je-hon'-a-than>~~ ([<sup>ˈ</sup>t;n;~~wɔɪ~~] yehonathan], "Yahweh has given"): The name is the same as Jonathan: the Hebrew has the two forms for the same person sometimes; sometimes only one is found. *See JONATHAN*. The form "Jehonathan" occurs as follows in English Versions of the Bible:

(1) A Levite who took part in teaching the Torah in the cities of Judah under Jehoshaphat (~~<1478>~~2 Chronicles 17:8 English Versions of the Bible and Hebrew).

(2) Head of the priestly family of Shemaiah (<sup><1628></sup>Nehemiah 12:18 English Versions of the Bible and Hebrew).

(3) the King James Version and Hebrew in <sup><1375></sup>1 Chronicles 27:25; *see JONATHAN*, (7).

## JEHORAM; JORAM

<je-ho'-ram>, written also in the abbreviated form, ([<sup><1270></sup>yrwby] yehoram], [<sup><1270></sup>yrw] yoram], “Yahweh is high”; the Revised Version (British and American) retains “Joram” for Hebrew *yehoram* in <sup><1295></sup>2 Kings 9:15-24):

(1) Ninth king of Israel (<sup><1217></sup>2 Kings 1:17 through 9:28), son of Ahab and Jezebel, successor to his brother Ahaziah, who died childless. He began to reign 853 BC, and reigned 12 years (<sup><1291></sup>2 Kings 3:1; 8:16).

The statement in <sup><1217></sup>2 Kings 1:17, “the second year of Jehoram,” follows a system of chronology common to the Lucian group of manuscripts, in which the 1st year of Jehoshaphat falls in the 11th year of Omri; the 24th year of Jehoshaphat in the 1st year of Ahaziah; and the 1st year of Jehoram in the 2nd year of Jehoram of Judah. The double chronology (<sup><1217></sup>2 Kings 1:17 and <sup><1291></sup>2 Kings 3:1) is due to the intention of the compiler of Kings to refer all the acts of Elisha to the reign of Jehoram, thus dislocating the order of events in that reign. Elisha, however, survived Jehoram many years, and it is possible that some of the events are to be referred to subsequent reigns.

## I. NINTH KING OF ISRAEL

### *1. His Religious Policy:*

It is difficult to estimate the religious character of Jehoram. Apparently the fierce fanaticism of Jezebel and the boldness of Ahab reappear in the son in the form of duplicity and superstition. The attempt of Jezebel to substitute Baal for Yahweh had failed. The people were on the side of Yahweh. Otherwise Jehu could not have carried out his bloody reform. All the worshippers of Baal in the land could be gathered into one temple of Baal (<sup><1208></sup>2 Kings 10:18 ff). Evidently Jehoram feared the people. Accordingly he posed as a reformer by putting away the pillar of Baal (<sup><1291></sup>2 Kings 3:2), while secretly he worshipped Baal (<sup><1291></sup>2 Kings 3:13a). Nevertheless, when he got into straits, he expected to receive the help of Yahweh (<sup><1291></sup>2 Kings



3:13b). He had not learned that a dual nature is as impossible as a union of Baal and Yahweh.

## *2. The Moabite War:*

Immediately upon his accession, Jehoram came into conflict with Mesha, king of Moab (~~2Kings~~ 2 Kings 3:4 ff). The account of the conflict is of special interest because of the supplementary information concerning Mesha furnished by the Moabite Stone. There we learn (ll. 1-8) that Moab became tributary to Israel in the days of Omri, and remained so for forty years, but that it rebelled in the days of Ahab. This probably brings us to the statement in ~~2Kings~~ 2 Kings 3:4 ff that Mesha “rendered unto the king of Israel the wool of a hundred thousand lambs, and of a hundred thousand rams,” and that “when Ahab was dead, .... the king of Moab rebelled against the king of Israel.” The victories of Mesha, glorified by the Moabite Stone, possibly took place before the events of ~~2Kings~~ 2 Kings 3:4 ff. Accordingly, Jehoram resolved to recover the allegiance of the Moabites. He called to his aid the ally of his father, Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, and the latter’s vassal, the king of Edom. Jehoram was entertained at Jerusalem (Josephus, Ant, IX, ii i, 1). The allies marched against Moab by the longer route, around the southern end of the Dead Sea, indicating that Moab was fortified against attack from the West, and that Israel was weak in the East Jordan country. After the allies had been miraculously delivered from perishing for lack of water, they devastated the land and sacked the cities, and finally they succeeded in shutting up Mesha in Kir-hareseth. Driven to despair, Mesha offered his eldest son upon the wall as a burnt offering to Chemosh. This seems to have caused the tide to turn, for “there was great wrath against Israel,” and the allies returned to their own land, apparently having failed to secure a lasting advantage.

## *3. The Conflicts with Syria:*

Assuming that 2 Kings 4 through 8 belong to the reign of Jehoram, it appears that the Syrians made frequent incursions into the land of Israel, perhaps more in the nature of plundering robber bands than invasions by a regular army (2 Kings 6). Finally, however, Ben-had in person invaded the country and besieged Samaria. The inhabitants were reduced to horrible straits by famine, when the oppressors took sudden flight and Israel was saved. In the years 849, 848, and 845, Shalmaneser II invaded Syria. It is probable that during this period Jehoram recovered Ramoth-gilead, which

had fallen to Syria under Ahab. Hazael succeeded Ben-hadad as ruler of Syria, and his first act, after having murdered his predecessor, was to regain Ramoth-gilead. In the defense of the city, Jehoram, who was assisted by his nephew, Ahaziah, was wounded, and returned to Jezreel to be healed of his wounds.

#### *4. The Conspiracy of Jehu:*

Jehoram left the army at Ramoth-gilead under the command of Jehu, a popular captain of the host. While Jehoram was at Jezreel, Elisha sent a prophet to anoint Jehu as king of Israel. Jehu had been a witness of the dramatic scene when Elijah hurled the curse of Yahweh at Ahab for his crime against Naboth. Jehu at once found in himself the instrument to bring the curse to fulfillment. Accordingly, he conspired his crime against Jehoram. With a company of horsemen he proceeded to Jezreel, where Ahaziah was visiting his sick uncle, Jehoram. Jehoram suspected treachery, and, in company with Ahaziah, he rode out to meet Jehu. On his question, "Is it peace, Jehu?" he received a brutal reply that no longer left him in doubt as to the intention of the conspirator. As Jehoram turned to flee, Jehu drew his bow and shot him in the back so that the arrow pierced his heart. His dead body was thrown into the plat of ground that had belonged to Naboth.

**(2)** King of Judah, son of Jehoshaphat (~~<1816>~~ 2 Kings 8:16-24; ~~<4200>~~ 2 Chronicles 21:1-20), he began to rule about 849 and reigned 8 years. With reference to the chronological difficulty introduced by ~~<1117>~~ 2 Kings 1:17, see (1) above.

## **II. KING OF JUDAH**

### *1. His Marriage:*

In the beginning of the reigns of Ahab and Jehoshaphat, an attempt was made to end the old feud between Israel and Judah. At the suggestion of Ahab, the two kingdoms, for the first time, joined forces against the common foe from the North, the Syrians. To seal the alliance, Athaliah, daughter of Jezebel and Ahab, was married to Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat. Thus Jehoram was brother-in-law to (1) above. No doubt this was considered as a master stroke of conciliatory policy by the parties interested. However, it proved disastrous for Judah. Beyond a doubt, the

unholy zeal of Jezebel included the Baalizing of Judah as well as of Israel. This marriage was a step in that direction.

## *2. His Idolatry:*

“A man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife.” Jehoram did so. “He walked in the ways of the kings of Israel, as did the house of Ahab” (~~<1288>~~2 Kings 8:18). According to ~~<1211>~~2 Chronicles 21:11,13, Jehoram not only accepted the religion of Athaliah, but he became a persecutor, compelling the inhabitants of Jerusalem and of the land to become apostates.

## *3. The Letter of Elijah:*

Because of his gross idolatry and his wickedness, he is said (~~<1212>~~2 Chronicles 21:12 ff) to have received a denunciatory letter from the prophet Elijah, which, however, had no effect on him. But this leads to a chronological difficulty. Was Elijah still alive? The inference from ~~<1201>~~2 Kings 3:11 is that he was not. Then, too, the Chronicler otherwise never mentions Elijah. Oettli is of the opinion that one should either read “Elisha” for “Elijah,” or else consider the letter to have been the conception of a later writer, who felt that Elijah must have taken note of the wickedness of Jehoram and his wife, Athaliah, daughter of Ahab. In the latter event, the letter might be called a haggadic Midrash.

## *4. His Character:*

A man's religion cannot be divorced from his character. Baalism had in it the elements of tyranny and civic unrighteousness. In keeping with his religion, and in true oriental fashion, Jehoram began his reign by murdering his brothers, and other princes of the land, to whom Jehoshaphat had given valuable gifts and responsible positions. The only event belonging to his reign recorded in Kings is the revolt of Edom.

## *5. The Revolt of Edom:*

Edom was subdued by David, and, probably with the exception of a temporary revolt under Solomon (~~<1114>~~1 Kings 11:14 ff), it had remained subject to the united kingdom or to Judah until the revolt under Jehoram. The text is somewhat obscure, but both accounts indicate that the expedition of Jehoram against Edom ended in failure. In the account we are told that at the same time Libnah revolted.

## 6. The Raid into Judah:

Perhaps the revolt of Libnah should be taken in connection with the invasion of the Philistines and of the Arabians, mentioned in 2 Chronicles 21. Libnah was located on the south-western border of Judah. Since it was a border city, it is possible that the compiler of Kings considered it as belonging to Philistia. In the account in Chronicles, Jehoram is represented as having lost all his possessions and all his family, save Jehoahaz, the youngest of his sons, when the town was sacked and the palace plundered by the invading force of Philistines and Arabians. The account appears to be based upon reliable sources.

## 7. His Death:

In his last days, he was afflicted with a frightful disease in the bowels. His death was unregretted, and his burial without honor. Contrast, however, <sup><1084></sup>2 Kings 8:24 with <sup><4021></sup>2 Chronicles 21:20. Ahaziah, also called Jehoahaz, his younger son, then became king in his stead.

**S. K. Mosiman**

## JEHOSHABEATH

<sup><je-ho-shab'-e-ath></sup> ([<sup>t</sup> [<sup>bj</sup>" w<sup>by</sup>] *yehoshabh`ath*], "Yahweh is an oath"): In <sup><4021></sup>2 Chronicles 22:11 = **JEHOSHEBA** (which see) Compare <sup><2102></sup>2 Kings 11:2.

## JEHOSHAPHAT (1)

<sup><je-hosh'-a-fat></sup> ([<sup>f</sup>p<sup>y</sup>w<sup>by</sup>] *yehoshaphaT*], "Yahweh has judged"):

**(1)** King of Judah. See separate article.

**(2)** Son of Ahilud. He was recorder under David (<sup><1086></sup>2 Samuel 8:16; 20:24; <sup><1385></sup>1 Chronicles 18:15) and Solomon (<sup><1048></sup>1 Kings 4:3).

**(3)** Son of Paruah, and Solomon's overseer in Issachar to provide victuals for the royal household for one month of the year (<sup><1047></sup>1 Kings 4:17).

**(4)** Son of Nimshi, and father of Jehu, king of Northern Israel (<sup><1292></sup>2 Kings 9:2,14). His name is omitted in 9:20 and <sup><11916></sup>1 Kings 19:16, where Jehu is called "son of Nimshi."

(5) the King James Version (but not Hebrew) in <sup><1352></sup>1 Chronicles 15:24; the Revised Version (British and American) correctly *JOSHAPHAT* (which see).

*David Francis Roberts*

## **JEHOSHAPHAT (2)**

<sup><je-hosh'-a-fat></sup> ([<sup><fpvwb></sup>yehoshaphaT], “Yahweh judges”): The 4th king of Judah, son of Asa. His mother was Azubah, the daughter of Shilhi, of whom nothing further is known. He was 35 years of age at his accession, and reigned 25 years, circa 873-849 BC. The history of his reign is contained in <sup><1224></sup>1 Kings 22:41-50 and in <sup><4170></sup>2 Chronicles 17:1 through 21:1. The narrative in <sup><1224></sup>1 Kings 22:1-35a and in <sup><1208></sup>2 Kings 3:4 ff belongs to the history of the Northern Kingdom. The absence from Kings of the details contained in 2 Chronicles affords no presumpt against their truth. Neither do high numbers, embellished statements, and the coloring of the writer’s own age destroy the historical perspective.

### **1. HIS RELIGIOUS POLICY:**

The reign of Jehoshaphat appears to have been one of unusual religious activity. It was, however, characterized not so much by striking religious measures as it was by the religious spirit that pervaded every act of the king, who sought the favor of Yahweh in every detail of his life (<sup><4170></sup>2 Chronicles 17:3,4). He evidently felt that a nation’s character is determined by its religion. Accordingly, he made it his duty to purify the national worship. The “sodomites,” i.e. those who practiced immorality in the worship of Yahweh in the temple precincts, were banished from the land (<sup><1224></sup>1 Kings 22:46). The Asherim were taken out of Judah (<sup><4170></sup>2 Chronicles 17:6; 19:3), and “the people from Beer-sheba to the hill-country of Ephraim were brought back unto Yahweh, the God of their fathers” (<sup><4490></sup>2 Chronicles 19:4). Because of his zeal for Yahweh, Jehoshaphat is rewarded with power and “riches and honor in abundance” (<sup><4170></sup>2 Chronicles 17:5).

### **2. HIS SYSTEM OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION:**

Believing that religion and morals, the civilization, suffer from ignorance, Jehoshaphat introduced a system of public instruction for the whole land (<sup><4170></sup>2 Chronicles 17:7 ff). He appointed a commission, composed of

princes, Levites and priests, to go from city to city to instruct the people. Their instruction was to be based on the one true foundation of sound morals and healthy religious life, “the book of the law of Yahweh” (<sup><417E></sup>2 Chronicles 17:7-9).

### 3. HIS JUDICIAL INSTITUTIONS:

Next in importance to Jehoshaphat’s system of public instruction, was his provision for the better administration of justice. He appointed judges to preside over courts of common pleas, which he established in all the fortified cities of Judah. In addition to these local courts, two courts of appeal, an ecclesiastical and a civil court, were established at Jerusalem to be presided over by priests, Levites, and leading nobles as judges. At the head of the ecclesiastical court of appeal was the high priest, and a layman, “the ruler of the house of Judah,” headed the civil court of appeal (<sup><44904></sup>2 Chronicles 19:4-11). The insistence that a judge was to be in character like Yahweh, with whom there is “no iniquity .... nor respect of persons, nor taking of bribes” (<sup><44907></sup>2 Chronicles 19:7), is worthy of note.

### 4. HIS MILITARY DEFENSES:

According to <sup><447D></sup>2 Chronicles 17:2, Jehoshaphat began his reign with defensive measures against Israel. Furthermore, he built castles and cities of store in the land of Judah, “and he had many works,” probably military supplies, “in the cities of Judah” (17:13). He appears to have had a large standing army, including cavalry (<sup><1224></sup>1 Kings 22:4; <sup><4474></sup>2 Chronicles 17:14 ff). However, the numbers in <sup><4474></sup>2 Chronicles 17:14 ff seem to be impossibly high.

### 5. HIS FOREIGN POLICY:

Godliness and security at home were followed by respect and peace abroad. The fact that the Philistines and the Arabians brought tribute (<sup><4471></sup>2 Chronicles 17:11), and that Edom had no king (<sup><1224></sup>1 Kings 22:47), but a deputy instead, who possibly was appointed by Jehoshaphat, would indicate that he held the suzerainty over the nations and tribes bordering Judah on the South and West Holding the suzerainty over the weaker nations, and being allied with the stronger, Jehoshaphat secured the peace for the greater part of his reign (<sup><1370></sup>1 Chronicles 17:10) that fostered the internal development of the kingdom.

## 6. HIS ALLIANCE WITH AHAB:

In contrast to the former kings of Judah, Jehoshaphat saw greater benefit in an alliance with Israel than in civil war. Accordingly, the old feud between the two kingdoms (<sup><1143></sup>1 Kings 14:30; 15:6) was dropped, and Jehoshaphat made peace with Israel (<sup><1124></sup>1 Kings 22:44). The political union was cemented by the marriage of Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat, to Athaliah, daughter of Ahab and Jezebel. Shortly after the marriage, Jehoshaphat joined Ahab in a campaign against Syria (<sup><1480></sup>2 Chronicles 18:1-3). In view of the subordinate position that Jehoshaphat seems to take in the campaign (<sup><1224></sup>1 Kings 22:4,30), and in view of the military service rendered to Jehoram (<sup><1200></sup>2 Kings 3:4 ff), Judah seems to have become a dependency of Israel. Nevertheless, the union may have contributed to the welfare and prosperity of Judah, and it may have enabled Jehoshaphat to hold the suzerainty over the neighboring nations. However, the final outcome of the alliance with the house of Omri was disastrous for Judah. The introduction into Judah of Baalism more than counterbalanced any political and material advantage gained, and in the succeeding reigns it indirectly led to the almost total extinction of the royal family of Judah (<sup><2100></sup>2 Kings 11:1 ff).

## 7. HIS ALLIANCE WITH JEHORAM:

In spite of the denunciation of the prophet Jehu for his expedition with Ahab, thus “help(ing) the wicked” (<sup><1490></sup>2 Chronicles 19:2), Jehoshaphat entered into a similar alliance with Jehoram of Israel (<sup><1200></sup>2 Kings 3:4 ff). On the invitation of Jehoram to join him in an expedition against Moab, Jehoshaphat was ready with the same set speech of acceptance as in the case of Ahab (<sup><1200></sup>2 Kings 3:7; compare <sup><1224></sup>1 Kings 22:4). For the details of the expedition *see* JEHORAM, (1).

## 8. VICTORY OVER THE MOABITES AND AMMONITES:

The Chronicler has given us a very remarkable account of a victory gained by Jehoshaphat over the Moabites and Ammonites. No doubt he made use of a current historical Midrash. Many find the historical basis of the Midrash in the events recorded in <sup><1200></sup>2 Kings 3:4 ff. However, the localities are different, and there a defeat is recorded, while in this case we have a victory. The story in outline bears the stamp of probability. <sup><1224></sup>1 Kings 22:45 seems to suggest wars of Jehoshaphat that are not mentioned in Kings. The tribes mentioned in the account are represented as trying to

make permanent settlement in Judah (~~401b~~ 2 Chronicles 20:11). In their advance through the South of Judah, they were doubtless harassed by the shepherd population of the country. Jehoshaphat, according to his custom, sought the help of Yahweh. The invading forces fell to quarreling among themselves (~~401b~~ 2 Chronicles 20:23), and destroyed one another. The spoil was great because the invaders had brought all their goods with them, expecting to remain in the land.

## 9. DESTRUCTION OF JEHOSEPHAT'S FLEET:

The destruction of Jehoshaphat's fleet is recorded in ~~1228~~ 1 Kings 22:48,49 and in ~~401b~~ 2 Chronicles 20:35-37. However, the two accounts are quite different. According to Kings, Jehoshaphat built ships of Tarshish to sail to Ophir for gold, but the vessels were wrecked at zion-geber. Thereupon Ahaziah offered to assist Jehoshaphat with seamen, but Jehoshaphat refused to enter into the alliance. According to Chronicles the alliance had been formed, and together they built ships at Ezion-geber, which were destroyed because Jehoshaphat had made an alliance with the wicked king of Israel. In view of Jehoshaphat's other alliances, the Chronicler may be in the right. Chronicles, however, misunderstood the term "ships of Tarshish."

## 10. HIS DEATH:

Jehoshaphat died at the age of 60. Josephus says (Ant., IX, iii, 2) that he was buried in a magnificent manner, for he had imitated the actions of David. The kingdom was left to Jehoram, who inaugurated the beginning of his reign by causing the massacre of his brethren.

*S. K. Mosiman*

## JEHOSEPHAT, VALLEY OF

([~~fpyw~~ ~~dyiqm~~] ~~e`~~ *emeq yehoshaphaT*]); the latter word means "Yahweh judgeth," and *`emeq*, "wide," "open valley"; Septuagint [*he koilas Iosaphat*]): The name is used in ~~201b~~ Joel 3:2,12 of the scene of Judgment: "Let the nations bestir themselves, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat; for there will I sit to judge all the nations round about" (~~201b~~ Joel 3:12). "The valley of decision" (or "sharp judgment") is another name the prophet gives to this spot (~~201b~~ Joel 3:14). Some have identified it with the valley (*`emeq*) of *BERACAH* (which see) of ~~401b~~ 2 Chronicles



20:26, where King Jehoshaphat obtained a great victory, but this is improbable.

Since the 4th century AD the *KIDRON* (which see) valley has been named the Valley of Jehoshaphat. The tradition is now strongest among the Moslems who point out the exact scene of the Judgment; the Bridge As Sirat, dividing heaven and hell, is to stretch across this valley from the Charam area to the Mount of Olives. It is, however, the ambition of every pious Jew to be buried on the slopes of this valley, to be at hand at the resurrection. This, too, was an ordinary place for Jewish graves in preexilic times (<sup><12316></sup>2 Kings 23:6, etc.). The valley today, especially that part adjacent to the temple, is crowded with Moslem and Jewish graves. A worthless tradition indicates the tomb of Jehoshaphat himself close to the so-called “Pillar of Absalom.” See *KING’S VALE*. There is not the slightest reason for believing that this is the spot referred to by Joel — indeed he may have spoken of an ideal spot only. The valley of the Kidron is a nachal (“ravine”), not an [ʿemeq] (“broad valley”). It is impossible not to suspect that there is some connection between the name Jehoshaphat and the name of a village near the head of this valley — Shaphat; perhaps at one time it was Wady Shaphat, which name would readily suggest the traditional one.

See *GEHENNA*.

*E. W. G. Masterman*

## JEHOSHEBA

<je-hosh'-e-ba>, <je-ho-she'-ba> ([ [ b" vɪʃə ] yehoshebha`], “Yahweh is an oath”): Called “Jehoshabeath” in <sup><14211></sup>2 Chronicles 22:11; daughter of Jehoram king of Judah, possibly by a wife other than Athaliah (<sup><12100></sup>2 Kings 11:2). According to <sup><14211></sup>2 Chronicles 22:11, she was the wife of Jehoiada, the priest. She hid Jehoash, the young son of King Ahaziah, and so saved his life from Queen Athaliah.

## JEHOSHUA

<je-hosh'-u-a> ([ [ vɪʃə ] yehoshua`], “Yahweh is deliverance,” or “is opulence”): The usual Hebrew form of the name “Joshua”; it occurs in the King James Version of <sup><041316></sup>Numbers 13:16 (the American Standard Revised Version “Hoshea”); and in some editions of the King James Version in

<sup><3072></sup>1 Chronicles 7:27, where others have the form “Jehoshuah” (h being wrongly added at the end).

*See JOSHUA, SON OF NUN.*

## JEHOVAH

*<je-ho'-va>, <je-ho'-va>.*

*See GOD, NAMES OF, II, 5.*

## JEHOVAH-JIREH

*<je-ho'-va-ji'-re>* ([*harj<sup>i</sup>hwhy*, *yahweh yir'-eh*], “Yahweh sees”): The name given by Abraham to the place where he had sacrificed a ram provided by God, instead of his son Isaac (<sup><0214></sup>Genesis 22:14). The meaning plainly is that the Lord sees and provides for the necessities of His servants. There is an allusion to <sup><0218></sup>Genesis 22:8 where Abraham says, “God will provide himself (the Revised Version, margin “will see for himself”) the lamb for a burnt offering.” The verse (22:14 the King James Version) goes on to connect the incident with the popular proverb, “In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen” (the Revised Version (British and American) “provided”), the Revised Version margin suggests “he shall be seen.” “The mount of Yahweh” in other places denotes the temple hill at Jerusalem (<sup><0218></sup>Psalms 24:3; <sup><0218></sup>Isaiah 2:3, etc.). With changes of the punctuation very different readings have been suggested. According to Swete’s text: “And Abraham called the name of that place (the) `Lord saw’ (aorist) in order that they may say today: `In the mountain (the) Lord was seen’” (aorist). Septuagint reads, “In the mountain Yahweh seeth,” or “will see.” If there is merely a verbal connection between the clauses we should most naturally read, “In the mount of Yahweh one is seen (appears),” i.e. men, people, appear — the reference being to the custom of visiting the temple at pilgrimages (Driver, HDB, under the word). But if the connection of the proverb with the name “Yahweh-jireh” depends on the double sense of the word “see,” then the best explanation may be, Yahweh sees the needs of those who come to worship before Him on Zion, and there “is seen,” i.e. reveals Himself to them by answering their prayers and supplying their wants. His “seeing,” in other words, takes practical effect in a “being seen” (ibid.).

## JEHOVAH-NISSI

<je-ho'-va nis'-i> ([ySni hwhy, yahweh nicci], “Yahweh is my banner”):

So Moses named the altar which he reared to signalize the defeat of the Amalekites by Israel under Joshua, at Rephidim (Exodus 17:15).

Septuagint translates “the Lord my refuge,” deriving *nicci* from [slw, nuc], “to flee.” Targum Onkelos reads, “Moses built an altar and worshipped on it before Yahweh, who had wrought for him miracles” ([^ySyni, niccin]).

The suggestion is that the people should rally round God as an army gathers round its standard. He it is who leads them to victory.

## JEHOVAH, SERVANT OF

See *SERVANT OF JEHOVAH*.

## JEHOVAH-SHALOM

<je-ho'-va sha'-lom> ([pwDv; hwhy, yahweb shalom], “Yahweh is peace”): This was the name given by Gideon to the altar he built at Ophra, in allusion to the word spoken to him by the Lord, “Peace be unto thee” (<sup><0013></sup>Judges 6:24). It is equivalent to “Yahweh is well disposed.”

## JEHOVAH-SHAMMAH

<je-ho'-va sham'-a> ([hMy; hwhy, yahweh shammah], “Yahweh is there”): The name to be given to the new Jerusalem, restored and glorified, as seen in the vision of Ezekiel (48:35 margin; compare <sup><0213></sup>Revelation 21:3). Yahweh returns to the temple which He had forsaken, and from that time forward the fact of supreme importance is that He is there, dwelling in the midst of His people.

## JEHOVAH-TSIDKENU (TSIDKENU)

<je-ho'-va tsid-ke'-nu>, <tsid'-ke-nu> ([Wnqd'ki hwhy, yahweh tsidhqenu], “Yahweh (is) our righteousness”): The symbolic name given

(1) to the king who is to reign over the restored Israel (<sup><0216></sup>Jeremiah 23:6);

(2) to the state or capital (<sup><0216></sup>Jeremiah 33:16).

## JEHOZABAD

<je-hoz'-a-bad> ([dbzwby] yehozabhadh), “Yahweh has bestowed”:

- (1) A servant of King Jehoash of Judah. According to <sup><2721></sup>2 Kings 12:21 (22), he was a son of Shomer, but <sup><4226></sup>2 Chronicles 24:26 makes him “son of Shimrith the Moabitess.”
- (2) A Korahite doorkeeper, son of Obed-edom (<sup><1304></sup>1 Chronicles 26:4).
- (3) A Benjamite, one of King Jehoshaphat’s warriors (<sup><4778></sup>2 Chronicles 17:18).

## JEHOZADAK

<je-hoz'-a-dak> ([qdxwby] yehotsadhaq), “Yahweh is righteous”: Priest at the time of the captivity under Nebuchadrezzar (<sup><1364></sup>1 Chronicles 6:14,15 (Hebrew 5:40,41)). He was the father of Joshua (Jeshua) the priest (<sup><3008></sup>Haggai 1:1,12,14; 2:2,4; Zec 6:11). the King James Version has Josedech in Haggai and Zec. Same as “Jozadak” ([qdxwq] yotsadhaq], same meaning) in Ezr 3:2,8; 5:2; 10:18; <sup><6226></sup>Nehemiah 12:26; and = “Josedek” (King James Version “Josedec”) of 1 Esdras 5:5,48,56; 6:2; 9:19; Sirach 49:12.

## JEHU

<je'-hu> ([awhyeyehu]; meaning uncertain, perhaps “Yahweh is he”; <sup><1196></sup>1 Kings 19:16,17; 2 Kings 9; 10; [E'ioú, Eiou]): Son of Jehoshaphat, and descendant of Nimshi, hence, commonly called “the son of Nimshi”; 10th king of Israel, and founder of its IVth Dynasty. Jehu reign for 28 years. His accession may be reckoned at circa 752 BC (some date a few years later).

### 1. OFFICER OF AHAB:

A soldier of fortune, Jehu appears first as an officer in the body-guard of Ahab. To himself we owe the information that he was present at the judicial murder of Naboth, and that Naboth’s sons were put to death with their father (<sup><1206></sup>2 Kings 9:26). He was in attendance when Ahab drove from Samaria to inspect his new possession in Jezreel, and was witness of the dramatic encounter at the vineyard between the king and the prophet Elijah (compare <sup><1216></sup>1 Kings 21:16 ff). Years after, Jehu reminded Bidkar,

his captain (literally, “thirdsman,” in chariot), of the doom they had there heard pronounced upon Ahab and his house (~~<1195>~~ 2 Kings 9:25 ff). It was in fulfillment of this doom that Jehu at that time ordered the body of the slain Jehoram to be thrown into the enclosure which had once been Naboth’s (~~<1195>~~ 2 Kings 9:26). Ahab’s temporary repentance averted the punishment from himself for a few years (~~<1127>~~ 1 Kings 21:27-29), but the blow fell at the battle of Ramoth-gilead, and Jehu would not be unmindful of the prophet’s words as he beheld the dogs licking Ahab’s blood as they washed his chariot “by the pool of Samaria” (~~<1128>~~ 1 Kings 22:38).

## 2. JEHORAM AT RAMOTH-GILEAD AND JEZREEL:

A different fate awaited Ahab’s two sons. The elder, Ahaziah, died, after a short reign, from the effects of an accident (2 Kings 1). He was succeeded by his brother Jehoram, who toward the close of his reign of 12 years (~~<1191>~~ 2 Kings 3:1) determined on an attempt to recover Ramoth-gilead, where his father had been fatally stricken, from Hazael, of Syria. Ramoth-gilead was taken (~~<1194>~~ 2 Kings 9:14), but in the attack the Israelite king was severely wounded, and was taken to Jezreel to be healed of his wounds (~~<1195>~~ 2 Kings 9:15). The city meanwhile was left in charge of Jehu and his fellow-captains. At Jezreel he was visited by Ahaziah, of Judah, who had taken part with him in the war (~~<1188>~~ 2 Kings 8:28,29; 9:16).

## 3. THE ANOINTING OF JEHU:

The time was now ripe for the execution of the predicted vengeance on the house of Ahab, and to Elisha the prophet, the successor of Elijah, it fell to take the decisive step which precipitated the crisis. Hazael and Jehu had already been named to Elijah as the persons who were to execute the Divine judgment, the one as king of Syria, the other as king of Israel (~~<1195>~~ 1 Kings 19:15-17). Elijah was doubtless aware of this commission, which it was now his part, as respected Jehu, to fulfill. A messenger was hastily dispatched to Ramoth-gilead, with instructions to seek out Jehu, take him apart, anoint him king of Israel in Yahweh’s name, and charge him with the task of utterly destroying the house of Ahab in punishment for the righteous blood shed by Ahab and Jezebel. The messenger was then to flee. This was done, and Jehu, the sacred oil poured on his head, found himself alone with this appalling trust committed to him (~~<1191>~~ 2 Kings 9:1-10).

#### 4. THE REVOLUTION — DEATH OF JEHORAM:

Events now moved rapidly. Jehu's companions were naturally eager to know what had happened, and on learning that Jehu had been anointed king, they at once improvised a throne by throwing their garments on the top of some steps, blew the trumpet, and proclaimed, "Jehu is king." Not a moment was lost. No one was permitted to leave the city to carry forth tidings, and Jehu himself, with characteristic impetuosity, set out, with a small body of horsemen, in his chariot to Jezreel. Bidkar was there as charioteer (~~1975~~ 2 Kings 9:25). As they came within sight of the city, a watchman reported their advance, and messengers were sent to inquire as to their errand. These were ordered to fall into the rear. This conduct awakened suspicion, and Jehoram and Ahaziah — who was still with his invalided kinsman — ordered their chariots, and proceeded in person to meet Jehu. The companies met at the ill-omened field of Naboth, and there the first stroke of vengeance fell. The anxious query, "Is it peace?" was answered by a storm of denunciation from Jehu, and on Jehoram turning to flee, an arrow from Jehu's powerful bow shot him through the heart, and he sank dead in his chariot. Ahaziah likewise was pursued, and smitten "at the ascent of Gur, which is by Ibleam." He died at Megiddo, and was taken to Jerusalem for burial in the sepulcher of the kings (~~1991~~ 2 Kings 9:11-28). A somewhat variant account of Ahaziah's death is given in ~~1479~~ 2 Chronicles 22:9. It is possible that Jehu came to Megiddo or its neighborhood, and had to do with his end there.

#### 5. DEATH OF JEZEBEL:

The slaughter of Jehoram was at once followed by that of the chief instigator of all the crimes for which the house of Ahab suffered — the queen-mother Jezebel. Hot from the pursuit of Ahaziah, Jehu pressed on Jezreel. Jezebel, now an aged woman, but still defiant, had painted and attired herself, and, looking from her window, met him as he drove into the palace court, with the insulting question, "Is it peace, thou Zimri, thy master's murderer?" (compare ~~1166~~ 1 Kings 16:9-12). Jehu's answer was an appeal for aid from those within. Two or three eunuchs of the palace gave signs of their concurrence. These, at Jehu's bidding, threw Jezebel down into the courtyard, where, lying in her blood, she was trodden under foot by the chariot horses. When, a little later, her remains were sought for burial, she was found to have been almost wholly devoured by the dogs — a lurid commentary on Elijah's earlier threatening, which was now recalled

(~~<1280>~~ 2 Kings 9:30-37). Jehu was an intrepid minister of judgment, but the pitiless zeal, needless cruelty, and, afterward, deceit, with which he executed his mission, withdraw our sympathy from him, as it did that of a later prophet (~~<3000>~~ Hosea 1:4).

## 6. SLAUGHTER OF AHAB'S DESCENDANTS:

The next acts of Jehu reveal yet more clearly his thoroughness of purpose and promptitude of action, while they afford fresh exhibitions of his ruthlessness and unscrupulousness of spirit. Samaria was the capital of the kingdom, and headquarters of the Baal-worship introduced by Jezebel, though it is recorded of Jehoram that he had removed, at least temporarily, an obelisk of Baal which his father had set up (~~<1280>~~ 2 Kings 3:2; compare 10:26). The city was still held for the house of Ahab, and 70 of Ahab's "son" — to be taken here in the large sense of male descendants — resided in it (~~<1200>~~ 2 Kings 10:1,6). Jehu here adopted a bold and astute policy. He sent letters to Samaria challenging those in authority to set up one of their master's sons as king, and fight for the city and the kingdom. The governors knew well that they could make no effective resistance to Jehu, and at once humbly tendered their submission. Jehu, in a second message, bade them prove their sincerity by delivering to him the heads of the 70 princes of Ahab's house in baskets. This they did, by their act irrevocably committing themselves to Jehu's cause (~~<2000>~~ 2 Kings 10:9). The ghastly relics were piled up in two heaps at the gate of Jezreel — a horrible object lesson to any still inclined to hesitate in their allegiance. Friends and partisans of the royal house shared the fate of its members (~~<2001>~~ 2 Kings 10:11).

## 7. SLAUGHTER OF AHAZIAH'S BRETHREN:

Apart from the faultiness in the agent's motive, the deeds now recounted fell within the letter of Jehu's commission. As much cannot be said of the deeds of blood that follow. Jehu had killed Ahaziah, king of Judah. Now, on his way to Samaria, he met a company of 42 persons, described as "brethren of Ahaziah" — evidently blood-relations of various degrees, as Ahaziah's own brethren had been earlier slain by the Arabians (~~<1217>~~ 2 Chronicles 21:17; 22:1) — and, on learning who they were, and of their purpose to visit their kinsfolk at Jezreel, gave orders that they be slain on the spot, and their bodies ignominiously thrown into the pit (or "cistern") of the shearing-house where he had encountered them. It was a cruel

excess for which no sufficient justification can be pleaded (~~<1202>~~2 Kings 10:12-14).

## 8. MASSACRE OF THE WORSHIPPERS OF BAAL:

Still less can the craft and violence be condoned by which, when he reached Samaria, Jehu evinced his “zeal for Yahweh” (~~<1206>~~2 Kings 10:16) in the extirpation of the worshippers of Baal. Jehu had secured on his side the support of a notable man — Jehonadab the son of Rechab (~~<1205>~~2 Kings 10:15,16; compare ~~<2436>~~Jeremiah 35:6-19) — and his entrance into Samaria was signalized by further slaying of all adherents of Ahab. Then, doubtless to the amazement of many, Jehu proclaimed himself an enthusiastic follower of Baal. A great festival was organized, to which all prophets, worshippers, and priests of Baal were invited from every part of Israel. Jehu himself took the leading part in the sacrifice (~~<1205>~~2 Kings 10:25). Vestments were distributed to distinguish the true worshippers of Baal from others. Then when all were safely gathered into “the house of Baal,” the gates were closed, and 80 soldiers were sent in to massacre the whole deluded company in cold blood. None escaped. The temple of Baal was broken up. Thus, indeed, “Jehu destroyed Baal out of Israel” (~~<1208>~~2 Kings 10:28), but at what a frightful cost of falsehood and treacherous dealing! (~~<1208>~~2 Kings 10:18-28).

## 9. WARS WITH HAZAEL:

The history of Jehu in the Bible is chiefly the history of his revolution as now narrated. His reign itself is summed up in a few verses, chiefly occupied with the attacks made by Hazael, king of Syria, on the trans-Jordanic territories of Israel (~~<1202>~~2 Kings 10:32,33). These districts were overrun, and remained lost to Israel till the reign of Jehu’s great-grandson, Jeroboam II (~~<1248>~~2 Kings 14:28).

## 10. ASSYRIAN NOTICES:

It is in another direction, namely, to the annals of Assyria, we have to look for any further information we possess on the reign of Jehu. In these annals, fortunately, some interesting notices are preserved. In 854 BC was fought the great battle of Qarqar (a place between Aleppo and Hamath), when Shalmaneser II, king of Assyria, defeated a powerful combination formed against him (Damascus, Hamath, Philistia Ammon, etc.). Among the allies on this occasion is mentioned “Ahabbu of Sir’-ilaa,” who took the third



place with 2,000 chariots and 10,000 footmen. There is a difficulty in supposing Ahab to have been still reigning as late as 854, and Wellhausen, Kamphausen and others have suggested that Ahab's name has been confused with that of his successor Jehoram in the Assyrian annals. Kittel, in his *History of the Hebrews* (II, 233, English translation) is disposed to accept this view. G. Smith, in his *Assyrian Eponym Canon* (179), is of the opinion that the tribute lists were often carelessly compiled and in error as to names. The point of interest is that from this time Israel was evidently a tributary of Assyria.

### 11. TRIBUTE OF JEHU:

With this accord the further notices of Israel in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser II, two in number. Both belong to the year 842 BC and relate to Jehu. On Shalmaneser's Black Obelisk is a pictorial representation of "the tribute of Jehu, son of Omri." An ambassador kneels before the conqueror, and presents his gifts. They include silver, gold, a gold cup, gold vessels, a golden ladle, lead, a staff for the king's hand, scepters. An allusion to the same event occurs in the annals of Shalmaneser's campaign against Hazael of Syria in this year. "At that time I received the tribute of the Tyrians, Sidonians, of Jehu, son of Omri."

There are some indications that in his latter years, which were clouded with misfortune, Jehu associated with himself his son Jehoahaz in the government (compare ~~<1231>~~ 2 Kings 13:1,10, where Jehoahaz comes to the throne in the 23rd, and dies in the 37th year of Jehoash of Judah — 14 years — yet has a total reign of 17 years). Jehu is not mentioned in Chronicles, except incidentally in connection with the death of Ahaziah (~~<1219>~~ 2 Chronicles 22:9), and as the grandfather of Jehoash (~~<1257>~~ 2 Chronicles 25:17).

The character of Jehu is apparent from the acts recorded of him. His energy, determination, promptitude, and zeal fitted him for the work he had to do. It was rough work, and was executed with relentless thoroughness. Probably gentler measures would have failed to eradicate Baal-worship from Israel. His impetuosity was evinced in his furious driving (~~<1211>~~ 2 Kings 9:20). He was bold, daring, unscrupulous, and masterful and astute in his policy. But one seeks in vain in his character for any touch of magnanimity, or of the finer qualities of the ruler. His "zeal for Yahweh" was too largely a cloak for merely worldly ambition. The

bloodshed in which his rule was rounded early provoked a reaction, and his closing years were dark with trouble. He is specially condemned for tolerating the worship of the golden calves (<sup><1209></sup>2 Kings 10:29-31). Nevertheless the throne was secured to his dynasty for four generations (<sup><1209></sup>2 Kings 10:30; compare 15:12).

*W. Shaw Caldecott*

## JEHUBBAH

<sup><je-hub'-a></sup> ([<sup>h</sup>Bj y] yechubbah], meaning unknown): A descendant of Asher, mentioned in <sup><1373></sup>1 Chronicles 7:34, where Qere is [<sup>h</sup>Bj w] wechubbah], “and Hubbah,” but Kethibh is [<sup>h</sup>Bj y] yachbah]; the Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus follows the Qere.

## JEHUCAL

<sup><je-hu'-kal></sup> ([<sup>l</sup> k" Why] yechukhal], probably meaning “Yahweh is able”): A courtier sent by King Zedekiah to Jeremiah to ask the prophet to pray for the king and the people (<sup><2578></sup>Jeremiah 37:3). Most versions except Septuagint, with <sup><2580></sup>Jeremiah 38:1, have “Jucal” ([<sup>l</sup> k" Wy, yukhal], same meaning).

## JEHUD

<sup><je'-hud></sup> ([<sup>d</sup>Why] yehudh]): A town in the lot of Dan named between Baalath and Bene-berak (<sup><695></sup>Joshua 19:45). The only possible identification seems to be with el-Yehudiyeh, which lies about 8 miles East of Jaffa.

## JEHUDI

<sup><je-hu'-di></sup> ([<sup>y</sup>dWhy] yehudhi], properly “a Jew”): An officer of King Jehoiakim (<sup><2634></sup>Jeremiah 36:14,21,23). He was sent by the princes to summon Baruch to read the roll containing Jeremiah’s prophecies to them; he afterward read them to the king, who destroyed them. His name is noteworthy, as also is that of his grandfather Cushi (i.e. “Ethiopian”), and the two are said to point to a foreign origin.

## JEHUDIJAH

<sup><je-hu-di'-ja></sup> (<sup><1388></sup>1 Chronicles 4:18 the King James Version).

*See HA-JEHUDIJAH.*

## JEHUEL

<je-hu'-el> (Kethibh [l a~~w~~ y] yechu'el]; but Qere [l a~~o~~j y] yechi'-el], i.e. “Jehiel” the King James Version, in ~~<1494>~~2 Chronicles 29:14): A Levite.

*See JEHIEL, (5).*

## JEHUSH

<je'-hush> (~~<1389>~~1 Chronicles 8:39).

*See JEUSH, (3).*

## JEIEL

<je-i'-el> ([l a~~o~~[y] ye`i'el], meaning unknown):

(1) A Reubenite (~~<1387>~~1 Chronicles 5:7).

(2) In ~~<1389>~~1 Chronicles 8:29, added in the Revised Version (British and American) from 9:35, where Kethibh is “Jeuel,” an ancestor of King Saul; the King James Version “Jehiel.”

(3) One of David’s mighty men (~~<13144>~~1 Chronicles 11:44). the King James Version is “Jehiel”; Kethibh is “Jeuel.”

(4) A Levite, keeper of the ark with Obed-edom (~~<13158>~~1 Chronicles 15:18,21; 16:5; ~~<14014>~~2 Chronicles 20:14), called “Jehiah” in ~~<13154>~~1 Chronicles 15:24.

(5) A Levite (~~<13165>~~1 Chronicles 16:5) = “Jaaziel” of ~~<13158>~~1 Chronicles 15:18 (which see).

(6) A scribe under King Uzziah (~~<14011>~~2 Chronicles 26:11).

(7) A chief of the Levites, present at King Josiah’s great Passover feast (~~<1489>~~2 Chronicles 35:9).

(8) One of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:43) = “Juel” in 1 Esdras 9:35.

(9) the King James Version in ~~<1494>~~2 Chronicles 29:14; *see JEHIEL, (5).*

(10) the King James Version in Ezr 8:13; *see JEUEL, (3).*

*David Francis Roberts*

## JEKABZEEL

<*je-kab'-ze-el*> ([*l aæbq̃" y]* *yeqabhtse'el*], “God gathers”;  
 <6125> Nehemiah 11:25).

*See KABZEEL.*

## JEKAMEAM

<*jek-a-me'-am*>, <*je-kam'-e-am*> ([*μymq̃" y]* *yeqam'-am*] probably  
 “may kinsman establish”): Head of a Levitical house (<13239> 1 Chronicles  
 23:19; 24:23). The meaning of the name depends upon that of ([*μ["`am*])  
 in compound names; see H P N, 46, 51 ff.

## JEKAMIAH

<*jek-am-mi'-a*> ([*hymq̃" y]* *yeqamyah*], “may Yahweh establish”):

(1) A Judahite, son of Shallum (<13241> 1 Chronicles 2:41).

(2) A son of King Jeconiah (Jehoiachin); in the King James Version  
 “Jecamiah” (<13218> 1 Chronicles 3:18).

## JEKUTHIEL

<*je-ku'-thi-el*> ([*l aetq̃y]* *yeqthi'el*] meaning doubtful): A Judahite  
 (<13248> 1 Chronicles 4:18). The meaning may be “preservation of God” or  
 perhaps the same as [*l aetq̃y]*, *yoqthe'el*], “Joktheel,” the name of a place  
 in <6158> Joshua 15:38; <2147> 2 Kings 14:7.

## JEMIMAH

<*je-mi'-ma*> ([*hmymj]* *yemimah*], perhaps a diminutive meaning “little  
 dove”): The first daughter of Job (42:14), born after his restoration from  
 affliction.

## JEMNAAN

<jem'-na-an> ([<sup>ⲓ</sup> ⲓⲉⲙⲛⲁⲛ, *Iemnaan*]): A city on the coast of Palestine; mentioned among those affected by the expedition of Holofernes (Judith 2:28; 3:1 ff). The name is used for Jabniel, generally called “Jamnia” by the Greek writers.

## JEMUEL

<je-mu'-el> ([<sup>ⲓ</sup> ⲁⲙⲙⲓ yemu'el], meaning unknown): A “son” of Simeon (<sup>ⲙⲁⲓⲃⲏ</sup>Genesis 46:10; Exodus 6:15) = “Nemuel” in <sup>ⲙⲁⲓⲃⲏ</sup>Numbers 26:12; <sup>ⲙⲁⲓⲃⲏ</sup>1 Chronicles 4:24.

The Syriac version has “Jemuel” in the 4 passages, but Gray (H P N, 307, note 6) thinks “Jemuel” is more probably a correction in Genesis than “Nemuel” in Numbers.

## JEOPARD; JEOPARDY

<jep'-ard>, <jep'-ar-di>: The Eng. word referred originally to a game where the chances were even (from OFr. jeu parti); transferred thence to designate any great risk. In the New Testament, represented by the Greek verb *kinduneuo* (<sup>ⲙⲁⲓⲃⲏ</sup>Luke 8:23; <sup>ⲙⲁⲓⲃⲏ</sup>1 Corinthians 15:30). In the Old Testament (<sup>ⲙⲁⲓⲃⲏ</sup>Judges 5:18) for a Hebrew idiom, “despise the soul,” i.e. they placed a small value upon their lives (Vulgate “offered their souls to death”); for elliptical expression, “went with their lives,” in <sup>ⲙⲁⲓⲃⲏ</sup>2 Samuel 23:17 m.

## JEPHTHAH

<jef'-tha> ([<sup>ⲓ</sup> ⲧⲡⲓ yiphtach], “opened,” or “opener,” probably signifying “Yahweh will open”; [<sup>ⲓ</sup> ⲓⲉⲫⲱⲗⲁⲓ, *Iephthae*]; used as the name of a place, as in <sup>ⲙⲁⲓⲃⲏ</sup>Joshua 15:43; 19:14; of a man, <sup>ⲙⲁⲓⲃⲏ</sup>Judges 10:6 through 12:7): Ninth judge of the Israelites. His antecedents are obscure. Assuming Gilead to be the actual name of his father, his mother was a harlot. He was driven from home on account of his illegitimacy, and went to the land of Tobit in Eastern Syria (<sup>ⲙⲁⲓⲃⲏ</sup>Judges 11:2,3). Here he and his followers lived the life of freebooters.

The Israelites beyond the Jordan being in danger of an invasion by the Ammonites, Jephthah was invited by the elders of Gilead to be their leader

(<sup><07105></sup>Judges 11:5,6). Remembering how they had expelled him from their territory and his heritage, Jephthah demanded of them that in the event of success in the struggle with the Ammonites, he was to be continued as leader. This condition being accepted he returned to Gilead (<sup><07105></sup>Judges 11:7-11). The account of the diplomacy used by Jephthah to prevent the Ammonites from invading Gilead is possibly an interpolation, and is thought by many interpreters to be a compilation from Numbers 20 through 21. It is of great interest, however, not only because of the fairness of the argument used (<sup><07112></sup>Judges 11:12-28), but also by virtue of the fact that it contains a history of the journey of the Israelites from Lower Egypt to the banks of the Jordan. This history is distinguished from that of the Pentateuch chiefly by the things omitted. If diplomacy was tried, it failed to dissuade the Ammonites from seeking to invade Israel. Jephthah prepared for battle, but before taking the field paused at Mizpeh of Gilead, and registered a vow that if he were successful in battle, he would offer as a burnt offering to Yahweh whatsoever should first come from his doors to greet him upon his return (<sup><07113></sup>Judges 11:29-31). The battle is fought, Jephthah is the victor, and now his vow returns to him with anguish and sorrow. Returning to his home, the first to greet him is his daughter and only child. The father's sorrow and the courage of the daughter are the only bright lights on this sordid, cruel conception of God and of the nature of sacrifice. That the sacrifice was made seems certain from the narrative, although some critics choose to substitute for the actual death of the maiden the setting the girl apart for a life of perpetual virginity. The Israelite laws concerning sacrifices and the language used in <sup><07113></sup>Judges 11:39 are the chief arguments for the latter interpretation. The entire narrative, however, will hardly bear this construction (11:34-40).

Jephthah was judge in Israel for 6 years, but appears only once more in the Scripture narrative. The men of Ephraim, offended because they had had no share in the victory over the Ammonites, made war upon Gilead, but were put to rout by the forces under Jephthah (<sup><07120></sup>Judges 12:1-6).

*C. E. Schenk*

## JEPHUNNEH

<je-fun'-e> ([<sup>h</sup><sup>n</sup><sup>p</sup><sup>y</sup>] yephunneh], meaning uncertain):

(1) Father of Caleb (<sup><04130></sup>Numbers 13:6; 14:6,30, etc.).

According to <sup><4136></sup>Numbers 13:6, he was of the tribe of Judah; according to 32:12; <sup><6446></sup>Joshua 14:6, a Kenizzite; the Kenizzites were incorporated in Judah (compare <sup><3413></sup>1 Chronicles 4:13-15).

(2) A son of Jether, an Asherite (<sup><3378></sup>1 Chronicles 7:38).

## JERAH

<sup><je'-ra></sup> ([j r" y, yerach]): A son of Joktan (<sup><4106></sup>Genesis 10:26 parallel <sup><3321></sup>1 Chronicles 1:20). No district Jerah has been discovered. However, Yurakh in Yemen and *Yarach* in Hijaz are places named by the Arabic geographers. The fact that the word in Hebrew means "moon" has led to the following suggestions: the Banu Hilal ("sons of the new moon") in the North of Yemen; Ghubb el-Qamar ("the bay of the moon"), Jebel el-Qamar ("the mountains of the moon") in Eastern Chadramant. But in Southern Arabia worship of the moon has caused the word to bulk largely in place-names.

## JERAHMEEL; JERAHMEELITES

<sup><je-ra'-me-el></sup>, <sup><je-ra'-me-el-its></sup> ([l aə] r̥y] yerachme'el], "may God have compassion!"):

(1) In <sup><339></sup>1 Chronicles 2:9,25,26,27,33,42, he is described as the son of Hezron, the son of Perez, the son of Judah by Tamar his daughter-in-law (Genesis 38). In <sup><4271></sup>1 Samuel 27:10 is mentioned the *neghebh* of the ([l aə] r̥y] h" , *ha-yerach-me'eli*], a collective noun), the Revised Version (British and American) "the South of the Jerahmeelites." The latter is a tribal name in use probably before the proper name, above; their cities are mentioned in <sup><4819></sup>1 Samuel 30:29. Cheyne has radical views on Jerahmeel. See EB, under the word; also T. Witton Davies in Review of Theology and Philosophy, III, 689-708 (May, 1908); and Cheyne's replies in Hibbert Journal, VII, 132-51 (October, 1908), and Decline and Fall of the Kingdom of Judah.

(2) A Merarite Levite, son of Kish (<sup><139></sup>1 Chronicles 24:29).

(3) "The king's son," the Revised Version (British and American) and the King James Version margin (<sup><2426></sup>Jeremiah 36:26). the Revised Version margin, the King James Version have "son of Hammelech," taking the word [Ēl Mh" , *ha-melek*] as a proper name. He was "probably a royal

prince, one who had a king among his ancestors but not necessarily son of the ruling king; so 38:6; <sup><1223></sup>1 Kings 22:26b; especially <sup><3008></sup>Zephaniah 1:8 written at a time when the reigning king, Josiah, could not have had a grown-up `son` “ (Driver, Jeremiah, 224, note e). Jerahmeel was with two others commanded by Jehoiakim to arrest Jeremiah and Baruch.

*David Francis Roberts*

## JERECHU; JERECHUS

<sup><jer'-e-ku></sup>, <sup><jer'-e-kus></sup> the King James Version (1 Esdras 5:22).

*See JERICO.*

## JERED

<sup><je'-red></sup> ([<sup>dry</sup>, <sup>yeredh</sup>], “descent”): A Judahite, father of Gedor (<sup><1048></sup>1 Chronicles 4:18).

*See also JARED.*

## JEREMAI

<sup><jer'-e-mi></sup>, <sup><jer-e-ma'-i></sup> ([<sup>ym</sup> <sup>ry</sup>] <sup>yeremay</sup>], meaning unknown): One of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:33).

*See JEREMIAS (1 Esdras 9:34).*

## JEREMIAH (1)

<sup><jer-e-mi'-a></sup>

(a) [<sup>W</sup><sup>hym</sup><sup>f</sup><sup>yi</sup>] <sup>yirmeyahu</sup>], or

(b) shorter form, [<sup>hym</sup><sup>f</sup><sup>yi</sup>] <sup>yirmeyah</sup>], both differently explained as “Yah establishes (so Giesebrecht), whom Yahweh casts,” i.e. possibly, as Gesenius suggests, “appoints” (A. B. Davidson in HDB, II, 569a), and “Yahweh looseneth” (the womb); see BDB): The form

(b) is used of Jeremiah the prophet only in <sup><2701></sup>Jeremiah 27:1; 28:5,6,10,11,12b,15; 29:1; Ezr 1:1; <sup><2702></sup>Daniel 9:2, while the other is found 116 times in Jeremiah alone. In 1 Esdras 1:28,32,47,57; 2 Esdras 2:18, English Versions of the Bible has “Jeremy,” so the King James



Version in 2 Macc 2:1,5,7; <sup><4027></sup>Matthew 2:17; 27:9; in <sup><4064></sup>Matthew 16:14, the King James Version has “Jeremias,” but the Revised Version (British and American) in 2 Maccabees and Matthew has “Jeremiah.”

- (1) The prophet. See special article. Of the following, (2), (3) and (4) have form (a) above; the others the form (b).
- (2) Father of Hamutal (Hamital), the mother of King Jehoahaz and King Jehoiakim (<sup><4239></sup>2 Kings 23:31; 24:18 parallel <sup><4501></sup>Jeremiah 52:1).
- (3) A Rechabite (<sup><4818></sup>Jeremiah 35:3).
- (4) In <sup><3123></sup>1 Chronicles 12:13 (Hebrew 14), a Gadite.
- (5) In <sup><3120></sup>1 Chronicles 12:10 (Hebrew 11), a Gadite.
- (6) In <sup><3124></sup>1 Chronicles 12:4 (Hebrew 5), a Benjamite(?) or Judean. (4), (5) and (6) all joined David at Ziklag.
- (7) Head of a Manassite family (<sup><4154></sup>1 Chronicles 5:24).
- (8) A priest who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (<sup><4602></sup>Nehemiah 10:2), probably the same as he of 12:34 who took part in the procession at the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem.
- (9) A priest who went to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel from exile and became head of a priestly family of that name (<sup><4600></sup>Nehemiah 12:1).

*David Francis Roberts*

## JEREMIAH (2)

<jer-e-mi'-a>:

### 1. NAME AND PERSON:

The name of one of the greatest prophets of Israel. The Hebrew [W<sup>h</sup>y<sup>m</sup>h<sup>t</sup>ŷi yirmeyahu], abbreviated to [h<sup>y</sup>m<sup>t</sup>ŷi yirmeyah], signifies either “Yahweh hurls” or “Yahweh founds.” Septuagint reads [ Ἰερμίας, *Iermias*], and the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Jeremias. As this name also occurs not infrequently, the prophet is called “the son of Hilkiah” (<sup><2400></sup>Jeremiah 1:1), who is, however, not the high priest mentioned in 2 Kings 22 and 23, as it is merely stated that he was “of the priests that were in Anathoth” in the land of Benjamin In Anathoth, now Anata, a small

village 3 miles Northeast of Jerusalem, lived a class of priests who belonged to a side line, not to the line of Zadok (compare ~~1026~~ 1 Kings 2:26).

## 2. LIFE OF JEREMIAH:

Jeremiah was called by the Lord to the office of a prophet while still a youth (1:6) about 20 years of age, in the 13th year of King Josiah (1:2; 25:3), in the year 627 BC, and was active in this capacity from this time on to the destruction of Jerusalem, 586 BC, under kings Josiah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah. Even after the fall of the capital city he prophesied in Egypt at least for several years, so that his work extended over a period of about 50 years in all. At first he probably lived in Anathoth, and put in his appearance publicly in Jerusalem only on the occasion of the great festivals; later he lived in Jerusalem, and was there during the terrible times of the siege and the destruction of the city.

Although King Josiah was God-fearing and willing to serve Yahweh, and soon inaugurated his reformation according to the law of Yahweh (in the 18th year of his reign), yet Jeremiah, at the time when he was called to the prophetic office, was not left in doubt of the fact that the catastrophe of the judgment of God over the city would soon come (1:11 ff); and when, after a few years, the Book of the Law was found in the temple (2 Kings 22 and 23), Jeremiah preached “the words of this covenant” to the people in the town and throughout the land (11:1-8; 17:19-27), and exhorted to obedience to the Divine command; but in doing this then and afterward he became the object of much hostility, especially in his native city, Anathoth. Even his own brethren or near relatives entered into a conspiracy against him by declaring that he was a dangerous fanatic (12:6). However, the condition of Jeremiah under this pious king was the most happy in his career, and he lamented the latter’s untimely death in sad lyrics, which the author of Chronicles was able to use (~~4825~~ 2 Chronicles 35:25), but which have not come down to our times.

Much more unfavorable was the prophet’s condition after the death of Josiah. Jehoahaz-Shallum, who ruled only 3 months, received the announcement of his sentence from Jeremiah (22:10 ff). Jehoiakim (609-598 BC) in turn favored the heathen worship, and oppressed the people through his love of luxury and by the erection of grand structures (~~4213~~ Jeremiah 22:13 ff). In addition, his politics were treacherous. He

conspired with Egypt against his superior, Nebuchadnezzar. Epoch-making was the 4th year of Jehoiakim, in which, in the battle of Carchemish, the Chaldeans gained the upper hand in Hither Asia, as Jeremiah had predicted (46:1-12). Under Jehoiakim Jeremiah delivered his great temple discourse (Jeremiah 7 through 9; 10:17-25). The priests for this reason determined to have the prophet put to death (Jeremiah 26). However, influential elders interceded for him, and the princes yet showed some justice. He was, however, abused by the authorities at the appeal of the priests (Jeremiah 20). According to 36:1 ff, he was no longer permitted to enter the place of the temple. For this reason the Lord commanded him to collect his prophecies in a bookroll, and to have them read to the people by his faithful pupil Baruch (Jeremiah 36; compare Jeremiah 45). The book fell into the hands of the king, who burned it. However, Jeremiah dictated the book a second time to Baruch, together with new additions.

Jehoiachin or Coniah (<sup>3024</sup>Jeremiah 22:24 ff), the son of Jehoiakim, after a reign of 3 months, was taken into captivity to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar, together with a large number of his nobles and the best part of the people (<sup>3041</sup>Jeremiah 24:1; 29:2), as the prophet had predicted (<sup>3023</sup>Jeremiah 22:20-30). But conditions did not improve under Zedekiah (597-586 BC). This king was indeed not as hostile to Jeremiah as Jehoiakim had been; but all the more hostile were the princes and the generals, who were now in command after the better class of these had been deported to Babylon. They continually planned rebellion against Babylon, while Jeremiah was compelled to oppose and put to naught every patriotic agitation of this kind. Finally, the Babylonian army came in order to punish the faithless vassal who had again entered into an alliance with Egypt. Jeremiah earnestly advised submission, but the king was too weak and too cowardly as against his nobles. A long siege resulted, which caused the direst sufferings in the life of Jeremiah. The commanders threw him into a vile prison, charging him with being a traitor (37:11 ff). The king, who consulted him secretly, released him from prison, and put him into the "court of the guard" (37:17 ff), where he could move around freely, and could again prophesy. Now that the judgment had come, he could again speak of the hopeful future (Jeremiah 32; 33). Also Jeremiah 30 and 31, probably, were spoken about this time. But as he continued to preach submission to the people, those in authority cast him into a slimy cistern, from which the pity of a courtier, Ebed-melech, delivered him (39:15-18).

He again returned to the court of the guard, where he remained until Jerusalem was taken.

After the capture of the city, Jeremiah was treated with great consideration by the Babylonians, who knew that he had spoken in favor of their government (39:11 ff; 40:1 ff). They gave him the choice of going to Babylon or of remaining in his native land. He decided for the latter, and went to the governor Gedaliah, at Mizpah, a man worthy of all confidence. But when this man, after a short time, was murdered by conscienceless opponents, the Jews who had been left in Palestine, becoming alarmed and fearing the vengeance of the Chaldeans, determined to emigrate to Egypt. Jeremiah advised against this most earnestly, and threatened the vengeance of Yahweh, if the people should insist upon their undertaking (42:1 ff). But they insisted and even compelled the aged prophet to go with them (43:1 ff). Their first goal was Tahpanhes (Daphne), a town in Lower Egypt. At this place he still continued to preach the word of God to his fellow-Israelites; compare the latest of his preserved discourses in 43:8-13, as also the sermon in Jeremiah 44, delivered at a somewhat later time but yet before 570 BC. At that time Jeremiah must have been from 70 to 80 years old. He probably died soon after this in Egypt. The church Fathers report that he was stoned to death at Daphne by the Jews (Jerome, Adv. Jovin, ii, 37; Tertullian, Contra Gnost., viii; Pseudepiphanius. De Proph., chapter viii; Dorotheus, 146; Isidorus, Ort. et Obit. Patr., chapter xxxviii). However, this report is not well founded. The same is the case with the rabbinical tradition, according to which he, in company with Baruch, was taken from Egypt to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar, and died there (*Cedher 'Olam Rabba'* 26).

### 3. THE PERSONAL CHARACTER OF JEREMIAH:

The Book of Jeremiah gives us not only a fuller account of the life and career of its author than do the books of the other prophets, but we also learn more about his own inner and personal life and feelings than we do of Isaiah or any other prophet. From this source we learn that he was, by nature, gentle and tender in his feelings, and sympathetic. A decided contrast to this is found in the hard and unmerciful judgment which it was his mission to announce. God made him strong and firm and immovable like iron for his mission (1:18; 15:20). This contrast between his naturally warm personal feelings and his strict Divine mission not rarely appears in the heart-utterances found in his prophecies. At first he rejoiced when God

spoke to him (15:16); but soon these words of God were to his heart a source of pain and of suffering (15:17 ff). He would have preferred not to utter them; and then they burned in his breast as a fire (20:7 ff; 23:9). He personally stood in need of love, and yet was not permitted to marry (16:1 f). He was compelled to forego the pleasures of youth (15:17). He loved his people as nobody else, and yet was always compelled to prophesy evil for it, and seemed to be the enemy of his nation. This often caused him to despair. The enmity to which he fell a victim, on account of his declaration of nothing but the truth, he deeply felt; see his complaints (9:1 ff; 12:5 f; 15:10; 17:14-18; 18:23, and often). In this sad antagonism between his heart and the commands of the Lord, he would perhaps wish that God had not spoken to him; he even cursed the day of his birth (15:10; 20:14-18; compare <sup><818></sup>Job 3:1 ff). Such complaints are to be carefully distinguished from that which the Lord through His Spirit communicated to the prophet. God rebukes him for these complaints, and demands of him to repent and to trust and obey Him (<sup><2459></sup>Jeremiah 15:19). This discipline makes him all the more unconquerable. Even his bitter denunciations of his enemies (<sup><2412></sup>Jeremiah 11:20 ff; 15:15; 17:18; 18:21-23) originated in part in his passionate and deep nature, and show how great is the difference between him and that perfect Sufferer, who prayed even for His deadly enemies. But Jeremiah was nevertheless a type of that Suffering Saviour, more than any of the Old Testament saints. He, as a priest, prayed for his people, until God forbade him to do so (7:16; 11:14; 14:11; 18:20). He was compelled more than all the others to suffer through the anger of God, which was to afflict his people. The people themselves also felt that he meant well to them. A proof of this is seen in the fact that the rebellious people, who always did the contrary of what he had commanded them, forced him, the unwelcome prophet of God, to go along with them, to Egypt, because they felt that he was their good genius.

#### 4. THE PROPHECIES OF JEREMIAH:

What Jeremiah was to preach was the judgment upon Judah. As the reason for this judgment Jeremiah everywhere mentioned the apostasy from Yahweh, the idolatry, which was practiced on bamoth, or the "high places" by Judah, as this had been done by Israel. Many heathenish abuses had found their way into the life of the people. Outspoken heathenism had been introduced by such men as King Manasseh, even the sacrifice of children to the honor of Baal-Molech in the valley of Hinnom (7:31; 19:5; 32:35), and

the worship of “the queen of heaven” (7:18; 44:19). It is true that the reformation of Josiah swept away the worst of these abominations. But an inner return to Yahweh did not result from this reformation. For the reason that the improvement had been more on the surface and outward, and was done to please the king, Jeremiah charges up to his people all their previous sins, and the guilt of the present generation was yet added to this (16:11 f). Together with religious insincerity went the moral corruption of the people, such as dishonesty, injustice, oppression of the helpless, slander, and the like. Compare the accusations found in 5:1 ff, 7 f, 26 ff; 6:7, 13; 7:5 f, 9; 9:2, 6, 8; 17:9 ff; 21:12; 22:13 ff; 23:10; 29:23, etc. Especially to the spiritual leaders, the priests and prophets, are these things charged up.

The judgment which is to come in the near future, as a punishment for the sins of the people, is from the outset declared to be the conquest of the country through an enemy from abroad. In this way the heated caldron with the face from the North, in the vision containing the call of the prophet (~~2013~~ Jeremiah 1:13 ff), is to be understood. This power in the North is not named until the 4th year of Jehoiakim (Jeremiah 25), where Nebuchadnezzar is definitely designated as the conqueror. It is often thought, that, in the earlier years of his career, Jeremiah had in mind the Scythians when he spoke of the enemies from the North, especially in Jeremiah 4 through 6. The Scythians (according to Herodotus i.103 ff) had, probably a few years before Jeremiah’s call to the prophetic office, taken possession of Media, then marched through Asia Minor, and even forced their way as far as Egypt. They crossed through Canaan, passing by on their march from East to West, near Beth-shean (Scythopolis). The ravages of this fierce people probably influenced the language used by Jeremiah in his prophecies (compare 4:11 ff; 5:15 ff; 6:3 ff, 22 ff). But it is unthinkable that Jeremiah expected nothing more than a plundering and a booty-seeking expedition of the Scythian nomad hordes. Chariots, such as are described in 4:13, the Scythians did not possess. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that Jeremiah from the outset speaks of a deportation of his people to this foreign land (3:18; 5:19), while an exile of Israel in the country of the Scythians was out of the question. At all events from the 4th year of Jehoiakim, Jeremiah regards the Chaldeans as the enemy who, according to his former announcement, would come from the North. It is possible that it was only in the course of time that he reached a clear conviction as to what nation was meant by the revelation from God. But,

upon further reflection, he must have felt almost certain on this subject, especially as Isaiah (39:6), Micah (4:10), and, soon after these, Habakkuk had named Babylon as the power that was to carry out the judgment upon Israel. Other prophets, too, regard the Babylonians as belonging to the northern group of nations (compare Zec 6:8), because they always came from the North, and because they were the legal successors of the Assyrians.

In contrast to optimistic prophets, who had hoped to remedy matters in Israel (<sup>2494</sup>Jeremiah 6:14), Jeremiah from the beginning predicted the destruction of the city and of the sanctuary, as also the end of the Jewish nation and the exile of the people through these enemies from abroad. According to 25:11; 29:10, the Babylonian supremacy (not exactly the exile) was to continue for 70 years; and after this, deliverance should come. Promises to this effect are found only now and then in the earlier years of the prophet (3:14 ff; 12:14 ff; 16:14 f). However, during the time of the siege and afterward, such predictions are more frequent (compare 23:1 ff; 24:6 f; 47:2-7; and in the "Book of Comfort," chapters 30 through 33).

What characterizes this prophet is the spiritual inwardness of his religion; the external theocracy he delivers up to destruction, because its forms were not animated by God-fearing sentiments. External circumcision is of no value without inner purity of heart. The external temple will be destroyed, because it has become the hiding-place of sinners. External sacrifices have no value, because those who offer them are lacking in spirituality, and this is displeasing to God. The law is abused and misinterpreted (<sup>2498</sup>Jeremiah 8:8); the words of the prophets as a rule do not come from God. Even the Ark of the Covenant is eventually to make way for a glorious presence of the Lord. The law is to be written in the hearts of men (<sup>2503</sup>Jeremiah 31:31 ff). The glories of the Messianic times the prophet does not describe in detail but their spiritual character he repeatedly describes in the words "Yahweh our righteousness" (<sup>2506</sup>Jeremiah 23:6; 33:16). However, we must not over-estimate the idealism of Jeremiah. He believed in a realistic restoration of theocracy to a form, just as the other prophets (compare Jeremiah 31 through 32, 38 through 40).

As far as the form of his prophetic utterances is concerned, Jeremiah is of a poetical nature; but he was not only a poet. He often speaks in the meter of an elegy; but he is not bound by this, and readily passes over into other forms of rhythms and also at times into prosaic speech, when the contents



of his discourses require it. The somewhat monotonous and elegiac tone, which is in harmony with his sad message to the people, gives way to more lively and varied forms of expression, when the prophet speaks of other and foreign nations. In doing this he often makes use of the utterances of earlier prophets.

## 5. THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH:

The first composition of the book is reported in ~~2401~~ Jeremiah 36:1 ff. In the 4th year of Jehoiakim, at the command of Yahweh, he dictated all of the prophecies he had spoken down to this time to his pupil Baruch, who wrote them on a roll. After the destruction of this book-roll by the king, he would not be stopped from reproducing the contents again and making additions to it (~~2402~~ Jeremiah 36:32). In this we have the origin of the present Book of Jeremiah. This book, however, not only received further additions, but has also been modified. While the discourses may originally have been arranged chronologically, and these reached only down to the 4th year of King Jehoiakim, we find in the book, as it is now, as early as ~~2403~~ Jeremiah 21:1 ff; 23:1 ff; 26:1 ff, discourses from the times of Zedekiah. However, the 2nd edition (~~2404~~ Jeremiah 36:28) contained, no doubt, Jeremiah 25, with those addresses directed against the heathen nations extant at that time. The lack of order, from a chronological point of view, in the present book, is attributable also to the fact that historical accounts or appendices concerning the career of Jeremiah were added to the book in later times, e.g. Jeremiah 26; 35; 36 and others; and in these additions are also found older discourses of the prophet. Beginning with Jeremiah 37, the story of the prophet during the siege of Jerusalem and after the destruction of the city is reported, and in connection with this are his words and discourses belonging to this period.

It is a question whether these pieces, which are more narrative in character, and which are the product of a contemporary, probably Baruch, at one time constituted a book by themselves, out of which they were later taken and incorporated in the book of the prophet, or whether they were inserted by Baruch. In favor of the first view, it may be urged that they are not always found at their proper places chronologically; e.g. Jeremiah 26 is a part of the temple discourse in Jeremiah 7 through 9. However, this "Book of Baruch," which is claimed by some critics to have existed as a separate book beside that of Jeremiah, would not furnish a connected biography, and does not seem to have been written for biographical purposes. It



contains introductions to certain words and speeches of the prophet and statements of what the consequences of these had been. Thus it is more probable that Baruch, at a later time, made supplementary additions to the original book, which the prophet had dictated without any personal data. But in this work the prophet himself may have cooperated. At places, perhaps, the dictation of the prophet ends in a narrative of Baruch (~~2494~~ Jeremiah 19:14 through 20:6), or vice versa. Baruch seems to have written a historical introduction, and then Jeremiah dictated the prophecy (27:1; 18:1; 32:1 ff, and others). Of course, the portions of the book which came from the pen of Baruch are to be regarded as an authentic account.

## 6. AUTHENTICITY AND INTEGRITY OF THE BOOK:

However, critics have denied to Jeremiah and his pupil certain sections of the present book, and they claim that these belong to a later date. Among these is 10:1-16, containing a warning to those in the exile against idolatry (and related to Isaiah 40 ff) which, it is claimed, could not possibly in this form and fullness be the work of Jeremiah. Also 17:19-27 is without reason denied to Jeremiah, upon the ground that he could not have thought of emphasizing the Sabbath law. He was, however, no modern idealist, but respected also the Divine ordinances (compare 11:1-8). Then Jeremiah 25 is rejected by some, while others attack especially 25:12-14 and 25:27-38; but in both cases without reason. On the other hand, we admit that 25:25 and also 25:13 f are later additions. The words, "all that is written in this book, which Jeremiah hath prophesied against all the nations," are probably a superscription, which has found its way into the text. In 25:26 the words, "and the king of Sheshach shall drink after them," are likewise considered spurious. Sheshach is rightly regarded here, as in 51:41, as a cipher for "Babel," but the use of 'At-bash (a cipher in which the order of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet is reversed, taw (t) for 'aleph ('), shin (sh) for beth (b), etc., hence, SHeSHaKH = BaBHeL, see the commentaries) does not prove spuriousness. The sentence is not found in the Septuagint. The attacks made on Jeremiah 30 and 31 are of little moment. ~~2494~~ Jeremiah 33:14-26 is not found in the Septuagint, and its contents, too, belong to the passages in Jeremiah that are most vigorously attacked. Critics regard Jeremiah as too spiritual to have perpetuated the Levitical priesthood. In ~~2494~~ Jeremiah 39:1,2,4-10 are evidently additions that do not belong to this place. The remaining portion can stand. Among the discourses against the nations, Jeremiah 46 through 51, those in 46:1-12, spoken immediately

preceding the battle of Carchemish, cannot be shown to be unauthentic; even 46:13-28 are also genuine. The fact, however, is that the text has suffered very much. Nor are there any satisfactory reasons against the prophecy in Jeremiah 47 through 49, if we assume that Jeremiah reasserted some of his utterances against the heathen nations that did not seem to have been entirely fulfilled. Jeremiah 50 and 51, the discourses against Babylon, have the distinct impress of Jeremiah. This impression is stronger than the doubts, which, however, are not without weight. The events in 51:59 ff, which are not to be called into question, presuppose longer addresses of Jeremiah against Babylon. The possibility, however, remains that the editing of these utterances as found in the present book dates from the time after 586 BC. That any influence of Deutero-Isaiah or later authors can be traced in Jeremiah cannot be shown with any certainty. Jeremiah 52 was written neither by Jeremiah nor for his book, but is taken from the Books of Kings, and is found there almost verbatim (2 Kings 24; 25).

## **7. RELATION TO THE SEPTUAGINT (SEPTUAGINT):**

A special problem is furnished by the relation of the text of Jeremiah to the Alexandrian version of the Seventy (Septuagint). Not only does the Hebrew form of the book differ from the Greek materially, much more than this is the case in other books of the Old Testament, but the arrangement, too, is a different one. The oracle concerning the heathen nations (Jeremiah 46 through 51) is in the Septuagint found in the middle of Jeremiah 25, and that, too, in an altogether different order (namely, 49:35 ff, 46; 50; 51; 47:1-7; 49:7-22; 49:1-5, 28-33, 13-27; 48). In addition, the readings throughout the book in many cases are divergent, the text in the Septuagint being in general shorter and more compact. The Greek text has about 2,700 Hebrew words less than the authentic Hebrew text, and is thus about one-eighth shorter.

As far as the insertion of the addresses against the heathen nations in Jeremiah 29 is concerned, the Greek order is certainly not more original than is the Hebrew. It rather tears apart, awkwardly, what is united in Jeremiah 25, and has probably been caused by a misunderstanding. The words of 25:13 were regarded as a hint that here the discourses against the heathen were to follow. Then, too, the order of these discourses in the Greek text is less natural than the one in Hebrew. In regard to the readings of the text, it has been thought that the text of the Septuagint deserves the

preference on account of its brevity, and that the Hebrew text had been increased by additions. However, in general, the Greek version is very free, and often is done without an understanding of the subject; and there are reasons to believe that the translator shortened the text, when he thought the style of Jeremiah too heavy. Then, too, where he met with repetitions, he probably would omit; or did so when he found trouble with the matter or the language. This does not deny that his translation in many places may be correct, and that additions may have been made to the Hebrew text.

### LITERATURE.

Calvin, Praelectiones in Librum Prophetiae Jeremiah et Thren, Geneva, 1653; Sebastian Schmidt, Commentarii in libr. prophet. Jeremiah, Argent, 1685. Modern commentary by Hitzig, Ewald, Graf, Nagelsbach, Keil; also Cheyne (Pulpit Comm.), Peake, Duhm, and von Orelli.

*C. von Orelli*

### JEREMIAH, EPISTLE OF

*See JEREMY, THE EPISTLE OF.*

### JEREMIAH, THE LAMENTATIONS OF

*See LAMENTATIONS.*

### JEREMIAS

<jer-e-mi'-as> ([<sup>ʾ</sup>Ιερεμίας, *Ieremias*]):

(1) Named among the sons of Baani as one of those who had married foreign wives (1 Esdras 9:34). In Ezr 10:33 we find, “Jeremai” among the sons of Hashum. In 1 Esdras it should come in 9:33 before Manasses.

(2) *See JEREMIAH* (general article).

### JEREMIEL

<jer-e-mi'-el> (Latin Hieremihel, al. Jeremiel, “El hurls” or “El appoints”): the King James Version margin and the Revised Version (British and American) in 2 Esdras 4:36 for the King James Version “Uriel.” He is here called the “archangel” who answers the questions raised

by the souls of the righteous dead. He is perhaps identical with Ramiel of Apocrypha Baruch or Remiel of Eth Enoch.

## JEREMOTH

<jer'-e-moth>

(a) [~~twɔrɐ]~~ yeremoth] and

(b) [~~twɔrɐ]~~ yeremowth],

(c) [~~twɔrɪ]~~ yerimowth], meaning unknown): Of the following (1) has form (b), (5) the form (c), the rest (a).

(1) In ~~<308>~~ 1 Chronicles 7:8 (the King James Version “Jerimoth”), and

(2) In ~~<384>~~ 1 Chronicles 8:14, Benjamites. Compare **JEROHAM**, (2).

(3) In ~~<323>~~ 1 Chronicles 23:23, and

(4) in ~~<352>~~ 1 Chronicles 25:22 = “Jerimoth,” 24:30; heads of Levitical houses.

(5) A Naphtalite, one of David’s tribal princes (~~<379>~~ 1 Chronicles 27:19); the King James Version “Jerimoth.”

(6) (7) (8) Men who had married foreign wives. In Ezr 10:26 (=“Hieremoth,” 1 Esdras 9:27); Ezr 10:27 (=“Jarimoth,” 1 Esdras 9:28); Ezr 10:29 (=“Hieremoth,” 1 Esdras 9:30); the Qere of the last is [~~twɔrw]~~ weramoth], “and Ramoth”; so the Revised Version margin, the King James Version.

*David Francis Roberts*

## JEREMY

<jer'-e-mi>.

See **JEREMIAH** (general article).

## JEREMY, THE EPISTLE OF

<jer'-e-mi>, ([<sup>᾽</sup>Επιστολὴ Ἰερεμίου, *Epistole Ieremiou*]):

### 1. NAME:

In manuscripts Vaticanus and Alexandrinus the title is simply “An Epistle of Jeremiah.” But in Codex Vaticanus, etc., there is a superscription introducing the letter: “Copy of a letter which Jeremiah sent to the captives about to be led to Babylon by (Peshitta adds Nebuchadnezzar) the king of the Babylonians, to make known to them what had been commanded him by God.” What follows is a satirical exposure of the folly of idolatry, and not a letter. The idea of introducing this as a letter from Jeremiah was probably suggested by ~~290~~ Jeremiah 29:1 ff.

### 2. CANONICITY AND POSITION:

The early Greek Fathers were on the whole favorably disposed toward this tract, reckoning it to be a part of the Canon. It is therefore included in the lists of Canonical writings of Origen, Epiphanius, Cyril of Jerusalem and Athanasius, and it was so authoritatively recognized by the Council of Laodicea (360 AD).

In most Greek manuscripts of the Septuagint (Codices Alexandrinus and Vaticanus. March, Chisl, in the Syriac Hexateuch), it follows Lamentations as an independent piece, closing the supposed writings of Jeremiah. In the bestknown printed of the Septuagint (Tischendorf, Swete, etc.), the order is Jeremiah, Baruch, Lain, Epistle of Jeremy. In Fritzsche, Lib. Apocrypha VT Graece, Epistle Jeremiah stands between Baruch and Tobit. But in Latin manuscripts, including those of the Vulgate, it is appended to Baruch, of which it forms chapter 6, though it really has nothing to do with that book. This last is the case with Protestant editions (English versions of the Bible, etc.) of the Apocrypha, a more intelligible arrangement, since Jeremiah and Lamentations do not occur in the Apocrypha, and the Biblical Baruch was Jeremiah’s amanuensis.

### 3. CONTENTS:

In the so-called letter (see 1, above) the author shows the absurdity and wickedness of heathen worship. The Jews, for their sins, will be removed to Babylon, where they will remain 7 generations. In that land they will be tempted to worship the gods of the people. The writer’s aim is ostensibly to warn them beforehand by showing how helpless and useless the idols worshipped are, and how immoral as well as silly the rites of the Bah religion are. For similar polemics against idolatry, see ~~240~~ Isaiah 44:9-19

(which in its earnestness resembles the Epistle Jeremiah closely); ~~<400>~~Jeremiah 10:3-9; ~~<450>~~Psalm 115:4-8; 135:15-18; The Wisdom of Solomon 13:10-19; 15:13-17.

#### 4. ORIGINAL LANGUAGE:

That the Epistle Jeremiah was composed in Greek is the opinion of practically all scholars. There are no marks of translation; the Greek is on the whole good, and abounds in such rhetorical terms as characterized the Greek of Northern Egypt about the beginning of our era. There is no trace of a Hebrew original, though Origen has been mistakenly understood to say there was one in his day (see Schurer, GJV4, III, 467 f). Romanist writers defend a Hebrew original, and point to some Hebraisms (verse 44 and the use of the fut. for the past), but these can be matched in admittedly Hellenistic Greek writings.

#### 5. AUTHORSHIP, DATE AND AIM:

The writer was almost certainly a resident in Alexandria toward the close of the last century BC. The Greek of the book, the references to Egyptian religion (verse 19, where the Feast of Lights at Sais — Herod. ii.62 — is referred to), and the allusion to the Epistle Jeremiah in 2 Macc 2:2, denied by Schurer, etc., make the above conclusion very probable. The author had in mind the dangers to the religion of his fellow-countrymen presented by the fascinating forms of idolatry existing at Alexandria. Certainly Jeremiah is not the author, for the book was written in Greek and never formed part of the Hebrew Canon. Besides, the treatment is far below the level of the genuine writings of that prophet.

#### 6. TEXT AND VERSIONS:

##### *(1) The Greek.*

This epistle occurs in the principal manuscripts of the Septuagint uncials (Codices Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, Q, Gamma, contain 7b-24a, etc.) and cursives (except 70, 96, 229).

##### *(2) The Syriac.*

P follows the Greek, but very freely. The Syriac H follows the text of Codex Vaticanus closely, often at the expense of Syriac idioms.

(3) *The Latin.*

The Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) is made direct from the Greek. There is a different Latin version published by Sabatier in his Biblical Sacr. Latin Versiones Antiquas, II, 734 ff. It is freer than the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.)

(4) *The Arabic.*

There are also Arabic (following A), Coptic (ed Quatremere, 1810), and Ethiopic (ed Dillmann, 1894) versions.

**LITERATURE.**

*See under APOCRYPHA for commentary and various editions. But note in addition to the literature mentioned the article the following: Reusch, Erklar. des B. Baruch, 1853; Daubanton, "Het Apok boek [Epistol h< Jeremiou, Epistole Ieremiou], " Theol. Studien, 1888, 126-38.*

*T. Witton Davies*

**JERIAH**

<je-ri'-a> ([<sup>W</sup>hYrj] yeriyahu], "founded of Yahweh"): In <sup><1231></sup>1 Chronicles 23:19; 24:23 = "Jerijah" ([<sup>h</sup>Yrj] yeriyah]), 26:31, head of a Levitical house: called chief of the Hebronites in 24:23 (compare 24:30).

**JERIBAI**

<jer'-i-bi>, <jer-i-ba'-i> ([yb" yrj] yeribhay], meaning uncertain): One of David's mighty men of the armies (<sup><3146></sup>1 Chronicles 11:46); one of the names not found in the list in <sup><1234></sup>2 Samuel 23:24-29a.

**JERICO**

<jer'-i-ko> (the word occurs in two forms. In the Pentateuch, in <sup><1235></sup>2 Kings 25:5 and in Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles it is written [<sup>w</sup>Dry] yerecho]; [<sup>w</sup>Dyrj] yericho], elsewhere): In <sup><1164></sup>1 Kings 16:34 the final Hebrew letter is he (<sup>h</sup>), instead of waw (<sup>w</sup>). The termination waw (<sup>w</sup>) thought to preserve the peculiarities of the old Canaanite. dialect. In the Septuagint we have the indeclinable form, [<sup>ῥ</sup>Ιερειχώ, Iericho] (Swete has

the form [*Iereicho*] as well), both with and without the feminine article; in the New Testament [*Iereicho*], once with the feminine article The Arabic is er-Riha. According to <sup>(-R349-)</sup>Deuteronomy 32:49 it stood opposite Nebo, while in 34:3 it is called a city grove of palm trees. It was surrounded with a wall (<sup>(-R125-)</sup>Joshua 2:15), and provided with a gate which was closed at night (<sup>(-R125-)</sup>Joshua 2:5), and was ruled over by a king. When captured, vessels of brass and iron, large quantities of silver and gold, and “a goodly Babylonish garment” were found in it (<sup>(-R122-)</sup>Joshua 7:21). It was on the western side of the Jordan, not far from the camp of Israel at Shittim, before crossing the river (<sup>(-R121-)</sup>Joshua 2:1). The city was on the “plains” (<sup>(-R113-)</sup>Joshua 4:13), but so close to “the mountain” on the West (probably the cliffs of Quarantania, the traditional scene of Christ’s temptation) that it was within easy reach of the spies, protected by Rahab. It was in the lot of Benjamin (<sup>(-R120-)</sup>Joshua 18:21), the border of which ascended to the “slope (English versions of the Bible “side”) of Jeremiah on the North” (<sup>(-R112-)</sup>Joshua 18:12). Authorities are generally agreed in locating the ancient city at Tel es-Sultan, a mile and a half Northwest of modern Jericho. Here there is a mound 1,200 ft. long and 50 ft. in height supporting 4 smaller mounds, the highest of which is 90 ft. above the base of the main mound.

The geological situation (*see JORDAN VALLEY*) sheds great light upon the capture of the city by Joshua (Joshua 6). If the city was built as we suppose it to have been, upon the unconsolidated sedimentary deposits which accumulated to a great depth in the Jordan valley during the enlargement of the Dead Sea, which took place in Pleistocene (or glacial) times, the sudden falling of the walls becomes easily credible to anyone who believes in the personality of God and in His power either to foreknow the future or to direct at His will the secondary causes with which man has to deal in Nature. The narrative does not state that the blowing of the rams’ horns of themselves effected the falling of the walls. It was simply said that at a specified juncture on the 7th day the walls would fall, and that they actually fell at that juncture. The miracle may, therefore, be regarded as either that of prophecy, in which the Creator by foretelling the course of things to Joshua, secured the junction of Divine and human activities which constitutes a true miracle, or we may regard the movements which brought down the walls to be the result of direct Divine action, such as is exerted by man when he produces an explosion of dynamite at a particular time and place. The phenomena are just such as occurred in the earthquake of San Francisco in 1906, where, according to



the report of the scientific commission appointed by the state, “the most violent destruction of buildings was on the made ground. This ground seems to have behaved during the earthquake very much in the same way as jelly in a bowl, or as a semi-liquid in a tank.” Santa Rosa, situated on the valley floor, “underlain to a considerable depth by loose or slightly coherent geological formations, .... 20 miles from the rift, was the most severely shaken town in the state and suffered the greatest disaster relatively to its population and extent” (Report, 13 and 15). Thus an earthquake, such as is easily provided for along the margin of this great Jordan crevasse, would produce exactly the phenomena here described, and its occurrence at the time and place foretold to Joshua constitutes it a miracle of the first magnitude.

Notwithstanding the curse pronounced in ~~<106>~~ Joshua 6:26 the King James Version, prophesying that whosoever should rebuild the city “he shall lay the foundations thereof in his firstborn,” it was rebuilt (~~<116>~~ 1 Kings 16:34) by Hiel the Bethelite in the days of Ahab. The curse was literally fulfilled. Still David’s messengers are said to have “tarried at Jericho” in his day (~~<100>~~ 2 Samuel 10:5; ~~<139>~~ 1 Chronicles 19:5). In Elisha’s time (~~<122>~~ 2 Kings 2:5) there was a school of prophets there, while several other references to the city occur in the Old Testament and the Apocrypha (~~<148>~~ 2 Chronicles 28:15, where it is called “the city of palmtrees”; ~~<123>~~ 2 Kings 25:5; ~~<291>~~ Jeremiah 39:5; Ezr 2:34; ~~<108>~~ Nehemiah 3:2; 7:36; 1 Macc 9:50). Josephus describes it and the fertile plain surrounding it, in glowing terms. In the time of Christ, it was an important place yielding a large revenue to the royal family. But the city which Herod rebuilt was on a higher elevation, at the base of the western mountain, probably at Beit Jubr, where there are the ruins of a small fort. Jericho was the place of rendezvous for Galilean pilgrims desiring to avoid Samaria, both in going to and in departing from Jerusalem, and it has been visited at all times by thousands of pilgrims, who go down from Jerusalem to bathe in the Jordan. The road leading from Jerusalem to Jericho is still infested by robbers who hide in the rocky caverns adjoining it, and appear without warning from the tributary gorges of the wadies which dissect the mountain wall. At the present time Jericho and the region about is occupied only by a few hundred miserable inhabitants, deteriorated by the torrid climate which prevails at the low level about the head of the Dead Sea. But the present barrenness of the region is largely due to the destruction of the aqueducts which formerly distributed over the plain the waters brought down through

the wadies which descend from the mountains of Judea. The ruins of many of these are silent witnesses of the cause of its decay. Twelve aqueducts at various levels formerly branched from the Wady Kelt, irrigating the plain both North and South. Remains of Roman masonry are found in these. In the Middle Ages they were so repaired that an abundance and variety of crops were raised, including wheat, barley, millet, figs, grapes and sugar cane.

*See further PALESTINE (RECENT EXPLORATION).*

*George Frederick Wright*

## JERIEL

<je'-ri-el>, <jer'-i-el> ([~~l~~ ~~ay~~ ~~y~~] yeri'el], “founded of God”; compare *JERIAH*): A chief of Issachar (~~<1302>~~ 1 Chronicles 7:2).

## JERIJAH

<je-ri'-ja> (~~<1351>~~ 1 Chronicles 26:31).

*See JERIAH.*

## JERIMOTH

<jer'-i-moth> (*see JEREMOTH*, (c)):

(1) A Benjamite (~~<1307>~~ 1 Chronicles 7:7).

(2) A Benjamite who joined David at Ziklag, or perhaps a Judean (~~<1325>~~ 1 Chronicles 12:5 (Hebrew 6)).

(3) In ~~<1334>~~ 1 Chronicles 24:30 = *JEREMOTH*, (4) (which see).

(4) A Levite musician in David's time (~~<1324>~~ 1 Chronicles 25:4).

(5) Son of David and father of Mahalath, Rehoboam's wife (~~<1418>~~ 2 Chronicles 11:18). He is not mentioned (~~<1082>~~ 2 Samuel 3:2-5; 5:14-16; ~~<1301>~~ 1 Chronicles 3:1-9; 14:4-7) among the sons of David's wives, so Curtis (Ch, 369) thinks that he was either the son of a concubine, or possibly the name is a corruption of “Ithream” ([~~μ~~ [~~r~~ ~~t~~ ~~y~~] yithre'am], ~~<1303>~~ 1 Chronicles 3:3).

(6) A Levite overseer in Hezekiah's time (~~<14813>~~ 2 Chronicles 31:13).

## JERIOTH

<jer'-i-oth>, <jer'-i-oth> ([~~twQyrj~~] yeri`oth], “(tent-) curtains”): In ~~<1328>~~ 1 Chronicles 2:18, where Massoretic Text is corrupt, Kittel in his commentary and in Biblical Hebrew reads “Caleb begat (children) of Azubah his wife, Jerioth.” Wellhausen (De Gent. et Fam. Jud., 33) reads, “Caleb begat (children) of Azubah his wife, the daughter of Jerioth.” According to English Versions of the Bible, Caleb had two wives, but the context does not bear this out. J. H. Michaelis regarded Jerioth as another name for Azubah. See Curtis, Commentary on Chronicles, 92.

## JEROBOAM

<jer-o-bo'-am> ([~~μ[ bṛy~~]; yarobh`am]; Septuagint [~~ῥ~~ ἱεροβοάμ, *Hieroboam*], usually assumed to have been derived from [~~nyr~~, *riyb*] and [~~μ[~~, `am], and signifying “the people contend,” or, “he pleads the people’s cause”): The name was borne by two kings of Israel.

(1) Jeroboam I, son of Nebat, an Ephraimite, and of Zeruah, a widow (~~<11125>~~ 1 Kings 11:26-40; 12 through 14:20). He was the first king of Israel after the disruption of the kingdom, and he reigned 22 years (937-915 BC).

### I. JEROBOAM I

#### *I. Sources:*

The history of Jeroboam is contained in ~~<11125>~~ 1 Kings 11:26-40; 12:1 through 14:20; ~~<1400>~~ 2 Chronicles 10:1 through 11:4; 11:14-16; 12:15; 13:3-20, and in an insertion in the Septuagint after ~~<11123>~~ 1 Kings 12:24 (a-z). This insertion covers about the same ground as the Massoretic Text, and the Septuagint elsewhere, with some additions and variations. The fact that it calls Jeroboam’s mother a [*porne*] (harlot), and his wife the Egyptian princess Ano (compare 1 Kings 11); that Jeroboam is punished by the death of his son before he has done any wrong; that the episode with the prophet’s mantle does not occur until the meeting at Shechem; that Jeroboam is not proclaimed king at all — all this proves the passage inferior to the Massoretic Text. No doubt it is a fragment of some historical work, which, after the manner of the later Midrash, has combined history and tradition, making rather free use of the historical kernel.

## *2. His Rise and Revolt:*

Jeroboam, as a highly gifted and valorous young Ephraimite, comes to the notice of Solomon early in his reign (<sup><11128></sup>1 Kings 11:28; compare 9:15,24). Having noticed his ability, the king made him overseer of the fortifications and public work at Jerusalem, and placed him over the levy from the house of Joseph. The fact that the latter term may stand for the whole of the ten tribes (compare <sup><1086></sup>Amos 5:6; 6:6; <sup><1018></sup>Obadiah 1:18) indicates the importance of the position, which, however, he used to plot against the king. No doubt he had the support of the people in his designs. Prejudices of long standing (<sup><1090></sup>2 Samuel 19:40 f; 20 f) were augmented when Israelite interests were made subservient to Judah and to the king, while enforced labor and burdensome taxation filled the people's hearts with bitterness and jealousy. Jeroboam, the son of a widow, would be the first to feel the gall of oppression and to give voice to the suffering of the people. In addition, he had the approval of the prophet Ahijah of the old sanctuary of Shiloh, who, by tearing his new mantle into twelve pieces and giving ten of them to Jeroboam, informed him that he was to become king of the ten tribes. Josephus says (Ant., VIII, vii, 8) that Jeroboam was elevated by the words of the prophet, "and being a young man of warm temper, and ambitious of greatness, he could not be quiet," but tried to get the government into his hands at once. For the time, the plot failed, and Jeroboam fled to Egypt where he was received and kindly treated by Shishak, the successor to the father-in-law of Solomon.

## *3. The Revolt of the Ten Tribes:*

The genial and imposing personality of Solomon had been able to stem the tide of discontent excited by his oppressive regime, which at his death burst all restraints. Nevertheless, the northern tribes, at a popular assembly held at Shechem, solemnly promised to serve Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, who had already been proclaimed king at Jerusalem, on condition that he would lighten the burdens that so unjustly rested upon them. Instead of receiving the magna charta which they expected, the king, in a spirit of despotism, gave them a rough answer, and Josephus says "the people were struck by his words, as it were, by an iron hammer" (Ant., VIII, viii, 3). But despotism lost the day. The rough answer of the king was met by the Marseillaise of the people:

*“What portion have we in David?  
Neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse:  
To your tents. O Israel:  
Now see to thine own house, David”* (~~<1126>~~ 1 Kings 12:16).

Seeing the turn affairs had taken, but still unwilling to make any concessions, Rehoboam sent Adoram, who had been over the levy for many years (~~<1124>~~ 1 Kings 5:14; 12:18), and who no doubt had quelled dissatisfaction before, to force the people to submission, possibly by the very methods he had threatened to employ (~~<1124>~~ 1 Kings 12:14). However, the attempt failed. The aged Adoram was stoned to death, while Rehoboam was obliged to flee ignominiously back to Jerusalem, king only of Judah (~~<1122>~~ 1 Kings 12:20). Thus, the great work of David for a united kingdom was shattered by inferiors, who put personal ambitions above great ideals.

#### *4. The Election:*

As soon as Jeroboam heard that Solomon was dead, he returned from his forced exile in Egypt and took up his residence in his native town, Zeredah, in the hill country of Ephraim Septuagint (~~<1122>~~ 1 Kings 12:20 ff). The northern tribes, having rejected the house of David, now turned to the leader, and perhaps instigator of the revolution. Jeroboam was sent for and raised to the throne by the choice and approval of the popular assembly. Divinely set apart for his task, and having the approval of the people, Jeroboam nevertheless failed to rise to the greatness of his opportunities, and his kingdom degenerated into a mere military monarchy, never stronger than the ruler who chanced to occupy the throne. In trying to avoid the Scylla that threatened its freedom and faith (~~<1113>~~ 1 Kings 11:33), the nation steered into the Charybdis of revolution and anarchy in which it finally perished.

#### *5. Political Events:*

Immediately upon his accession, Jeroboam fortified Shechem, the largest city in Central Israel, and made it his capital. Later he fortified Penuel in the East Jordan country. According to ~~<1147>~~ 1 Kings 14:17, Tirzah was the capital during the latter part of his reign. About Jeroboam's external relations very little is known beyond the fact that there was war between him and Rehoboam constantly (~~<1143>~~ 1 Kings 14:30). In ~~<4132>~~ 2 Chronicles 13:2-20 we read of an inglorious war with Abijah of Judah. When Shishak

invaded Judah (~~<11425>~~ 1 Kings 14:25 f), he did not spare Israel, as appears from his inscription on the temple at Karnak, where a list of the towns captured by him is given. These belong to Northern Israel as well as to Judah, showing that Shishak exacted tribute there, even if he used violence only in Judah. The fact that Jeroboam successfully managed a revolution but failed to establish a dynasty shows that his strength lay in the power of his personality more than in the soundness of his principles.

### *6. His Religious Policy:*

Despite the success of the revolution politically, Jeroboam desecrated the halo surrounding the temple and its ritual a danger which threatened the permanency of his kingdom. He justifiably dreaded a reaction in favor of the house of David, should the people make repeated religious pilgrimages to Jerusalem after the first passion of the rebellion had spent itself. He therefore resolved to establish national sanctuaries in Israel. Accordingly, he fixed on Bethel, which from time immemorial was one of the chief sanctuaries of the land (~~<10289>~~ Genesis 28:19; 35:1; ~~<28204>~~ Hosea 12:4), and Dan, also a holy place since the conquest, as the chief centers of worship for Israel. Jeroboam now made “two calves of gold” as symbols of the strength and creative power of Yahweh, and set them up in the sanctuaries at Bethel and Dan, where altars and other sacred objects already existed. It appears that many of the priests still in the land were opposed to his image-worship (~~<41113>~~ 2 Chronicles 11:13 ff). Accordingly, he found it necessary to institute a new, non-Levitical priesthood (~~<11133>~~ 1 Kings 13:33). A new and popular festival on the model of the feasts at Jerusalem was also established. Jeroboam’s policy might have been considered as a clever political move, had it not contained the dangerous appeal to the lower instincts of the masses, that led them into the immoralities of heathenism and hastened the destruction of the nation. Jeroboam sacrificed the higher interests of religion to politics. This was the “sin of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, wherewith he made Israel to sin” (~~<11123>~~ 1 Kings 12:30; 16:26).

### *7. Hostility of the Prophets:*

It may be that many of the prophets sanctioned Jeroboam’s religious policy. Whatever the attitude of the majority may have been, there was no doubt a party who strenuously opposed the image-worship.

### (1) **The Anonymous Prophet.**

On the very day on which Jeroboam inaugurated the worship at the sanctuary at Bethel “a man of God out of Judah” appeared at Bethel and publicly denounced the service. The import of his message was that the royal altar should some day be desecrated by a ruler from the house of David. The prophet was saved from the wrath of the king only by a miracle. “The altar also was rent, and the ashes poured out from the altar.” This narrative of 1 Kings 13 is usually assumed to belong to a later time, but whatever the date of compilation, the general historicity of the account is little affected by it.

### (2) **The Prophet Ahijah.**

At a later date, when Jeroboam had realized his ambition, but not the ideal which the prophet had set before him, Ahijah predicted the consequences of his evil policy. Jeroboam’s eldest son had fallen sick. He thought of Ahijah, now old and blind, and sent the queen in disguise to learn the issue of the sickness. The prophet bade her to announce to Jeroboam that the house of Jeroboam should be extirpated root and branch; that the people whom he had seduced to idolatry should be uprooted from the land and transported beyond the river; and, severest of all, that her son should die.

#### *8. His Death:*

Jeroboam died, in the 22nd year of his reign, having “bequeathed to posterity the reputation of an apostate and a succession of endless revolutions.”

**S. K. Mosiman**

(2) Jeroboam II (<sup><1243></sup>2 Kings 14:23-29), son of Joash and 13th king of Israel; 4th sovereign of the dynasty of Jehu. He reigned 41 years. His accession may be placed circa 798 BC (some date lower).

## **II. JEROBOAM II**

### *1. His Warlike Policy:*

Jeroboam came into power on the crest of the wave of prosperity that followed the crushing of the supremacy of Damascus by his father. By his great victory at Aphek, followed by others, Joash had regained the territory lost to Israel in the reigns of Jehu and Jehoahaz (<sup><1237></sup>2 Kings 13:17,25).

This satisfied Joash, or his death prevented further hostilities. Jeroboam, however, then a young man, resolved on a war of retaliation against Damascus, and on further conquests. The condition of the eastern world favored his projects, for Assyria was at the time engaged, under Shalmaneser III and Assur-dan III, in a life-and-death struggle with Armenia. Syria being weakened, Jeroboam determined on a bold attempt to conquer and annex the whole kingdom of which Damascus was the capital. The steps of the campaign by which this was accomplished are unknown to us. The result only is recorded, that not only the intermediate territory fell into Jeroboam's hands, but that Damascus itself was captured (~~248~~ 2 Kings 14:28). Hamath was taken, and thus were restored the eastern boundaries of the kingdom, as they were in the time of David (~~335~~ 1 Chronicles 13:5). From the time of Joshua "the entrance of Hamath" (~~635~~ Joshua 13:5), a narrow pass leading into the valley of the Lebanon, had been the accepted northern boundary of the promised land. This involved the subjection of Moab and Ammon, probably already tributaries of Damascus.

## *2. New Social Conditions:*

Jeroboam's long reign of over 40 years gave time for the collected tribute of this greatly increased territory to flow into the coffers of Samaria, and the exactions would be ruthlessly enforced. The prophet Amos, a contemporary of Jeroboam in his later years, dwells on the cruelties inflicted on the trans-Jordanic tribes by Hazael, who "threshed Gilead with threshing instruments of iron" (Amos 1:3). All this would be remembered now, and wealth to which the Northern Kingdom had been unaccustomed flowed in to its treasuries. The hovels of unburned brick in which the citizens had lived were replaced by "houses of hewn stone" (~~315~~ Amos 5:11). The ivory house which Ahab built in Samaria (~~123~~ 1 Kings 22:39; decorations only are meant) was imitated, and there were many "great houses" (~~315~~ Amos 3:15). The sovereign had both a winter and a summer palace. The description of a banqueting scene within one of these palatial abodes is lifelike in its portraiture. The guests stretched themselves upon the silken cushions of the couches, eating the flesh of lambs and stall-fed calves, drinking wine from huge bowls, singing idle songs to the sound of viols, themselves perfumed and anointed with oil (~~316~~ Amos 6:4-6).

Meanwhile, they were not grieved for the affliction of Joseph, and cared nothing for the wrongdoing of which the country was full. Side by side with this luxury, the poor of the land were in the utmost distress. A case in which a man was sold into slavery for the price of a pair of shoes seems to



have come to the prophet's knowledge, and is twice referred to by him (~~<3016>~~Amos 2:6; 8:6).

### *3. Growth of Ceremonial Worship:*

With all this, and as part of the social organization, religion of a kind flourished. Ritual took the place of righteousness; and in a memorable passage, Amos denounces the substitution of the one for the other (~~<3024>~~Amos 5:21 ff). The worship took place in the sanctuaries of the golden calves, where the votaries prostrated themselves before the altar clothed in garments taken in cruel pledge, and drank sacrificial wine bought with the money of those who were fined for non-attendance there (~~<3028>~~Amos 2:8). There we are subsidiary temples and altars at Gilgal and Beersheba (~~<3034>~~Amos 4:4; 5:5; 8:14). Both of these places had associations with the early history of the nation, and would be attended by worshippers from Judah as well as from Israel.

### *4. Mission to Amos:*

Toward the close of his reign, it would appear that Jeroboam had determined upon adding greater splendor and dignity to the central shrine, in correspondence with the increased wealth of the nation. Amos, about the same time, received a commission to go to Bethel and testify against the whole proceedings there. He was to pronounce that these sanctuaries should be laid waste, and that Yahweh would raise the sword against the house of Jeroboam. (~~<3070>~~Amos 7:9). On hearing his denunciation, made probably as he stood beside the altar, Amaziah, the priest of Bethel, sent a messenger to the king at Samaria, to tell him of the "conspiracy" of Amos, and that the land was not able to bear all his words. The messenger bore the report that Amos had declared "Jeroboam shall die by the sword," which Amos had not done. When the messenger had gone, priest and prophet had a heated controversy, and new threatenings were uttered (~~<3070>~~Amos 7:10-17).

### *5. Prophecy of Jonah:*

The large extension of territory acquired for Israel by Jeroboam is declared to have been the realization of a prophecy uttered earlier by Jonah, the son of Amittai (~~<3245>~~2 Kings 14:25) — the same whose mission to Nineveh forms the subject of the Book of Jonah (1:1). It is also indicated that the relief which had now come was the only alternative to the utter extinction

of Israel. But Yahweh sent Israel a “saviour” (<sup><1235></sup>2 Kings 13:5), associated by some with the Assyrian king Ramman-nirari III, who crushed Damascus, and left Syria an easy prey, first to Jehoash, then to Jeroboam. (*see* JEHOASH), but whom the historian seems to connect with Jeroboam himself (<sup><1246></sup>2 Kings 14:26,27).

Jeroboam was succeeded on his death by his weak son Zechariah (<sup><1249></sup>2 Kings 14:29).

*W. Shaw Caldecott*

## JEROHAM

<je-ro'-ham> ([<sup>μj</sup> <sup>ry</sup>] yerocham], “may he be compassionate!”):

- (1) An Ephraimite, the father of Elkanah, and grandfather of Samuel (<sup><9001></sup>1 Samuel 1:1; <sup><1367></sup>1 Chronicles 6:27,34 (Hebrew 12,19)): Jerahmeel is the name in Septuagint, Codex Vaticanus, in 1 Samuel and in Septuagint, L and manuscripts, in 1 Chronicles.
- (2) A Benjamite (<sup><1387></sup>1 Chronicles 8:27), apparently = *JEREMOTH*, (2) (compare 8:14), and probably the same as he of <sup><1398></sup>1 Chronicles 9:8.
- (3) Ancestor of a priest in Jerusalem (<sup><1392></sup>1 Chronicles 9:12 = <sup><16112></sup>Nehemiah 11:12).
- (4) A man of Gedor, father of two of David's Benjamite recruits at Ziklag, though Gedor might be a town in Southern Judah (<sup><1317></sup>1 Chronicles 12:7 (Hebrew 8)).
- (5) Father of Azarel, David's tribal chief over Dan (<sup><1372></sup>1 Chronicles 27:22).
- (6) Father of Azariah, one of the captains who supported Jehoiada in overthrowing Queen Athaliah (<sup><1421></sup>2 Chronicles 23:1).

*David Francis Roberts*

## JERUBBAAL

<jer-u-ba'-al>, <je-rub'-a-al> ([<sup>l</sup> [<sup>B</sup> <sup>ry</sup>] yerubba'al], “let Baal contend”): The name given to Gideon by his father, Joash, and the people in recognition of his destruction of the altar of Baal at Ophrah (<sup><9762></sup>Judges 6:32). For this name the form “Jerubbesheth” (<sup><1021></sup>2 Samuel 1:21) was

substituted after the analogy of “Ishbosheth” and “Mephibosheth,” in which *bosheth*, the Hebrew word for “shame,” displaced the word *ba`al*, no doubt because the name resembled one given in honor of Baal.

*See GIDEON.*

## JERUBBESHETH

<jer-ub-be'-sheth>, <je-rub'-e-sheth> ([<sup>tvBry</sup>yerubbesheth], *see JERUBBAAL*, for meaning): It is found once (<sup>1012</sup>2 Samuel 11:21) for *JERUBBAAL*.

The word [<sup>tvB</sup>, *bosheth*], “shameful thing,” was substituted by later editors of the text for [<sup>l</sup> [<sup>B</sup>” , *ba`al*], “lord,” in the text of <sup>2472</sup>Jeremiah 3:24; <sup>2490</sup>Hosea 9:10; in <sup>1018</sup>2 Samuel 2:8, etc., we find Ish-bosheth = Eshbaal (Ishbaal) in <sup>1383</sup>1 Chronicles 8:33; 9:39. The reason for this was reluctant to pronounce the word *Ba`al*, which had by their time been associated with Canaanitic forms of worship. In <sup>1012</sup>2 Samuel 11:21 Septuagint, Lucian, has “Jeroboal,” which Septuagint, Codex Vaticanus, has corrupted to “Jeroboam.” Compare *MERIBBAAL*; *MEPHIBOSHETH*; and see Ginsburg, *New Massoretico-Critical Text of the Hebrew Bible*, Intro, 400 ff. For a New Testament case compare <sup>5104</sup>Romans 11:4 and see Sanday and Headlam at the place.

*See JERUBBAAL.*

*David Francis Roberts*

## JERUEL

<je-roo'-el>, <jer'-oo-el> ([<sup>l</sup> <sup>alry</sup>]yeru'el], “founded by El”): Jahaziel prophesied that King Jehoshaphat should meet the hordes of Moabites and Ammonites, after they had come up by the “ascent of Ziz,” “at the end of the valley (i.e. wady), before the wilderness of Jeruel” (<sup>1406</sup>2 Chronicles 20:16). The particular part of the wilderness intended, is unknown. Cheyne (*Encyclopedia Biblica*) thinks this may be an error for the Jezreel of Judah, mentioned in <sup>1655</sup>Joshua 15:56, etc.

*See JEZREEL.*

# JERUSALEM

<je-roo'-sa-lem>:

## I. THE NAME.

### 1. In Cuneiform:

The earliest mention of Jerusalem is in the Tell el-Amarna Letters (1450 BC), where it appears in the form Uru-sa-lim; allied with this we have Ur-sa-li-immu on the Assyrian monuments of the 8th century BC.

The most ancient Biblical form is [יְרוּשָׁלַיִם ~~yrushalayim~~], shortened in ~~Psalm 76:2~~ (compare ~~Genesis 14:18~~ to Salem, but in Massoretic Text we have it vocalized [יְרוּשָׁלַאִים ~~yrushalaim~~]. In ~~Jeremiah 26:18~~; ~~Esther 2:6~~; ~~2 Chronicles 25:1~~; 32:9 we have [יְרוּשָׁלַיִם ~~yrushalayim~~], a form which occurs on the Jewish coins of the Revolt and also in Jewish literature; it is commonly used by modern Talmudic Jews.

### 2. In Hebrew:

The form Hebrew with the ending -aim or -ayim is interpreted by some as being a dual, referring to the upper and lower Jerusalem, but such forms occur in other names as implying special solemnity; such a pronunciation is both local and late.

### 3. In Greek and Latin:

In the Septuagint we get ([Ἱερουσαλήμ, *Ierousalem*]), constantly reflecting the earliest and the common Hebrew pronunciation, the initial letter being probably unaspirated; soon, however, we meet with ([Ἱερουσαλήμ, *Hierousalem*]) — with the aspirate — the common form in Josephus, and ([Ἱεροσόλυμα, *Hierosoluma*]) in Macc (Books II through IV), and in Strabo. This last form has been carried over into the Latin writers, Cicero, Pliny, Tacitus and Suetonius. It was replaced in official use for some centuries by Hadrian's Aelia Capitolina, which occurs as late as Jerome, but it again comes into common use in the documents of the Crusades, while Solyma occurs at various periods as a poetic abbreviation.

In the New Testament we have ([Ἱερουσαλήμ, *Hierousalem*]), particularly in the writings of Luke and Paul, and ([luma, ta Hierosoluma]) elsewhere.

The King James Version of 1611 has Ierosalem in the Old Testament and Hierusalem in the New Testament. The form Jerusalem first occurs in French writings of the 12th century.

#### *4. The Meaning of Jerusalem*

With regard to the meaning of the original name there is no concurrence of opinion. The oldest known form, Uru-sa-lim, has been considered by many to mean either the “City of Peace” or the “City of (the god) Salem,” but other interpreters, considering the name as of Hebrew origin, interpret it as the “possession of peace” or “foundation of peace.” It is one of the ironies of history that a city which in all its long history has seen so little peace and for whose possession such rivers of blood have been shed should have such a possible meaning for its name.

#### *5. Other Names:*

Other names for the city occur. For the name Jebus *see JESUS*. In <sup><3301></sup>Isaiah 29:1, occurs the name [laeyria], ‘ari’el] probably “the hearth of God,” and in 1:26 the “city of righteousness.” In <sup><19726></sup>Psalm 72:16; <sup><34724></sup>Jeremiah 32:24 f; <sup><24723></sup>Ezekiel 7:23, we have the term [ry[ih;, ha`ir], “the city” in contrast to “the land.” A whole group of names is connected with the idea of the sanctity of the site; `ir ha-qodhesh, the “holy city” occurs in <sup><23824></sup>Isaiah 48:2; 52:1; <sup><6101></sup>Nehemiah 11:1, and yerushalayim ha-qedhoshah, “Jerusalem the holy” is inscribed on Simon’s coins. In <sup><1015></sup>Matthew 4:5; 27:53 we have [ἡ ἁγία πόλις, he hagia polis], “the holy city,” and in Philo, [ιερόπολις, Hieropolis], with the same meaning.

In Arabic the common name is Beit el Maqdis, “the holy house,” or [el Muqaddas], “the holy,” or the common name, used by the Moslems everywhere today, el Quds, a shortened form of el Quds esh Sheref, “the noble sanctuary.”

Non-Moslems usually use the Arabic form Yerusalem.

## **II. GEOLOGY, CLIMATE, AND SPRINGS.**

### *1. Geology*

The geology of the site and environs of Jerusalem is comparatively simple, when studied in connection with that of the land of Palestine as a whole (see *GEOLOGY OF PALESTINE*). The outstanding feature is that the

rocks consist entirely of various forms of limestone, with strata containing flints; there are no primary rocks, no sandstone (such as comes to the surface on the East of the Jordan) and no volcanic rocks. The lime stone formations are in regular strata dipping toward the Southeast, with an angle of about 10 degrees.

On the high hills overlooking Jerusalem on the East, Southeast and Southwest there still remain strata of considerable thickness of those chalky limestones of the post-Tertiary period which crown so many hilltops of Palestine, and once covered the whole land. On the "Mount of Olives," for example, occurs a layer of conglomerate limestone known as Nari, or "firestone," and another thicker deposit, known as Ka`kuli, of which two distinct strata can be distinguished. In these layers, especially the latter, occur pockets containing marl or haur, and in both there are bands of flint.

Over the actual city's site all this has been denuded long ages ago. Here we have three layers of limestone of varying density very clearly distinguished by all the native builders and masons:

- (1) Mizzeḥ helu, literally, "sweet mizzeḥ," a hard, reddish-grey layer capable of polish, and reaching in places to a depth of 70 ft. or more. The "holy rock" in the temple-area belongs to this layer, and much of the ancient building stone was of this nature.
- (2) Below this is the Melekeh or "royal" layer, which, though not very thick — 35 ft. or so — has been of great importance in the history of the city. This rock is peculiar in that when first exposed to the air it is often so soft that it can be cut with a knife, but under the influence of the atmosphere it hardens to make a stone of considerable durability, useful for ordinary buildings. The great importance of this layer, however, lies in the fact that in it have been excavated the hundreds of caverns, cisterns, tombs and aqueducts which honeycomb the city's site.
- (3) Under the Melekeh is a Cenomanian limestone of great durability, known as Mizzeḥ Yehudeh, or "Jewish mizzeḥ." It is a highly valued building stone, though hard to work. Geologically it is distinguished from Mizzeḥ helu by its containing ammonites. Characteristically, it is a yellowish-grey stone, sometimes slightly reddish. A variety of a distinctly reddish appearance, known as Mizzeḥ ahmar, or "red

mizzeh,” makes a very ornamental stone for columns, tombstones, etc.; it takes a high polish and is sometimes locally known as “marble.”

This deep layer, which underlies the whole city, comes to the surface in the Kidron valley, and its impermeability is probably the explanation of the appearance there of the one true spring, the “Virgin’s Fount.” The water over the site and environs of Jerusalem percolates with ease the upper layer, but is conducted to the surface by this hard layer; the comparatively superficial source of the water of this spring accounts for the poorness of its quality.

## *2. Climate and Rainfall:*

The broad features of the climate of Jerusalem have probably remained the same throughout history, although there is plenty of evidence that there have been cycles of greater and lesser abundance of rain. The almost countless cisterns belonging to all ages upon the site and the long and complicated conduits for bringing water from a distance, testify that over the greater part of history the rainfall must have been, as at present, only seasonal.

As a whole, the climate of Jerusalem may be considered healthy. The common diseases should be largely preventable — under an enlightened government; even the malaria which is so prevalent is to a large extent an importation from the low-lying country, and could be stopped at once, were efficient means taken for destroying the carriers of infection, the abundant *Anopheles* mosquitoes. On account of its altitude and its exposed position, almost upon the watershed, wind, rain and cold are all more excessive than in the maritime plains or the Jordan valley. Although the winter’s cold is severely felt, on account of its coinciding with the days of heaviest rainfall (compare *Ezr* 10:9), and also because of the dwellings and clothes of the inhabitants being suited for enduring heat more than cold, the actual lowest cold recorded is only 25 degrees F., and frost occurs only on perhaps a dozen nights in an average year. During the rainless summer months the mean temperature rises steadily until August, when it reaches 73,1 degrees F., but the days of greatest heat, with temperature over 100 degrees F. in the shade at times, occur commonly in September. In midsummer the cool northwest breezes, which generally blow during the afternoons and early night, do much to make life healthy. The most unpleasant days occur in May and from the middle of September until the

end of October, when the dry southeast winds — the sirocco — blow hot and stifling from over the deserts, carrying with them at times fine dust sufficient in quantity to produce a marked haze in the atmosphere. At such times all vegetation droops, and most human beings, especially residents not brought up under such conditions, suffer more or less from depression and physical discomfort; malarial, “sandfly,” and other fevers are apt to be peculiarly prevalent. “At that time shall it be said .... to Jerusalem, A hot wind from the bare heights in the wilderness toward the daughter of my people, not to winnow, nor to cleanse” (<sup>2001</sup>Jeremiah 4:11).

During the late summer — except at spells of sirocco — heavy “dews” occur at night, and at the end of September or beginning of October the “former” rains fall — not uncommonly in tropical downpours accompanied by thunder. After this there is frequently a dry spell of several weeks, and then the winter’s rain falls in December, January and February. In some seasons an abundant rainfall in March gives peculiar satisfaction to the inhabitants by filling up the cisterns late in the season and by producing an abundant harvest. The average rainfall is about 26 inches, the maximum recorded in the city being 42,95 inches in the season 1877-78, and the minimum being 12,5 inches in 1869-70. An abundant rainfall is not only important for storage, for replenishment of the springs and for the crops, but as the city’s sewage largely accumulates in the very primitive drains all through the dry season, it requires a considerable force of water to remove it. Snow falls heavily in some seasons, causing considerable destruction to the badly built roofs and to the trees; in the winter of 1910-11 a fall of 9 inches occurred.

### *3. The Natural Springs:*

There is only one actual spring in the Jerusalem area, and even to this some authorities would deny the name of true spring on account of the comparatively shallow source of its origin; this is the intermittent spring known today as `Ain Umm edition deraj (literally, “spring of the mother of the steps”), called by the native Christians `Ain Sitti Miriam (the “spring of the Lady Mary”), and by Europeans commonly called “The Virgin’s Fount.” All the archaeological evidence points to this as the original source of attraction of earliest occupants of the site; in the Old Testament this spring is known as GIHON (which see). The water arises in the actual bottom, though apparent west side, of the Kidron valley some 300 yards due South of the south wall of the Charam. The approach to the spring is



down two flights of steps, an upper of 16 leading to a small level platform, covered by a modern arch, and a lower, narrower flight of 14 steps, which ends at the mouth of a small cave. The water has its actual source in a long cleft (perhaps 16 ft. long) running East and West in the rocky bottom of the Kidron valley, now many feet below the present surface. The western or higher end of the cleft is at the very entrance of the cave, but most of the water gushes forth from the lower and wider part which lies underneath the steps. When the water is scanty, the women of Siloam creep down into the cavity under the steps and fill their water-skins there; at such times no water at all finds its way into the cave. At the far end of the cave is the opening of that system of ancient tunnel-aqueducts which is described in VI, below. This spring is “intermittent,” the water rising rapidly and gushing forth with considerable force, several times in the 24 hours after the rainy season, and only once or twice in the dry. This “intermittent” condition of springs is not uncommon in Palestine, and is explained by the accumulation of the underground water in certain cavities or cracks in the rock, which together make up a reservoir which empties itself by siphon action. Where the accumulated water reaches the bend of the siphon, the overflow commences and continues to run until the reservoir is emptied. Such a phenomenon is naturally attributed to supernatural agency by the ignorant — in this case, among the modern fellahin, to a dragon — and natives, specially Jews, visit the source, even today, at times of its overflow, for healing. Whether this intermittent condition of the fountain is very ancient it is impossible to say, but, as Jerome (Comm. in Esa, 86) speaks of it, it was probably present in New Testament times, and if so we have a strong argument for finding here the “Pool of Bethesda.”

*See BETHESDA.*

In ancient times all the water flowed down the open, rocky valley, but at an early period a wall was constructed to bank up the water and convert the source into a pool. Without such an arrangement no water could find its way into the cave and the tunnels. The tunnels, described below (VI), were constructed for the purpose

- (1) of reaching the water supply from within the city walls, and
- (2) of preventing the enemies of the Jews from getting at the water (~~433~~2 Chronicles 32:4). The water of this source, though used for all purposes by the people of Siloam, is brackish to the taste, and contains

a considerable percentage of sewage; it is quite unfit for drinking. This condition is doubtless due to the wide distribution of sewage, both intentionally (for irrigation of the gardens) and unintentionally (through leaking sewers, etc.), over the soil overlying the rocks from which the water flows. In earlier times the water was certainly purer, and it is probable, too, that the fountain was more copious, as now hundreds of cisterns imprison the waters which once found their way through the soil to the deep sources of the spring.

The waters of the Virgin's Fount find their way through the Siloam tunnel and out at `Ain Silwan (the "spring" of Siloam), into the Pool of Siloam, and from this source descend into the Kidron valley to water the numerous vegetable gardens belonging to the village of Siloam (*see SILOAM*).

The second source of water in Jerusalem is the deep well known as Bir Eyyub, "Job's well," which is situated a little below the point where the Kidron valley and Hinnom meet. In all probability it derives its modern name from a legend in the Koran (Sura 38 5,40-41) which narrates that God commanded Job to stamp with his foot, whereupon a spring miraculously burst up. The well, which had been quite lost sight of, was rediscovered by the Crusaders in 1184 AD, and was by them cleaned out. It is 125 ft. deep. The supply of water in this well is practically inexhaustible, although the quality is no better than that of the "Virgin's Fount"; after several days of heavy rain the water overflows underground and bursts out a few yards lower down the valley as a little stream. It continues to run for a few days after a heavy fall of rain is over, and this "flowing Kidron" is a great source of attraction to the native residents of Jerusalem, who pour forth from the city to enjoy the rare sight of running water. Somewhere in the neighborhood of Bir Eyyub must have lain `En-Rogel, but if that were once an actual spring, its source is now buried under the great mass of rubbish accumulated here (*see EN-ROGEL*).

Nearly 600 yards South of Bir Eyyub is a small gravelly basin where, when the Bir Eyyub overflows, a small spring called `Ain el Lozeh (the "spring of the almond") bursts forth. It is not a true spring, but is due to some of the water of Job's well which finds its way along an ancient rock-cut aqueduct on the west side of the Wady en Nar, bursting up here.

The only other possible site of a spring in the Jerusalem area is the Chammam esh Shefa, "the bath of healing." This is an underground rock-

basin in the Tyropeon valley, within the city walls, in which water collects by percolation through the debris of the city. Though once a reservoir with probably rock-cut channels conducting water to it, it is now a deep well with arches erected over it at various periods, as the rubbish of the city gradually accumulated through the centuries. There is no evidence whatever of there being any natural fountain, and the water is, in the dry season, practically pure sewage, though used in a neighboring Turkish bath.

G.A. Smith thinks that the *JACKAL'S WELL* (which see) mentioned by Nehemiah (2:13), which must have been situated in the Valley of Hinnom, may possibly have been a temporary spring arising there for a few years in consequence of an earthquake, but it is extremely likely that any well sunk then would tap water flowing along the bed of the valley. There is no such "spring" or "well" there today.

### III. THE NATURAL SITE

Modern Jerusalem occupies a situation defined geographically as 31 degrees 46 feet 45 inches North latitude., by 35 degrees 13 feet 25 inches East longitude. It lies in the midst of a bare and rocky plateau, the environs being one of the most stony and least fruitful districts in the habitable parts of Palestine, with shallow, gray or reddish soil and many outcrops of bare limestone. Like all the hill slopes with a southeasterly aspect, it is so thoroughly exposed to the full blaze of the summer sun that in its natural condition the site would be more or less barren. Today, however, as a result of diligent cultivation and frequent watering, a considerable growth of trees and shrubs has been produced in the rapidly extending suburbs. The only fruit tree which reaches perfection around Jerusalem is the olive.

#### *1. The Mountains Around:*

The site of Jerusalem is shut in by a rough triangle of higher mountain ridges: to the West runs the main ridge, or water parting, of Judea, which here makes a sweep to the westward. From this ridge a spur runs Southeast and East, culminating due East of the city in the *MOUNT OF OLIVES* (which see), nearly 2,700 ft. above sea-level and about 300 ft. above the mean level of the ancient city. Another spur, known as Jebel Deir abu Tor, 2,550 ft. high, runs East from the plateau of el Buqei'a and lies Southwest of the city; it is the traditional "Hill of Evil Counsel." The city

site is thus dominated on all sides by these higher ranges — “the mountains (that) are round about Jerus” (~~BCB~~ Psalm 125:2) — so that while on the one hand the ancient city was hidden, at any considerable distance, from any direction except the Southeast, it is only through this open gap toward the desert and the mountains of Moab that any wide outlook is obtainable. This strange vision of wilderness and distant mountain wall — often of exquisite loveliness in the light of the setting sun — must all through the ages have been the most familiar and the most potent of scenic influences to the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

## 2. The Valleys:

Within the enfolding hills the city’s proper site is demarked by two main valleys. That on the West and Southwest commences in a hollow occupied by the Moslem cemetery around the pool Birket Mamilla. The valley runs due East toward the modern Jaffa Gate, and there bends South, being known in this upper part of its course as the Wady el Mes. In this southern course it is traversed by a great dam, along which the modern Bethlehem road runs, which converts a large area of the valley bed into a great pool, the Birket es Sultan. Below this the valley — under the name of Wady er Rabadi — bends Southeast, then East, and finally Southeast again, until near Bir Eyyub it joins the western valley to form the Wady en Nar, 670 ft. below its origin. This valley has been very generally identified as the Valley of Hinnom (*see HINNOM*.)

The eastern valley takes a wider sweep. Commencing high up in the plateau to the North of the city, near the great water-parting, it descends as a wide and open valley in a southeasterly direction until, where it is crossed by the Great North Road, being here known as Wady el Joz (the “Valley of the Walnuts”), it turns more directly East. It gradually curves to the South, and as it runs East of the city walls, it receives the name of Wady Sitti Miriam (the “Valley of the Lady Mary”). Below the Southeast corner of the temple-area, near the traditional “Tomb of Absalom,” the valley rapidly deepens and takes a direction slightly to the West of South. It passes the “Virgin’s Fount,” and a quarter of a mile lower it is joined by el Wad from the North, and a little farther on by the Wady er Rababi from the West. South of Bir Eyyub, the valley formed by their union is continued under the name of Wady en Nar to the Dead Sea. This western valley is that commonly known as the Brook Kidron, or, more shortly, the “Brook” ([hachal]), or ravine (*see KIDRON*), but named from the 5th century

onward by Christians the *VALLEY OF JEHOSEPHAT* (which see). The rocky tongue of land enclosed between these deep ravines, an area, roughly speaking, a little over one mile long by half a mile wide, is further subdivided into a number of distinct hills by some shallower valleys. The most prominent of these — indeed the only one noticeable to the superficial observer today — is the great central valley known to modern times by the single name el Wad, “the valley.” It commences in a slight depression of the ground a little North of the modern “Damascus Gate,” and after entering the city at this gate it rapidly deepens — a fact largely disguised today by the great accumulation of rubbish in its course. It traverses the city with the *Charam* to its east, and the Christian and Moslem quarters on rapidly rising ground to its west. Its course is observed near the Babylonian es Silseleh, where it is crossed by an ancient causeway, but farther South the valley reappears, having the walls of the *Charam* (near the “wailing place” and “Robinson’s arch”) on the East, and steep cliffs crossed by houses of the Jewish quarter on the West. It leaves the city at the “Dung Gate,” and passes with an open curve to the East, until it reaches the Pool of Siloam, below which it merges in the Wady Sitti Miriam. This is the course of the main valley, but a branch of great importance in the ancient topography of the city starts some 50 yards to the West of the modern Jaffa Gate and runs down the Suwaikat Allun generally known to travelers as “David’s Street,” and thus easterly, along the Tarik bab es Silseleh, until it merges in the main valley. The main valley is usually considered to be the Tyropeon, or “Cheesemongers’ Valley” of Josephus, but some writers have attempted to confine the name especially to this western arm of it.

Another interior valley, which is known rather by the rock contours, than by surface observations, being largely filled up today, cuts diagonally across the Northeast corner of the modern city. It has no modern name, though it is sometimes called “St. Anne’s Valley.” It arises in the plateau near “Herod’s Gate,” known as es Sahra, and entering the city about 100 yards to the East of that gate, runs South-Southeast., and leaves the city between the Northeast angle of the *Charam* and the Golden Gate, joining the Kidron valley farther Southeast. The Birket Israel runs across the width of this valley, which had far more influence in determining the ancient topography of the city than has been popularly recognized. There is an artificially made valley between the *Charam* and the buildings to its north, and there is thought by many to be a valley between the Southeast hill,

commonly called "Ophel" and the temple-area. Such, then, are the valleys, great and small, by which the historic hills on which the city stood are defined. All of them, particularly in their southern parts, were considerably deeper in ancient times, and in places the accumulated debris is 80 ft. or more. All of them were originally torrent beds, dry except immediately after heavy rain. The only perennial outflow of water is the scanty and intermittent stream which overflows from the Pool of Siloam, and is used to irrigate the gardens in the Wady Sitti Miriam.

### *3. The Hills:*

The East and West valleys isolate a roughly quadrilateral tongue of land running from Northwest-West to South-Southeast, and tilted so as to face Southeast. This tongue is further subdivided by el Wad into two long ridges, which merge into each other in the plateau to the North. The western ridge has its actual origin considerably North of the modern wall, being part of the high ground lying between the modern Jaffa road to the West, and the commencement of the Kidron valley to the East. Within the city walls it rises as high as 2,581 ft. near the northwestern corner. It is divided by the west branch of the Tyropeon valley into two parts: a northern part — the northwestern hill — on which is situated today the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the greater part of the "Christian quarter" of the city, and a southern hill — the southwestern — which is connected with the northwestern hill by but a narrow saddle — 50 yards wide — near the Jaffa Gate. This hill sustains the citadel (the so-called "Tower of David"), the barracks and the Armenian quarter within the walls, and the Coenaculum and adjacent buildings outside the walls. This hill is from 2,500 to 2,350 ft. high along its summit, but drops rapidly on its southwestern, southern and southeastern sides. In its central part it falls much more gently toward the eastern hill across the now largely filled valley el Wad.

The eastern ridge may be reckoned as beginning at the rocky hill el-Edhemiyeh — popularly known as Gordon's Calvary — but the wide trench made here by quarrying somewhat obscures this fact. The ridge may for convenience be regarded as presenting three parts, the northeastern, central or central-eastern, and southeastern summits. The northeastern hill within the modern wall supports the Moslem quarter, and rises in places to a height of over 2,500 ft.; it narrows to a mere neck near the "Ecce Homo" arch, where it is joined to the barracks, on the site of the ancient Antonia.

Under the present surface it is here separated from the temple summit by a deep rocky trench.

The central, or central-eastern, summit is that appearing as es Sakhra, the sacred temple rock, which is 2,404 ft. high. This is the highest point from which the ground rapidly falls East, West, and South, but the natural contours of the adjacent ground are much obscured by the great substructures which have been made to sustain the temple platform.

The sloping, southeastern, hill, South of the temple area appears today, at any rate, to have a steady fall of from 2,350 ft. just South of the *Charam* southern wall to a little over 2,100 ft. near the Pool of Siloam. It is a narrow ridge running in a somewhat curved direction, with a summit near 200 ft. above the Kidron and 100 ft. above the bed of the Tyropeon. In length it is not more than 600 yards, in width, at its widest, only 150 yards, but its chief feature, its natural strength, is today greatly obscured on account of the rubbish which slopes down its sides and largely fills up its surrounding valleys. In earlier times, at least three of its sides were protected by deep valleys, and probably on quite two-thirds of its circumference its summit was surrounded by natural rocky scarps. According to Professor Guthe, this hill is divided from the higher ground to the North by a depression 12 ft. deep and 30-50 yards wide, but this has not been confirmed by other observers. The city covering so hilly a site as this must ever have consisted, as it does today, of houses terraced on steep slopes' with stairways for streets.

#### IV. GENERAL TOPOGRAPHY OF JERUSALEM.

From the foregoing description of the "natural site," it will be seen that we have to deal with 5 natural subdivisions or hills, two on the western and three on the eastern ridges.

##### *1. Description of Josephus:*

In discussing the topography it is useful to commence with the description of Josephus, wherein he gives to these 5 areas the names common in his day (BJ, V, iv, 1,2). He says: "The city was built upon two hills which are opposite to one another and have a valley to divide them asunder .... Now the Valley of the Cheesemongers, as it was called, and was that which distinguished the hill of the upper city from that of the lower, extended as far as Siloam" (ibid., V, iv, 1). Here we get the first prominent physical

feature, the bisection of the city-site into two main hills. Farther on, however, in the same passage — one, it must be admitted, of some obscurity — Josephus distinguishes 5 distinct regions:

### **(1) The Upper City or Upper Market Place:**

(The hill) “which sustains the upper city is much higher and in length more direct. Accordingly, it was called the citadel ([**φρούριον**, *phrourion*]) of King David .... but it is by us called the Upper Market Place.” This is without dispute the southwestern hill.

### **(2) Akra and Lower City:**

“The other hill, which was called Akra, and sustains the lower city, was double-curved” ([**ἀμφίκυρτος**, *amphikurtos*]). The description can apply only to the semicircular shape of the southeastern hill, as viewed from the “upper city.” These names, “Akra” and “Lower City,” are, with reservations, therefore, to be applied to the southeastern hill.

### **(3) The Temple Hill:**

Josephus’ description here is curious, on account of its indefiniteness, but there can be no question as to which hill he intends. He writes: “Over against this is a third hill, but naturally lower than the Akra and parted formerly from the other by a fiat valley. However, in those times when the Hasmoneans reigned, they did away with this valley, wishing to connect the city with the temple; and cutting down the summit of the Akra, they made it lower, so that the temple might be visible over it.” Comparison with other passages shows that this “third hill” is the central-eastern — the “Temple Hill.”

### **(4) Bezetha:**

“It was Agrippa who encompassed the parts added to the old city with this wall (i.e. the third wall) which had been all naked before; for as the city grew more populous, it gradually crept beyond its old limits, and those parts of it that stood northward of the Temple, and joined that hill to the city, made it considerably larger, and occasioned that hill which is in number the fourth, and is called ‘Bezetha,’ to be inhabited also. It lies over against the tower Antonia, but is divided from it by a deep valley, which was dug on purpose. .... This new-built part of the city was called



`Bezetha' in our language, which, if interpreted in the Greek language, may be called the `New City.' " This is clearly the northeastern hill.

### **(5) The Northern Quarter of the City:**

From the account of the walls given by Josephus, it is evident that the northern part of his "first wall" ran along the northern edge of the southwestern hill; the second wall enclosed the inhabited part of the northwestern hill. Thus Josephus writes: "The second wall took its beginning from the gate which they called Gennath in the first wall, and enclosing, the northern quarter only reached to the Antonia." This area is not described as a separate hill, as the inhabited area, except on the South, was defined by no natural valleys, and besides covering the northwestern hill, must have extended into the Tyropeon valley.

### *2. Summary of the Names of the Five Hills:*

Here then we have Josephus' names for these five districts:

#### **(1) Southwestern Hill:**

Southwestern Hill, "Upper City" and "Upper Market Place"; also the Summary [*Phrourion*], or "fortress of David." From the 4th century AD, this hill has also been known as "Zion," and on it today is the so-called "Tower of David," built on the foundations of two of Herod's great towers.

#### **(2) Northwestern Hill:**

"The northern quarter of the city." This district does not appear to have had any other name in Old Testament or New Testament, though some of the older authorities would place the "Akra" here (see *infra*). Today it is the "Christian quarter" of Jerusalem, which centers round the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

#### **(3) Northeastern Hill:**

"Bezetha" or "New City," even now a somewhat sparsely inhabited area, has no name in Biblical literature.

#### **(4) Central-eastern Hill:**

The "third hill" of Josephus, clearly the site of the Temple which, as Josephus says (BJ, V, v), "was built upon a strong hill." In earlier times it

was the “threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite.” On the question whether it has any claims to be the Moriah of ~~<0220>~~Genesis 22:2, as it is called in ~~<4000>~~2 Chronicles 3:1, *see* MORIAH. The temple hill is also in many of the Hebrew writings called Zion, on which point *see* ZION.

### (5) **Southeastern Hill:**

This Josephus calls “Akra” and “Lower City,” but while on the one hand these names require some elucidation, there are other names which have at one period or another come to be applied to this hill, namely, “City of David,” “Zion” and “Ophel.” These names for this hill we shall now deal with in order.

### *3. The Akra:*

In spite of the very definite description of Josephus, there has been considerable difference of opinion regarding the situation of the “Akra.” Various parts of the northwestern, the northeastern, the southeastern hills, and even the central-eastern itself, have been suggested by earlier authorities, but instead of considering the various arguments, now largely out of date, for other proposed sites, it will be better to deal with the positive arguments for the southeastern hill. Josephus states that in his day the term “Akra” was applied to the southeastern hill, but in references to the earlier history it is clear that the Akra was not a whole hill, but a definite fortress ([~~ἄκρᾱ~~, *akra*] = “fortress”).

(1) It was situated on the site, or on part of the site, which was considered in the days of the Maccabees to have been the “City of David.” Antiochus Epiphanes (168 BC), after destroying Jerusalem, “fortitied the city of David with a great and strong wall, with strong towers and it became unto them an Akra” (1 Macc 1:33-36). The formidable fortress — known henceforth as “the Akra” — became a constant menace to the Jews, until at length, in 142 BC, it was captured by Simon, who not only razed the whole fortress, but, according to Josephus (*Ant.*, XIII, vi, 7; *B J*, V, iv, 1), actually cut down the hill on which it stood. He says that “they all, labouring zealously, demolished the hill, and ceasing not from the work night and day for three whole years, brought it to a level and even slope, so that the Temple became the highest of all after the Akra and the hill upon which it was built had been removed” (*Ant.*, XIII, vi, 7). The fact that at the time of Josephus this hill was evidently lower than the temple hill

is in itself sufficient argument against any theory which would place the Akra on the northwestern or southwestern hills.

(2) The Akra was close to the temple (1 Macc 13:52), and from its walls the garrison could actually overlook it (1 Macc 14:36). Before the hill was cut down it obscured the temple site (same place) .

(3) It is identified by Josephus as forming part, at least, of the lower city, which (see below) bordered upon the temple (compare BJ, I, i, 4; V, iv, 1; vi, 1).

(4) The Septuagint identifies the Akra with Millo (~~1089~~2 Samuel 5:9; ~~1095~~1 Kings 9:15-24; ~~1435~~2 Chronicles 32:5).

Allowing that the original Akra of the Syrians was on the southeastern hill, it is still a matter of some difficulty to determine whereabouts it stood, especially as, if the statements of Josephus are correct, the natural configuration of the ground has been greatly altered. The most prominent point upon the southeastern hill, in the neighborhood of Gihon, appears to have been occupied by the Jebusite fortress of ZION (which see), but the site of the Akra can hardly be identical with this, for this became the “City of David,” and here were the venerated tombs of David and the Judean kings, which must have been destroyed if this hill was, as Josephus states, cut down. On this and other grounds we must look for a site farther north. Sir Charles Watson (PEFS, 1906, 1907) has produced strong topographical and literary arguments for placing it where the al Aqsa mosque is today; other writers are more inclined to put it farther south, somewhere in the neighborhood of the massive tower discovered by Warren on the “Ophel” wall (*see MILLO*). If the account of Josephus, written two centuries after the events, is to be taken as literal, then Watson’s view is the more probable.

#### *4. The Lower City:*

Josephus, as we have seen, identified the Akra of his day with the Lower City. This latter is not a name occurring in the Bible because, as will be shown, the Old Testament name for this part was “City of David.” That by Lower City Josephus means the southeastern hill is shown by many facts. It is actually the lowest part of the city, as compared with the “Upper City,” Temple Hill and the Bezetha; it is, as Josephus describes, separated from the Upper City by a deep valley — the Tyropeon; this southeastern

hill is “double-curved,” as Josephus describes, and lastly several passages in his writings show that the Lower City was associated with the Temple on the one end and the Pool of Siloam at the other (compare Ant, XIV, xvi, 2; BJ, II, xvii, 5; IV, ix, 12; VI, vi, 3; vii, 2).

In the wider sense the “Lower City” must have included, not only the section of the city covering the southeastern hill up to the temple precincts, where were the palaces (BJ, V, vi, 1; VI, vi, 3), and the homes of the well-to-do, but also that in the valley of the Tyropeon from Siloam up to the “Council House,” which was near the northern “first wall” (compare BJ, V, iv, 2), a part doubtless inhabited by the poorest.

### *5. City of David and Zion:*

It is clear (~~<1087>~~2 Samuel 5:7; ~~<1306>~~1 Chronicles 11:5) that the citadel “Zion” of the Jebusites became the “City of David,” or as G. A. Smith calls it, “David’s Burg,” after its capture by the Hebrews. The arguments for placing “Zion” on the southeastern hill are given elsewhere (*see ZION*), but a few acts relevant especially to the “City of David” may be mentioned here: the capture of the Jebusite city by means of the gutter (~~<1088>~~2 Samuel 5:8), which is most reasonably explained as “Warren’s Shaft” (see VII); the references to David’s halt on his flight (~~<1053>~~2 Samuel 15:23), and his sending Solomon to Gihon to be crowned (~~<1003>~~1 Kings 1:33), and the common expression “up,” used in describing the transference of the Ark from the City of David to the Temple Hill (~~<1001>~~1 Kings 8:1; ~~<1082>~~2 Chronicles 5:2; compare ~~<1024>~~1 Kings 9:24), are all consistent with this view. More convincing are the references to Hezekiah’s aqueduct which brought the waters of Gihon “down on the west side of the city of David” (~~<1432>~~2 Chronicles 32:30); the mention of the City of David as adjacent to the Pool of Shelah (or Shiloah; compare ~~<2006>~~Isaiah 8:6), and the “king’s garden” in ~~<1085>~~Nehemiah 3:15, and the position of the Fountain Gate in this passage and ~~<1627>~~Nehemiah 12:37; and the statement that Manasseh built “an outer wall to the City of David, on the west side of Gihon” in the [nachal], i.e. the Kidron valley (~~<1434>~~2 Chronicles 33:14).

The name appears to have had a wider significance as the city grew. Originally “City of David” was only the name of the Jebusite fort, but later it became equivalent to the whole southeastern hill. In the same way, Akra was originally the name of the Syrian fort, but the name became extended to the whole southeastern hill. Josephus looks upon “City of David” and

“Akra” as synonymous, and applies to both the name “Lower City.” For the names Ophel and Ophlas *see OPHEL*.

## V. EXCAVATIONS AND ANTIQUITIES.

During the last hundred years explorations and excavations of a succession of engineers and archaeologists have furnished an enormous mass of observations for the understanding of the condition of ancient Jerusalem. Some of the more important are as follows:

In 1833 Messrs. Bonorni, Catherwood and Arundale made a first thorough survey of the *Charam* (temple-area), a work which was the foundation of all subsequent maps for over a quarter of a century.

### *1. Robinson:*

In 1838, and again in 1852, the famous American traveler and divine, E. Robinson, D.D., visited the land as the representative of an American society, and made a series of brilliant topographical investigations of profound importance to all students of the Holy Land, even today.

In 1849 Jerusalem was surveyed by Lieuts. Aldrich and Symonds of the Royal Engineers, and the data acquired were used for a map constructed by Van de Vilde and published by T. Tobler.

In 1857 an American, J.T. Barclay, published another map of Jerusalem and its environs “from actual and minute survey made on the spot.”

In 1860-1863 De Vogue in the course of some elaborate researches in Syria explored the site of the sanctuary.

### *2. Wilson and the Palestine Exploration Fund (1865):*

In 1864-65 a committee was formed in London to consider the sanitary condition of Jerusalem, especially with a view to furnishing the city with a satisfactory water-supply, and Lady Burdett-Coutts gave 500 pounds toward a proper survey of Jerusalem and its environs as a preliminary step. Captain (later Lieutenant-General Sir Charles) Wilson, R.E., was lent by the Ordnance Survey Department of Great Britain for the purpose. The results of this survey, and of certain tentative excavations and observations made at the same time, were so encouraging that in 1865 “The Palestine Exploration Fund” was constituted, “for the purpose of investigating the archaeology, geography, geology, and natural history of the Holy Land.”

### *3. Warren and Conder:*

During 1867-70 Captain (later Lieutenant-General Sir Charles) Warren, R.E., carried out a series of most exciting and original excavations all over the site of Jerusalem, especially around the *Charam*. During 1872-75 Lieutenant (later Lieutenant-Colonel) Conder, R.E., in the course of the great survey of Western Palestine, made further contributions to our knowledge of the Holy City.

### *4. Maudslay:*

In 1875 Mr. Henry Maudslay, taking advantage of the occasion of the rebuilding of “Bishop Gobat’s Boys’ School,” made a careful examination of the remarkable rock cuttings which are now more or less incorporated into the school buildings, and made considerable excavations, the results being described in PEFS (April, 1875).

In 1881 Professor Guthe made a series of important excavations on the southeastern hill, commonly called “Ophel,” and also near the Pool of Siloam; his reports were published in ZDPV, 1882.

### *5. Schick:*

The same year (1881), the famous Siloam inscription was discovered and was first reported by Herr Baurath Schick, a resident in Jerusalem who from 1866 until his death in 1901 made a long series of observations of the highest importance on the topography of Jerusalem. He had unique opportunities for scientifically examining the buildings in the [Charam], and the results of his study of the details of that locality are incorporated in his wonderful Temple model. He also made a detailed report of the ancient aqueducts of the city. Most important of all were the records he so patiently and faithfully kept of the rock levels in all parts of the city’s site whenever the digging of foundations for buildings or other excavations gave access to the rock. His contributions to the PEF and ZDPV run into hundreds of articles.

### *6. Clermont-Ganneau:*

M. Clermont-Ganneau, who was resident in Jerusalem in the French consular service, made for many years, from 1880 onward, a large number of acute observations on the archaeology of Jerusalem and its environs, many of which were published by the PEF. Another name honored in

connection with the careful study of the topography of Jerusalem over somewhat the same period is that of Selah Merrill, D.D., for many years U.S. consul in Jerusalem.

### *7. Bliss and Dickie:*

In 1894-97 the Palestine Exploration Fund conducted an elaborate series of excavations with a view to determining in particular the course of the ancient southern walls under the direction of Mr. T.J. Bliss (son of Daniel Bliss, D.D., then president of the Syrian Protestant College, Beirut), assisted by Mr. A.C. Dickie as architect. After picking up the buried foundations of walls at the southeastern corner where “Maudslay’s scarp” was exposed in the Protestant cemetery, Bliss and Dickie followed them all the way to the Pool of Siloam, across the Tyropeon and on to “Ophel” — and also in other directions. Discoveries of great interest were also made in the neighborhood of the Pool of Siloam (*see SILOAM*).

Following upon these excavations a number of private investigations have been made by the Augustinians in a large estate they have acquired on the East side of the traditional hill of Zion.

In 1909-1911 a party of Englishmen, under Captain the Honorable M. Parker, made a number of explorations with very elaborate tunnels upon the hill of Ophel, immediately above the Virgin’s Fount. In the course of their work, they cleaned out the whole Siloam aqueduct, finding some new passages; they reconstructed the Siloam Pool, and they completed Warren’s previous investigation in the neighborhood of what has been known as “Warren’s Shaft.”

### *8. Jerusalem Archaeological Societies:*

There are several societies constantly engaged in observing new facts connected with the topography of ancient Jerusalem, notably the School of Archaeology connected with the University of Stephens, under the Dominicans; the American School of Archaeology; the German School of Biblical Archaeology under Professor Dalman, and the Palestine Exploration Fund.

## VI. THE CITY'S WALLS AND GATES.

### *1. The Existing Walls:*

Although the existing walls of Jerusalem go back in their present form to but the days of Suleiman the Magnificent, circa 1542 AD, their study is an essential preliminary to the understanding of the ancient walls. The total circuit of the modern walls is 4,326 yards, or nearly 2 1/8 miles, their average height is 35 ft., and they have altogether 35 towers and 8 gates — one of which is walled up. They make a rough square, with the four sides facing the cardinal points of the compass. The masonry is of various kinds, and on every side there are evidences that the present walls are a patchwork of many periods. The northern wall, from near the northwestern angle to some distance East of the “Damascus Gate,” lies parallel with, though somewhat inside of, an ancient fosse, and it and the gate itself evidently follow ancient lines. The eastern and western walls, following as they do a general direction along the edges of deep valleys, must be more or less along the course of earlier walls. The eastern wall, from a little south of Stephen’s Gate to the southeastern angle, contains many ancient courses, and the general line is at least as old as the time of Herod the Great; the stretch of western wall from the so-called “Tower of David” to the southwestern corner is certainly along an ancient line and has persisted through very many centuries. This line of wall was allowed to remain undestroyed when Titus leveled the remainder. At the northwestern angle are some remains known as Kala`at Jalud (“Goliath’s castle”), which, though largely medieval, contain a rocky core and some masonry of Herodian times, which are commonly accepted as the relics of the lofty tower Psephinus.

### *2. Wilson’s Theory:*

The course of the southern wall has long been a difficulty; it is certainly not the line of wall before Titus; it has none of the natural advantages of the western and eastern walls, and there are no traces of any great rock fosse, such as is to be found on the north. The eastern end is largely built upon the lower courses of Herod’s southern wall for his enlarged temple-platform, and in it are still to be found walled up the triple, single and double gates which lead up to the Temple. The irregular line followed by the remainder of this wall has not until recent times received any explanation. Sir Charles Wilson (Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre)



suggests the probable explanation that the line of wall from the southwestern to the “Zion Gate” was determined by the legionary camp which stood on the part of the city now covered by the barracks and the Armenian quarter. Allowing that the remains of the first wall on the North and West were utilized for this fortified camp (from 70-132 AD), and supposing the camp to have occupied the area of 50 acres, as was the case with various European Roman camps, whose remains are known, the southern camp wall would have run along the line of the existing southern walls. This line of fortification having been thus selected appears to have been followed through the greater part of the succeeding centuries down to modern times. The line connecting the two extremities of the southern wall, thus determined by the temple-platform and legionary camp, respectively, was probably that first followed by the southern wall of Hadrian’s city AElia.

### *3. The Existing Gate:*

Of the 8 existing city gates, on the west side there is but one, Babylonian el Khulil (the “Gate of Hebron”), commonly known to travelers as the Jaffa Gate. It is probably the site of several earlier gates. On the North there are 3 gates, Babylonian Abd’ul Kamid (named after the sultan who made it) or the “New Gate”; Babylonian el `amud (“Gate of the Columns”), now commonly called the “Damascus Gate,” but more in ancient times known as “St. Stephen’s Gate,” and clearly, from the existing remains, the site of an earlier gateway; and, still farther east, the Babylonian es Sahirah (“Gate of the Plain”), or “Herod’s Gate.” On the east side the only open gate is the Babylonian el `Asbat (“Gate of the Tribes”), commonly called by native Christians, Babylonian Sitti Miriam (“Gate of the Lady Mary”), but in European guide-books called “St. Stephen’s Gate.” A little farther South, near the northeastern corner of the *Charam*, is the great walled-up Byzantine Gate, known as Babylonian edition Dahariyeh (“Gate of the Conqueror”), but to Europeans as the “Golden Gate.” This structure has been variously ascribed to Justinian and Heraclius, but there are massive blocks which belong to a more ancient structure, and early Christian tradition places the “Beautiful Gate” of the Temple here. In the southern wall are two city gates; one, insignificant and mean, occupies the center of el Wad and is known as Babylonian el Mugharibeh (“Gate of the Moors”), and to Europeans as the “Dung Gate”; the other, which is on the crown of the western hill, traditional Zion, is the important Babylonian Nebi Daoud (“Gate of the Prophet David”), or the “Zion Gate.”

All these gates assumed their present form at the time of the reconstruction of the walls by Suleiman the Magnificent, but the more important ones occupy the sites of earlier gates. Their names have varied very much even since the times of the Crusaders. The multiplicity of names for these various gates — they all have two or three today — and their frequent changes are worth noticing in connection with the fact that in the Old Testament history some of the gates appear to have had two or more names.

As has been mentioned, the course of the present southern wall is the result of Roman reconstruction of the city since the time of Titus. To Warren, Guthe, Maudslay and Bliss we owe a great deal of certain knowledge of its more ancient course. These explorers have shown that in all the pre-Roman period (and at least one period since) the continuation southward of the western and eastern ridges, as well as the wide valley between — an area now but sparsely inhabited — was the site of at once the most crowded life, and the most stirring scenes in the Hebrew history of the city. The sanctity of the Holy Sepulchre has caused the city life to center itself more and more around that sanctuary, thereby greatly confusing the ancient topography for many centuries.

#### *4. Buried Remains of Earlier Walls:*

(1) Warren's excavations revealed:

(a) a massive masonry wall 46 ft. East of the Golden Gate, which curved toward the West at its northern end, following the ancient rock contours at this spot. It is probable that this was the eastern wall of the city in pre-Herodian times. Unfortunately the existence of a large Moslem cemetery outside the eastern wall of the *Charam* precludes the possibility of any more excavations in this neighborhood.

(b) More important remains in the southeastern hill, commonly known as "Ophel." Here commencing at the southeastern angle of the *Charam*, Warren uncovered a wall 14 1/2 ft. thick running South for 90 ft. and then Southwest along the edge of the hill for 700 ft. This wall, which shows at least two periods of construction, abuts on the sanctuary wall with a straight joint. Along its course were found 4 small towers with a projection of 6 ft. and a face from 22 to 28 ft. broad, and a great corner tower projecting 41 1/2 ft. from the wall and with a face 80 ft. broad. The face of this great tower consists of stones

one to two ft. high and 2 or 3 ft. long; it is founded upon rock and stands to the height of 66 ft. Warren considers that this may be *ha-mighdal ha-yotse* or “tower that standeth out” of ~~14825~~ Nehemiah 3:25.

(2) In 1881 Professor Guthe picked up fragmentary traces of this city-wall farther south, and in the excavations of Captain Parker (1910-1911) further fragments of massive walls and a very ancient gate have been found.

(3) Maudslay’s excavations were on the southwestern hill, on the site occupied by “Bishop Gobat’s School” for boys, and in the adjoining Anglo-German cemetery. The school is built over a great mass of scarped rock 45 ft. square, which rises to a height of 20 ft. from a platform which surrounds it and with which it is connected by a rock-cut stairway; upon this massive foundation must have stood a great tower at what was in ancient times the southwestern corner of the city. From this point a scarp facing westward was traced for 100 ft. northward toward the modern southwestern angle of the walls, while a rock scarp, in places 40 ft. high on the outer or southern side and at least 14 ft. on the inner face, was followed for 250 ft. eastward until it reached another great rock projection with a face of 43 ft. Although no stones were found in situ, it is evident that such great rock cuttings must have supported a wall and tower of extraordinary strength, and hundreds of massive squared stones belonging to this wall are now incorporated in neighboring buildings.

(4) Bliss and Dickie’s work commenced at the southeastern extremity of Maudslay’s scarp, where was the above-mentioned massive projection for a tower, and here were found several courses of masonry still in situ. This tower appears to have been the point of divergence of two distinct lines of wall, one of which ran in a direction Northeast, skirting the edge of the southeastern hill, and probably joined the line of the modern walls at the ruined masonry tower known as Burj el Kebrit, and another running Southeast down toward the Pool of Siloam, along the edge of the Wady er Rababi (Hinnom). The former of these walls cannot be very ancient, because of the occurrence of late Byzantine moldings in its foundations. The coenaculum was included in the city somewhere about 435-450 AD (see IX, 55), and also in the 14th century. Bliss considers it probable that this is the wall built in 1239 By Frederick II, and it is certainly that depicted in the map of Marino Sanuto (1321 AD). Although these masonry remains are thus comparatively late, there were some reasons for thinking that at a much earlier date a wall took a similar direction along the edge of the

southwestern hill; and it is an attractive theory, though unsupported by any very definite archaeological evidence, that the wall of Solomon took also this general line. The wall running Southeast from the tower, along the edge of the gorge of Hinnom, is historically of much greater importance. Bliss's investigations showed that here were remains belonging to several periods, covering altogether considerably over a millennium. The upper line of wall was of fine masonry, with stones 1 ft. by 3 ft. in size, beautifully jointed and finely dressed; in some places this wall was founded upon the remains of the lower wall, in others a layer of debris intervened. It is impossible that this upper wall can be pre-Roman, and Bliss ascribes it to the Empress Eudoxia (see IX, 55). The lower wall rested upon the rock and showed at least 3 periods of construction. In the earliest the stones had broad margins and were carefully jointed, without mortar. This may have been the work of Solomon or one of the early kings of Judah. The later remains are evidently of the nature of repairs, and include the work of the later Judean kings, and of Nehemiah and of all the wall-repairers, down to the destruction in 70 AD. At somewhat irregular intervals along the wall were towers of very similar projection and breadth to those found on Warren's wall on the southeastern hill. The wall foundations were traced — except for an interval where they passed under a Jewish cemetery — all the way to the mouth of the Tyropeon valley. The upper wall disappeared (the stones having been all removed for later buildings) before the Jewish cemetery was reached.

### *5. The Great Dam of the Tyropeon:*

During most periods, if not indeed in all, the wall was carried across the mouth of the Tyropeon valley upon a great dam of which the massive foundations still exist under the ground, some 50 ft. to the East of the slighter dam which today supports the Birket el Kamra (see *SILAM*). This ancient dam evidently once supported a pool in the mouth of the Tyropeon, and it showed evidences of having undergone buttressing and other changes and repairs. Although it is clear that during the greater part of Jewish history, before and after the captivity, the southern wall of Jerusalem crossed upon this dam, there were remains of walls found which tended to show that at one period, at any rate, the wall circled round the two Siloam pools, leaving them outside the fortifications.

### *6. Ruins of Ancient Gates:*

In the stretch of wall from “Maudslay’s Scarp” to the Tyropeon valley remains of 2 city gates were found, and doubtful indications of 2 others. The ruins of the first of these gates are now included in the new extension of the Anglo-German cemetery. The gate had door sills, with sockets, of 4 periods superimposed upon each other; the width of the entrance was 8 ft. 10 inches during the earliest, and 8 ft. at the latest period. The character of the masonry tended to show that the gate belonged to the upper wall, which is apparently entirely of the Christian era. If this is so, this cannot be the “Gate of the Gai” of <sup><14183></sup>Nehemiah 3:13, although the earlier gate may have occupied this site. Bliss suggests as a probable position for this gate an interval between the two contiguous towers IV and V, a little farther to the East.

Another gate was a small one, 4 ft. 10 inches wide, marked only by the cuttings in the rock for the door sockets. It lay a little to the West of the city gate next to be described, and both from its position and its insignificance, it does not appear to have been an entrance to the city; it may, as Bliss suggests, have given access to a tower, now destroyed.

The second great city gateway was found some 200 ft. South of the Birket el Kamra, close to the southeastern angle of the ancient wall. The existing remains are bonded into walls of the earlier period, but the three superimposed door sills, with their sockets — to be seen uncovered today in situ — mark three distinct periods of long duration. The gate gave access to the great main street running down the Tyropeon, underneath which ran a great rock-cut drain, which probably traversed the whole central valley of the city. During the last two periods of the gate’s use, a tower was erected — at the exact southeastern angle — to protect the entrance. The earliest remains here probably belong to the Jewish kings, and it is very probable that we have here the gate called by Nehemiah (3:13) the “Dung Gate.” Bliss considered that it might be the “Fountain Gate” (<sup><14185></sup>Nehemiah 3:15), which, however, was probably more to the East, although Bliss could find no remains of it surviving. The repairs and alterations here have been so extensive that its disappearance is in no way surprising. The Fountain Gate is almost certainly identical with the “Gate between the Two Walls,” through which Zedekiah and his men of war fled (<sup><1294></sup>2 Kings 25:4; <sup><2404></sup>Jeremiah 39:4; 52:7).

### *7. Josephus' Description of the Walls:*

The most definite account of the old walls is that of Josephus (Jewish Wars, V, iv, 1, 2), and though it referred primarily to the existing walls of his day, it is a convenient one for commencing the historical survey. He describes three walls. The first wall "began on the North, at the tower called Hippicus, and extended as far as the Xistus, and then Joining at the Council House, ended at the western cloister of the temple." On the course of this section of the wall there is no dispute. The tower Hippicus was close to the present Jaffa Gate, and the wall ran from here almost due West to the temple-area along the southern edge of the western arm of the Tyropeon (see III, 2, above). It is probable that the Karet edition Dawayeh, a street running nearly parallel with the neighboring "David Street," but high up above it, lies above the foundations of this wall.

### *8. First Wall:*

It must have crossed the main Tyropeon near the Tarik bab es Silsilel, and joined the western cloisters close to where the [Mechkemeh], the present "Council House," is situated.

Josephus traces the southern course of the first wall thus: "It began at the same place (i.e. Hippicus), and extended through a place called Bethso to the gate of the Essenes; and after that it went southward, having its bending above the fountain Siloam, when it also bends again toward the East at Solomon's Pool, and reaches as far as a certain place which they called 'Ophlas,' where it was joined to the eastern cloister of the temple." Although the main course of this wall has now been followed with pick and shovel, several points are still uncertain. Bethso is not known, but must have been close to the southwestern angle, which, as we have seen, was situated where "Bishop Gobat's School" is today. It is very probably identical with the "Tower of the Furnaces" of <sup><KIR></sup>Nehemiah 3:11, while the "Gate of the Essenes" must have been near, if not identical with, the "Gate of the Gai" of 3:13. The description of Josephus certainly seems to imply that the mouth of the Siloam aqueduct ("fountain of Siloam") and the pools were both outside the fortification. We have seen from these indications in the underground remains that this was the case at one period. Solomon's Pool is very probably represented by the modern Birket el Khamra. It is clear that the wall from here to the southeastern angle of the temple-platform followed the edge of the southeastern hill, and coincided

farther north with the old wall excavated by Warren. As will be shown below, this first wall was the main fortification of the city from the time of the kings of Judah onward. In the time of Josephus, this first wall had 60 towers.

### *9. Second Wall:*

The Second Wall of Josephus “took its beginning from that gate which they called ‘Gennath,’ which belonged to the first wall: it only encompassed the northern quarter of the city and reached as far as the tower Antonia” (same place). In no part of Jerusalem topography has there been more disagreement than upon this wall, both as regards its curve and as regards its date of origin. Unfortunately, we have no idea at all where the “Gate Gennath” was. The Tower Antonia we know. The line must have passed in a curved or zigzag direction from some unknown point on the first wall, i.e. between the Jaffa Gate and the [Charam] to the Antonia. A considerable number of authorities in the past and a few careful students today would identify the general course of this wall with that of the modern northern wall. The greatest objections to this view are that no really satisfactory alternative course has been laid down for the third wall (see below), and that it must have run far North of the Antonia, a course which does not seem to agree with the description of Josephus, which states that the wall “went up” to the Antonia. On the other hand, no certain remains of any city wall within the present north wall have ever been found; fragments have been reported by various observers (e.g. the piece referred to as forming the eastern wall of the so-called “Pool of Hezekiah”; see VII, ii, below), but in an area so frequently desolated and rebuilt upon — where the demand for squared stones must always have been great — it is probable that the traces, if surviving at all, are very scanty. This is the case with the south wall excavated by Bliss (see VI), and that neighborhood has for many centuries been unbuilt upon. It is quite probable that the area included within the second wall may have been quite small, merely the buildings which clustered along the sides of the Tyropeon. Its 40 towers may have been small and built close together, because the position was, from the military aspect, weak. It must be remembered that it was the unsatisfactory state of the second wall which necessitated a third wall. There is no absolute reason why it may not have excluded the greater part of the northwestern hill — and with it the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre — but there is no proof that it did. The date of the second wall is unknown (see below).



### *10. Third Wall:*

This third wall, which was commenced after the time of Christ by Herod Agrippa I, is described in more detail by Josephus. It was begun upon an elaborate plan, but was not finished in its original design because Agrippa feared Claudius Caesar, “lest he should suspect that so strong a wall was built in order to make some innovation in public affairs” (Jewish Wars, V, iv, 2). It, however, at the time of the siege, was of a breadth of over 18 ft., and a height of 40 ft., and had 90 massive towers. Josephus describes it as beginning at the tower Hippicus (near the Jaffa Gate), “where it reached as far as the north quarter of the city, and the tower Psephinus.” This mighty tower, 135 ft. high, was at the northwestern corner and overlooked the whole city. From it, according to Josephus (Jewish Wars, V, vi, 3), there was a view of Arabia (Moab) at sunrising, and also of “the utmost limits of the Hebrew possessions at the Sea westward.” From this corner the wall turned eastward until it came over against the monuments of Helene of Adiabene, a statement, however, which must be read in connection with another passage (Ant., XX, iv, 3), where it says that this tomb “was distant no more than 3 furlongs from the city of Jerusalem.” The wall then “extended to a very great length” and passed by the sepulchral caverns of the kings — which may well be the so-called “Solomon’s Quarries,” and it then bent at the “Tower of the Corner,” at a monument which is called the Monument of the Fuller (not identified), and joined to the old wall at the Kidron valley.

The commonly accepted theory is that a great part of this line of wall is that pursued by the modern north wall, and Kal`at el Jalud, or rather the foundation of it, that marks the site of Psephinus. The Damascus Gate is certainly on the line of some earlier gate. The “Tower of the Corner” was probably about where the modern Herod’s Gate is, or a little more to the East, and the course of the wall was from here very probably along the southern edge of the “St. Anne’s Valley,” joining on to the Northeast corner of the [Charam] a little South of the present Stephen’s Gate. This course of the wall fits in well with the description of Josephus. If the so-called “Tombs of the Kings” are really those of Queen Helena of Adiabene and her family, then the distance given as 3 furlongs is not as far out as the distance to the modern wall; the distance is actually 3 1/2 furlongs.

Others, following the learned Dr. Robinson, find it impossible to believe that the total circuit of the walls was so small, and would carry the third



wall considerably farther north, making the general line of the modern north wall coincide with the second wall of Josephus. The supporters of this view point to the description of the extensive view from Psephinus, and contend that this presupposed a site on still higher ground, e.g. where the present Russian buildings now are. They also claim that the statement that the wall came “over against” the monument of Queen Helena certainly should mean very much nearer that monument than the present walls. Dr. Robinson and others who have followed him have pointed to various fragments which they claim to have been pieces of the missing wall. The present writer, after very many years’ residence in Jerusalem, watching the buildings which in the last 25 years have sprung up over the area across which this line of wall is claimed to have run, has never seen a trace of wall foundations or of fosse which was in the very least convincing; while on the other hand this area now being rapidly covered by the modern suburb of Jerusalem presents almost everywhere below the surface virgin rock. There is no evidence of any more buildings than occasional scattered Roman villas, with mosaic floors. The present writer has rather unwillingly come to the opinion that the city walls were never farther north than the line they follow today. With respect to the objection raised that there could not possibly have been room enough between the two walls for the “Camp of the Assyrians,” where Titus pitched his camp (Jewish Wars, V, vii, 3), any probable line for the second wall would leave a mean of 1,000 ft. between the two walls, and in several directions considerably more. The probable position of the “Camp of the Assyrians” would, according to this view, be in the high ground (the northwestern hill) now occupied by the Christian quarter of the modern city. The question of what the population of Jerusalem was at this period is discussed in IX, 49, below. For the other great buildings of the city at this period, see also IX, 43-44, below.

### *11. Date of Second Wall:*

Taking then the walls of Jerusalem as described by Josephus, we may work backward and see how the walls ran in earlier periods. The third wall does not concern us any more, as it was built after the Crucifixion. With respect to the second wall, there is a great deal of difference of opinion regarding its origin. Some consider, like Sir Charles Watson, that it does not go back earlier than the Hasmoneans; whereas others (e.g. G.A. Smith), because of the expression in ~~435~~2 Chronicles 32:5 that Hezekiah, after repairing the wall, raised “another wall without,” think that this wall goes back as far as this monarch. The evidence is inconclusive, but the most probable view

seems to be that the “first wall,” as described by Josephus, was the only circuit of wall from the kings of Judah down to the 2nd century BC, and perhaps later.

### *12. Nehemiah’s Account of the Walls:*

The most complete Scriptural description we have of the walls and gates of Jerusalem is that given by Nehemiah. His account is valuable, not only as a record of what he did, but of what had been the state of the walls before the exile. It is perfectly clear that considerable traces of the old walls and gates remained, and that his one endeavor was to restore what had been before — even though it produced a city enclosure much larger than necessary at his time. The relevant passages are ~~KPT~~ Nehemiah 2:13-15, the account of his night ride; 3:1-32, the description of the rebuilding; and 12:31-39, the routes of the two processions at the dedication.

### *13. Valley Gate:*

In the first account we learn that Nehemiah went out by night by the **VALLEY GATE** (which see), or Gate of the Gai, a gate (that is, opening) into the Gai Hinnom, and probably at or near the gate discovered by Bliss in what is now part of the Anglo-German cemetery; he passed from it to the Dung Gate, and from here viewed the walls of the city.

### *14. Dung Gate:*

This, with considerable assurance, may be located at the ruined foundations of a gate discovered by Bliss at the southeastern corner of the city. The line of wall clearly followed the south edge of the southwestern hill from the Anglo-German cemetery to this point. He then proceeded to the Fountain Gate, the site of which has not been recovered, but, as there must have been water running out here (as today) from the mouth of the Siloam tunnel, is very appropriately named here.

### *15. Fountain Gate:*

Near by was the **KING’S POOL** (which see), probably the pool — now deeply buried — which is today represented by the Birket el Kamra. Here Nehemiah apparently thought of turning into the city, “but there was no place for the beast that was under me to pass” (2:14), so he went up by the *Nachal* (Kidron), viewed the walls from there, and then retraced his steps to the Valley Gate. There is another possibility, and that is that the King’s

Pool was the pool (which certainly existed) at Gihon, in which case the Fountain Gate may also have been in that neighborhood.

All the archaeological evidence is in favor of the wall having crossed the mouth of the Tyropeon by the great dam at this time, and the propinquity of this structure to the Fountain Gate is seen in <sup><418></sup>Nehemiah 3:15, where we read that Shallum built the Fountain Gate “and covered it, and set up the doors thereof .... and the bars thereof, and the wall of the pool of Shelah (*see SILOAM*) by the *KING’S GARDEN* (which see), even unto the stairs that go down from the city of David.” All these localities were close together at the mouth of el Wad.

Passing from here we can follow the circuit of the city from the accounts of the rebuilding of the walls in <sup><418></sup>Nehemiah 3:15 f. The wall from here was carried “over against the sepulchres of David,” which we know to have stood in the original “City of David” above Gihon, past “the pool that was made,” and “the house of the Gibborim” (mighty men) — both unknown sites. It is clear that the wall is being carried along the edge of the southeastern hill toward the temple. We read of two angles in the wall — both needed by the geographical conditions — the high priest’s house, of “the tower that standeth out” (supposed to have been unearthed by Warren), and the wall of the *OPHEL* (which see).

### *16. Water Gate:*

There is also mention of a Water Gate in this position, which is just where one would expect a road to lead from the temple-area down to Gihon. From the great number of companies engaged in building, it may be inferred that all along this stretch of wall from the Tyropeon to the temple, the destruction of the walls had been specially great.

### *17. Horse Gate:*

Proceeding North, we come to the Horse Gate. This was close to the entry to the king’s house (<sup><2116></sup>2 Kings 11:16; <sup><4215></sup>2 Chronicles 23:15; <sup><2314></sup>Jeremiah 31:40). The expression used, “above” the Horse Gate, may imply that the gate itself may have been uninjured; it may have been a kind of rock-cut passage or tunnel. It cannot have been far from the present southeastern angle of the city. Thence “repaired the priests, every one over against his own house” — the houses of these people being to the East of the temple. Then comes the *GATE OF HAMMIPHKAD* (which see), the ascent (or

“upper chamber,” margin) of the corner, and finally the *SHEEP GATE* (which see), which was repaired by the goldsmiths and merchants.

### *18. Sheep Gate:*

This last gate was the point from which the circuit of the repairs was traced. The references, <sup><460></sup>Nehemiah 3:1,31; 12:39, clearly show that it was at the eastern extremity of the north wall.

The details of the gates and buildings in the north wall as described by Nehemiah, are difficult, and certainty is impossible; this side must always necessarily have been the weak side for defense because it was protected by no, or at best by very little, natural valley. As has been said, we cannot be certain whether Nehemiah is describing a wall which on its western two-thirds corresponded with the first or the second wall of Josephus. Taking the first theory as probable, we may plan it as follows: West of the Sheep Gate two towers are mentioned (<sup><460></sup>Nehemiah 3:1; 12:39). Of these *HANANEL* (which see) was more easterly than *HAMMEAH* (which see), and, too, it would appear from Zec 14:10 to have been the most northerly point of the city. Probably then two towers occupied the important hill where afterward stood the fortress Baris and, later, the Antonia. At the Hammeah tower the wall would descend into the Tyropeon to join the eastern extremity of the first wall where in the time of Josephus stood the Council House (BJ, V, iv, 2).

### *19. Fish Gate:*

It is generally considered that the *FISH GATE* (which see) (<sup><460></sup>Nehemiah 3:3; 12:39; <sup><3010></sup>Zephaniah 1:10; <sup><4314></sup>2 Chronicles 33:14) stood across the Tyropeon in much the same way as the modern Damascus Gate does now, only considerably farther South. It was probably so called because here the men of Tyre sold their fish (<sup><4616></sup>Nehemiah 13:16). It is very probably identical with the “Middle Gate” of <sup><2408></sup>Jeremiah 39:3. With this region are associated the *MISHNEH* (which see) or “second quarter” (<sup><3010></sup>Zephaniah 1:10 margin) and the *MAKTESH* (which see) or “mortar” (<sup><3011></sup>Zephaniah 1:11).

### *20. “Old Gate”:*

The next gate westward, after apparently a considerable interval, is translated in English Versions of the Bible the “*OLD GATE*” (which see), but is more correctly the “Gate of the old ....”; what the word thus

qualified is, is doubtful. <sup><4816></sup>Nehemiah 3:6 margin suggests “old city” or “old wall,” whereas Mitchell (Wall of Jerusalem according to the Book of Neh) proposes “old pool,” taking the pool in question to be the so-called “Pool of Hezekiah.” According to the view here accepted, that the account of Nehemiah refers only to the first wall, the expression “old wall would be peculiarly suitable, as here must have been some part of that first wall which went back unaltered to the time of Solomon. The western wall to the extent of 400 cubits had been rebuilt after its destruction by Jehoash, king of Israel (see IX, 12, below), and Manasseh had repaired all the wall from Gihon round North and then West to the Fish Gate. This gate has also been identified with the *Sha`ar ha-Pinnah*, or “Corner Gate,” of <sup><21413></sup>2 Kings 14:13; <sup><4253></sup>2 Chronicles 25:23; <sup><4613></sup>Jeremiah 31:38; Zec 14:10, and with the *Sha`ar ha-Ri`shon*, or “First Gate,” of Zec 14:10, which is identified as the same as the Corner Gate; indeed *ri`shon* (“first”) is probably a textual error for *yashan* (“old”). If this is so, this “Gate of the Old” or “Corner Gate” must have stood near the northwestern corner of the city, somewhere near the present Jaffa Gate.

### 21. Gate of Ephraim:

The next gate mentioned is the Gate of Ephraim (<sup><4129></sup>Nehemiah 12:39), which, according to <sup><21413></sup>2 Kings 14:13; <sup><4253></sup>2 Chronicles 25:23, was 400 cubits or 600 ft. from the Corner Gate. This must have been somewhere on the western wall; it is scarcely possible to believe, as some writers would suggest, that there could have been no single gate between the Corner Gate near the northwestern corner and the Valley Gate on the southern wall.

### 22. Tower of the Furnaces:

The “Broad Wall” appears to correspond to the southern stretch of the western wall as far as the “Tower of the Furnaces” or ovens, which was probably the extremely important corner tower now incorporated in “Bishop Gobat’s School.” This circuit of the walls satisfies fairly well all the conditions; the difficulties are chiefly on the North and West. It is a problem how the Gate of Ephraim comes to be omitted in the account of the repairs, but G.A. Smith suggests that it may be indicated by the expression, “throne of the governor beyond the river” (<sup><4816></sup>Nehemiah 3:7). See, however, Mitchell (loc. cit.). If theory be accepted that the second wall already existed, the Corner Gate and the Fish Gate will have to be placed farther north.

### *23. The Gate of Benjamin:*

In Old Testament as in later times, some of the gates appear to have received different names at various times. Thus the Sheep Gate, at the northeastern angle, appears to be identical with the Gate of Benjamin or Upper Gate of Benjamin (~~2410B~~ Jeremiah 20:2; 37:13; 38:7); the prophet was going, apparently, the nearest way to his home in Anathoth. In Zec 14:10 the breadth of the city is indicated, where the prophet writes, “She shall be lifted up, and shall dwell in her place, from Benjamin’s gate unto the place of the first gate, unto the corner gate.”

### *24. Upper Gate of the Temple:*

The Upper Gate of the Temple (~~1255B~~ 2 Kings 15:35; ~~1420B~~ 2 Chronicles 27:3; compare ~~1420B~~ 2 Chronicles 23:20; ~~3890B~~ Ezekiel 9:2) is probably another name for the same gate. It must be remembered the gates were, as excavations have shown us, reduced to a minimum in fortified sites: they were sources of weakness.

The general outline of the walls and gates thus followed is in the main that existing from Nehemiah back until the early Judean monarchy, and possibly to Solomon.

### *25. The Earlier Walls:*

Of the various destructions and repairs which occurred during the time of the monarchy, a sufficient account is given in IX below, on the history. Solomon was probably the first to enclose the northwestern hill within the walls, and to him usually is ascribed all the northern and western stretch of the “First Wall”; whether his wall ran down to the mouth of the Tyropeon, or only skirted the summit of the northwestern hill is uncertain, but the latter view is probable. David was protected by the powerful fortifications of the Jebusites, which probably enclosed only the southeastern hill; he added to the defenses the fortress MILLO (which see). It is quite possible that the original Jebusite city had but one gate, on the North (~~1085B~~ 2 Samuel 15:2), but the city must have overflowed its narrow limits during David’s reign and have needed an extended and powerful defense, such as Solomon made, to secure the capital. For the varied history and situation of the walls in the post-Biblical period, see IX (“History”), below.

## VII. ANTIQUARIAN REMAINS CONNECTED WITH THE WATER-SUPPLY.

In a city like Jerusalem, where the problem of a water-supply must always have been one of the greatest, it is only natural that some of the most ancient and important works should have centered round it. The three sources of supply have been

- (1) springs,
- (2) cisterns,
- (3) aqueducts.

### *1. Gihon: The Natural Spring:*

(1) The natural springs have been described in II, 3; but connected with them, and especially with the city's greatest and most venerated source, the Gihon, there are certain antiquarian remains of great interest.

(a) The "Virgin's Fount," ancient Gihon, arises, as has been described (II, 3), in a rocky cleft in the Kidron valley bottom; under natural conditions the water would run along the valley bed, now deeply buried under debris of the ancient city, and doubtless when the earliest settlers made their dwellings in the caves (which have been excavated) on the sides of the valley near the spring, they and their flocks lived on the banks of a stream of running water in a sequestered valley among waterless hills. From, however, a comparatively early period — at the least 2000 BC — efforts were made to retain some of the water, and a solid stone dam was built which converted the sources into a pool of considerable depth. Either then, or somewhat later, excavations were made in the cliffs overhanging the pool, whereby some at least of these waters were conducted, by means of a tunnel, into the heart of the southeastern hill, "Ophel," so that the source could be reached from within the city walls. There are today two systems of tunnels which are usually classed as one under the name of the "Siloam aqueduct," but the two systems are probably many centuries apart in age.

### *2. The Aqueduct of the Canaanites:*

The older tunnel begins in a cave near the source and then runs westward for a distance of 67 ft.; at the inner end of the tunnel there is a

perpendicular shaft which ascends for over 40 ft. and opens into a lofty rock-cut passage which runs, with a slight lateral curvature, to the North, in the direction of the surface. The upper end has been partially destroyed, and the roof, which had fallen in, was long ago partially restored by a masonry arch. At this part of the passage the floor is abruptly interrupted across its whole width by a deep chasm which Warren partially excavated, but which Parker has since conclusively shown to end blindly. It is clear that this great gallery, which is 8 to 9 ft. wide, and in places as high or higher, was constructed (a natural cavern possibly utilized in the process) to enable the inhabitants of the walled-in city above it to reach the spring. It is in fact a similar work to the great water-passage at GEZER (which see), which commenced in a rock-cut pit 26 ft. deep and descended with steps, to a depth of 94 ft. 6 inches below the level of the rock surface; the sloping passage was 23 ft. high and 13 ft. broad. This passage which could be dated with certainty as before 1500 BC, and almost certainly as early as 2000 BC, was cut out with flint knives and apparently was made entirely to reach a great underground source of water.

### *3. Warren's Shaft:*

The discovery of this Gezer well-passage has thrown a flood of light upon the "Warren's Shaft" in Jerusalem, which would appear to have been made for an exactly similar purpose. The chasm mentioned before may have been an effort to reach the source from a higher point, or it may have been made, or later adapted, to prevent ingress by means of the system of tunnels into the city. This passage is in all probability the "watercourse" (*tsinnor*) of <sup><1018></sup>2 Samuel 5:8 up which, apparently, Joab and his men (<sup><13106></sup>1 Chronicles 11:6) secretly made their way; they must have waded through the water at the source, ascended the perpendicular shaft (a feat performed in 1910 by some British officers without any assistance from ladders), and then made their way into the heart of the city along the great tunnel. Judging by the similar Gezer water tunnel, this great work may not only have existed in David's time, but may have been constructed as much as 1,000 years before.

### *4. Hezekiah's "Siloam" Aqueduct:*

The true Siloam tunnel is a considerably later work. It branches off from the older aqueduct at a point 67 ft. from the entrance, and after running an exceedingly winding course of 1,682 ft., it empties itself into the Pool of



Siloam (total length 1,749 ft.). The whole canal is rock cut; it is 2 to 3 ft. wide, and varies in height from 16 ft. at the south end to 4 ft. 6 inches at the lowest point, near the middle. The condition of this tunnel has recently been greatly changed through Captain Parker's party having cleared out the accumulated silt of centuries; before this, parts of the channel could be traversed only with the greatest difficulty and discomfort. The primitive nature of this construction is shown by the many false passages made, and also by the extensive curves which greatly add to its length. This latter may also be partly due to the workmen following lines of soft strata. M. Clermont-Ganneau and others have thought that one or more of the great curves may have been made deliberately to avoid the tombs of the kings of Judah. The method of construction of the tunnel is narrated in the Siloam Inscription (*see SILOAM*). It was begun simultaneously from each end, and the two parties met in the middle. It is a remarkable thing that there is a difference of level of only one foot at each end; but the lofty height of the southern end is probably due to a lowering of the floor here after the junction was effected. It is practically certain that this great work is that referred to in <sup><223></sup>2 Kings 20:20: "Now the rest of the acts of Hezekiah, and all his might, and how he made the pool, and the conduit, and brought water into the city, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah?" And in <sup><443></sup>2 Chronicles 32:30: "This same Hezekiah also stopped the upper spring of the waters of Gihon, and brought them straight down on the west side of the city of David."

### *5. Other Aqueducts at Gihon:*

In addition to these two conduits, which have a direct Scriptural interest, there are remains of at least two other aqueducts which take their origin at the Virgin's Fount — one a channel deeply cut in rock along the western sides of the Kidron valley, found by Captain Parker, and the other a built channel, lined with very good cement, which takes its rise at a lower level than any of the other conduits close to the before-mentioned rocky cleft from which the water rises, and runs in a very winding direction along the western side of the Kidron. This the present writer has described in PEFS, 1902. One of these, perhaps more probably the former, may be the conduit which is referred to as Shiloah ([shiloach]), or "conducted" (<sup><386></sup>Isaiah 8:6), before the construction of Hezekiah's work (*see SILOAM*).

There are other caves and rock-cut channels around the ancient Gihon which cannot fully be described here, but which abundantly confirm the sanctity of the site.

#### 6. *Bir Eyyub:*

(b) Bir Eyyub has a depth of 125 ft.; the water collects at the bottom in a large rock-hewn chamber, and it is clear that it has been deepened at some period, because at the depth of 113 ft. there is a collecting chamber which is now replaced by the deeper one. Various rock-cut passages or staircases were found by Warren in the neighborhood of this well.

#### 7. *Varieties of Cisterns:*

(2) The cisterns and tanks. — Every ancient site in the hill country of Palestine is riddled with cisterns for the storage of rain water. In Jerusalem for very many centuries the private resident has depended largely upon the water collected from the roof of his house for all domestic purposes. Such cisterns lie either under or alongside the dwelling. Many of the earliest of these excavations are bottle-shaped, with a comparatively narrow mouth cut through the hard *Mizzeh* and a large rounded excavation made in the underlying Melekeh (see II, 1 above). Other ancient cisterns are cavities hewn in the rock, of irregular shape, with a roof of harder rock and often several openings. The later forms are vaulted over, and are either cut in the rock or sometimes partially built in the superlying rubbish.

For more public purposes large cisterns were made in the *Charam*, or temple-area. Some 3 dozen are known and planned; the largest is calculated to contain 3,000,000 gallons. Such structures were made largely for the religious ritual, but, as we shall see, they have been supplied by other sources than the rainfall. In many parts of the city open tanks have been constructed, such a tank being known in Arabic as a *birkeh*, or, followed by a vowel, *birket*. With most of these there is considerable doubt as to their date of construction, but probably none of them, in their present form at any rate, antedates the Roman period.

#### 8. *Birket Israel:*

Within the city walls the largest reservoir is the Birket Israel which extends from the northeastern angle of the *Charam* westward for 360 ft. It is 125 ft. wide and was originally 80 ft. deep, but has in recent years been largely

filled up by the city's refuse. The eastern and western ends of this pool are partially rock-cut and partly masonry, the masonry of the former being a great dam 45 ft. thick, the lower part of which is continuous with the ancient eastern wall of the temple-area. The sides of the pool are entirely masonry because this reservoir is built across the width of the valley referred to before (III, 2) as "St. Anne's Valley." Other parts of this valley are filled with debris to the depth of 100 ft. The original bottom of the reservoir is covered with a layer of about 19 inches of very hard concrete and cement. There was a great conduit at the eastern end of the pool built of massive stones, and connected with the pool by a perforated stone with three round holes 5 1/2 inches in diameter. The position of this outlet shows that all water over a depth of 22 ft. must have flowed away. Some authorities consider this pool to have been pre-exilic. By early Christian pilgrims it was identified as the "Sheep Pool" of ~~REB~~ John 5:2, and at a later period, until quite recent times, it was supposed to have been the Pool of Bethesda.

### *9. Pool of Bethesda:*

The discovery, a few years ago, of the long-lost Piscina in the neighborhood of the "Church of Anne," which was without doubt the Pool of Bethesda of the 5th century AD, has caused this identification to be abandoned.

*See BETHESDA.*

### *10. The Twin Pools:*

To the West of the Birket Israel are the "twin pools" which extend under the roadway in the neighborhood of the "Ecce Homo" arch. The western one is 165 ft. by 20 ft. and the eastern 127 ft. by 20 ft. M. Clermont-Ganneau considers them to be identical with the Pool Struthius of Josephus (BJ, V, xi, 4), but others, considering that they are actually made in the fosse of the Antonia, give them a later date of origin. In connection with these pools a great aqueduct was discovered in 1871, 2 1/2-3 ft. wide and in places 12 ft. high, running from the neighborhood of the Damascus Gate — but destroyed farther north — and from the pools another aqueduct runs in the direction of the *Charam*.

### *11. Birket Hammam el Batrak:*

On the northwestern hill, between the Jaffa Gate and the Church of the Sepulchre there is a large open reservoir, known to the modern inhabitants of the city as Birket Kammam el Batrak, “the Pool of the Patriarch’s Bath.” It is 240 ft. long (North to South), 144 ft. broad and 19-24 ft. deep. The cement lining of the bottom is cracked and practically useless. The eastern wall of this pool is particularly massive, and forms the base of the remarkably level street Karet en Nasara, or “Christian Street”; it is a not improbable theory that this is actually a fragment of the long-sought “second” wall. If so, the pool, which is proved to have once extended 60 ft. farther north, may have been constructed originally as part of the fosse. On the other hand, this pool appears to have been the Amygdalon Pool, or “Pool of the Tower” (*berekhath ha-mighdalin*), mentioned by Josephus (Jewish Wars, V, xi, 4), which was the scene of the activities of the 10th legion, and this seems inconsistent with the previous theory, as the events described seem to imply that the second wall ran outside the pool. The popular travelers’ name, “Pool of Hezekiah,” given to this reservoir is due to theory, now quite discredited, that this is the pool referred to in ~~2~~2 Kings 20:20, “He made the pool, and the conduit, and brought water into the city.” Other earlier topographers have identified it as the “upper pool” of ~~2308~~Isaiah 7:3; 36:2.

### *12. Birket Mamilla:*

The Birket Kammam el Batrak is supplied with water from the Birket Mamilla, about 1/2 mile to the West. This large pool, 293 ft. long by 193 ft. broad and 19 1/2 ft. deep, lies in the midst of a large Moslem cemetery at the head of the Wady Mes, the first beginning of the Wady er Rababi (*Hinnom*). The aqueduct which connects the two pools springs from the eastern end of the Birket Mamilla, runs a somewhat winding course and enters the city near the Jaffa Gate. The aqueduct is in bad repair, and the water it carries, chiefly during heavy rain, is filthy. In the Middle Ages it was supposed that this was the “Upper Pool of Gihon” (*see GIHON*), but this and likewise the “highway of the *FULLER’S FIELD*” (which *see*) are now located elsewhere. Wilson and others have suggested that it is the “Serpent’s Pool” of Josephus (Jewish Wars, V, iii, 2). Titus leveled “all the places from Scopus to Herod’s monument which adjoins the pool called that of the Serpent.” Like many such identifications, there is not very much to be said for or against it; it is probable that the pool existed at the time of

the siege. It is likely that this is the Beth Memel of the Talmud (the Babylonian Talmud, `Erubin 51 b; Sanhedrin 24 a; Bere'shith Rabba' 51).

### *13. Birket es Sultan:*

The Birket es Sultan is a large pool — or, more strictly speaking, enclosure — 555 ft. North and South by 220 ft. East and West. It is bounded on the West and North by a great curve of the low-level aqueduct as it passes along and then across the Wady er Rababi. The southern side consists of a massive dam across the valley over which the Bethlehem carriage road runs. The name may signify either the “great” pool or be connected with the fact that it was reconstructed in the 16th century by the sultan Suleiman ibn Selim, as is recorded on an inscription upon a wayside fountain upon the southern wall. This pool is registered in the cartulary of the Holy Sepulchre as the Lacus Germani, after the name of a knight of Germanus, who built or renovated the pool in 1176 AD. Probably a great part of the pool is a catchment area, and the true reservoir is the rock-cut birkeh at the southern end, which has recently been cleaned out. It is extremely difficult to believe that under any conditions any large proportion of the whole area could ever have even been filled. Today the reservoir at the lower end holds, after the rainy season, some 10 or 12 ft. of very dirty water, chiefly the street drainage of the Jaffa road, while the upper two-thirds of the enclosure is used as a cattle market on Fridays. The water is now used for sprinkling the dusty roads in dry seasons.

The Pool of Siloam and the now dry Birket el Kamra are described under *SILLOAM* (which see).

There are other tanks of considerable size in and around the city, e.g. the Birket Sitti Miriam, near “St. Stephen’s Gate,” an uncemented pool in the Wady Joz, connected with which there is a rockcut aqueduct and others, but they are not of sufficient historical importance to merit description here.

### *14. “Solomon’s Pools”:*

**(3)** The conduits bringing water to the city from a distance are called the “high-level” and “low-level” aqueducts respectively, because they reached the city at different levels — the former probably somewhere near the present Jaffa Gate, the latter at the temple-platform.

### 15. Low-Level Aqueduct:

The low-level aqueduct which, though out of repair, can still be followed along its whole course, conveyed water from three great pools in the Wady `Artas, 7 miles South of Jerusalem. They are usually called "Solomon's pools," in reference perhaps partly to <sup>2006</sup>Ecclesiastes 2:6: "I made me pools o water, to water therefrom the forest where trees were reared," but as any mighty work in Palestine is apt to be referred to the wise king of Israel, much stress cannot be laid on the name. These three storage reservoirs are constructed across the breadth of the valley, the lowest and largest being 582 ft. long by 177 ft. broad and, at the lowest end, 50 ft. deep. Although the overflow waters of `Ain es Saleh, commonly known as the "sealed fountain" (compare <sup>2002</sup>Song of Solomon 4:12), reach the pools, the chief function was probably to collect the flood waters from the winter rains, and the water was passed from tank to tank after purification. There are in all four springs in this valley which supply the aqueduct which still conveys water to Bethlehem, where it passes through the hill by means of a tunnel and then, after running, winding along the sides of the hill, it enters another tunnel now converted into a storage tank for Jerusalem; from this it runs along the mountain sides and along the southern slopes of the site of Jerusalem to the *Charam*. The total length of this aqueduct is nearly 12 miles, but at a later date the supply was increased by the construction of a long extension of the conduit for a further 28 miles to Wady `Arrub on the road to Hebron, another 5 miles directly South of the pools. Here, too, there is a reservoir, the Birket el `Arrub, for the collection of the flood-water, and also several small springs, which are conducted in a number of underground rock-cut channels to the aqueduct. The total length of the low-level aqueduct is about 40 miles, and the fall in level from Birket el `Arrub (2,645 ft. above sea-level) at its far end to el Kas, the termination in the *Charam* Jerusalem (2,410 ft. above sea-level), is 235 ft.

### 16. High-Level Aqueduct:

The high-level aqueduct commences in a remarkable chain of wells connected with a tunnel, about 4 miles long, in the Wady Biar, "the Valley of Wells." Upward of 50 wells along the valley bottom supplied each its quotient; the water thence passed through a pool where the solid matter settled, and traversed a tunnel 1,700 ft. long into the `Artas valley. Here, where its level was 150 ft. above that of the low-level aqueduct, the

conduit received the waters of the “sealed fountain,” and finally “delivered them in Jerusalem at a level of about 20 ft. above that of the Jaffa Gate” (Wilson). The most remarkable feature of this conduit is the inverted siphon of perforated limestone blocks, forming a stone tube 15 inches in diameter, which carried the water across the valley near Rachel’s Tomb.

### *17. Dates of Construction of These Aqueducts:*

On a number of these blocks, Latin inscriptions with the names of centurions of the time of Severus (195 AD) have been found, and this has led many to fix a date to this great work. So good an authority as Wilson, however, considers that these inscriptions may refer to repairs, and that the work is more probably Herodian. Unless the accounts of Josephus (Jewish Wars, V, iv, 4; II, xvii, 9) are exaggerated, Herod must have had some means of bringing abundant running water into the city at the level obtained by this conduit. The late Dr. Schick even suggested a date as early as Hyrcanus (135-125 BC). With regard to the low-level aqueduct, we have two definite data. First Josephus (Ant., XVIII, iii, 2) states that Pontius Pilate “undertook to bring a current of water to Jerusalem, and did it with the sacred money, and derived the origin of the stream from the distance of 200 furlongs,” over 22 miles; in Jewish Wars, II, ix, 4 he is said to have brought the water “from 400 furlongs” — probably a copyist’s error. But these references must either be to restorations or to the extension from Wady `Arrub to Wady `Artas (28 miles), for the low-level aqueduct from the pools to Jerusalem is certainly the same construction as the aqueduct from these pools to the “Frank Mountain,” the Herodium, and that, according to the definite statements of Josephus (Ant., XV, ix, 4; BJ, I, xxi, 10), was made by Herod the Great. On the whole the usual view is that the high-level aqueduct was the work of Severus, the low-level that of Herod, with an extension southward by Pontius Pilate.

Jerus still benefits somewhat from the low-level aqueduct which is in repair as far as Bethlehem, though all that reaches the city comes only through a solitary 4-inch pipe. The high-level aqueduct is hopelessly destroyed and can be traced only in places; the wells of Wady Biar are choked and useless, and the long winding aqueduct to Wady `Arrub is quite broken.

## VIII. TOMBS, ANTIQUARIAN REMAINS AND ECCLESIASTICAL SITES.

### *1. The “Tombs of the Kings”:*

Needless to say all the known ancient tombs in the Jerusalem area have been rifled of their contents long ago. The so-called Tombs of the Kings in the Wady el Joz are actually the monument of Queen Helena of Adiabene, a convert to Judaism (circa 48 AD). Josephus (Ant., XX, iv, 3) states that her bones, with those of members of her family, were buried “at the pyramids,” which were 3 in number and distant from Jerusalem 3 furlongs. A Hebrew inscription upon a sarcophagus found here by De Saulcy ran: (*tsarah malkethah*), “Queen Sarah,” possibly the Jewish name of Queen Helena.

### *2. “Herod’s Tomb”:*

On the western side of the Wady el Mes (the higher part of Hinnom), is a very interesting Greek tomb containing beautifully carved sarcophagi. These are commonly known as “Herod’s Tombs” (although Herod the Great was buried on the Herodium), and, according to Schick, one of the sarcophagi may have belonged to Mariamne, Herod’s wife. A more probable theory is that this is the tomb of the high priest Ananias (Jewish Wars, V, xii, 2).

### *3. “Absalom’s Tomb”:*

On the eastern side of the Kidron, near the southeastern angle of the *Charam*, are 3 conspicuous tombs. The most northerly, *Tantur Fer’on*, generally called “Absalom’s Tomb,” is a Greek-Jewish tomb of the Hasmonean period, and, according to Conder, possibly the tomb of Alexander Janneus (HDB, article “Jerusalem”). S. of this is the traditional “Grotto of James,” which we know by a square Hebrew inscription over the pillars to be the family tomb of certain members of the priestly family (<sup><13245></sup>1 Chronicles 24:15), of the Beni Hazir. It may belong to the century before Christ.

The adjoining traditional tomb of Zachariah is a monolithic monument cut out of the living rock, 16 ft. square and 30 ft. high. It has square pilasters at the corners, Ionic pillars between, and a pyramidal top. Its origin is unknown; its traditional name is due to our Lord’s word in <sup><1235></sup>Matthew 23:35; <sup><1215></sup>Luke 11:51 (*see ZACHARIAH*).



#### 4. The “Egyptian Tomb”:

A little farther down the valley of the Kidron, at the commencement of the village of Siloam, is another rock-cut tomb, the so-called Egyptian Tomb, or according to some, “the tomb of Solomon’s Egyptian wife.” It is a monolith 18 ft. square and 11 ft. high, and the interior has at one time been used as a chapel. It is now Russian property. It probably belongs to much the same period as the three before-mentioned tombs, and, like them, shows strong Egyptian influence.

The so-called “Tombs of the Judges” belong to the Roman period, as do the scores of similar excavations in the same valley. The “Tombs of the Prophets” on the western slopes of the Mount of Olives are now considered to belong to the 4th or 5th Christian century.

Near the knoll over Jeremiah’s Grotto, to the West and Northwest, are a great number of tombs, mostly Christian. The more northerly members of the group are now included in the property of the Dominicans attached to the Church of Stephen, but one, the southernmost, has attracted a great deal of attention because it was supposed by the late General Gordon to be the tomb of Christ.

#### 5. The “Garden Tomb”:

In its condition when found it was without doubt, like its neighbors, a Christian tomb of about the 5th century, and it was full of skeletons. Whether it may originally have been a Jewish tomb is unproved; it certainly could not have been recognized as a site of any sanctity until General Gordon promulgated his theory (see PEFS, 1892, 120-24; see also *GOLGOTHA*).

#### 6. Tomb of “Simon the Just”:

The Jews greatly venerate a tomb on the eastern side of the Wady el Joz, not far South of the great North Road; they consider it to be the tomb of Simon the Just, but it is in all probability not a Jewish tomb at all.

#### 7. Other Antiquities:

Only passing mention can here be made of certain remains of interest connected with the exterior walls of the *Charam*. The foundation walls of the temple-platform are built, specially upon the East, South and West, of magnificent blocks of smooth, drafted masonry with an average height of 3

1/2 ft. One line, known as the “master course,” runs for 600 ft. westward from the southeastern angle, with blocks 7 ft. high. Near the southeastern angle at the foundation itself, certain of the blocks were found by the Palestine Exploration Fund engineers to be marked with Phoenician characters, which it was supposed by many at the time of their discovery indicated their Solomonic origin. It is now generally held that these “masons’ marks” may just as well have been used in the time of Herod the Great, and on other grounds it is held that all this magnificent masonry is due to the vast reconstruction of the Temple which this great monarch initiated (*see TEMPLE*). In the western wall of the *Charam*, between the southwestern corner and the “Jewish wailing place,” lies “Robinson’s Arch.” It is the spring of an arch 50 ft. wide, projecting from the temple-wall; the bridge arising from it had a span of 50 ft., and the pier on the farther side was discovered by Warren. Under the bridge ran a contemporary paved Roman street, and beneath the unbroken pavement was found, lying inside a rock aqueduct, a voussoir of an older bridge. This bridge connected the temple-enclosure with the upper city in the days of the Hasmonean kings. It was broken down in 63 BC by the Jews in anticipation of the attack of Pompey (Antiquities, XIV, iv, 2; BJ, I, vii, 2), but was rebuilt by Herod in 19 BC (Jewish Wars, VI, viii, 1; vi, 2), and finally destroyed in 70 AD.

Nearly 600 ft. farther North, along this western temple-wall is Wilson’s Arch, which lies under the surface within the causeway which crosses the Tyropeon to the Babylonian es Silseleh of the *Charam*; although not itself very ancient there are here, deeper down, arches belonging to the Herodian causeway which here approached the temple-platform.

### *8. Ecclesiastical Sites:*

With regard to the common ecclesiastical sites visited by pious pilgrims little need be said here. The congeries of churches that is included under that name of Church of the Holy Sepulchre includes a great many minor sites of the scenes of the Passion which have no serious claims. Besides the Holy Sepulchre itself — which, apart from its situation, cannot be proved or disproved, as it has actually been destroyed — the only important site is that of “Mount Calvary.” All that can be said is that if the Sepulchre is genuine, then the site may be also; it is today the hollowed-out shell of a rocky knoll encased in marble and other stones and riddled with chapels.

See *GOLGOTHA*.

The coenaculum, close to the Moslem “Tomb of David” (a site which has no serious claims), has been upheld by Professor Sanday (Sacred Sites of the Gospels) as one which has a very strong tradition in its favor. The most important evidence is that of Epiphanius, who states that when Hadrian visited Jerusalem in 130, one of the few buildings left standing was “the little Church of God, on the site where the disciples, returning after the Ascension of the Saviour from Olivet, had gone up to the Upper room, for there it had been built, that is to say in the quarter of Zion.” In connection with this spot there has been pointed out from early Christian times the site of the House of Caiaphas and the site of the death of the Virgin Mary — the Dormitio Sanctae Virginis. It is in consequence of this latter tradition that the German Roman Catholics have now erected here their magnificent new church of the Dormition. A rival line of traditions locates the tomb of the Virgin in the Kidron valley near Gethsemane, where there is a remarkable underground chapel belonging to the Greeks.

## IX. HISTORY.

Pre-Israelite period. — The beginnings of Jerusalem are long before recorded history: at various points in the neighborhood, e.g. at el Bukei`a to the Southwest, and at the northern extremity of the Mount of Olives to the Northeast, were very large settlements of Paleolithic man, long before the dawn of history, as is proved by the enormous quantities of Celts scattered over the surface. It is certain that the city’s site itself was occupied many centuries before David, and it is a traditional view that the city called *SALEM* (which see) (<sup>OLD</sup>Genesis 14:18), over which Melchizedek was king, was identical with Jerusalem.

### *1. Tell el-Amarna Correspondence:*

The first certain reference to this city is about 1450 BC, when the name Ur-u-salem occurs in several letters belonging to the Tell el-Amarna Letters correspondence. In 7 of these letters occurs the name Abd Khiba, and it is clear that this man was “king,” or governor of the city, as the representative of Pharaoh of Egypt. In this correspondence Abd Khiba represents himself as hard pressed to uphold the rights of his suzerain against the hostile forces which threaten to overwhelm him. Incidentally we may gather that the place was then a fortified city, guarded partly by mercenary Egyptian troops, and there are reasons for thinking that then

ruler of Egypt, Amenhotep IV, had made it a sanctuary of his god Aten — the sun-disc. Some territory, possibly extending as far west as Ajalon, seems to have been under the jurisdiction of the governor. Professor Sayce has stated that Abd Khiba was probably a Hittite chief, but this is doubtful. The correspondence closes abruptly, leaving us in uncertainty with regard to the fate of the writer, but we know that the domination of Egypt over Palestine suffered an eclipse about this time.

### *2. Joshua's Conquest:*

At the time of Joshua's invasion of Canaan, **ADONI-ZEDEK** (which see) is mentioned (<sup><000></sup>Joshua 10:1-27) as king of Jerusalem; he united with the kings of Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish and Eglon to fight against the Gibeonites who had made peace with Joshua; the 5 kings were defeated and, being captured in hiding at the cave Makkedah, were all slain. Another king, **ADONI-BEZEK** (which see) (whom some identify with Adoni-zedek), was defeated by Judah after the death of Joshua, and after being mutilated was brought to Jerusalem and died there (<sup><000></sup>Judges 1:1-7), after which it is recorded (<sup><000></sup>Judges 1:8) that Judah "fought against Jerusalem, and took it .... and set the city on fire." But it is clear that the city remained in the hands of the "Jebusites" for some years more (<sup><000></sup>Judges 1:21; 19:11), although it was theoretically reckoned on the southern border of Benjamin (<sup><000></sup>Joshua 15:8; 18:16,28). David, after he had reigned 7 1/2 years at Hebron, determined to make the place his capital and, about 1000 BC, captured the city.

### *3. Site of the Jebusite City:*

Up to this event it is probable that Jerusalem was like other contemporary fortified sites, a comparatively small place encircled with powerful walls, with but one or perhaps two gates; it is very generally admitted that this city occupied the ridge to the South of the temple long incorrectly called "Ophel," and that its walls stood upon steep rocky scarps above the Kidron valley on the one side, and the Tyropeon on the other. We have every reason to believe that the great system of tunnels, known as "Warren's Shaft" (see VII, 3, above) existed all through this period.

### *4. David:*

The account of the capture of Jerusalem by David is obscure, but it seems a probable explanation of a difficult passage (<sup><000></sup>2 Samuel 5:6-9) if we

conclude that the Jebusites, relying upon the extraordinary strength of their position, challenged David: “Thou shalt not come in hither, but the blind and the lame shall turn thee away” (<sup><1086></sup>2 Samuel 5:6 margin), and that David directed his followers to go up the “watercourse” and smite the “lame and the blind” — a term he in his turn applies mockingly to the Jebusites. “And Joab the son of Zeruiah went up first, and was made chief” (<sup><13106></sup>1 Chronicles 11:6). It seems at least probable that David’s men captured the city through a surprise attack up the great tunnels (see VII, 3, above). David having captured the stronghold “Zion,” renamed it the “City of David” and took up his residence there; he added to the strength of the fortifications “round about from the MILLO (which see) and onward”; with the assistance of Phoenician workmen supplied by Hiram, king of Tyre, he built himself “a house of cedar” (<sup><1081></sup>2 Samuel 5:11; compare 7:2). The ark of Yahweh was brought from the house of Obed-edom and lodged in a tent (<sup><1067></sup>2 Samuel 6:17) in the “city of David” (compare <sup><1081></sup>1 Kings 8:1). The threshing-floor of Araunah (<sup><1048></sup>2 Samuel 24:18), or Ornan (<sup><13115></sup>1 Chronicles 21:15), the Jebusite, was later purchased as the future site of the temple.

### *5. Expansion of the City:*

The Jerusalem which David captured was small and compact, but there are indications that during his reign it must have increased considerably by the growth of suburbs outside the Jebusite walls. The population must have been increased from several sources. The influx of David’s followers doubtless caused many of the older inhabitants to be crowded out of the walled area. There appear to have been a large garrison (<sup><1058></sup>2 Samuel 15:18; 20:7), many officials and priests and their families (<sup><1086></sup>2 Samuel 8:16-18; 20:23-26; 23:8 ff), and the various members of David’s own family and their relatives (<sup><1053></sup>2 Samuel 5:13-16; 14:24,28; <sup><1086></sup>1 Kings 1:5,53, etc.). It is impossible to suppose that all these were crowded into so narrow an area, while the incidental mention that Absalom lived two whole years in Jerusalem without seeing the king’s face implies suburbs (<sup><1042></sup>2 Samuel 14:24,28). The new dwellings could probably extend northward toward the site of the future temple and northwestward into and up the Tyropeon valley along the great north road. It is improbable that they could have occupied much of the western hill.

## 6. *Solomon:*

With the accession of Solomon, the increased magnificence of the court, the foreign wives and their establishments, the new officials and the great number of work people brought to the city for Solomon's great buildings must necessarily have enormously swelled the resident population, while the recorded buildings of the city, the temple, the king's house, the House of the Daughter of Pharaoh, the House of the Forest of Lebanon, the Throne Hall and the Pillared Hall (~~<1000>~~1 Kings 7:1-8) must have altered the whole aspect of the site. In consequence of these new buildings, the sanctuary together with the houses of the common folk, a new wall for the city was necessary, and we have a statement twice made that Solomon built "the wall of Jerusalem round about" (~~<1000>~~1 Kings 3:1; 9:15); it is also recorded that he built Millo (~~<1095>~~1 Kings 9:15,24; 11:27), and that "he repaired the breach of the city of David his father" (~~<1112>~~1 Kings 11:27). The question of the Millo is discussed elsewhere (*see MILLO*); the "breach" referred to may have been the connecting wall needed to include the Millo within the complete circle of fortifications, or else some part of David's fortification which his death had left incomplete.

## 7. *Solomon's City Wall:*

As regards the "Wall of Jerus" which Solomon built, it is practically certain that it was, on the North and West, that described by Josephus as the First Wall (see VI, 7 above). The vast rock-cut scarps at the southwestern corner testify to the massiveness of the building. Whether the whole of the southwestern hill was included is matter of doubt. Inasmuch as there are indications at Bliss's tower (see VI, 4th above) of an ancient wall running northeasterly, and enclosing the summit of the southwestern hill, it would appear highly probable that Solomon's wall followed that line; in this case this wall must have crossed the Tyropeon at somewhat the line of the existing southern wall, and then have run southeasterly to join the western wall of the old city of the Jebusites. The temple and palace buildings were all enclosed in a wall of finished masonry which made it a fortified place by itself — as it appears to have been through Hebrew history — and these walls, where external to the rest of the city, formed part of the whole circle of fortification.

Although Solomon built so magnificent a house for Yahweh, he erected in the neighborhood shrines to other local gods (~~<1110>~~1 Kings 11:7,8), a lapse

ascribed largely to the influence of his foreign wives and consequent foreign alliances.

### *8. The Disruption (933 BC):*

The disruption of the kingdom must have been a severe blow to Jerusalem, which was left the capital, no longer of a united state, but of a petty tribe. The resources which were at the command of Solomon for the building up of the city were suddenly cut off by Jeroboam's avowed policy, while the long state of war which existed between the two peoples — a state lasting 60 years (<sup><1148></sup>1 Kings 14:30; 15:6,16; 22:44) — must have been very injurious to the growth of commerce and the arts of peace.

### *9. Invasion of Shishak (928 BC):*

In the 5th year of Rehoboam (928), Shishak (*Sheshonq*) king of Egypt came up against Jerusalem (<sup><1145></sup>1 Kings 14:25 ff) and took "the fenced cities of Judah" (<sup><4124></sup>2 Chronicles 12:4 the King James Version). It has been commonly supposed that he besieged and captured Jerusalem itself, but as there is no account of the destruction of fortifications and as the name of this city has not been deciphered upon the Egyptian records of this campaign, it is at least as probable, and is as consistent with the Scriptural references, that Shishak was bought off with "the treasures of the house of Yahweh, and the treasures of the king's house" and "all the shields of gold which Solomon had made" (<sup><1145></sup>1 Kings 14:26).

### *10. City Plundered by Arabs:*

It is clear that by the reign of Jehoshaphat the city had again largely recovered its importance (compare 1 Kings 22), but in his son Jehoram's reign (849-842 BC) Judah was invaded and the royal house was pillaged by Philistines and Arabs (<sup><4216></sup>2 Chronicles 21:16-17). Ahaziah (842 BC), Jehoram's son, came to grief while visiting his maternal relative at Jezreel, and after being wounded in his chariot near Ibleam, and expiring at Megiddo, his body was carried to Jerusalem and there buried (<sup><1127></sup>2 Kings 9:27-28). Jerusalem was now the scene of the dramatic events which center round the usurpation and death of Queen Athaliah (<sup><2116></sup>2 Kings 11:16; <sup><4235></sup>2 Chronicles 23:15) and the coronation and reforms of her grandson Joash (<sup><1211></sup>2 Kings 12:1-16; <sup><4201></sup>2 Chronicles 24:1-14).

### *11. Hazael King of Syria Bought Off (797 BC):*

After the death of the good priest Jehoiada, it is recorded (<sup><4015></sup>2 Chronicles 24:15 ff) that the king was led astray by the princes of Judah and forsook the house of Yahweh, as a consequence of which the Syrians under Hazael came against Judah and Jerusalem, slew the princes and spoiled the land, Joash giving him much treasure from both palace and temple (<sup><1217></sup>2 Kings 12:17,18; <sup><4023></sup>2 Chronicles 24:23). Finally Joash was assassinated (<sup><1221></sup>2 Kings 12:20,21; <sup><4025></sup>2 Chronicles 24:25) “at the house of Millo, on the way that goeth down to Silla.”

### *12. Capture of the City of Jehoash of Israel:*

During the reign of Amaziah (797-729 BC), the murdered king’s son, a victory over Edom appears to have so elated the king that he wantonly challenged Jehoash of Israel to battle (<sup><1248></sup>2 Kings 14:8 f). The two armies met at Beth-shemesh, and Judah was defeated and “fled every man to his tent.” Jerusalem was unable to offer any resistance to the victors, and Jehoash “brake down the wall of Jerusalem from the gate of Ephraim unto the corner gate, 400 cubits” and then returned to Samaria, loaded with plunder and hostages (<sup><1244></sup>2 Kings 14:14). Fifteen years later, Amaziah was assassinated at Lachish whither he had fled from a conspiracy; nevertheless they brought his body upon horses, and he was buried in Jerusalem.

### *13. Uzziah’s Refortification (779-740 BC):*

Doubtless it was a remembrance of the humiliation which his father had undergone which made Uzziah (Azariah) strengthen his position. He subdued the Philistines and the Arabs in Gur, and put the Ammonites to tribute (<sup><4017></sup>2 Chronicles 26:7,8). He “built towers in Jerusalem at the corner gate, and at the valley gate, and at the turnings (Septuagint) of the walls, and fortified them” (<sup><4019></sup>2 Chronicles 26:9). He is also described as having made in Jerusalem “engines, invented by skillful men, to be on the towers and upon the battlements, wherewith to shoot arrows and great stones” (<sup><4035></sup>2 Chronicles 26:15). The city during its long peace with its northern neighbors appears to have recovered something of her prosperity in the days of Solomon. During his reign the city was visited by a great earthquake (Zec 14:4; <sup><3008></sup>Amos 1:1; compare <sup><2910></sup>Isaiah 9:10; 29:6; <sup><3011></sup>Amos 4:11; 8:8). Jotham, his son, built the upper gate of the house of Yahweh” (<sup><1255></sup>2 Kings 15:35; <sup><4028></sup>2 Chronicles 27:3), probably the same as the “upper gate of Benjamin” (<sup><2012></sup>Jeremiah 20:2). He also built much on



the wall of Ophel — probably the ancient fortress of Zion on the southeastern hill (~~<127B>~~ 2 Chronicles 27:3); *see* OPHEL.

#### *14. Ahaz Allies with Assyria (736-728 BC):*

His son Ahaz was soon to have cause to be thankful for his father's and grandfather's work in fortifying the city, for now its walls were successful in defense against the kings of Syria and Israel (~~<126B>~~ 2 Kings 16:5,6); but Ahaz, feeling the weakness of his little kingdom, bought with silver and gold from the house of Yahweh the alliance of Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria. He met the king at Damascus and paid him a compliment by having an altar similar to his made for his own ritual in the temple (~~<126A>~~ 2 Kings 16:10-12). His reign is darkened by a record of heathen practices, and specially by his making "his son to pass through the fire" — as a human sacrifice in, apparently, the Valley of Hinnom (~~<116B>~~ 1 Kings 16:3-4; compare ~~<143B>~~ 2 Chronicles 28:3).

#### *15. Hezekiah's Great Works:*

Hezekiah (727-699 BC), his son, succeeded to the kingdom at a time of surpassing danger. Samaria, and with it the last of Israel's kingdom, had fallen. Assyria had with difficulty been bought off, the people were largely apostate, yet Jerusalem was never so great and so inviolate to prophetic eyes (~~<200B>~~ Isaiah 7:4 f; 8:8,10; 10:28 f; 14:25-32, etc.). Early in his reign, the uprising of the Chaldean Merodach-baladan against Assyria relieved Judah of her greatest danger, and Hezekiah entered into friendly relations with this new king of Babylon, showing his messengers all his treasures (~~<230B>~~ Isaiah 39:1,2). At this time or soon after, Hezekiah appears to have undertaken great works in fitting his capital for the troubled times which lay before him. He sealed the waters of Gihon and brought them within the city to prevent the kings of Assyria from getting access to them (~~<127B>~~ 2 Kings 20:20; ~~<143B>~~ 2 Chronicles 32:4,30).

#### *See SILOAM.*

It is certain, if their tunnel was to be of any use, the southwestern hill must have been entirely enclosed, and it is at least highly probable that in the account (~~<143B>~~ 2 Chronicles 32:5), he "built up all the wall that was broken down, and built towers thereon (margin), and the other wall without," the last phrase may refer to the stretch of wall along the edge of the southwestern hill to Siloam. On the other hand, if that was the work of

Solomon, “the other wall” may have been the great buttressed dam, with a wall across it which closed the mouth of the Tyropeon, which was an essential part of his scheme of preventing a besieging army from getting access to water. He also strengthened MILLO (which see), on the southeastern hill. Secure in these fortifications, which made Jerusalem one of the strongest walled cities in Western Asia, Hezekiah, assisted, as we learn from Sennacherib’s descriptions, by Arab mercenaries, was able to buy off the great Assyrian king and to keep his city inviolate (~~2 Kings~~ 2 Kings 18:13-16). A second threatened attack on the city appears to be referred to in ~~2 Kings~~ 2 Kings 19:9-37.

### *16. His Religious Reforms:*

Hezekiah undertook reforms. “He removed the high places, and brake the pillars, and cut down the Asherah: and he brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made and .... he called it Nehushtan,” i.e. a piece of brass (~~2 Kings~~ 2 Kings 18:4).

Manasseh succeeded his father when but 12, and reigned 55 years (698-643) in Jerusalem (~~2 Kings~~ 2 Kings 21:1). He was tributary to Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal, as we know from their inscriptions; in one of the latter’s he is referred to as king “of the city of Judah.” The king of Assyria who, it is said (~~2 Chronicles~~ 2 Chronicles 33:11; compare Ant, X, iii, 2), carried Manasseh in chains to Babylon, was probably Ashurbanipal. How thoroughly the country was permeated by Assyrian influence is witnessed by the two cuneiform tablets recently found at Gezer belonging to this Assyrian monarch’s reign (PEFS, 1905, 206, etc.).

### *17. Manasseh’s Alliance with Assyria:*

The same influence, extending to the religious sphere, is seen in the record (~~2 Kings~~ 2 Kings 21:5) that Manasseh “built altars for all the host of heaven in the two courts of the house of Yahweh.” There are other references to the idolatrous practices introduced by this king (compare ~~Jeremiah~~ Jeremiah 7:18; ~~2 Kings~~ 2 Kings 23:5,11,12, etc.). He also filled Jerusalem from one end to the other with the innocent blood of martyrs faithful to Yahweh (~~2 Kings~~ 2 Kings 21:16; compare ~~Jeremiah~~ Jeremiah 19:4). Probably during this long reign of external peace the population of the city much increased, particularly by the influx of foreigners from less isolated regions.

### *18. His Repair of the Walls:*

Of this king's improvements to the fortifications of Jerusalem we have the statement (~~<4634>~~2 Chronicles 33:14), "He built an outer wall to the city of David, on the west side of Gihon in the valley, even to the entrance at the fish gate." This must have been a new or rebuilt wall for the whole eastern side of the city. He also compassed about the OPHEL (which see) and raised it to a very great height.

Manasseh was the first of the Judahic kings to be buried away from the royal tombs. He was buried (as was his son Amon) "in the garden of his own house, in the garden of Uzza" (~~<1218>~~2 Kings 21:18). These may be the tombs referred to (~~<4637>~~Ezekiel 43:7-9) as too near the temple precincts.

### *19. Josiah and Religious Reforms (640-609 BC):*

In the reign of Josiah was found the "Book of the Law," and the king in consequence instituted radical reforms (2 Kings 22; 23). Kidron smoked with the burnings of the Asherah and of the vessels of Baal, and Topheth in the Valley of Hinnom was defiled. At length after a reign of 31 years (~~<1239>~~2 Kings 23:29,30), Josiah, in endeavoring to intercept Pharaoh-necho from combining with the king of Babylon, was defeated and slain at Megiddo and was buried "in his own sepulchre" in Jerusalem — probably in the same locality where his father and grandfather lay buried. Jehoahaz, after a reign of but 3 months, was carried captive (~~<1234>~~2 Kings 23:34) by Necho to Egypt, where he died — and apparently was buried among strangers (~~<4221>~~Jeremiah 22:10-12). His brother Eliakim, renamed Jehoiakim, succeeded. In the 4th year of his reign, Egypt was defeated at Carchemish by the Babylonians, and as a consequence Jehoiakim had to change from subjection to Egypt to that of Babylon (1 Kings 23:35 ff).

### *20. Jeremiah Prophesies the Approaching Doom:*

During this time Jeremiah was actively foretelling in streets and courts of Jerusalem (5:1, etc.) the approaching ruin of the city, messages which were received with contempt and anger by the king and court (~~<4653>~~Jeremiah 36:23). In consequence of his revolt against Babylon, bands of Chaldeans, Syrians, Moabites and Ammonites came against him (~~<1241>~~2 Kings 24:2), and his death was inglorious (~~<1246>~~2 Kings 24:6; ~~<4278>~~Jeremiah 22:18,19).

### *21. Nebuchadnezzar Twice Takes Jerusalem (586 BC):*

His son Jehoiachin, who succeeded him, went out with all his household and surrendered to the approaching Nebuchadnezzar (597), and was carried to Babylon where he passed more than 37 years (~~<1257>~~ 2 Kings 25:27-30). Jerusalem was despoiled of all its treasures and all its important inhabitants. The king of Babylon's nominee, Zedekiah, after 11 years rebelled against him, and consequently Jerusalem was besieged for a year and a half until "famine was sore in the city." On the 9th of Ab all the men of war "fled by night by the way of the gate between the two walls, which was by the king's garden," i.e. near the mouth of the Tyropeon, and the king "went by the way of the Arabah," but was overtaken and captured "in the plains of Jericho." A terrible punishment followed his faithlessness to Babylon (~~<1251>~~ 2 Kings 25:1-7). The city and the temple were despoiled and burnt; the walls of Jerusalem were broken down, and none but the poorest of the land "to be vinedressers and husbandmen" were left behind (~~<1251>~~ 2 Kings 25:8 f; ~~<1487>~~ 2 Chronicles 36:17 f). It is probable that the ark was removed also at this time.

### *22. Cyrus and the First Return (538 BC):*

With the destruction of their city, the hopes of the best elements in Judah turned with longing to the thought of her restoration. It is possible that some of the remnant left in the land may have kept up some semblance of the worship of Yahweh at the temple-site. At length, however, when in 538 Cyrus the Persian became master of the Babylonian empire, among many acts of a similar nature for the shrines of Assyrian and Babylonian gods, he gave permission to Jews to return to rebuild the house of Yahweh (Ezr 1:1 f). Over 40,000 (Ezr 1; 2) under Sheshbazzar, prince of Judah (Ezr 1:8,11), governor of a province, returned, bringing with them the sacred vessels of the temple. The daily sacrifices were renewed and the feasts and fasts restored (Ezr 3:3-7), and later the foundations of the restored temple were laid (Ezr 3:10; 5:16), but on account of the opposition of the people of the land and the Samaritans, the building was not completed until 20 years later (Ezr 6:15).

### *23. Nehemiah Rebuilds the Walls:*

The graphic description of the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem in 445 by Nehemiah gives us the fullest account we have of these fortifications at any ancient period. It is clear that Nehemiah set himself to restore the

walls, as far as possible, in their condition before the exile. The work was done hurriedly and under conditions of danger, half the workers being armed with swords, spears and bows to protect the others, and every workman was a soldier (~~cf.~~ Nehemiah 4:13,16-21). The rebuilding took 52 days, but could not have been done at all had not much of the material lain to hand in the piles of ruined masonry. Doubtless the haste and limited resources resulted in a wall far weaker than that Nebuchadnezzar destroyed 142 years previously, but it followed the same outline and had the same general structure.

#### *24. Bagohi Governor:*

For the next 100 years we have scarcely any historical knowledge of Jerusalem. A glimpse is afforded by the papyri of Elephantine where we read of a Jewish community in Upper Egypt petitioning Bagohi, the governor of Judea, for permission to rebuild their own temple to Yahweh in Egypt; incidentally they mention that they had already sent an unsuccessful petition to Johanan the high priest and his colleagues in Jerusalem. In another document we gather that this petition to the Persian governor was granted. These documents must date about 411-407 BC. Later, probably about 350, we have somewhat ambiguous references to the destruction of Jerusalem and the captivity of numbers of Jews in the time of Artaxerxes (III) Ochus (358-337 BC).

With the battle of Issus and Alexander's Palestinian campaign (circa 332 BC), we are upon surer historical ground, though the details of the account (Ant., XI, viii, 4) of Alexander's visit to Jerusalem itself are considered of doubtful authenticity.

#### *25. Alexander the Great:*

After his death (323 BC), Palestine suffered much from its position, between the Ptolemies of Egypt and the Seleucids of Antioch. Each became in turn its suzerain, and indeed at one time the tribute appears to have been divided between them (Ant., XII, iv, 1).

#### *26. The Ptolemaic Rule:*

In 321 Ptolemy Soter invaded Palestine, and, it is said (Ant., XII, i, 1), captured Jerusalem by a ruse, entering the city on the Sabbath as if anxious to offer sacrifice. He carried away many of his Jewish prisoners to Egypt and settled them there. In the struggles between the contending

monarchies, although Palestine suffered, the capital itself, on account of its isolated position, remained undisturbed, under the suzerainty of Egypt. In 217 BC, Ptolemy (IV) Philopator, after his victory over Antiochus III at Raphia, visited the temple at Jerusalem and offered sacrifices; he is reported (3 Macc 1) to have entered the “Holy of Holies.” The comparative prosperity of the city during the Egyptian domination is witnessed to by Hecataeus of Abdera, who is quoted by Jos; he even puts the population of the city at 120,000, which is probably an exaggeration.

### *27. Antiochus the Great:*

At length in 198, Antiochus the Great having conquered Coele-Syria in the epoch-making battle at Banias, the Jews of their own accord went over to him and supplied his army with plentiful provisions; they assisted him in besieging the Egyptian garrison in the AKRA (which see) (Ant., XII, iii, 3). Josephus produces letters in which Antiochus records his gratification at the reception given him by the Jews and grants them various privileges (same place) . We have an account of the prosperity of the city about this time (190-180 BC) by Jesus ben Sira in the Book of Ecclus; it is a city of crowded life and manifold activities. He refers in glowing terms to the great high priest, Simon ben Onias (226-199 BC), who (Ecclesiasticus 50:1-4) had repaired and fortified the temple and strengthened the walls against a siege. The letter of Aristaeas, dated probably at the close of this great man’s life (circa 200 BC), gives a similar picture. It is here stated that the compass of the city was 40 stadia. The very considerable prosperity and religious liberty which the Jews had enjoyed under the Egyptians were soon menaced under the new ruler; the taxes were increased, and very soon fidelity to the tenets of Judaism came to be regarded as treachery to the Seleucid rule.

### *28. Hellenization of the City under Antiochus Epiphanes:*

Under Antiochus Epiphanes the Hellenization of the nation grew apace (2 Macc 4:9-12; Ant, XII, v, 1); at the request of the Hellenizing party a “place of exercise” was erected in Jerusalem (1 Macc 1:14; 2 Macc 4:7 f). The Gymnasium was built and was soon thronged by young priests; the Greek hat — the [*petasos*] — became the fashionable headdress in Jerusalem. The Hellenistic party, which was composed of the aristocracy, was so loud in its professed devotion to the king’s wishes that it is not to be wondered at that Antiochus, who, on a visit to the city, had been

received with rapturous greetings, came to think that the poor and pious who resisted him from religious motives were largely infected with leanings toward his enemies in Egypt. The actual open rupture began when tidings reached Antiochus, after a victorious though politically barren campaign in Egypt, that Jerusalem had risen in his rear on behalf of the house of Ptolemy. Jason, the renegade high priest, who had been hiding across the Jordan, had, on the false report of the death of Antiochus, suddenly returned and re-possessioned himself of the city. Only the Akra remained to Syria, and this was crowded with Menelaus and those of his followers who had escaped the sword of Jason.

### *29. Capture of the City (170 BC):*

Antiochus lost no time; he hastened (170 BC) against Jerusalem with a great army, captured the city, massacred the people and despoiled the temple (1 Macc 1:20-24; Ant, XII, v, 3). Two years later Antiochus, balked by Rome in Egypt (Polyb. xxix. 27; Livy xlv. 12), appears to have determined that in Jerusalem, at any rate, he would have no sympathizers with Egypt.

### *30. Capture of 168 BC:*

He sent his chief collector of tribute (1 Macc 1:29), who attacked the city with strong force and, by means of stratagem, entered it (1 Macc 1:30). After he had despoiled it, he set it on fire and pulled down both dwellings and walls. He massacred the men, and many of the women and children he sold as slaves (1 Macc 1:31-35; 2 Macc 5:24).

### *31. Attempted Suppression of Judaism:*

He sacrificed swine (or at least a sow) upon the holy altar, and caused the high priest himself — a Greek in all his sympathies — to partake of the impure sacrificial feasts; he tried by barbarous cruelties to suppress the ritual of circumcision (Ant., XII, v, 4). In everything he endeavored, in conjunction with the strong Hellenizing party, to organize Jerusalem as a Greek city, and to secure his position he built a strong wall, and a great tower for the Akra, and, having furnished it well with armor and victuals, he left a strong garrison (1 Macc 1:33-35). But the Syrians had overreached themselves this time, and the reaction against persecution and attempted religious suppression produced the great uprising of the Maccabees.

### *32. The Maccabean Rebellion:*

The defeat and retirement of the Syrian commander Lysias, followed by the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, led to an entire reversal of policy on the part of the Council of the boy-king, Antiochus V. A general amnesty was granted, with leave to restore the temple-worship in its ancestral forms. The following year (165 BC) Judas Maccabeus found “the sanctuary desolate, and the altar profaned, the gates burned up, and shrubs growing in the courts as in a forest . . . and the priests’ chambers pulled down” (1 Macc 4:38).

### *33. The Dedication of the Temple (165 BC):*

He at once saw to the reconstruction of the altar and restored the temple-services, an event celebrated ever after as the “Feast of the Dedication,” or *chanukkah* (1 Macc 4:52-59; 2 Macc 10:1-11; Ant, XII, vii, 7; compare ~~John~~ John 10:22). Judas also “builded up Mt. Zion,” i.e. the temple-hill, making it a fortress with “high walls and strong towers round about,” and set a garrison in it (1 Macc 4:41-61).

### *34. Defeat of Judas and Capture of the City:*

The Hellenizing party suffered in the reaction, and the Syrian garrison in the Akra, Syria’s one hold on Judea, was closely invested, but though Judas had defeated three Syrian armies in the open, he could not expel this garrison. In 163 BC a great Syrian army, with a camel corps and many elephants, came to the relief of the hard-pressed garrison. Lysias, accompanied by the boy-king himself (Antiochus V), approached the city from the South via *BETH-ZUR* (which see). At Beth-zachariah the Jews were defeated, and Judas’ brother Eleazar was slain, and Jerusalem was soon captured. The fort on Mt. Zion which surrounded the sanctuary was surrendered by treaty, but when the king saw its strength he broke his oath and destroyed the fortifications (1 Macc 6:62). But even in this desperate state Judas and his followers were saved. A certain pretender, Philip, raised a rebellion in a distant part of the empire, and Lysias was obliged to patch up a truce with the nationalist Jews more favorable to Judas than before his defeat; the garrison in the Akra remained, however, to remind the Jews that they were not independent. In 161 BC another Syrian general, Nicanor, was sent against Judas, but he was at first won over to friendship and when, later, at the instigation of the Hellenistic party, he was compelled to attack Judas, he did so with hastily raised levies and was



defeated at Adasa, a little North of Jerusalem. Judas was, however, not long suffered to celebrate his triumph. A month later Bacchides appeared before Jerusalem, and in April, 161, Judas was slain in battle with him at Berea.

### *35. His Death (161 BC):*

Both the city and the land were re-garrisoned by Syrians; nevertheless, by 152, Jonathan, Judas' brother, who was residing at Michmash, was virtual ruler of the land, and by astute negotiation between Demetrius and Alexander, the rival claimants to the throne of Antioch, Jonathan gained more than any of his family had ever done. He was appointed high priest and *strategos*, or deputy for the king, in Judea. He repaired the city and restored the temple-fortress with squared stones (1 Macc 10:10-11).

### *36. Jonathan's Restorations:*

He made the walls higher and built up a great part of the eastern wall which had been destroyed and "repaired which was called Caphenatha" (1 Macc 12:36-37; Ant., XIII, v, ii); he also made a great mound between the Akra and the city to isolate the Syrian garrison (same place) .

### *37. Surrender of City to Antiochus Sidetes (134 BC):*

Simon, who succeeded Jonathan, finally captured the Akra in 139, and, according to Josephus (Ant., XIII, vi, 7), not only destroyed it, but partially leveled the very hill on which it stood (see, however, 1 Macc 14:36,37). John Hyrcanus, 5 years later (134 BC), was besieged in Jerusalem by Antiochus Sidetes in the 4th year of his reign; during the siege the Syrian king raised 100 towers each 3 stories high against the northern wall — possibly these may subsequently have been used for the foundations of the second wall. Antiochus was finally bought off by the giving of hostages and by heavy tribute, which Hyrcanus is said to have obtained by opening the sepulcher of David. Nevertheless the king "broke down the fortifications that encompassed the city" (Ant., XIII, viii, 2-4).

### *38. Hasmonean Buildings:*

During the more prosperous days of the Hasmonean rulers, several important buildings were erected. There was a great palace on the western (southwestern) hill overlooking the temple (Ant., XX, viii, 11), and connected with it at one time by means of a bridge across the Tyropeon,

and on the northern side of the temple a citadel — which may (see VIII, 7 above) have been the successor of one here in pre-exilic times — known as the Baris; this, later on, Herod enlarged into the Antonia (Ant., XV, xi, 4; BJ, V, v, 8).

### *39. Rome's Intervention:*

In consequence of the quarrel of the later Hasmonean princes, further troubles fell upon the city. In 65 BC, Hyrcanus II, under the instigation of Antipas the Idumean, rebelled against his brother Aristobulus, to whom he had recently surrendered his claim to sovereignty. With the assistance of Aretas, king of the Nabateans, he besieged Aristobulus in the temple. The Roman general Scaurus, however, by order of Pompey, compelled Aretas to retire, and then lent his assistance to Aristobulus, who overcame his brother (Ant., XIV, ii, 1-3). Two years later (63 BC) Pompey, having been met by the ambassadors of both parties, bearing presents, as well as of the Pharisees, came himself to compose the quarrel of the rival factions, and, being shut out of the city, took it by storm.

### *40. Pompey Takes the City by Storm:*

He entered the “Holy of Holies,” but left the temple treasures unharmed. The walls of the city were demolished; Hyrcanus II was reinstated high priest, but Aristobulus was carried a prisoner to Rome, and the city became tributary to the Roman Empire (Ant., XIV, iv, 1-4; BJ, I, vii, 1-7). The Syrian proconsul, M. Lucinius Crassus, going upon his expedition against the Parthians in 55 BC, carried off from the temple the money which Pompey had left (Ant., XIV, vii, 1).

### *41. Julius Caesar Appoints Antipater Procurator (47 BC):*

In 47 BC Antipater, who for 10 years had been gaining power as a self-appointed adviser to the weak Hyrcanus, was made a Roman citizen and appointed procurator in return for very material services which he had been able to render to Julius Caesar in Egypt (Ant., XIV, viii, 1, 3, 5); at the same time Caesar granted to Hyrcanus permission to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem besides other privileges (Ant., XIV, x, 5). Antipater made his eldest son, Phaselus, governor of Jerusalem, and committed Galilee to the care of his able younger son, Herod.

#### *42. Parthian Invasion:*

In 40 BC Herod succeeded his father as procurator of Judea by order of the Roman Senate, but the same year the Parthians under Pacorus and Barzapharnes captured and plundered Jerusalem (Ant., XIV, xiii, 3,1) and re-established Antigonus (Jewish Wars, I, xiii, 13). Herod removed his family and treasures to Massada and, having been appointed king of Judea by Antony, returned, after various adventures, in 37 BC. Assisted by Sosius, the Roman proconsul, he took Jerusalem by storm after a 5 months siege; by the promise of liberal reward he restrained the soldiers from sacking the city (Ant., XIV, xvi, 2-3).

#### *43. Reign of Herod the Great (37-4 BC):*

During the reign of this great monarch Jerusalem assumed a magnificence surpassing that of all other ages. In 24 BC the king built his vast palace in the upper city on the southwestern hill, near where today are the Turkish barracks and the Armenian Quarter. He rebuilt the fortress to the North of the temple — the ancient Baris — on a great scale with 4 lofty corner towers, and renamed it the Antonia in honor of his patron. He celebrated games in a new theater, and constructed a hippodrome (Jewish Wars, II, iii, 1) or amphitheater (Antiquities, XV, viii, 1).

#### *44. Herod's Great Buildings:*

He must necessarily have strengthened and repaired the walls, but such work was outshone by the 4 great towers which he erected, Hippicus, Pharsel and Mariamne, near the present Jaffa Gate — the foundations of the first two Great are supposed to be incorporated in the present so-called “Tower of David” — and the lofty octagonal tower, Psephinus, farther to the Northwest. The development of Herod's plans for the reconstruction of the temple was commenced in 19 BC, but they were not completed till 64 AD (~~ROM~~ John 2:20; ~~ROM~~ Matthew 24:1,2; ~~ROM~~ Luke 21:5,6). The sanctuary itself was built by 1,000 specially trained priests within a space of 18 months (11-10 BC). The conception was magnificent, and resulted in a mass of buildings of size and beauty far surpassing anything that had stood there before. Practically all the remains of the foundations of the temple-enclosure now surviving in connection with the *Charam* belong to this period. In 4 BC — the year of the Nativity — occurred the disturbances following upon the destruction of the Golden Eagle which Herod had erected over the great gate of the temple, and shortly afterward Herod

died, having previously shut up many of the leading Jews in the hippodrome with orders that they should be slain when he passed away (Jewish Wars, I, xxxiii, 6). The accession of Archelaus was signaled by Passover riots which ended in the death of 3,000, an after-result of the affair of the Golden Eagle.

#### *45. Herod Archelaus (4 BC-6 AD):*

Thinking that order had been restored, Archelaus set out for Rome to have his title confirmed. During his absence Sabinus, the Roman procurator, by mismanagement and greed, raised the city about his ears, and the next Passover was celebrated by a massacre, street fighting and open robbery. Varus, the governor of Syria, who had hastened to the help of his subordinate, suppressed the rebellion with ruthless severity and crucified 2,000 Jews. Archelaus returned shortly afterward as ethnarch, an office which he retained until his exile in 6 AD. During the procuratorship of Coponius (6-10 AD) another Passover riot occurred in consequence of the aggravating conduct of some Samaritans.

#### *46. Pontius Pilate:*

During the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate (26-37 AD) there were several disturbances, culminating in a riot consequent upon his taking some of the “corban” or sacred offerings of the temple for the construction of an aqueduct (Ant., XVIII, iii, 2) — probably part at least of the “lowlevel aqueduct” (see VII, 15, above). Herod Agrippa I enclosed the suburbs, which had grown up North of the second wall and of the temple, by what Josephus calls the “Third Wall” (see V, above).

#### *47. King Agrippa:*

His son, King Agrippa, built — about 56 AD — a large addition to the old Hasmonean palace, from which he could overlook the temple area. This act was a cause of offense to the Jews who built a wall on the western boundary of the Inner Court to shut off his view. In the quarrel which ensued the Jews were successful in gaining the support of Nero (Ant., XX, viii, 11). In 64 AD the long rebuilding of the temple-courts, which had been begun in 19 BC, was concluded. The 18,000 workmen thrown out of employment appear to have been given “unemployed work” in “paving the city with white stone” (Ant., XX, ix, 6-7).

#### *48. Rising against Florus and Defeat of Gallus:*

Finally the long-smoldering discontent of the Jews against the Romans burst forth into open rebellion under the criminal incompetence of Gessius Florus, 66 AD (Ant., XX, xi, 1). Palaces and public buildings were fired by the angered multitude, and after but two days' siege, the Antonia itself was captured, set on fire and its garrison slain (Jewish Wars, II, xvii, 6-7). Cestius Gallus, hastening from Syria, was soon engaged in a siege of the city. The third wall was captured and the suburb **BEZETHA** (which see) burnt, but, when about to renew the attack upon the second wall, Gallus appears to have been seized with panic, and his partial withdrawal developed into an inglorious retreat in which he was pursued by the Jews down the pass to the Beth-horons as far as Antipatris (Jewish Wars, II, xix).

#### *49. The City Besieged by Titus (70 AD):*

This victory cost the Jews dearly in the long run, as it led to the campaign of Vespasian and the eventual crushing of all their national hopes. Vespasian commenced the conquest in the north, and advanced by slow and certain steps. Being recalled to Rome as emperor in the midst of the war, the work of besieging and capturing the city itself fell to his son Titus. None of the many calamities which had happened to the city are to be compared with this terrible siege. In none had the city been so magnificent, its fortifications so powerful, its population so crowded. It was Passover time, but, in addition to the crowds assembled for this event, vast numbers had hurried there, flying from the advancing Roman army. The loss of life was enormous; refugees to Titus gave 600,000 as the number dead (Jewish Wars, V, xiii, 7), but this seems incredible. The total population today within the walls cannot be more than 20,000, and the total population of modern Jerusalem, which covers a far greater area than that of those days, cannot at the most liberal estimate exceed 80,000. Three times this, or, say, a quarter of a million, seems to be the utmost that is credible, and many would place the numbers at far less.

#### *50. Party Divisions within the Besieged Walls:*

The siege commenced on the 14th of Nisan, 70 AD, and ended on the 8th of Elul, a total of 134 days. The city was distracted by internal feuds. Simon held the upper and lower cities; John of Gischala, the temple and "Ophel"; the Idumeans, introduced by the Zealots, fought only Walls for

themselves, until they relieved the city of their terrors. Yet another party, too weak to make its counsels felt, was for peace with Rome, a policy which, if taken in time, would have found in Titus a spirit of reason and mercy. The miseries of the siege and the destruction of life and property were at least as much the work of the Jews themselves as of their conquerors. On the 15th day of the siege the third wall (Agrippa's), which had been but hastily finished upon the approach of the Romans, was captured; the second wall was finally taken on the 24th day; on the 72nd day the Antonia fell, and 12 days later the daily sacrifice ceased. On the 105th day — the ominous 9th of Ab — the temple and the lower city were burnt, and the last day found the whole city in flames.

### *51. Capture and Utter Destruction of the City:*

Only the three great towers of Herod, Hippicus, Pharsel and Mariamne, with the western walls, were spared to protect the camp of the Xth Legion which was left to guard the site, and “in order to demonstrate to posterity what kind of city it was and how well fortified”; the rest of the city was dug up to its foundations (Jewish Wars, VII, i, 1).

### *52. Rebellion of Bar-Cochba:*

For 60 years after its capture silence reigns over Jerusalem. We know that the site continued to be garrisoned, but it was not to any extent rebuilt. In 130 AD it was visited by Hadrian, who found but few buildings standing. Two years later (132-35 AD) occurred the last great rebellion of the Jews in the uprising of Bar-Cochba (“son of a star”), who was encouraged by the rabbi Akiba. With the suppression of this last effort for freedom by Julius Severus, the remaining traces of Judaism were stamped out, and it is even said (the Jerusalem Talmud, Ta'anith 4) that the very site of the temple was plowed up by T. Annius Rufus; An altar of Jupiter was placed upon the temple-site, and Jews were excluded from Jerusalem on pain of death.

### *53. Hadrian Builds Aelia Capitolina:*

In 138 Hadrian rebuilt the city, giving it the name Aelia Capitolina. The line of the Southern wall of Aelia was probably determined by the southern fortification of the great Roman legionary camp on the western (southwestern) hill, and it is probable that it was the general line of the existing southern wall. At any rate, we know that the area occupied by the coenaculum and the traditional “Tomb of David” was outside the walls in

the 4th century. An equestrian statue of Hadrian was placed on the site of the “Holy of Holies” (Jerome, Commentary on ~~2318~~ Isaiah 2:8; ~~4145~~ Matthew 24:15). An inscription now existing in the southern wall of the temple-area, in which occurs the name of Hadrian, may have belonged to this monument, while a stone head, discovered in the neighborhood of Jerusalem some 40 years ago, may have belonged to the statue. Either Hadrian himself, or one of the Antonine emperors, erected a temple of Venus on the northwestern hill, where subsequently was built the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (Euseb., Life of Constantine, III, 36). The habit of pilgrimage to the holy sites, which appears to have had its roots far back in the 2nd century (see Turner, Journal of Theological Studies, I, 551, quoted by Sanday, Sacred Sites of the Gospels, 75-76), seems to have increasingly flourished in the next two centuries; beyond this we know little of the city.

#### *54. Constantine Builds the Church of the Anastasis:*

In 333 AD, by order of Constantine, the new church of the Anastasis, marking the supposed site of the Holy Sepulchre, was begun. The traditions regarding this site and the Holy Cross alleged to have been found there, are recorded some time after the events and are of doubtful veracity. The building must have been magnificent, and covered a considerably larger area than that of the existing church. In 362 Julian is said to have attempted to rebuild the temple, but the work was interrupted by an explosion. The story is doubtful.

At some uncertain date before 450 the coenaculum and “Church of the Holy Zion” were incorporated within the walls. This is the condition depicted in the Madeba Mosaic and also that described by Eucherius who, writing between 345-50 AD, states that the circuit of the walls “now receives within itself Mt. Zion, which was once outside, and which, lying on the southern side, overhangs the city like a citadel.” It is possible this was the work of the emperor Valentinian who is known to have done some reconstruction of the walls.

#### *55. The Empress Eudoxia Rebuilds the Walls:*

In 450 the empress Eudoxia, the widow of Theodosius II, took up her residence in Jerusalem and rebuilt the walls upon their ancient lines, bringing the whole of the southwestern hill, as well as the Pool of Siloam, within the circuit (Evagarius, Hist. Eccles., I, 22). At any rate, this inclusion of the pool existed in the walls described by Antoninus Martyr in

560 AD, and it is confirmed by Bliss's work (see above VI, 4). She also built the church of Stephen, that at the Pool of Siloam and others.

#### *56. Justinian:*

The emperor Justinian, who was perhaps the greatest of the Christian builders, erected the great Church of Mary, the remains of which are now considered by some authorities to be incorporated in the el Aqsa Mosque; he built also a "Church of Sophia" in the "Pretorian," i.e. on the site of the Antonia (see, however, *PRAETORIUM*), and a hospital to the West of the temple. The site of the temple itself appears to have remained in ruins down to the 7th century.

#### *57. Chosroes II Captures the City:*

In 614 Palestine was conquered by the Persian Chosroes II, and the Jerusalem churches, including that of the Holy Sepulchre, were destroyed, an event which did much to prepare the way for the Moslem architects of half a century later, who freely used the columns of these ruined churches in the building of the "Dome of the Rock."

#### *58. Heracleus Enters It in Triumph:*

In 629 Heracleus, having meanwhile made peace with the successor of Chosroes II, reached Jerusalem in triumph, bearing back the captured fragment of the cross. He entered the city through the "Golden Gate," which indeed is believed by many to have reached its present form through his restorations. The triumph of Christendom was but short. Seven years earlier had occurred the historic flight of Mohammed from Mecca (the Hegira), and in 637 the victorious followers of the Prophet appeared in the Holy City. After a short siege, it capitulated, but the khalif Omar treated the Christians with generous mercy.

#### *59. Clemency of Omar:*

The Christian sites were spared, but upon the temple-site, which up to this had apparently been occupied by no important Christian building but was of peculiar sanctity to the Moslems through Mohammed's alleged visions there, a wooden mosque was erected, capable of accommodating 3,000 worshippers. This was replaced in 691 AD by the magnificent Kubbet es Sakah], or "Dome of the Rock," built by `Abd'ul Malek, the 10th khalif. For some centuries the relations of the Christians and Moslems appear to



have been friendly: the historian el Muqaddasi, writing in 985, describes the Christians and Jews as having the upper hand in Jerusalem. In 969 Palestine passed into the power of the Egyptian dynasty, and in 1010 her ruler, the mad Hakim, burnt many of the churches, which, however, were restored in a poor way.

#### *60. The Seljuk Turks and Their Cruelties:*

In 1077 Isar el Atsis, a leader of the Seljuk Turks conquered Palestine from the North, drove out the Egyptians and massacred 3,000 of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The cruelty of the Turks — in contrast, be it noted, with the conduct of the Arab Moslems — was the immediate cause of the Crusades. In 1098 the city was retaken by the Egyptian Arabs, and the following year was again captured after a 40 days' seige by the soldiers of the First Crusade, and Godfrey de Bouillon became the first king. Great building activity marked the next 80 peaceful years of Latin rule: numbers of churches were built, but, until toward the end of this period, the walls were neglected.

#### *61. Crusaders Capture the City in 1099:*

In 1177 they were repaired, but 10 years later failed to resist the arms of the victorious Saladin. The city surrendered, but City the inhabitants were spared. In 1192 Saladin repaired the walls, but in 1219 they were dismantled by orders of the sultan of Damascus. In 1229 the emperor Frederick II of Germany obtained the Holy City by treaty, on condition that he did not restore the fortifications, a stipulation which, being broken by the inhabitants 10 years later, brought down upon them the vengeance of the emir of Kerak. Nevertheless, in 1243 the city was again restored to the Christians unconditionally.

#### *62. The Kharizimians:*

The following year, however, the Kharizimian Tartars — a wild, savage horde from Central Asia — burst into Palestine, carrying destruction before them; they seized Jerusalem, massacred the people, and rifled the tombs of the Latin kings. Three years later they were ejected from Palestine by the Egyptians who in their turn retained it until, in 1517, they were conquered by the Ottoman Turks, who still hold it. The greatest of their sultans, Suleiman the Magnificent, built the present walls in 1542.

### *63. Ottoman Turks Obtain the City (1517 AD):*

In 1832 Mohammed Ali with his Egyptian forces came and captured the city, but 2 years later the fellahin rose against his rule and for a time actually gained possession of the city, except the citadel, making their entrance through the main drain. The besieged citadel was relieved by the arrival of Ibrahim Pasha from Egypt with reinforcements. The city and land were restored to the Ottoman Turks by the Great Powers in 1840.

## **X. MODERN JERUSALEM.**

### *1. Jews and "Zionism":*

The modern city of Jerusalem has about 75,000 inhabitants, of whom over two-thirds are Jews. Until about 50 years ago the city was confined within its 16th-century walls, the doors of its gates locked every night, and even here there were considerable areas unoccupied. Since then, and particularly during the last 25 years, there has been a rapid growth of suburbs to the North, Northwest, and West of the old city. This has been largely due to the steady stream of immigrant Jews from every part of the world, particularly from Russia, Romania, Yemin, Persia, Bokhara, the Caucasus, and from all parts of the Turkish empire. This influx of Jews, a large proportion of whom are extremely poor, has led to settlements or "colonies" of various classes of Jews being erected all over the plateau to the North — an area never built upon before — but also on other sides of the city. With the exception of the Bokhara Colony, which has some fine buildings and occupies a lofty and salubrious situation, most of the settlements are mean cottages or ugly almshouses. With the exception of a couple of hospitals, there is no Jewish public building of any architectural pretensions. The "Zionist" movement, which has drawn so many Jews to Jerusalem, cannot be called a success, as far as this city is concerned, as the settlers and their children as a rule either steadily deteriorate physically and morally — from constant attacks of malaria, combined with pauperism and want of work — or, in the case of the energetic and enlightened, they emigrate — to America especially; this emigration has been much stimulated of late by the new law whereby Jews and Christians must now, like Moslems, do military service.

The foreign Christian population represents all nations and all sects; the Roman church is rapidly surpassing all other sects or religions in the importance of their buildings. The Russians are well represented by their

extensive enclosure, which includes a large cathedral, a hospital, extensive hospice in several blocks, and a handsome residence for the consul-general, and by the churches and other buildings on the Mount of Olives. The Germans have a successful colony belonging to the “Temple” sect to the West of Jerusalem near the railway station, and are worthily represented by several handsome buildings, e.g. the Protestant “Church of the Redeemer,” built on the site and on the ground plan of a fine church belonging to the Knights of John, the new (Roman Catholic) Church of the Dormition on “Mount Zion,” with an adjoining Benedictine convent, a very handsome Roman Catholic hospice outside the Damascus Gate, the Kaiserin Augusta Victoria Sanatorium on the Mount of Olives, and a Protestant Johanniter Hospice in the city, a large general hospital and a leper hospital, a consulate and two large schools. In influence, both secular and religious, the Germans have rapidly gained ground in the last 2 decades. British influence has much diminished, relatively.

## *2. Christian Buildings and Institutions:*

The British Ophthalmic Hospital, belonging to the “Order of the Knights of John,” the English Mission Hospital, belonging to the London Jews Society, the Bishop Gobat’s School and English College connected with the Church Missionary Society, 3 Anglican churches, of which the handsome George’s Collegiate Church adjoins the residence of the Anglican bishop, and a few small schools comprise the extent of public buildings connected with British societies. France and the Roman Catholic church are worthily represented by the Dominican monastery and seminary connected with the handsome church of Stephen — rebuilt on the plan of an old Christian church — by the Ratisbon (Jesuit) Schools, the Hospital of Louis, the hospice and Church of Augustine, and the monastery and seminary of the “white fathers” or Freres de la mission algerienne, whose headquarters center round the beautifully restored Church of Anne. Not far from here are the convent and school of the Saeurs de Sion, at the Ecce Homo Church. Also inside the walls near the New Gate is the residence of the Latin Patriarch — a cardinal of the Church of Rome — with a church, the school of the Freres de la doctrine chretienne, and the schools, hospital and convent of the Franciscans, who are recognized among their co-religionists as the “parish priests” in the city, having been established there longer than the numerous other orders.

All the various nationalities are under their respective consuls and enjoy extra-territorial rights. Besides the Turkish post-office, which is very inefficiently managed, the Austrians, Germans, French, Russians and Italians all have post-offices open to all, with special "Levant" stamps. The American mail is delivered at the French post-office. There are four chief banks, French, German, Ottoman and Anglo-Palestinian (Jewish). As may be supposed, on account of the demand for land for Jewish settlements or for Christian schools or convents, the price of such property has risen enormously. Unfortunately in recent years all owners of land — and Moslems have not been slow to copy the foreigners — have taken to enclosing their property with high and unsightly walls, greatly spoiling both the walks around the city and the prospects from many points of view. The increased development of carriage traffic has led to considerable dust in the dry season, and mud in winter, as the roads are metaled with very soft limestone. The Jerus-Jaffa Railway (a French company), 54 miles long, which was opened in 1892, has steadily increased its traffic year by year, and is now a very paying concern. There is no real municipal water-supply, and no public sewers for the new suburbs — though the old city is drained by a leaking, ill-constructed medieval sewer, which opens just below the Jewish settlement in the Kidron and runs down the Wady en Nauru. A water-supply, new Sewers, electric trams and electric lights for the streets, are all much-talked-of improvements. There are numerous hotels, besides extensive accommodations in the religious hospices, and no less than 15 hospitals and asylums.

### LITERATURE.

This is enormous, but of very unequal value and much of it out of date. For all purposes the best book of reference is *Jerusalem from the Earliest Times to AD 70*, 2 volumes, by Principal G.A. Smith. It contains references to all the literature. To this book and to its author it is impossible for the present writer adequately to express his indebtedness, and no attempt at acknowledgment in detail has been made in this article. In supplement of the above, *Jerusalem*, by Dr. Selah Merrill, and *Jerusalem in Bible Times*, by Professor Lewis B. Paton, will be found useful. The latter is a condensed account, especially valuable for its illustrations and its copious references. Of the articles in the recent Bible Dictionaries on Jerusalem, that by Conder in HDB is perhaps the most valuable. Of guide-books, Baedeker's *Guide to Palestine and Syria* (1911), by Socin and

Benzinger, and Barnabe Meistermann's (R.C.) New Guide to the Holy Land (1909), will be found useful; also Hanauer's Walks about Jerusalem.

*On Geology, Climate and Water-Supply:*

Hull's "Memoir on Physical Geography and Geology of Arabian Petrea, Palestine, and Adjoining Districts," PEF; and Blankenhorn, "Geology of the Nearer Environs of Jerusalem," ZDPV, 1905; Chaplin, "Climate of Jerusalem," PEFS, 1883; Glaisher, "Meteorol. Observations in Palestine," special pamphlet of the Palestine Exploration Fund; Hilderscheid, "Die Niederschlagsverhältnisse Palestine in alter u. neuer Zeit," ZDPV (1902); Huntington, Palestine and Its Transformation (1911); Andrew Watt, "Climate in Hebron," etc., Journal of the Scottish Meteorological Society (1900-11); Schick, "Die Wasserversorgung der Stadt Jerusalem," ZDPV, 1878; Wilson "Water Supply of Jerusalem," Proceedings of the Victoria Institute, 1906; Masterman, in Biblical World, 1905.

*On Archaeology and Topography:*

PEF, volume on Jerusalem, with accompanying maps and plans; Clermont-Ganneau, Archaeological Researches, I, 1899 (PEF); William, Holy City (1849); Robinson, Biblical Researches (1856); Wilson, Recovery of Jerusalem (1871); Warren Underground Jerusalem (1876); Vincent, Underground Jerusalem (1911); Guthe, "Ausgrabungen in Jerusalem," ZDPV, V; Bliss and Dickie, Excavations in Jerusalem (1894-97); Sanday, Sacred Sites of the Gospels (1903); Mitchell, "The Wall of Jerusalem according to the Book of Neh," JBL (1903); Wilson, Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre (1906); Kuemmel, Materialien z. Topographie des alten Jerusalem; also numerous reports in the PEFS; Zeitschrift des deutschen Palestine Vereins; and the Revue biblique.

*On History:*

Besides Bible, Apocrypha, works of Josephus, and History of Tacitus: Besant and Palmer, History of Jerusalem; Conder, Judas Maccabeus and Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem; Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems (1890); C.F. Kent, Biblical Geography and History (1911). Bevan, Jerusalem under the High-Priests; Watson, The Story of Jerusalem.

***E. W. G. Masterman***

## JERUSALEM, NEW

([ *Ἱερουσαλὴμ καινή*, *Hierousalem kaine*]): This name occurs in <sup><621></sup>Revelation 21:2 (21:10, “holy city”). The conception is based on prophecies which predict a glorious future to Jerusalem after the judgment (<sup><251></sup>Isaiah 52:1). In Revelation, however, it is not descriptive of any actual locality on earth, but allegorically depicts the final state of the church (“the bride,” “the wife of the Lamb,” <sup><621></sup>Revelation 21:2,9), when the new heaven and the new earth shall have come into being. The picture is drawn from a twofold point of view: the new Jerusalem is a restoration of Paradise (<sup><621></sup>Revelation 21:6; 22:1,2,14); it is also the ideal of theocracy realized (<sup><621></sup>Revelation 21:3,12,14,22). The latter viewpoint explains the peculiar representation that the city descends “out of heaven from God” (<sup><621></sup>Revelation 21:2,10), which characterizes it as, on the one hand, a product of God’s supernatural workmanship, and as, on the other hand, the culmination of the historic process of redemption. In other New Testament passages, where theocratic point of view is less prominent, the antitypical Jerusalem appears as having its seat in heaven instead of, as here, coming down from heaven to earth (compare <sup><802></sup>Galatians 4:26; <sup><811></sup>Hebrews 11:10; 12:22).

*See also REVELATION OF JOHN.*

*Geerhardus Vos*

## JERUSHA

<je-roo'-sha> ([*avWry*] *yerusha'*], “taken possession of,” i.e. “married”): In <sup><1253></sup>2 Kings 15:33 = “Jerushah” ([*hvWry*] *yerushah*], same meaning) of <sup><421></sup>2 Chronicles 27:1, the mother of King Jotham of Judah. Zadok was her father’s name; he may be the priest of <sup><1362></sup>1 Chronicles 6:12 (Hebrew 5:38).

## JESHAIAH

<je-sha'-ya>, <je-shi'-a>

(a) [*Why*] *Y*” , *yesha`yahu*];

(b) [*hy*] *Y*” *y*] *yesha`yah*], “deliverance of Yah”; (2) (3) below have form (a), the others form (b)):

(1) Son of Hananiah, and grandson of Zerubbabel, according to <sup><1321></sup>1 Chronicles 3:21, the King James Version “Jesaiah.”

But commentators follow Hebrew (and the Revised Version margin) in the first part of the verse, and Septuagint, Vulgate, Syriac in the second part, thus reading, “And the son of Hananiah (was) Pelatiah, and Jeshaiiah (was) his son, and Arnan his son,” etc., thus making Jeshaiiah a grandson of Hananiah.

(2) A “son” of Jeduthun, and like him a temple musician; head of the family of that name (<sup><1321></sup>1 Chronicles 25:3,15).

(3) A Levite, ancestor of Shelemoth, one of David’s treasurers (<sup><1325></sup>1 Chronicles 26:25).

(4) A descendant of Elam; he went with Ezra from Babylon to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:7) = “Jesias” (Revised Version), “Josias” (the King James Version), 1 Esdras 8:33.

(5) A descendant of Merari and a contemporary of Ezra (Ezr 8:19) = “Osaias” of 1 Esdras 8:48.

(6) A Benjamite (<sup><1317></sup>Nehemiah 11:7), the King James Version “Jesaiah.”

*David Francis Roberts*

## JESHANAH

<jesh'-a-na>, <je-sha'-na> ([<sup>hnyy</sup>] yeshanah): A town named with Bethel and Ephron among the places taken by Abijah from Jeroboam (<sup><1439></sup>2 Chronicles 13:19). Most scholars are agreed that the same name should be read instead of [<sup>Vh</sup> , ha-shen], in <sup><1072></sup>1 Samuel 7:12. It is probably identical with the [Ἰσάνας, Isanas], of Josephus (Ant., XIV, xv, 12). It is represented by the modern `Ain Sinia, 3 1/4 miles North of Bethel, with a spring and interesting ancient remains.

## JESHARELAH

<jesh-a-re'-la> ([<sup>hl æɕ</sup> y] yesar'elah], meaning doubtful): One of the (or probably a family of) Levitical musicians (<sup><1354></sup>1 Chronicles 25:14), called “Asharelah” in verse 2. The names should be written “Asarelah” and “Jesarelah.”

## JESHEBEAB

<je-sheb'-e-ab> ([babʁy, yeshebh'abh], meaning uncertain): A Levite of the 14th course (<13413> 1 Chronicles 24:13). Kittel and Gray (HPN, 24) read with Septuagint, A, "Ishbaal"; the name is omitted in Septuagint (Codex Vaticanus) and the change in Massoretic Text as well as the omission in Septuagint may be due to the word *ba'al* forming part of the name. Compare *JERUBBESHETH*.

## JESHER

<je'-sher> ([rvyeyesher], or [rvy, yesher], "uprightness"): A son of Caleb (<1218> 1 Chronicles 2:18).

## JESHIMON

<je-she'-mon>, <jesh'-i-mon> ([ʾmɔvɪh" , ha-yeshimon], "the desert," and in the Revised Version (British and American) so translated but in the King James Version, <0211> Numbers 21:20; 23:28; <0239> 1 Samuel 23:19,24; 26:1,3, "Jeshimon" as a place-name. In Numbers, the Septuagint reads [ἡ ἔρημος, *he eremos*], "the desert"; in 1 Samuel, the Septuagint reads [Ἰεσσαίμων, *Iessaïmon*]): In these passages probably two districts are referred to:

(1) The "desert" North of the Dead Sea, which was overlooked from Pisgah (<0211> Numbers 21:20; 23:28). This is the bare and sterile land, saturated with salt, lying on each side of the Jordan North of the Dead Sea, where for miles practically no vegetable life can exist.

(2) The sterile plateau West of the steep cliffs bordering the western shores of the Dead Sea. Here between the lower slopes of the Judean hills, where thousands of Bedouin live and herd their flocks, and the more fertile borders of the sea with their oases (ʿAin Feshkhah, ʿAin Jidy, etc.), is a broad strip of utterly waterless land, the soft chalky hills of which are, for all but a few short weeks, destitute of practically any vegetation. The Hill of Hachilah was on the edge of this desert (<0239> 1 Samuel 23:19; 26:1,3), and the Arabah was to its south (<0234> 1 Samuel 23:24). It is possible that the references in Numbers may also apply to this region.



The word “Jeshimon” (*yeshimon*) is often used as a common noun in referring to the desert of Sinai (<sup><620></sup>Deuteronomy 32:10; <sup><984></sup>Psalm 78:40; 106:14; <sup><2389></sup>Isaiah 43:19, etc.), and except in the first two of these references, when we have “wilderness,” it is always translated “desert.” Although used in 7 passages in poetical parallelism to *midhbar*, translated “wilderness,” it really means a much more hopeless place; in a *midhbar* animals can be pastured, but a *yeshimon* is a desolate waste.

**E. W. G. Masterman**

## JESHISHAI

<sup><je-shish'-a-i></sup> ([<sup>yv</sup> <sup>yvj</sup>] *yeshishay*], “aged”): A Gadite chief (and family?) (<sup><154></sup>1 Chronicles 5:14).

## JESHOAIAH

<sup><jesh-o-ha'-ya></sup>, <sup><jesh-o-hi'-a></sup> ([<sup>hyj</sup> <sup>wQy</sup>] *yeshochayah*], meaning unknown): A prince in Simeon (<sup><136></sup>1 Chronicles 4:36).

## JESHUA; JESHUAH

<sup><jesh'-u-a></sup>, <sup><je-shu'-a></sup> ([<sup>Wvy</sup> <sup>eyeshua`</sup>], “Yahweh is deliverance” or “opulence”; compare *JOSHUA*):

(1) the King James Version “Jeshuah,” head of the 9th course of priests, and possibly of “the house of Jeshua” (<sup><1241></sup>1 Chronicles 24:11; Ezr 2:36; <sup><1073></sup>Nehemiah 7:39).

(2) A Levite of Hezekiah’s time (<sup><4815></sup>2 Chronicles 31:15).

(3) Son of Jozadak = Joshua the high priest (Ezr 2:2; 3:2,8; 4:3; 5:2; 10:18; <sup><1000></sup>Nehemiah 7:7; 12:1,7,10,26); *see JOSHUA* (4) = “Jesus” (1 Esdras 5:48 and Sirach 49:12).

(4) A man of Pahath-moab, some of whose descendants returned from Babylon to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:6; <sup><1071></sup>Nehemiah 7:11) = “Jesus” (1 Esdras 58).

(5) Head of a Levitical house which had oversight of the workmen in the temple (Ezr 2:40; 3:9; <sup><1083></sup>Nehemiah 7:43). He is mentioned again in <sup><1087></sup>Nehemiah 8:7 as taking part in explaining the Torah to the people, in <sup><1094></sup>Nehemiah 9:4 f (compare 12:8) as leading in the worship, and in 10:9

(Hebrew 10) as sealing the covenant; this Jeshua is called son of Azaniah (<sup><1609></sup>Nehemiah 10:9). To these references should be added probably <sup><1624></sup>Nehemiah 12:24, where commentators read, “Jeshua, Binnui, Kadmiel” for “Jeshua the son of Kadmiel.” Perhaps Jozabad (Ezr 8:33) is a “son” of this same Jeshua; compare Ezr 8:33 = 1 Esdras 8:63, where the King James Version is “Jesu,” the Revised Version (British and American) “Jesus.” He is the same as Jessue (the King James Version), Jesus (Revised Version) (1 Esdras 5:26).

(6) Father of Ezer, a repairer of the wall (<sup><1689></sup>Nehemiah 3:19).

(7) **JOSHUA**, son of Nun (<sup><1687></sup>Nehemiah 8:17) (which see).

*David Francis Roberts*

## JESHUA

<sup><jesh'-u-a></sup>, <sup><je-shu'-a></sup> ([<sup>Wvyē</sup>yeshua`]): A place occupied by the children of Judah after their return from captivity (<sup><1626></sup>Nehemiah 11:26), evidently, from the places named with it, in the extreme South of Judah. It may correspond with the Shema of <sup><1626></sup>Joshua 15:26, and possibly to the Sheba of 19:2. The site may be *Khirbet Sa`weh*, a ruin upon a prominent hill, *Tell es Sa`weh*, 12 miles East-Northeast of Beersheba. The hill is surrounded by a wall of large blocks of stone. PEF, III, 409-10, Sh XXV.

## JESHURUN

<sup><je-shu'-run></sup>, <sup><jesh'-u-run></sup> ([<sup>Wrvy</sup>yeshurun], “upright one,” <sup><1625></sup>Deuteronomy 32:15; 33:5,26; <sup><2412></sup>Isaiah 44:2): Septuagint translates it “the beloved one” [<sup>ηγαπημένος</sup>, *egapemenos*], the perfect participle passive of *agapao*, and in <sup><2412></sup>Isaiah 44:2 adds “Israel”; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) has *dilectus* in <sup><1625></sup>Deuteronomy 32:15, elsewhere *rectissimus*; Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion have “upright.” For the form, Duhm compares [<sup>Wl bz</sup>zebhum], Zebulun.

(1) The name used to be explained as a diminutive form, a pet name, and some, e.g. Cornill, Schultz (Old Testament Theology, English translation, II, 29, note 12) still explain it so, “the righteous little people.” But there is no evidence that the ending *-un* had a diminutive force.

(2) Most moderns take it as a poetical or ideal title of Israel, derived from [*rvy*; *yashar*], “upright”; it is held to contain a tacit reference to the word Israel ([*l aecʲi* *yisra’el*]), of which the first three consonants are almost the same as those of “Jeshurun”; in <sup>(1230)</sup>Numbers 23:10 the term “the righteous ones” ([*pyrivʲ* *yesharim*]) is supposed to contain a similar reference. Most commentators compare also “the Book of Jashar,” and it has been held that “Jashar” is similarly a name by which Israel is called.

*See JASHAR.*

Following Bacher (ZATW, 1885, 161 ff), commentators hold that in Isaiah this new name, a coinage due to the author of Second Isaiah and adopted in Deuteronomy, stands in contrast to Jacob, “the supplanter,” as his name was explained by the Hebrews (compare <sup>(8312)</sup>Hosea 12:2-4). Israel is here given a new name, “the upright, pious one,” and with the new name goes new chance in life, to live up to its meaning. Driver (Deuteronomy, 361) says that in <sup>(1525)</sup>Deuteronomy 32:15 “where the context is of declension from its ideal (it is) applied reproachfully. ‘Nomen Recti pro Israele ponens, ironice eos perstringit qui a rectitudine defecerant’ (Calv.). Elsewhere it is used as a title of honor.” the King James Version has “Jesurun” in <sup>(2342)</sup>Isaiah 44:2.

*David Francis Roberts*

## JESIAH

<*je-si’-a*> (<sup>(1230)</sup>1 Chronicles 23:20 the King James Version).

*See ISSHIAH.*

## JESIAS

<*je-si’-as*> ([*’ l e sʲi a s*, *Iesias*]; the King James Version Josias (1 Esdras 8:33)): Corresponding to Jeshaiah, son of Athaliah (Ezr 8:7).

## JESIMIEL

<*je-sim’-i-el*> ([*l a mʲi cʲj* *yesimi’el*], “God establishes”): A prince of Simeon (<sup>(1306)</sup>1 Chronicles 4:36).

## JESSE

<jes'-e> ([yv" yi yishay], meaning doubtful; according to Gesenius it = “wealthy”; Olshausen, Gram., sections 277 f, conjectures [hy;vyEyesh yah], “Yahweh exists”; Wellhausen (<0149> 1 Samuel 14:49) explains it as [yv" ybā] ‘abhishay] (see ABISHAI); [ 'Ιεσσαί, Iessai]; <0847> Ruth 4:17,22; 1 Samuel 16; 17; 20; 22; 25:10; <1006> 2 Samuel 20:1; 23:1; <1126> 1 Kings 12:16; <1304> 1 Chronicles 10:14; 12:18; <1972> Psalm 72:20; <2310> Isaiah 11:1,10 (= <6152> Romans 15:12)); <4006> Matthew 1:5,6; <4432> Acts 13:22): Son of Obed, grandson of Boaz, and father of King David. The grouping of the references to Jesse in 1 Samuel is bound up with that of the grouping of the whole narrative of David and Saul. See **SAMUEL, BOOKS OF**. There seem to be three main veins in the narrative, so far as Jesse is concerned.

(1) In <0149> 1 Samuel 16:1-13, where Jesse is called the Bethlehemite. Samuel is sent to seek among Jesse's sons successor to Saul.

Both Samuel and Jesse fail to discern at first Yahweh's choice, Samuel thinking that it would be the eldest son (<0149> 1 Samuel 16:6), while Jesse had not thought it worth while to call the youngest to the feast (<0149> 1 Samuel 16:11).

### (2)

(a) In <0149> 1 Samuel 16:14-23, Saul is mentally disturbed, and is advised to get a harpist. David “the son of Jesse the Bethlehemite” is recommended by a courtier, and Saul sends to Jesse for David.

“And Jesse took ten loaves (so emend and translate, and not as the Revised Version (British and American), “an ass laden with bread”), and a (skin) bottle of wine, and a kid, and sent them” to Saul as a present with David, who becomes a courtier of Saul's with his father's consent.

(b) The next mention of Jesse is in three contemptuous references by Saul to David as “the son of Jesse” in <0227> 1 Samuel 20:27,30,31, part of the quarrel-scene between Saul and Jonathan. (But it is not quite certain if 1 Samuel 20 belongs to the same source as 16:14-23.) In answer to the first reference, Jonathan calls his friend “David,” and Saul repeats the phrase “the son of Jesse,” abusing Jonathan personally (<0227> 1 Samuel 20:30, where the meaning is uncertain). The reference to David as “the son of Jesse” here and in the following verse is

contemptuous, not because of any reproach that might attach itself to Jesse, but, as Budde remarks, because “an upstart is always contemptuously referred to under his father’s name” in courts and society. History repeats itself!

**(c)** Further references of a like kind are in the passage, <sup><0216></sup>1 Samuel 22:6-23, namely, in 22:7,8,13 by Saul, and repeated by Doeg in 22:9.

**(d)** The final one of this group is in <sup><0250></sup>1 Samuel 25:10, where Nabal sarcastically asks “Who is David ? and who is the son of Jesse?”

**(3)** The parts of 1 Samuel 17 through 18:5 which are omitted by Septuagint B, i.e. 17:12-31,41,48b,50,55 through 18:6a. Here Jesse is mentioned as “an Ephrathite of Beth-lehem-judah” (17:12, not “that” Ephrathite, which is a grammatically impossible translation of the Massoretic Text), Ephrath or Ephrathah being another name for Bethlehem, or rather for the district. He is further said to have eight sons (17:12), of whom the three eldest had followed Saul to the war (17:13).

Jesse sends David, the shepherd, to his brothers with provisions (<sup><0972></sup>1 Samuel 17:17). Afterward David, on being brought to Saul and asked who he is, answers, “I am the son of thy servant Jesse the Bethlehemite” (<sup><0978></sup>1 Samuel 17:58). Jesse is also described (<sup><0972></sup>1 Samuel 17:12) as being “in the days of Saul an old man, advanced in years” (so emend and translate, not as the Revised Version (British and American), “stricken in years among men”). The mention of his having 8 sons in <sup><0972></sup>1 Samuel 17:12 is not in agreement with <sup><1323></sup>1 Chronicles 2:13-15, which gives only 7 sons with two sisters, but where Syriac gives 8, adding, from 27:18, Elihu which Massoretic Text has there probably by corruption (Curtis, Chronicles, 88). <sup><0960></sup>1 Samuel 16:10 should be translated” and Jesse made his 7 sons to pass before Samuel” (not as the Revised Version (British and American), the King James Version, “seven of his sons”). Budde (Kurz. Hand-Komm., “Samuel,” 114) holds <sup><0960></sup>1 Samuel 16:1-13 to be a late Midrash, and (ibid., 123 f) omits

**(a)** “that” in 17:12;

**(b)** also “and he had 8 sons” as due to a wrong inference from 16:10;

**(c)** the names of the 3 eldest in 17:13;

(d) 17:14b; he then changes 17:15a, and reads thus: (12) “Now David was the son of an Ephrathite of Bethlehem-Judah, whose name was Jesse who was .... (years) old at the time of Saul. (13) And the 3 eldest sons of Jesse had marched with Saul to the war, (14) and David was the youngest, (15) and David had remained to feed his father’s sheep at Bethlehem. (16) Now the Philistines came,” etc.

According to all these narratives in 1 Samuel, whether all 3 be entirely independent of one another or not, Jesse had land in Bethlehem, probably outside the town wall, like Boaz (*see BOAZ*) his grandfather (<sup><Ruth></sup>Ruth 4:17). In <sup><22:3></sup>1 Samuel 22:3,1 David entrusts his father and mother to the care of the king of Moab, but from 20:29 some have inferred that Jesse was dead (although most critics assign 22:3 at any rate to the same stratum as chapter 20).

Jonathan tells Saul that David wanted to attend a family sacrificial feast at Bethlehem (<sup><20:29></sup>1 Samuel 20:29). Massoretic Text reads, “And he, my brother, has commanded me,” whereas we should probably read with Septuagint, “and my brethren have commanded me,” i.e. the members of the clan, as we have farther on in the verse, “Let me get away, I pray thee, and see my brethren.” As to Jesse’s daughters, *see ABIGAIL; NAHASH*.

(4) Of the other references to Jesse, the most noteworthy is that in <sup><29:11></sup>Isaiah 11:1: “There shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a branch out of his roots shall bear fruit,” i.e. out of Jesse’s roots (compare <sup><6:15></sup>Revelation 5:5). “Why Jesse and not David?” asks Duhm; and he answers, “Because the Messiah will be a second David, rather than a descendant of David.” Marti explains it to mean that he will be, not from David, but from a collateral line of descent. Duhm’s explanation suggests a parallelism between David and Christ, of whom the former may be treated as a type similar to Aaron and Melchizedek in He. Saul might pour contempt upon “the son of Jesse,” but Isaiah has given Jesse here a name above all Hebrew names, and thus does Providence mock “society.”

*See also ROOT OF JESSE.*

*David Francis Roberts*

## JESTING

<sup><jest’-ing></sup>: Used from Tyndale down as the translation of [εὐτραπεία, *eutrapelia*] (<sup><5:4></sup>Ephesians 5:4). Aristotle uses the original in his Ethics

iv.14 as an equivalent of “quick-witted,” from its root meaning “something easily turned,” adding that, since the majority of people love excessive jesting, the word is apt to be degraded. This is the case here, where it clearly has a flavor of the coarse or licentious.

## JESUI

<jes'-u-i>.

See *ISHVI*.

## JESUITES

<jes'-u-its>.

See *ISHVI*.

## JESURUN

<je-su'-run>, <jes'-u-run>.

See *JESHURUN*.

## JESUS

<je'-zus> ([ 'Ἰησοῦς, *Iesous*], for [[ 'yḡdy], *yehoshua`*]):

(1) Joshua, son of Nun (the King James Version <sup><4075></sup>Acts 7:45; <sup><3048></sup>Hebrews 4:8; compare 1 Macc 2:55; 2 Esdras 7:37).

(2) (3) High priest and Levite.

See *JESHUA*, 2, 5.

(4) Son of Sirach.

See *SIRACH*.

(5) An ancestor of Jesus (<sup><4189></sup>Luke 3:29, the King James Version “Jose”).

(6) (7) See the next three articles.

## JESUS CHRIST

<je'-zus krist> ([ 'Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, *Iesous Christos*]):

Jesus Christ: The Founder of the Christian religion; the promised Messiah and Saviour of the world; the Lord and Head of the Christian church.

## I. THE NAMES.

### 1. *Jesus*:

(*Iesous*) is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew “Joshua” ([*yehoshua*]), meaning “Yahweh is salvation.” It stands therefore in the Septuagint and Apocrypha for “Joshua,” and in Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8 likewise represents the Old Testament Joshua; hence, in the Revised Version (British and American) is in these passages rendered “Joshua.” In Matthew 1:21 the name as commanded by the angel to be given to the son of Mary, “for it is he that shall save his people from their sins” (see below on “Nativity”). It is the personal name of the Lord in the Gospels and the Acts, but generally in the Epistles appears in combination with “Christ” or other appellative (alone in Romans 3:26; 4:24; 1 Corinthians 12:3; 2 Corinthians 11:4; Phil 2:10; 1 Thessalonians 4:14; Hebrews 7:22; 10:19, etc.).

### 2. *Christ*:

(*Christos*) is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew “Messiah” ([*mashiach*]; compare in the New Testament, John 1:41; 4:25, “Messiah”), meaning “anointed” (see *MESSIAH*). It designates Jesus as the fulfiller of the Messianic hopes of the Old Testament and of the Jewish people. It will be seen below that Jesus Himself made this claim. After the resurrection it became the current title for Jesus in the apostolic church. Most frequently in the Epistles He is called “Jesus Christ,” sometimes “Christ Jesus” (Romans 8:1,2,39; 1 Corinthians 1:2,30; 4:15; Ephesians 1:1; Phil 1:1; Colossians 1:4,28 the King James Version; 1 Thessalonians 2:14, etc.), often “Christ” alone (Romans 1:16 the King James Version; Romans 5:6,8; 6:4,8,9; 8:10, etc.). In this case “Christ” has acquired the force of a proper name. Very frequently the term is associated with “Lord” ([*kurios*]) — “the (or “our”) Lord Jesus Christ” (Acts 11:17; 15:11 the King James Version; Acts 16:31 the King James Version; Acts 20:21; 28:31; Romans 1:7; 5:1,11; 13:14; 1 Corinthians 16:23, etc.).



## II. ORDER OF TREATMENT.

In studying, as it is proposed to do in this article, the earthly history of Jesus and His place in the faith of the apostolic church, it will be convenient to pursue the following order:

First, as introductory to the whole study, certain questions relating to the sources of our knowledge of Jesus, and to the preparation for, and circumstances of, His historical appearance, invite careful attention (Part I).

Next, still as preliminary to the proper narrative of the life of Jesus, it is desirable to consider certain problems arising out of the presentation of that life in the Gospels with which modern thought is more specially concerned, as determining the attitude in which the narratives are approached. Such are the problems of the miracles, the Messiahship, the sinless character and supernatural claims of Jesus (Part II).

The way is then open for treatment in order of the actual events of Christ's life and ministry, so far as recorded. These fall into many stages, from His nativity and baptism till His death, resurrection and ascension (Part III).

A final division will deal with Jesus as the exalted Lord in the aspects in which He is presented in the teaching of the Epistles and remaining writings of the New Testament (Part IV).

### PART I. INTRODUCTORY

#### I. THE SOURCES.

##### *1. In General:*

The principal, and practically the only sources for our knowledge of Jesus Christ are the four Canonical Gospels — distinction being made in these between the first three (Synoptic) Gospels, and the Gospel of John. Nothing, either in the few notices of Christ in non-Christian authors, or in the references in the other books of the New Testament, or in later Christian literature, adds to the information which the Gospels already supply. The so-called apocryphal Gospels are worthless as authorities (see under the word); the few additional sayings of Christ (compare Acts 20:35) found in outside writings are of doubtful genuineness (compare a

collection of these in Westcott's Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, Appendix C; see also *LOGIA*).

## *2. Denial of Existence of Jesus:*

It marks the excess to which skepticism has gone that writers are found in recent years who deny the very existence of Jesus Christ (Kalthoff, *Das Christus-Problem*, and *Die Entstehung des Christenthums*; Jensen, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*, I; Drews, *Die Christusmythe*; compare on Kalthoff, Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, English translation, 313 ff; Jensen is reviewed in the writer's *The Resurrection of Jesus*, chapter ix). The extravagance of such skepticism is its sufficient refutation.

## *3. Extra-Christian Notices:*

Of notices outside the Christian circles the following may be referred to.

### **(1)** Josephus.

There is the famous passage in Josephus, *Ant*, XVIII, iii, 3, commencing, "Now there was about this time, Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man," etc. It is not unlikely that Josephus had some reference to Jesus, but most agree that the passage in question, if not entirely spurious, has been the subject of Christian interpolation (on the lit. and different views, see Schurer, *Jewish People in the Time of Christ*, Div II, volume II, 143 ff; in support of interpolation, Edersheim on "Josephus," in *Dictionary of Christ. Biography*).

### **(2)** Tacitus.

The Roman historian, Tacitus, in a well-known passage relating to the persecution of Nero (*Ann.* xv.44), tells how the Christians, already "a great multitude" (*ingens multitudo*), derived their name "from one Christus, who was executed in the reign of Tiberius by the procurator of Judea, Pontius Pilate."

**(3)** Suetonius also, in his account of Claudius, speaks of the Jews as expelled from Rome for the raising of tumults at the instigation of one "Chrestus" (*impulsore Chresto*), plainly a mistake for "Christus." The incident is doubtless that referred to in ~~AKD~~ Acts 18:2.

#### 4. *The Gospels:*

The four Gospels, then, with their rich contents, remain as our primary sources for the knowledge of the earthly life of Jesus.

##### (1) The Synoptics.

It may be taken for granted as the result of the best criticism that the first three Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke) all fall well within the apostolic age (compare Harnack, *Altchr. Lit.*, Pref; see *GOSPELS*). The favorite theory at present of the relations of these Gospels is, that Mark is an independent Gospel, resting on the teaching of Peter; that Matthew and Luke have as sources the Gospel of Mark and a collection of discourses, probably attributable to the apostle Matthew (now commonly called Q) ; and that Luke has a third, well-authenticated source (~~ROM~~ Luke 1:1-4) peculiar to himself. The present writer is disposed to allow more independence to the evangelists in the embodying of a tradition common to all; in any case, the sources named are of unexceptionable authority, and furnish a strong guaranty for the reliability of the narratives. The supreme guaranty of their trustworthiness, however, is found in the narratives themselves; for who in that (or any) age could imagine a figure so unique and perfect as that of Jesus, or invent the incomparable sayings and parables that proceeded from His lips? Much of Christ's teaching is high as heaven above the minds of men still.

##### (2) The Fourth Gospel

The Fourth Gospel stands apart from the Synoptics in dealing mainly with another set of incidents (the Jerusalem ministry), and discourses of a more private and intimate kind than those belonging to the Galilean teaching. Its aim, too, is doctrinal — to show that Jesus is “the Son of God,” and its style and mode of conception are very different from those of the Synoptic Gospels. Its contents touch their narratives in only a few points (as in ~~ROM~~ John 6:4-21). Where they do, the resemblance is manifest. It is obvious that the reminiscences which the Gospel contains have been long brooded over by the apostle, and that a certain interpretative element blends with his narration of incidents and discourses. This, however, does not warrant us in throwing doubt, with so many, on the genuineness of the Gospel, for which the external evidence is exceptionally strong (compare Sanday, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*; Drummond, *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*; and see *JOHN, GOSPEL OF*). The Gospel is accepted

here as a genuine record of the sayings and doings of Jesus which it narrates.

## II. THE PREPARATION.

### *1. Both Gentile and Jewish:*

In the Gospels and throughout the New Testament Jesus appears as the goal of Old Testament revelation, and the point to which all providential developments tended. He came, Paul says, in “the fullness of the time” (~~<804>~~ Galatians 4:4). It has often been shown how, politically, intellectually, morally, everything in the Greco-Roman world was ready for such a universal religion as Jesus brought into it (compare Baur’s Hist of the Church in the First Three Cents., English translation, chapter i). The preparation in Israel is seen alike in God’s revelations to, and dealings with, the chosen people in the patriarchal, Mosaic, monarchical and prophetic periods, and in the developments of the Jewish mind in the centuries immediately before Christ.

### *2. Old Testament Preparation:*

As special lines in the Old Testament preparation may be noted the ideas of the Messianic king, a ruler of David’s house, whose reign would be righteous, perpetual, universal (compare ~~<2073>~~ Isaiah 7:13-9:7; 32:1,2; ~~<2685>~~ Jeremiah 33:15,16; ~~<801>~~ Psalm 2:1-10, etc.); of a Righteous Sufferer (Psalm 22, etc.), whose sufferings are in Isaiah 53 declared to have an expiatory and redeeming character; and of a Messianic kingdom, which, breaking the bounds of nationalism, would extend through the whole earth and embrace all peoples (compare Isaiah 60; Psalm 87; ~~<2084>~~ Daniel 2:44; 7:27, etc.). The kingdom, at the same time, is now conceived of under a more spiritual aspect. Its chief blessings are forgiveness and righteousness.

### *3. Post-exilian Preparation:*

The age succeeding the return from exile witnessed a manifold preparation for the advent of Christ. Here may be observed the decentralization of the Jewish religious ideals through the rise of synagogue worship and the widespread dispersion of the race; the contact with Hellenic culture (as in Philo); but especially the marked sharpening of Messianic expectations. Some of these were of a crude apocalyptic character (see *APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE; ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT*); many were political and revolutionary; but some were of a purer and more

spiritual kind (compare <sup><4025></sup>Luke 2:25,38). To these purer elements Jesus attached Himself in His preaching of the kingdom and of Himself as its Lord. Even in the Gentileworld, it is told, there was an expectation of a great One who about this time would come from Judea (Tacitus, History v.13; Suet. Vespas. 4).

### III. THE OUTWARD SITUATION.

#### *1. The Land:*

Of all lands Palestine was the most fitted to be the scene of the culminating revelation of God's grace in the person and work of Jesus Christ, as before it was fitted to be the abode of the people chosen to receive and preserve the revelations that prepared the way for that final manifestation. At once central and secluded — at the junction of the three great continents of the Old World, Asia, Africa and Europe — the highway of nations in war and commerce — touching mighty powers on every hand, Egypt, Syria, Assyria, kingdoms of Asia Minor, as formerly more ancient empires, Hittite and Babylonian, now in contact with Greece and Rome, yet singularly enclosed by mountain, desert, Jordan gorge, and Great Sea, from ready entrance of foreign influences, Palestine has a place of its own in the history of revelation, which only a Divine wisdom can have given it (compare Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, Part II, chapter ii; G.A. Smith, Hist. Geog. of the Holy Land, Book I, chapters i, ii; Lange, Life of Christ, I, 246 ff).

#### **Its Divisions.**

Palestine, in the Roman period, was divided into four well-defined provinces or districts — Judaea, with Jerusalem as its center, in the South, the strong-hold of Jewish conservatism; Samaria, in the middle, peopled from Assyrian times by mixed settlers (<sup><2724></sup>2 Kings 17:24-34), preponderatingly heathen in origin, yet now professing the Jewish religion, claiming Jewish descent (compare <sup><4012></sup>John 4:12), possessing a copy of the law (Samuel Pentateuch), and a temple of their own at Gerizim (the original temple, built by Manasseh, circa 409 BC, was destroyed by John Hyrcanus, 109 BC); Galilee — “Galilee of the Gentiles” (<sup><4015></sup>Matthew 4:15; compare <sup><3901></sup>Isaiah 9:1) — in the North, the chief scene of Christ's ministry, freer and more cosmopolitan in spirit, through a large infusion of Gentile population, and contact with traders, etc., of varied nationalities: these in Western Palestine, while on the East, “beyond Jordan,” was

Peraea, divided up into Peraea proper, Batanea, Gaulonitis, Ituraea, Trachonitis, Decapolis, etc. (compare ~~ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲥ~~ Matthew 4:25; 19:1; ~~ⲁⲓⲟⲓⲃ~~ Luke 3:1). The feeling of bitterness between Jews and Samaritans was intense (~~ⲁⲓⲟⲓⲃ~~ John 4:9). The language of the people throughout was *ARAMAIC* (which see), but a knowledge of the Greek tongue was widely diffused, especially in the North, where intercourse with Greek-speaking peoples was habitual (the New Testament writings are in Greek). Jesus doubtless used the native dialect in His ordinary teaching, but it is highly probable that He also knew Greek, and was acquainted with Old Testament Scriptures in that language (the Septuagint). In this case He may have sometimes used it in His preaching (compare Roberts, Discussions on the Gospels).

## *2. Political Situation*

The miserable story of the vicissitudes of the Jewish people in the century succeeding the great persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabean revolt — a story made up of faction, intrigue, wars, murders, massacres, of growing degeneracy of rulers and nation, of repeated sackings of Jerusalem and terrible slaughters — till Herod, the Idumean, misnamed “the Great,” ascended the throne by favor of the Romans (37 BC), must be read in the books relating to the period (Ewald, History of Israel, V; Milman, Hist of Jews; Schurer, History of the Jewish People in Time of Christ, Div I, Vol I; Stanley, Jewish Church, III, etc.). Rome’s power, first invited by Judas Maccabeus (161 BC), was finally established by Pompey’s capture of Jerusalem (63 BC). Herod’s way to the throne was tracked by crime and bloodshed, and murder of those most nearly related to him marked every step in his advance. His taste for splendid buildings — palace, temple (~~ⲁⲓⲟⲓⲃ~~ Matthew 24:1; ~~ⲁⲓⲟⲓⲃ~~ John 2:20), fortresses, cities (Sebaste, Caesarea, etc.) — and lavish magnificence of his royal estate and administration, could not conceal the hideousness of his crafty, unscrupulous selfishness, his cold-blooded cruelty, his tyrannous oppression of his subjects. “Better be Herod’s hog ([*hus*]) than his son ([*huios*]),” was the comment of Augustus, when he heard of the dying king’s unnatural doings.

## **Changes in Territory.**

At the time of Christ’s birth, the whole of Palestine was united under Herod’s rule, but on Herod’s death, after a long reign of 37 (or, counting

from his actual accession, 34) years, his dominions were, in accordance with his will, confirmed by Rome, divided. Judea and Samaria (a few towns excepted) fell to his son Archelaus (~~<402>~~ Matthew 2:22), with the title of “ethnarch”; Galilee and Perea were given to Herod Antipas, another son, with the title of “tetrarch” (~~<440>~~ Matthew 14:1; ~~<400>~~ Luke 3:1,19; 23:7; ~~<417>~~ Acts 13:1); Herod Philip, a third son, received Iturea, Trachonitis, and other parts of the northern trans-Jordanic territory, likewise as “tetrarch” (~~<400>~~ Luke 3:1; compare ~~<443>~~ Matthew 14:3; ~~<407>~~ Mark 6:17). A few years later, the tyranny of Archelaus provoked an appeal of his subjects to Augustus, and Archelaus, summoned to Rome, was banished to Gaul (7 AD). Thereafter Judea, with Samaria, was governed by a Roman procurator, under the oversight of the prefect of Syria.

### *3. The Religious Sects:*

In the religious situation the chief fact of interest is the place occupied and prominent part played by the religious sects — the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and (though unmentioned in the Gospels, these had an important influence on the early history of the church) the Essenes. The rise and characteristics of these sects can here only be alluded to (see special articles).

#### **(1) The Scribes.**

From the days of Ezra zealous attention had been given to the study of the law, and an order of men had arisen — the “scribes” — whose special business it was to guard, develop and expound the law. Through their labors, scrupulous observance of the law, and, with it, of the innumerable regulations intended to preserve the law, and apply it in detail to conduct (the so-called “tradition of the elders,” ~~<415>~~ Matthew 15:2 ff), became the ideal of righteousness. The sects first appear in the Maccabean age. The Maccabean conflict reveals the existence of a party known as the “Assidaeans” (Hebrew [chacidhim]), or “pious” ones, opposed to the lax Hellenizing tendencies of the times, and staunch observers of the law. These in the beginning gave brave support to Judas Maccabeus, and doubtless then embraced the best elements of the nation.

#### **(2) The Pharisees.**

From them, by a process of deterioration too natural in such cases, developed the party of legalists known in the Gospels as the “Pharisees”

("separated"), on which Christ's sternest rebukes fell for their self-righteousness, ostentation, pride and lack of sympathy and charity (~~40B~~ Matthew 6:2 ff; 23; ~~20D~~ Luke 18:9-14). They gloried in an excessive scrupulosity in the observance of the externals of the law, even in trivialities. To them the multitude that knew not the law were "accursed" (~~40B~~ John 7:49). To this party the great body of the scribes and rabbis belonged, and its powerful influence was eagerly sought by contending factions in the state.

### (3) The Sadducees.

Alongside of the Pharisees were the "Sadducees" (probably from "Zadok") — rather a political and aristocratic clique than a religious sect, into whose possession the honors of the high-priesthood and other influential offices hereditarily passed. They are first met with by name under John Hyrcanus (135-106 BC). The Sadducees received only the law of Moses, interpreted it in a literal, secularistic spirit, rejected the Pharisaic traditions and believed in neither resurrection, angel nor spirit (~~40B~~ Acts 23:8). Usually in rivalry with the Pharisees, they are found combining with these to destroy Jesus (~~40B~~ Matthew 26:3-5,57).

### (4) The Essenes.

The third party, the "Essenes," differed from both (some derive also from the Assideans) in living in fraternities apart from the general community, chiefly in the desert of Engedi, on the Northwest shore of the Dead Sea, though some were found also in villages and towns; in rejecting animal sacrifices, etc., sending only gifts of incense to the temple; in practicing celibacy and community of goods; in the wearing of white garments; in certain customs (as greeting the sunrise with prayers) suggestive of oriental influence. They forbade slavery, war, oaths, were given to occult studies, had secret doctrines and books, etc. As remarked, they do not appear in the Gospel, but on account of certain resemblances, some have sought to establish a connection between them and John the Baptist and Jesus. In reality, however, nothing could be more opposed than Essenism to the essential ideas and spirit of Christ's teaching (compare Schurer, as above, Div. II, Vol. II, 188 ff; Kuenen, Hibbert Lects on National Religions and Universal Religions, 199-208; Lightfoot, Colossians, 114-79).



#### *IV. The Chronology.*

The leading chronological questions connected with the life of Jesus are discussed in detail elsewhere (*CHRONOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; QUIRINIUS*, etc.); here it is sufficient to indicate the general scheme of dating adopted in the present article, and some of the grounds on which it is preferred. The chief questions relate to the dates of the birth and baptism of Jesus, the duration of the ministry and the date of the crucifixion.

##### **1. Date of the Birth of Jesus:**

Though challenged by some (Caspari, Bosanquet, Conder, etc., put it as late as 1 BC) the usual date for the death of Herod the Great, March, 4 BC (year of Rome 750), may be assumed as correct (for grounds of this dating, see Schurer, *op. cit.*, Div. I, Vol. I, 464-67). The birth of Jesus was before, and apparently not very long before, this event (Matthew 2). It may therefore be placed with probability in the latter part of the previous year (5 BC), the ordinary dating of the commencement of the Christian era being thus, as is generally recognized, four years too late. There is no certainty as to the month or day of the birth. The Christmas date, December 25, is first met with in the West in the 4th century (the eastern date was January 6), and was then possibly borrowed from a pagan festival. December, in the winter season, seems unlikely, as unsuitable for the pasturing of flocks (~~QNT~~ Luke 2:8), though this objection is perhaps not decisive (Andrews, Conder). A more probable date is a couple of months earlier. The synchronism with Quirinius (~~QNT~~ Luke 2:2) is considered in connection with the nativity. The earlier datings of 6, 7, or even 8 BC, suggested by Ramsay, Mackinlay and others, on grounds of the assumed Roman census, astronomical phenomena, etc., appear to leave too long an interval before the death of Herod, and conflict with other data, as ~~QNT~~ Luke 3:1 (see below).

##### **2. Date of Baptism:**

John is said by Luke to have begun to preach and baptize “in the fifteenth year of Tiberius” (~~QNT~~ Luke 3:1), and Jesus “was about thirty years of age” (~~QNT~~ Luke 3:23) when He was baptized by John, and entered on His ministry. If the 15th year of Tiberius is dated, as seems most likely, from his association with Augustus as colleague in the government, 765 AUC, or 12 AD (Tacitus, *Annals* i.3; Suetonius on Augustus, 97), and if Jesus

may be supposed to have been baptized about 6 months after John commenced his work, these data combine in bringing us to the year 780 AUC, or 27 AD, as the year of our Lord's baptism, in agreement with our former conclusion as to the date of His birth in 5 BC. To place the birth earlier is to make Jesus 32 or 33 years of age at His baptism — an unwarrantable extension of the “about.” In accord with this is the statement in ~~REB~~ John 2:20 that the temple had been 46 years in building (it began in 20-19 BC) at the time of Christ's first Passover; therefore in 780 AUC, or 27-AD (compare Schurer, *op. cit.*, Div. I, Vol. I, 410).

### 3. Length of Ministry:

The determination of the precise duration of our Lord's ministry involves more doubtful elements. Setting aside, as too arbitrary, schemes which would, with some of the early Fathers, compress the whole ministry into little over a single year (Browne, Hort, etc.) — a view which involves without authority the rejection of the mention of the Passover in ~~REB~~ John 6:4 — there remains the choice between a two years' and a three years' ministry. Both have able advocates (Turner in article “Chronology,” and Sanday in article “Jesus Christ,” in H D B, advocate the two years' scheme; Farrar, Ramsay, D. Smith, etc., adhere to the three years' scheme). An important point is the view taken of the unnamed “feast” in ~~REB~~ John 5:1. John has already named a Passover — Christ's first — in 2:13,23; another, which Jesus did not attend, is named in 6:4; the final Passover, at which He was crucified, appears in all the evangelists. If the “feast” of ~~REB~~ John 5:1 (the article is probably to be omitted) is also, as some think, a Passover, then John has four Passovers, and a three years' ministry becomes necessary. It is claimed, however, that in this case the “feast” would almost certainly have been named. It still does not follow, even if a minor feast — say Purim — is intended, that we are shut up to a two years' ministry. Mr. Turner certainly goes beyond his evidence in affirming that “while two years must, not more than two years can, be allowed for the interval from ~~REB~~ John 2:13,23 to ~~REB~~ John 11:55.” The two years' scheme involves, as will be seen on consideration of details, a serious overcrowding and arbitrary transposition of incidents, which speak to the need of longer time. We shall assume that the ministry lasted for three years, reserving reasons till the narrative is examined.

#### **4. Date of Christ's Death:**

On the hypothesis now accepted, the crucifixion of Jesus took place at the Passover of 30 AD. On the two years' scheme it would fall a year earlier. On both sides it is agreed that it occurred on the Friday of the week of the Passover, but it is disputed whether this Friday was the 14th or the 15th day of the month. The Gospel of John is pleaded for the former date, the Synoptics for the latter. The question will be considered in connection with the time of the Last Supper. Meanwhile it is to be observed that, if the 15th is the correct date, there seems reason to believe that the 15th of Nisan fell on a Friday in the year just named, 783 AUG, or 30 AD. We accept this provisionally as the date of the crucifixion.

### **PART II. THE PROBLEMS OF THE LIFE OF JESUS**

#### *I. The Miracles.*

##### **1. The "Modern" Attitude:**

Everyone is aware that the presence of miracle in the Gospels is a chief ground of the rejection of its history by the representatives of the "modern" school. It is not questioned that it is a super-natural person whose picture is presented in the Gospels. There is no real difference between the Synoptics and John in this respect. "Even the oldest Gospel," writes Bousset, "is written from the standpoint of faith; already for Mark, Jesus is not only the Messiah of the Jewish people, but the miraculous eternal Son of God, whose glory shone in the world" (Was wissen wir von Jesus? 54, 57). But the same writer, interpreting the "modern" spirit, declares that no account embracing supernatural events can be accepted as historical. "The main characteristic of this modern mode of thinking," he says, "rests upon the determination to try to explain everything that takes place in the world by natural causes, or — to express it in another form — it rests on the determined assertion of universal laws to which all phenomena, natural and spiritual, are subject" (What Is Religion? English translation, 283).

##### **2. Supernatural in the Gospels:**

With such an assumption it is clear that the Gospels are condemned before they are read. Not only is Jesus there a supernatural person, but He is presented as super-natural in natural in character, in works, in claims (see below); He performs miracles; He has a supernatural birth, and a supernatural resurrection. All this is swept away. It may be allowed that He

had remarkable gifts of healing, but these are in the class of “faithcures” (thus Harnack), and not truly supernatural. When one seeks the justification for this selfconfident dogmatism, it is difficult to discover it, except on the ground of a pantheistic or monistic theory of the universe which excludes the personal God of Christianity. If God is the Author and Sustainer of the natural system, which He rules for moral ends, it is impossible to see why, for high ends of revelation and redemption, a supernatural economy should not be engrafted on the natural, achieving ends which could not otherwise be attained. This does not of course touch the question of evidence for any particular miracle, which must be judged of from its connection with the person of the worker, and the character of the apostolic witnesses. The well-meant effort to explain all miracles through the action of unknown natural laws — which is what Dr. Sanday calls “making both ends meet” (*Life of Christ in Recent Research*, 302) — breaks down in the presence of such miracles as the instantaneous cleansing of the leper, restoration of sight to the blind, the raising of the dead, acts which plainly imply an exercise of creative power. In such a life as Christ’s, transcendence of the ordinary powers of Nature is surely to be looked for.

## *II. The Messiahship.*

### **1. Reserve of Jesus and Modern Criticism:**

A difficulty has been found in the fact that in all the Gospels Jesus knew Himself to be the Messiah at least from the time of His baptism, yet did not, even to His disciples, unreservedly announce Himself as such till after Peter’s great confession at Caesarea Philippi (~~cf.~~ Matthew 16:13 ff). On this seeming secrecy the bold hypothesis has been built that Jesus in reality never made the claim to Messiahship, and that the passages which imply the contrary in Mark (the original Gospel) are unhistorical (Wrede; compare on this and other theories, Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, English translation; Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*). So extreme an opinion is rejected by most; but modern critics vie with each other in the freedom with which they treat the testimony of the evangelists on this subject. Baldensperger, e.g., supposes that Jesus did not attain full certainty on His Messiahship till near the time of Peter’s confession, and arbitrarily transposes the earlier sections in which the title “Son of Man” occurs till after that event (*Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, 2nd edition, 246). Bousset thinks that Jesus adopted the Messianic role as the

only one open to Him, but bore it as a “burden” (compare his Jesus). Schweitzer connects it with apocalyptic ideas of a wildly fantastic character (op. cit., chapter xix).

## 2. A Growing Revelation:

There is, however, no need for supposing that Peter’s confession marks the first dawn of this knowledge in the minds of the apostles. Rather was it the exalted expression of a faith already present, which had long been maturing. The baptism and temptation, with the use of the title “Son of Man,” the tone of authority in His teaching, His miracles, and many special incidents, show, as clearly as do the discourses in John, that Jesus was from the beginning fully conscious of His vocation, and His reserve in the use of the title sprang, not from any doubt in His own mind as to His right to it, but from His desire to avoid false associations till the true nature of His Messiahship should be revealed. The Messiahship was in process of self-revelation throughout to those who had eyes to see it (compare ~~886~~ John 6:66-71). What it involved will be seen later.

### *III. Kingdom and Apocalypse.*

#### 1. The Kingdom — Present or Future?:

Connected with the Messiahship is the idea of the “Kingdom of God” or “of heaven,” which some in modern times would interpret in a purely eschatological sense, in the light of Jewish apocalyptic conceptions (Johannes Weiss, Schweitzer, etc.). The kingdom is not a thing of the present, but wholly a thing of the future, to be introduced by convulsions of Nature and the Parousia of the Son of Man. The language of the Lord’s Prayer, “Thy kingdom come,” is quoted in support of this contention, but the next petition should guard against so violent an inference. “Thy will be done,” Jesus teaches His disciples to pray, “as in heaven, so on earth” (~~886~~ Matthew 6:10). The kingdom is the reign of God in human hearts and lives in this world as well as in the next. It would not be wrong to define it as consisting essentially in the supremacy of God’s will in human hearts and human affairs, and in every department of these affairs. As Jesus describes the kingdom, it has, in the plain meaning of His words, a present being on earth, though its perfection is in eternity. The parables in Matthew 13 and elsewhere exhibit it as founded by the sowing of the word of truth (Sower), as a mingling of good and evil elements (Tares), as growing from small beginnings to large proportions (Mustard Seed), as gradually

leavening humanity (Leaven), as of priceless value (Treasure; Pearl; compare <sup><4163></sup>Matthew 6:33); as terminating in a judgment (Tares, Dragnet); as perfected in the world to come (<sup><4133></sup>Matthew 13:43). It was a kingdom spiritual in nature (<sup><2171></sup>Luke 17:20,21), universal in range (<sup><4181></sup>Matthew 8:11; 21:43, etc.), developing from a principle of life within (<sup><4025></sup>Mark 4:26-29), and issuing in victory over all opposition (<sup><4144></sup>Matthew 21:44).

## 2. Apocalyptic Beliefs:

It is difficult to pronounce on the extent to which Jesus was acquainted with current apocalyptic beliefs, or allowed these to color the imagery of parts of His teachings. These beliefs certainly did not furnish the substance of His teaching, and it may be doubted whether they more than superficially affected even its form. Jewish apocalyptic knew nothing of a death and resurrection of the Messiah and of His return in glory to bring in an everlasting kingdom. What Jesus taught on these subjects sprang from His own Messianic consciousness, with the certainty He had of His triumph over death and His exaltation to the right hand of God. It was in Old Testament prophecy, not in late Jewish apocalypse, that His thoughts of the future triumph of His kingdom were grounded, and from the vivid imagery of the prophets He borrowed most of the clothing of these thoughts. Isaiah 53 e.g., predicts not only the rejection and death of the Servant of Yahweh (53:3,1-9,12), but the prolongation of His days and His victorious reign (53:10-12). Dnl, not the Book of En, is the source of the title, “Son of Man,” and of the imagery of coming on the clouds of heaven (<sup><2073></sup>Daniel 7:13). The ideas of resurrection, etc., have their ground in the Old Testament (*see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT*). With the extravagant, unspiritual forms into which these conceptions were thrown in the Jewish apocalyptic books His teaching had nothing in common. The new apocalyptic school represented by Schweitzer reduces the history of Jesus to folly, fanaticism and hopeless disillusionment.

### *IV. The Character and Claims.*

#### 1. Denial of Christ’s Moral Perfection:

Where the Gospels present us in Jesus with the image of a flawless character — in the words of the writer to the Hebrews, “holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners” (<sup><3025></sup>Hebrews 7:26) — modern criticism is driven by an inexorable necessity to deprive Jesus of His sinless perfection, and to impute to Him the error, frailty, and moral infirmity that

belong to ordinary mortals. In Schweitzer's portraiture (compare op. cit.), He is an apocalyptic enthusiastic, ruled by illusory ideals, deceiving Himself and others as to who He was, and as to the impending end of the world. Those who show a more adequate appreciation of Christ's spiritual greatness are still prevented by their humanitarian estimate of His person and their denial of the supernatural in history from recognizing the possibility of His sinlessness. It may confidently be said that there is hardly a single writer of the modern school who grants Christ's moral perfection. To do so would be to admit a miracle in humanity, and we have heard that miracle is by the highest rational necessity excluded. This, however, is precisely the point on which the modern so-called "historical-critical" mode of presentation most obviously breaks down. The ideal of perfect holiness in the Gospels which has fascinated the conscience of Christendom for 18 centuries, and attests itself anew to every candid reader, is not thus lightly to be got rid of, or explained away as the invention of a church gathered out (without the help of the ideal) promiscuously from Jews and Gentiles. It was not the church — least of all such a church — that created Christ, but Christ that created the church.

### (1) The Sinlessness Assured.

The sinlessness of Jesus is a datum in the Gospels. Over against a sinful world He stands as a Saviour who is Himself without sin. His is the one life in humanity in which is presented a perfect knowledge and unbroken fellowship with the Father, undeviating obedience to His will, unswerving devotion under the severest strain of temptation and suffering to the highest ideal of goodness. The ethical ideal was never raised to so absolute a height as it is in the teaching of Jesus, and the miracle is that, high as it is in its unsullied purity, the character of Jesus corresponds with it, and realizes it. Word and life for once in history perfectly agree. Jesus, with the keenest sensitiveness to sin in thought and feeling as in deed, is conscious of no sin in Himself, confesses no sin, disclaims the presence of it, speaks and acts continually on the assumption that He is without it. Those who knew Him best declared Him to be without sin (~~1022~~ 1 Peter 2:22; ~~1025~~ 1 John 3:5; compare ~~1026~~ 2 Corinthians 5:21). The Gospels must be rent in pieces before this image of a perfect holiness can be effaced from them.

### (2) What This Implies.

How is this phenomenon of a sinless personality in Jesus to be explained? It is itself a miracle, and can only be made credible by a creative miracle in Christ's origin. It may be argued that a Virgin Birth does not of itself secure sinlessness, but it will hardly be disputed that at least a sinless personality implies miracle in its production. It is precisely because of this that the modern spirit feels bound to reject it. In the Gospels it is not the Virgin Birth by itself which is invoked to explain Christ's sinlessness, but the supernatural conception by the Holy Spirit (~~and~~ Luke 1:35). It is because of this conception that the birth is a virgin one. No explanation of the supernatural element in Christ's Person is more rational or credible (see below on "Nativity").

## **2. Sinlessness and the Messianic Claim:**

If Jesus from the first was conscious of Himself as without sin and if, as the converse of this, He knew Himself as standing in an unbroken filial fellowship with the Father, He must early have become conscious of His special vocation, and learnt to distinguish Himself from others as one called to bless and save them. Here is the true germ of His Messianic consciousness, from which everything subsequently is unfolded. He stood in a rapport with the Father which opened His spirit to a full, clear revelation of the Father's will regarding Himself, His mission, the kingdom He came to found, His sufferings as the means of salvation to the world, the glory that awaited Him when His earthly work was done. In the light of this revelation He read the Old Testament Scriptures and saw His course there made plain. When the hour had come He went to John for baptism, and His brief, eventful ministry, which should end in the cross, began. This is the reading of events which introduces consistency and purpose into the life of Jesus, and it is this we mean to follow in the sketch now to be given.

## **PART III. COURSE OF THE EARTHLY LIFE OF JESUS**

### **1. Divisions of the History:**

The wonderful story of the life of the world's Redeemer which we are now to endeavor to trace falls naturally into several divisions:

**A.** From the Nativity to the Baptism and Temptation.

**B.** The Early Judean Ministry.



- C.** The Galilean Ministry and Visits to the Feasts.
- D.** The Last Journey to Jerusalem.
- E.** The Passion Week — Betrayal, Trial, and Crucifixion.
- F.** The Resurrection and Ascension.

## **2. Not a Complete “Life”:**

To avoid misconception, it is important to remember, that, rich as are the narratives of the Gospels, materials do not exist for a complete biography or “Life” of Jesus. There is a gap, broken only by a single incident, from His infancy till His 30th year; there are cycles of events out of myriads left unrecorded (<sup><40125></sup>John 21:25); there are sayings, parables, longer discourses, connected with particular occasions; there are general summaries of periods of activity comprised in a few verses. The evangelists, too, present their materials each from his own standpoint — Matthew from theocratic, Mark from that of Christ’s practical activity, Luke from the universalistic and human-sympathetic, John from the Divine. In reproducing the history respect must be had to this focusing from distinct points of view.

### *A. FROM THE NATIVITY TO THE BAPTISM AND TEMPTATION*

#### **I. The Nativity.**

##### **1. Hidden Piety in Judaism:**

Old Testament prophecy expired with the promise on its lips, “Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, will suddenly come to his temple; and the messenger of the covenant, whom ye desire, behold, he cometh, saith Yahweh of hosts” (<sup><40118></sup>Malachi 3:1). In the years immediately before Christ’s birth the air was tremulous with the sense of impending great events. The fortunes of the Jewish people were at their lowest ebb. Pharisaic formalism, Sadducean unbelief, fanatical Zealotry, Herodian sycophantism, Roman oppression, seemed to have crushed out the last sparks of spiritual religion. Yet in numerous quiet circles in Judea, and even in remote Galilee, little godly bands still nourished their souls on the promises, looking for “the consolation of Israel” and “redemption of Jerusalem” (<sup><40125></sup>Luke 2:25,38). Glimpses of these are vouchsafed in Zacharias and Elisabeth, in Simeon, in Anna, in Joseph and Mary (Luke 1; 2; <sup><40118></sup>Matthew 1:18 ff). It was in

hearts in these circles that the stirrings of the prophetic spirit began to make themselves felt anew, preparing for the Advent (compare ~~<127>~~ Luke 2:27,36).

## 2. Birth of the Baptist:

### (LUKE 1)

In the last days of Herod — perhaps in the year 748 of Rome, or 6 BC — the aged priest Zacharias, of the course of Abijah (~~<1240>~~ 1 Chronicles 24:10; compare Schurer, Div. II, Vol. I, 219 ff), was ministering in the temple at the altar of incense at the hour of evening prayer. Scholars have reckoned, if on somewhat precarious grounds, that the ministry of the order to which Zacharias belonged fell in this year in the month of April or in early October (compare Andrews, Life of our Lord). Now a wonderful thing happened. Zacharias and his wife Elisabeth, noted for their blameless piety, were up to this time childless. On this evening an angel, appearing at the side of the altar of incense, announced to Zacharias that a son should be born to them, in whom should be realized the prediction of Malachi of one coming in the spirit and power of Elijah to prepare the way of the Lord (compare ~~<1015>~~ Malachi 4:5,6). His name was to be called John. Zacharias hesitated to believe, and was stricken with dumbness till the promise should be fulfilled. It happened as the angel had foretold, and at the circumcision and naming of his son his tongue was again loosed. Zacharias, filled with the Spirit, poured forth his soul in a hymn of praise — the Benedictus (~~<1015>~~ Luke 1:5-25,57-80; compare *JOHN THE BAPTIST*).

## 3. The Annunciation and Its Results:

### (~~<1015>~~ LUKE 1:26-56; ~~<1018>~~ MATTHEW 1:18-25)

Meanwhile yet stranger things were happening in the little village of Nazareth, in Galilee (now enNacirah). There resided a young maiden of purest character, named Mary, betrothed to a carpenter of the village (compare ~~<1015>~~ Matthew 13:55), called Joseph, who, although in so humble a station, was of the lineage of David (compare ~~<2100>~~ Isaiah 11:1). Mary, most probably, was likewise of Davidic descent (~~<1013>~~ Luke 1:32; on the genealogies, see below). The fables relating to the parentage and youth of Mary in the Apocryphal Gospels may safely be discarded. To this maiden, three months before the birth of the Baptist, the same angelic visitant

(Gabriel) appeared, hailing her as “highly favored” of God, and announcing to her that, through the power of the Holy Spirit, she should become the mother of the Saviour. The words “Blessed art thou among women,” in the King James Version of ~~(<sup>4018</sup>)~~ Luke 1:28 are omitted by the Revised Version (British and American), though found below (1:42) in Elisabeth’s salutation. They give, in any case, no support to Mariolatry, stating simply the fact that Mary was more honored than any other woman of the race in being chosen to be the mother of the Lord.

### (1) The Amazing Message.

The announcement itself was of the most amazing import. Mary herself was staggered at the thought that, as a virgin, she should become a mother (~~(<sup>4018</sup>)~~ Luke 1:34). Still more surprising were the statements made as to the Son she was to bear. Conceived of the Holy Spirit (~~(<sup>4018</sup>)~~ Luke 1:35; ~~(<sup>4018</sup>)~~ Matthew 1:18), He would be great, and would be called “the Son of the Most High” (~~(<sup>4018</sup>)~~ Luke 1:32) — “the Son of God” (~~(<sup>4018</sup>)~~ Luke 1:35); there would be given to Him the throne of His father David, and His reign would be eternal (~~(<sup>4018</sup>)~~ Luke 1:32,33; compare ~~(<sup>2106</sup>)~~ Isaiah 9:6,7); He would be “holy” from the womb (~~(<sup>4018</sup>)~~ Luke 1:35). His name was to be called Jesus (~~(<sup>4018</sup>)~~ Luke 1:31; compare ~~(<sup>4021</sup>)~~ Matthew 1:21), denoting Him as Saviour. The holiness of Jesus is here put in connection with His miraculous conception, and surely rightly. In no case in the history of mankind has natural generation issued in a being who is sinless, not to say superhuman. The fact that Jesus, even in His human nature, was supernaturally begotten — was “Son of God” — does not exclude the higher and eternal Sonship according to the Divine nature (~~(<sup>4018</sup>)~~ John 1:18). The incarnation of such a Divine Being as Paul and John depict, itself implies miracle in human origin. On the whole message being declared to her, Mary accepted what was told her in meek humility (~~(<sup>4018</sup>)~~ Luke 1:38).

### (2) The Visit to Elisabeth.

With the announcement to herself there was given to Mary an indication of what had befallen her kinswoman Elisabeth, and Mary’s first act, on recovering from her astonishment, was to go in haste to the home of Elisabeth in the hill country of Judea (~~(<sup>4019</sup>)~~ Luke 1:39 ff). Very naturally she did not rashly forestall God’s action in speaking to Joseph of what had occurred, but waited in quietness and faith till God should reveal in His own way what He had done. The meeting of the two holy women was the

occasion of a new outburst of prophetic inspiration. Elisabeth, moved by the Spirit, greeted Mary in exalted language as the mother of the Lord (~~Q142~~ Luke 1:42-45) — a confirmation to Mary of the message she had received; Mary, on her part, broke forth in rhythmical utterance, “My soul doth magnify the Lord,” etc. (~~Q146~~ Luke 1:46-56). Her hymn — the sublime Magnificat — is to be compared with Hannah’s (~~Q111~~ 1 Samuel 2:1-11), which furnishes the model of it. Mary abode with Elisabeth about three months, then returned to her own house.

### (3) Joseph’s Perplexity.

Here a new trial awaited her. Mary’s condition of motherhood could not long be concealed, and when Joseph first became aware of it, the shock to a man so just (~~Q119~~ Matthew 1:19) would be terrible in its severity. The disappearance of Joseph from the later gospel history suggests that he was a good deal older than his betrothed, and it is possible that, while strict, upright and conscientious, his disposition was not as strong on the side of sympathy as so delicate a case required. It is going too far to say with Lange, “He encountered the modest, but unshakably firm Virgin with decided doubt; the first Ebionite”; but so long as he had no support beyond Mary’s word, his mind was in a state of agonized perplexity. His first thought was to give Mary a private “bill of divorcement” to avoid scandal (~~Q119~~ Matthew 1:19). Happily, his doubts were soon set at rest by a Divine intimation, and he hesitated no longer to take Mary to be his wife (~~Q124~~ Matthew 1:24). Luke’s Gospel, which confines itself to the story of Mary, says nothing of this episode; Matthew’s narrative, which bears evidence of having come from Joseph himself, supplies the lack by showing how Joseph came to have the confidence in Mary which enabled him to take her to wife, and become sponsor for her child. The trial, doubtless, while it lasted, was not less severe for Mary than for Joseph — a prelude of that sword which was to “pierce through (her) own soul” (~~Q125~~ Luke 2:35). There is no reason to believe that Joseph and Mary did not subsequently live in the usual relations of wedlock, and that children were not born to them (compare ~~Q135~~ Matthew 13:55,56, etc.).

### 4. The Birth at Bethlehem:

(~~400~~ MATTHEW 2:1; ~~400~~ LUKE 2:1-7)

Matthew gives no indication of where the events narrated in his first chapter took place, first mentioning Nazareth on the occasion of the return of the holy family from Egypt (2:23). In 2:1 he transports us to Bethlehem as the city of Christ's birth. It is left to Luke to give an account of the circumstances which brought Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem — thus fulfilling prophecy (~~400~~ Micah 5:2; ~~400~~ Matthew 2:5,6) — at this critical hour, and to record the lowly manner of Christ's birth there.

(1) The Census of Quirinius.

The emperor Augustus had given orders for a general enrollment throughout the empire (the fact of periodical enrollments in the empire is well established by Professor W.M. Ramsay in his *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?*), and this is stated to have been given effect to in Judea when Quirinius was governor of Syria (~~400~~ Luke 2:1,2). The difficulties connected with the enrollment or census here mentioned are discussed in the article *QUIRINIUS*. It is known that Quirinius did conduct a census in Judea in 6 AD (compare ~~400~~ Acts 5:37), but the census at Christ's birth is distinguished from this by Luke as "the first enrollment." The difficulty was largely removed when it was ascertained, as it has been to the satisfaction of most scholars, that Quirinius was twice governor of Syria — first, after Herod's death, 4-1 BC, and again in 6-11 AD. The probability is that the census was begun under Varus, the immediate predecessor of Quirinius — or even earlier under Saturninus — but was delayed in its application to Judea, then under Herod's jurisdiction, and was completed by Quirinius, with whose name it is officially connected. That the enrollment was made by each one going to his own city (verse 3) is explained by the fact that the census was not made according to the Roman method, but, as befitted a dependent kingdom, in accordance with Jewish usages (compare Ramsay).

(2) Jesus Born.

It must be left undecided whether the journey of Mary to Bethlehem with Joseph was required for any purpose of registration, or sprang simply from her unwillingness to be separated from Joseph in so trying a situation. To Bethlehem, in any case, possibly by Divine monition, she came, and there, in the ancestral city of David, in circumstances the lowliest conceivable, brought forth her marvelous child. In unadorned language — very different from the embellishments of apocryphal story — Luke narrates how, when

the travelers arrived, no room was found for them in the “inn” — the ordinary eastern khan or caravanserai, a square enclosure, with an open court for cattle, and a raised recess round the walls for shelter of visitors — and how, when her babe was born, Mary wrapped Him in swaddling clothes, and laid Him in a manger. The wearied pair having, according to Luke, been crowded out of, and not merely within, the inn, there is every probability that the birth took place, not, as some suppose, in the courtyard of the inn, but, as the oldest tradition asserts (Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho, 78), in a cave in the neighborhood, used for similar purposes of lodgment and housing of cattle. High authorities look favorably on the “cave of the nativity” still shown, with its inscription, Hic de virgine Maria Jesus Christus natus est, as marking the sacred spot. In such incredibly mean surroundings was “the only begotten of the Father” ushered into the world He came to redeem. How true the apostle’s word that He “emptied” Himself (Phil 2:7)! A problem lies in the very circumstances of the entrance into time of such a One, which only the thought of a voluntary humiliation for saving ends can solve.

## 5. The Incidents of the Infancy:

(~~8008~~ **LUKE 2:8-39;** ~~8008~~ **MATTHEW 2:1-12**)

Born, however, though Jesus was, in a low condition, the Father did not leave Him totally without witness to His Sonship. There were rifts in the clouds through which cidents of the hidden glory streamed. The scenes in the narratives of the Infancy exhibit a strange commingling of the glorious and the lowly.

### (1) The Visit of the Shepherds.

To shepherds watching their flocks by night in the fields near Bethlehem the first disclosure was made. The season, one would infer, could hardly have been winter, though it is stated that there is frequently an interval of dry weather in Judea between the middle of December and the middle of February, when such a keeping of flocks would be possible (Andrews). The angel world is not far removed from us, and as angels preannounced the birth of Christ, so, when He actually came into the world (compare ~~8006~~ Hebrews 1:6), angels of God made the night vocal with their songs. First, an angel appearing in the midst of the Divine glory — the “Shekinah” — announced to the sorely alarmed shepherds the birth of a “Saviour who

was Christ the Lord” at Bethlehem; then a whole chorus of the heavenly host broke in with the refrain, “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men in whom He is well pleased” (literally, “men of good pleasure”) — since, the Christmas hymn of the generations (<sup><011></sup>Luke 2:1-14). The shepherds, guided as to how to recognize the babe (<sup><012></sup>Luke 2:12), went at once, and found it to be ever, as they had been told. Thence they hastened to spread abroad the tidings — the first believers, the first worshippers, the first preachers (<sup><015></sup>Luke 2:15-20). Mary cherished the sayings in the stillness of her heart.

## (2) The Circumcision and Presentation in the Temple.

Jewish law required that on the 8th day the male child should be circumcised, and on the same day He received His name (compare <sup><019></sup>Luke 1:59-63). Jesus, though entirely pure, underwent the rite which denoted the putting off of fleshly sin (<sup><021></sup>Colossians 2:11), and became bound, as a true Israelite, to render obedience to every Divine commandment. The name “Jesus” was then given Him (<sup><021></sup>Luke 2:21). On the 40th day came the ceremony of presentation in the temple at Jerusalem, when Mary had to offer for her purifying (Leviticus 12; Mary’s was the humbler offering of the poor, “a pair of turtle-doves, or two young pigeons” (<sup><028></sup>Leviticus 12:8; <sup><028></sup>Luke 2:24)), and when the first-born son had to be redeemed with 5 shekels of the sanctuary (<sup><035></sup>Numbers 18:15,16; about \$3.60). The observance was an additional token that Christ — personally sinless — did not shrink from full identification with our race in the responsibilities of its sinful condition. Ere it was completed, however, the ceremony was lifted to a Diviner level, and a new attestation was given of the dignity of the child of Mary, by the action and inspired utterances of the holy Simeon and the aged prophetess Anna. To Simeon, a righteous and devout man, “looking for the consolation of Israel,” it had been revealed that he should not die till he had seen the Lord’s Christ, and, led by the Spirit into the temple at the very time when Jesus was being presented, he recognized in Him the One for whom he had waited, and, taking Him in his arms, gave utterance to the beautiful words of the Nunc Dimittis — “Now lettest thou thy servant depart, Lord,” etc. (<sup><025></sup>Luke 2:25-32). He told also how this child was set for the falling and rising of many in Israel, and how, through Him, a sword should pierce through Mary’s own soul (<sup><034></sup>Luke 2:34,35). Entering at the same hour, the prophetess Anna — now in extreme old age (over 100; a constant frequenter of the temple, <sup><037></sup>Luke 2:37 — confirmed

his words, and spoke of Him to all who, like herself, looked “for the redemption of Jerusalem.”

### (3) Visit of the Magi.

It seems to have been after the presentation in the temple that the incident took place recorded by Matthew of the visit of the Magi. The Magi, a learned class belonging originally to Chaldea or Persia (*see MAGI*), had, in course of time, greatly degenerated (compare Simon Magus, <sup>418b</sup>Acts 8:9), but those who now came to seek Christ from the distant East were of a nobler order. They appeared in Jerusalem inquiring, “Where is He that is born King of the Jews?” and declaring that they had seen His star in the East, and had come to worship Him (<sup>418c</sup>Matthew 2:2). Observers of the nightly sky, any significant appearance in the heavens would at once attract their attention. Many (Kepler, Ideler, etc.; compare Ramsay, op. cit., 215 ff) are disposed to connect this “star” with a remarkable conjunction — or series of conjunctions — of planets in 7-6 BC, in which case it is possible that two years may have elapsed (compare the inquiry of Herod and his subsequent action, <sup>418d</sup>Matthew 2:7,16) from their observation of the sign. On the other hand, the fact of the star reappearing and seeming to stand over a house in Bethlehem (<sup>418e</sup>Matthew 2:9) rather points to a distinct phenomenon (compare *BETHLEHEM, STAR OF*). The inquiry of the Magi at once awakened Herod’s alarm; accordingly, having ascertained from the scribes that the Christ should be born at Bethlehem (<sup>418f</sup>Micah 5:2), he summoned the Magi, questioned them as to when exactly the star appeared, then sent them to Bethlehem to search out the young child, hypocritically pretending that he also wished to worship Him (<sup>418g</sup>Matthew 2:7,8). Herod had faith enough to believe the Scriptures, yet was foolish enough to think that he could thwart God’s purpose. Guided by the star, which anew appeared, the wise men came to Bethlehem, offered their gifts, and afterward, warned by God, returned by another road, without reporting to Herod. It is a striking picture — Herod the king, and Christ the King; Christ a power even in His cradle, inspiring terror, attracting homage! The faith of these sages, unrepelled by the lowly surroundings of the child they had discovered, worshipping, and laying at His feet their gold, frankincense and myrrh, is a splendid anticipation of the victories Christ was yet to win among the wisest as well as the humblest of our race. Herod, finding himself, as he thought, befooled by the Magi, avenged himself by ordering a massacre of all the male children of two years old, and under, in Bethlehem and its neighborhood (<sup>418h</sup>Matthew 2:16-19). This



slaughter, if not recorded elsewhere (compare however, Macrobius, quoted by Ramsay, *op. cit.*, 219), is entirely in keeping with the cruelty of Herod's disposition. Meanwhile, Joseph and Mary had been withdrawn from the scene of danger (<sup>4127</sup>Matthew 2:17 connects the mourning of the Bethlehem mothers with Rachel's weeping, <sup>2415</sup>Jeremiah 31:15).

## 6. Flight to Egypt and Return to Nazareth:

### (<sup>4123</sup>MATTHEW 2:13-15,19-23)

The safety of Mary and her threatened child was provided for by a Divine warning to retire for a time to Egypt (mark the recurring expression, "the young child and his mother" — the young child taking the lead, <sup>4121</sup>Matthew 2:11,13,14,20,21), whither, accordingly, they were conducted by Joseph (<sup>4124</sup>Matthew 2:14). The sojourn was not a long one. Herod's death brought permission to return, but as Archelaus, Herod's son (the worst of them), reigned in Judea in his father's stead (not king, but "ethnarch"), Joseph was directed to withdraw to Galilee; hence it came about that he and Mary, with the babe, found themselves again in Nazareth, where Luke anew takes up the story (<sup>4128</sup>Matthew 2:39), the thread of which had been broken by the incidents in Matthew. Matthew sees in the return from Egypt a refulfilling of the experiences of Israel (<sup>2910</sup>Hosea 11:1), and in the settling in Nazareth a connection with the Old Testament prophecies of Christ's lowly estate (<sup>2910</sup>Isaiah 11:1, [netser], "branch"; Zec 3:8; 6:12, etc.).

## 7. Questions and Objections:

The objections to the credibility of the narratives of the Virgin Birth have already partly been adverted to. (See further the articles on *MARY; THE VIRGIN BIRTH*; and the writer's volume, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*.)

### (1) The Virgin Birth.

The narratives in Matthew and Luke are attested by all manuscripts and versions genuine parts of their respective Gospels, and as coming to us in their integrity. The narrative of Luke is generally recognized as resting on an Aramaic basis, which, from its diction and the primitive character of its conceptions, belongs to the earliest age. While in Luke's narrative everything is presented from the standpoint of Mary, in Matthew it is Joseph who is in the forefront, suggesting that the virgin mother is the

source of information in the one case, and Joseph himself in the other. The narratives are complementary, not contradictory. That Mark and John do not contain narratives of the Virgin Birth cannot be wondered at, when it is remembered that Mark's Gospel begins of purpose with the Baptism of John, and that the Fourth Gospel aims at setting forth the Divine descent, not the circumstances of the earthly nativity. "The Word became flesh" (~~ⲁⲓⲛ~~ John 1:14) — everything is already implied in that. Neither can it be objected to that Paul does not in his letters or public preaching base upon so essentially private a fact as the miraculous conception — at a time, too, when Mary probably still lived. With the exception of the narrowest sect of the Jewish Ebionites and some of the Gnostic sects, the Virgin Birth was universally accepted in the early church.

## (2) The Genealogies

(~~ⲁⲓⲛ~~ MATTHEW 1:1-17; ~~ⲁⲓⲛ~~ LUKE 3:23-28)

Difficulty is felt with the genealogies in Matthew and Luke (one descending, the other ascending), which, while both professing to trace the descent of Jesus from David and Abraham (Luke from Adam), yet go entirely apart in the pedigree after David. See on this the article *GENEALOGIES OF JESUS CHRIST*. A favorite view is that Matthew exhibits the legal, Luke the natural descent of Jesus. There is plausibility in the supposition that though, in form, a genealogy of Joseph, Luke's is really the genealogy of Mary. It was not customary, it is true, to make out pedigrees of females, but the case here was clearly exceptional, and the passing of Joseph into the family of his father-in-law Heli would enable the list to be made out in his name. Celsus, in the 2nd century, appears thus to have understood it when he derides the notion that through so lowly a woman as the carpenter's wife, Jesus should trace His lineage up to the first man (Origen, *Contra Celsus*, ii.32; Origen's reply proceeds on the same assumption. Compare article on "Genealogies" in Kitto, II).

## II. The Years of Silence — the Twelfth Year.

### 1. The Human Development:

(~~ⲁⲓⲛ~~ LUKE 2:40,52)

With the exception of one fragment of incident — that of the visit to Jerusalem and the Temple in His 12th year — the Canonical Gospels are

silent as to the history of Jesus from the return to Nazareth till His baptism by John. This long period, which the Apocryphal Gospels crowd with silly fables (*see APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS*), the inspired records leave to be regarded as being what it was — a period of quiet development of mind and body, of outward uneventfulness, of silent garnering of experience in the midst of the Nazareth surroundings. Jesus “grew, and waxed strong, filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was upon him .... advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men” (~~◄B4~~ Luke 2:40,52). The incarnation was a true acceptance of humanity, with all its sinless limitations of growth and development. Not a hint is offered of that omniscience or omnipotence which theology has not infrequently imputed to Jesus even as child and boy. His schooling was probably that of the ordinary village child (He could read, ~~◄B7~~ Luke 4:17 ff, and write, ~~◄B6~~ John 8:6-8); He wrought at the carpenter’s bench (compare ~~◄B3~~ Mark 6:3; Justin Martyr, following tradition, speaks of Him as making “plows and yokes,” Dial., 88). His gentleness and grace of character endeared Him to all who knew Him (~~◄B5~~ Luke 2:52). No stain of sin clouded His vision of Divine things. His after-history shows that His mind was nourished on the Scriptures; nor, as He pondered psalms and prophets, could His soul remain unvisited by presentiments, growing to convictions, that He was the One in whom their predictions were destined to be realized.

## 2. Jesus in the Temple:

### (~~◄B4~~ LUKE 2:41-50)

Every year, as was the custom of the Jews, Joseph and Mary went, with their friends and neighbors, in companies, to Jerusalem to the Passover. When Jesus was 12 years old, it would seem that, for the first time, He was permitted to accompany them. It would be to Him a strange and thrilling experience. Everything He saw — the hallowed sites, the motley crowd, the service of the temple, the very shocks His moral consciousness would receive from contact with abounding scandals — would intensify His feeling of His own unique relation to the Father. Every relationship was for the time suspended and merged to His thought in this higher one. It was His Father’s city whose streets He trod; His Father’s house He visited for prayer; His Father’s ordinance the crowds were assembled to observe; His Father’s name, too, they were dishonoring by their formalism and hypocrisy. It is this exalted mood of the boy Jesus which explains the scene

that follows — the only one rescued from oblivion in this interval of growth and preparation. When the time came for the busy caravan to return to Nazareth, Jesus, acting, doubtless, from highest impulse, “tarried behind” (verse 43). In the large company His absence was not at first missed, but when, at the evening halting-place, it became known that He was not with them, His mother and Joseph returned in deep distress to Jerusalem. Three days elapsed before they found Him in the place where naturally they should have looked first — His Father’s house. There, in one of the halls or chambers where the rabbis were wont to teach, they discovered Him seated “in the midst,” at the feet of the men of learning, hearing them discourse, asking questions, as pupils were permitted to do, and giving answers which awakened astonishment by their penetration and wisdom (~~Q126~~ Luke 2:46,47). Those who heard Him may well have thought that before them was one of the great rabbis of the future! Mary, much surprised, asked in remonstrance, “Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us?” evoking from Jesus the memorable reply, “How is it that ye sought me? knew ye not that I must be in my Father’s house?” or “about my Father’s business?” the King James Version (~~Q128~~ Luke 2:48,49). Here was the revelation of a selfconsciousness that Mary might have been prepared for in Jesus, but perhaps, in the common intercourse of life, was tending to lose sight of. The lesson was not unneeded. Yet, once it had been given, Jesus went back with Joseph and Mary to Nazareth, and “was subject unto them”; and Mary did not forget the teaching of the incident (~~Q129~~ Luke 2:51).

### III. The Forerunner and the Baptism.

#### 1. The Preaching of John:

(~~Q130~~ MATTHEW 3:1-12; ~~Q131~~ MARK 1:1-8; ~~Q132~~ LUKE 3:1-18)

Time passed, and when Jesus was nearing His 30th year, Judea was agitated by the message of a stern preacher of righteousness who had appeared in the wilderness by the Jordan, proclaiming the imminent approach of the kingdom of heaven, summoning to repentance, and baptizing those who confessed their sins. Tiberius had succeeded Augustus on the imperial throne; Judea, with Samaria, was now a Roman province, under the procurator Pontius Pilate; the rest of Palestine was divided between the tetrarchs Herod (Galilee) and Philip (the eastern parts). The Baptist thus appeared at the time when the land had lost the last vestige of

self-government, was politically divided, and was in great ecclesiastical confusion. Nurtured in the deserts (~~<408>~~ Luke 1:80), John's very appearance was a protest against the luxury and self-seeking of the age. He had been a Nazarite from his birth; he fed on the simplest products of nature — locusts and wild honey; his coarse garb of camel's hair and leathern girdle was a return to the dress of Elijah (~~<1208>~~ 2 Kings 1:8), in whose spirit and power he appeared (~~<4017>~~ Luke 1:17) (*see JOHN THE BAPTIST*).

### The Coming Christ.

John's preaching of the kingdom was unlike that of any of the revolutionaries of his age. It was a kingdom which could be entered only through moral preparation. It availed nothing for the Jew simply that he was a son of Abraham. The Messiah was at hand. He (John) was but a voice in the wilderness sent to prepare the way for that Greater than himself. The work of the Christ would be one of judgment and of mercy. He would lay the axe at the root of the tree — would winnow the chaff from the wheat — yet would baptize with the Holy Spirit (~~<4080>~~ Matthew 3:10-12; ~~<4015>~~ Luke 3:15-17). Those who professed acceptance of his message, with its condition of repentance, John baptized with water at the Jordan or in its neighborhood (compare ~~<4016>~~ Matthew 3:6; ~~<4018>~~ John 1:28; 3:23).

## 2. Jesus Is Baptized:

(~~<4013>~~ MATTHEW 3:13-17; ~~<4009>~~ MARK 1:9-11; ~~<4021>~~ LUKE 3:21,22)

John's startling words made a profound impression. All classes from every part of the land, including Pharisees and Sadducees (~~<4016>~~ Matthew 3:7), came to his baptism. John was not deceived. He saw how little change of heart underlay it all. The Regenerator had not yet come. But one day there appeared before him One whom he intuitively recognized as different from all the rest — as, indeed, the Christ whose coming it was his to herald. John, up to this time, does not seem to have personally known Jesus (compare ~~<4011>~~ John 1:31). He must, however, have heard of Him; he had, besides, received a sign by which the Messiah should be recognized (~~<4013>~~ John 1:33); and now, when Jesus presented Himself, Divinely pure in aspect, asking baptism at his hands, the conviction was instantaneously flashed on his mind, that this was He. But how should he, a sinful man, baptize this Holy One? "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest

thou to me?” (~~4184~~ Matthew 3:14). The question is one which forces itself upon ourselves — How should Jesus seek or receive a “baptism of repentance”? Jesus Himself puts it on the ground of meetness. “Suffer it now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness” (~~4185~~ Matthew 3:15). The Head was content to enter by the same gateway as the members to His specific vocation in the service of the kingdom. In submitting to the baptism, He formally identified Himself with the expectation of the kingdom and with its ethical demands; separated Himself from the evil of His nation, doubtless with confession of its sins; and devoted Himself to His life-task in bringing in the Messianic salvation. The significance of the rite as marking His consecration to, and entrance upon, His Messianic career, is seen in what follows. As He ascended from the water, while still “praying” (~~4181~~ Luke 3:21), the heavens were opened, the Spirit of God descended like a dove upon Him, and a voice from heaven declared: “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased” (~~4186~~ Matthew 3:16,17). It is needless to inquire whether anyone besides John (compare ~~4183~~ John 1:33) and Jesus (~~4186~~ Matthew 3:16; ~~4110~~ Mark 1:10) received this vision or heard these words; it was for them, not for others, the vision was primarily intended. To Christ’s consecration of Himself to His calling, there was now added the spiritual equipment necessary for the doing of His work. He went forward with the seal of the Father’s acknowledgment upon Him.

#### **IV. The Temptation.**

##### **1. Temptation Follows Baptism:**

(~~4101~~ MATTHEW 4:1-11; ~~4113~~ MARK 1:13,14; ~~4101~~ LUKE 4:1-13)

On the narrative of the baptism in the first three Gospels there follows at once the account of the temptation of Jesus in the wilderness. The psychological naturalness of the incident is generally acknowledged. The baptism of Jesus was a crisis in His experience. He had been plenished by the Spirit for His work; the heavens had been opened to Him, and His mind was agitated by new thoughts and emotions; He was conscious of the possession of new powers. There was need for a period of retirement, of still reflection, of coming to a complete understanding with Himself as to the meaning of the task to which He stood committed, the methods He should employ, the attitude He should take up toward popular hopes and expectations. He would wish to be alone. The Spirit of God led Him (~~4101~~ Matthew 4:1; ~~4112~~ Mark 1:12; ~~4101~~ Luke 4:1) whither His own spirit also

impelled. It is with a touch of similar motive that Buddhist legend makes Buddha to be tempted by the evil spirit Mara after he has attained enlightenment.

## 2. Nature of the Temptation:

The scene of the temptation was the wilderness of Judea. Jesus was there 40 days, during which, it is told, He neither ate nor drank (compare the fasts of Moses and Elijah, Exodus 24:18; 34:28; ~~<1198>~~ Deuteronomy 9:18; ~~<1198>~~ 1 Kings 19:8). Mark adds, “He was with the wild beasts” (verse 13). The period was probably one of intense self-concentration. During the whole of it He endured temptations of Satan (~~<4013>~~ Mark 1:13); but the special assaults came at the end (~~<4042>~~ Matthew 4:2 ff; ~~<4042>~~ Luke 4:2 ff). We assume here a real tempter and real temptations — the question of diabolic agency being considered after. This, however, does not settle the form of the temptations. The struggle was probably an inward one. It can hardly be supposed that Jesus was literally transported by the devil to a pinnacle of the temple, then to a high mountain, then, presumably, back again to the wilderness. The narrative must have come from Jesus Himself, and embodies an ideal or parabolic element. “The history of the temptation,” Lange says, “Jesus afterwards communicated to His disciples in the form of a real narrative, clothed in symbolical language” (Commentary on Matthew, 83, English translation).

## 3. Stages of the Temptation:

The stages of the temptation were three — each in its own way a trial of the spirit of obedience.

**(1)** The first temptation was to distrust. Jesus, after His long fast, was hungry. He had become conscious also of supernatural powers. The point on which the temptation laid hold was His sense of hunger — the most over-mastering of appetites. “If thou art the Son of God, command that these stones become bread.” The design was to excite distrustful and rebellious thoughts, and lead Jesus to use the powers entrusted to Him in an unlawful way, for private and selfish ends. The temptation was promptly met by a quotation from Scripture: “Man shall not live by bread alone,” etc. (~~<4044>~~ Matthew 4:4; ~~<4044>~~ Luke 4:4; compare ~~<4044>~~ Deuteronomy 8:3). If Jesus was in this position, it was His Father who had brought Him there for purposes of trial. Man has a higher life than can be sustained on bread; a life, found in depending on God’s word, and obeying it at whatever cost.

(2) The second temptation (in Luke the third) was to presumption. Jesus is borne in spirit (compare <sup><2601></sup>Ezekiel 40:1,2) to a pinnacle of the temple. From this dizzy elevation He is invited to cast Himself down, relying on the Divine promise: “He shall give His angels charge over thee,” etc. (compare <sup><2911></sup>Psalms 91:11,12). In this way an easy demonstration of His Messiahship would be given to the crowds below. The temptation was to overstep those bounds of humility and dependence which were imposed on Him as Son; to play with signs and wonders in His work as Messiah. But again the tempter is foiled by the word: “Thou shalt not make trial of (try experiments with, propose tests, put to the proof) the Lord thy God” (<sup><4047></sup>Matthew 4:7; <sup><4042></sup>Luke 4:12; compare <sup><1816></sup>Deuteronomy 6:16).

(3) The third temptation (Luke’s second) was to worldly sovereignty, gained by some small concession to Satan. From some lofty elevation — no place on a geographical map — the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them are flashed before Christ’s mind, and all are offered to Him on condition of one little act of homage to the tempter. It was the temptation to choose the easier path by some slight pandering to falsehood, and Jesus definitely repelled it by the saying: “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve” (<sup><4040></sup>Matthew 4:10; <sup><4048></sup>Luke 4:8). Jesus had chosen His path. The Father’s way of the cross would be adhered to.

Its Typical Character.

The stages of the temptation typify the whole round of Satanic assault on man through body, mind, and spirit (<sup><4043></sup>Luke 4:13; compare <sup><4016></sup>1 John 2:16), and the whole round of Messianic temptation. Jesus was constantly being tempted

- (a) to spare Himself;
- (b) to gratify the Jewish signseekers;
- (c) to gain power by sacrifice of the right. In principle the victory was gained over all at the commencement. His way was henceforth clear.

## *B. THE EARLY JUDAEAN MINISTRY*

### **I. The Testimonies of the Baptist.**

#### **1. The Synoptics and John:**



While the Synoptics pass immediately from the temptation of Jesus to the ministry in Galilee the imprisonment of the Baptist (~~4012~~ Matthew 4:12; ~~4014~~ Mark 1:14,15; ~~4044~~ Luke 4:14), the Fourth Gospel furnishes the account, full of interest, of the earlier ministry of Jesus in Judea while the Baptist was still at liberty.

## 2. Threefold Witness of the Baptist:

### (~~4019~~ JOHN 1:19-37)

The Baptist had announced Christ's coming; had baptized Him when He appeared; it was now his privilege to testify to Him as having come, and to introduce to Jesus His first disciples.

#### a) First Testimony — Jesus and Popular Messianic Expectation:

### (~~4019~~ JOHN 1:19-28)

John's work had assumed proportions which made it impossible for the ecclesiastical authorities any longer to ignore it (compare ~~4015~~ Luke 3:15). A deputation consisting of priests and Levites was accordingly sent to John, where he was baptizing at Bethany beyond Jordan, to put to him categorical questions about his mission. Who was he? And by what authority did — he baptize? Was he the Christ? or Elijah? or the expected prophet? (compare ~~4014~~ John 6:14; 7:4; ~~4014~~ Matthew 16:14). To these questions John gave distinct and straightforward replies. He was not the Christ, not Elijah, not the prophet. His answers grow briefer every time, "I am not the Christ"; "I am not"; "No." Who was he then? The answer was emphatic. He was but a "voice" (compare ~~2308~~ Isaiah 40:3) — a preparer of the way of the Lord. In their midst already stood One — not necessarily in the crowd at that moment — with whose greatness his was not to be compared (~~4016~~ John 1:26,27). John utterly effaces himself before Christ.

#### b) Second Testimony — Christ and the Sin of the World:

### (~~4019~~ JOHN 1:29-34)

The day after the interview with the Jerusalem deputies, John saw Jesus coming to him — probably fresh from the temptation — and bore a second and wonderful testimony to His Messiahship. Identifying Jesus with the subject of his former testimonies, and stating the ground of his knowledge

in the sign God had given him (1:30-34), he said, “Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world” (1:29). The words are rich in suggestion regarding the character of Jesus, and the nature, universality and efficacy of His work (compare ~~4035~~ 1 John 3:5). The “Lamb” may point specifically to the description of the vicariously Suffering Servant of Yahweh in ~~2511~~ Isaiah 53:11.

**c) Third Testimony — Christ and the Duty of the Disciple:**

**(~~4035~~ JOHN 1:35-37)**

The third testimony was borne “again on the morrow,” when John was standing with two of his disciples (one Andrew, 1:40, the other doubtless the evangelist himself). Pointing to Jesus, the Baptist repeated his former words, “Behold, the Lamb of God.” While the words are the same, the design was different. In the first “behold” the idea is the recognition of Christ; in the second there is a call to duty — a hint to follow Jesus. On this hint the disciples immediately acted (1:37). It is next to be seen how this earliest “following” of Jesus grew.

**II. The First Disciples.**

**1. Spiritual Accretion:**

**(~~4037~~ JOHN 1:37-51)**

John’s narrative shows that Jesus gathered His disciples, less by a series of distinct calls, than by a process of spiritual accretion. Men were led to Him, then accepted by Him. This process of selection left Jesus at the close of the second day with five real and true followers. The history confutes the idea that it was first toward the close of His ministry that Jesus became known to His disciples as the Messiah. In all the Gospels it was as the Christ that the Baptist introduced Jesus; it was as the Christ that the first disciples accepted and confessed Him (~~4041~~ John 1:41,45,49).

**a) Andrew and John — Discipleship as the Fruit of Spiritual Converse:**

**(~~4037~~ JOHN 1:37-40)**

The first of the group were Andrew and John — the unnamed disciple of ~~4041~~ John 1:40. These followed Jesus in consequence of their Master’s testimony. It was, however, the few hours’ converse they had with Jesus in

His own abode that actually decided them. To Christ's question, "What seek ye?" their answer was practically "Thyself." "The mention of the time — the 10th hour, i.e. 10 AM — is one of the small traits that mark John. He is here looking back on the date of his own spiritual birth" (Westcott).

**b) Simon Peter — Discipleship a Result of Personal Testimony:**

(~~JOH~~ **JOHN 1:41,42**)

John and Andrew had no sooner found Christ for themselves ("We have found the Messiah," ~~JOH~~ John 1:41) than they hastened to tell others of their discovery. Andrew at once sought out Simon, his brother, and brought him to Jesus; so, later, Philip sought Nathanael (~~JOH~~ John 1:45). Christ's unerring eye read at once the quality of the man whom Andrew introduced to Him. "Thou art Simon the son of John: thou shalt be called Cephas" — "Rock" or "Stone" (1:42). ~~MA~~ Matthew 16:18, therefore, is not the original bestowal of this name, but the confirmation of it. The name is the equivalent of "Peter" (Petros), and was given to Simon, not with any official connotation, but because of the strength and clearness of his convictions. His general steadfastness is not disproved by His one unhappy failure. (Was it thus the apostle acquired the name "Peter"?)

**c) Philip — the Result of Scriptural Evidence:**

(~~JOH~~ **JOHN 1:43,14**)

The fourth disciple, Philip, was called by Jesus Himself, when about to depart for Galilee (~~JOH~~ John 1:43). Friendship may have had its influence on Philip (like the foregoing, he also was from Bethsaida of Galilee, ~~JOH~~ John 1:44), but that which chiefly decided him was the correspondence of what he found in Jesus with the prophetic testimonies (~~JOH~~ John 1:45).

**d) Nathanael — Discipleship an Effect of Heart-Searching Power:**

(~~JOH~~ **JOHN 1:45-51**)

Philip sought Nathanael (of Cana of Galilee, ~~JOH~~ John 21:2) — the same probably as Bartholomew the Apostle — and told him he had found Him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets had written (~~JOH~~ John 1:45). Nathanael doubted, on the ground that the Messiah was not likely to have His origin in an obscure place like Nazareth (~~JOH~~ John 1:46; compare 7:52).

Philip's wise answer was, "Come and see"; and when Nathanael came, the Lord met him with a word which speedily rid him of his hesitations. First, Jesus attested His seeker's sincerity ("Behold, an Israelite indeed," etc., <sup><B04></sup>John 1:47); then, on Nathanael expressing surprise, revealed to him His knowledge of a recent secret act of meditation or devotion ("when thou wast under the fig tree," etc., <sup><B04></sup>John 1:48). The sign was sufficient to convince Nathanael that he was in the presence of a superhuman, nay a Divine, Being, therefore, the Christ — "Son of God .... King of Israel" (<sup><B04></sup>John 1:49). Jesus met his faith with further self-disclosure. Nathanael had believed on comparatively slight evidence; he would see greater things: heavens opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man (<sup><B05></sup>John 1:51). The allusion is to Jacob's vision (<sup><B20></sup>Genesis 28:10-22) — a Scripture which had possibly been theme of Philip's meditation in his privacy. Jesus puts Himself in place of that mystic ladder as the medium of reopened communication between heaven and earth.

## 2. "Son of Man" and "Son of God":

The name "Son of Man" — a favorite designation of Jesus for Himself — appears here for the first time in the Gospels. It is disputed whether it was a current Messianic title (*see SON OF MAN*), but at least it had this force on the lips of Jesus Himself, denoting Him as the possessor of a true humanity, and as standing in a representative relation to mankind universally. It is probably borrowed from <sup><B07></sup>Daniel 7:13 and appears in the Book of Enoch (*see APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE*). The higher title, "Son of God," given to Jesus by Nathanael, could not, of course, as yet carry with it the transcendental associations of John's Prologue (<sup><B00></sup>John 1:1,14,18), but it evidently conveyed an idea of superhuman dignity and unique relation to God, such as the better class of minds would seem to have attributed to the Messiah (compare <sup><B05></sup>John 5:18; 10:33 ff; <sup><B06></sup>Matthew 26:63).

## III. The First Events.

An interval of a few weeks is occupied by a visit of Jesus to Cana of Galilee (<sup><B01></sup>John 2:1 ff) and a brief sojourn in Capernaum (<sup><B02></sup>John 2:12); after which Jesus returned to Jerusalem to the Passover as the most appropriate place for His public manifestation of Himself as Messiah (<sup><B03></sup>John 2:13 ff). The notes of time in John suggest that the Passover

(beginning of April, 27 AD) took place about three months after the baptism by John (compare 1:43; 2:1,12).

## 1. The First Miracle:

### (~~RP1~~) JOHN 2:1-11)

Prior to His public manifestation, a more private unfolding of Christ's glory was granted to the disciples at the marriage feast of Cana of Galilee (compare ~~RP1~~ John 2:11). The marriage was doubtless that of some relative of the family, and the presence of Jesus at the feast, with His mother, brethren and disciples (as Joseph no more appears, it may be concluded that he was dead), is significant as showing that His religion is not one of antagonism to natural relations. The marriage festivities lasted seven days, and toward the close the wine provided for the guests gave out. Mary interposed with an indirect suggestion that Jesus might supply the want. Christ's reply, literally, "Woman, what is that to thee and to me?" (~~RP1~~ John 2:4), is not intended to convey the least tinge of reproof (compare Westcott, in the place cited.), but intimates to Mary that His actions were henceforth to be guided by a rule other than hers (compare ~~RP1~~ Luke 2:51). This, however, as Mary saw (~~RP1~~ John 2:5), did not preclude an answer to her desire. Six waterpots of stone stood near, and Jesus ordered these to be filled with water (the quantity was large; about 50 gallons); then when the water was drawn off it was found changed into a nobler element — a wine purer and better than could have been obtained from any natural vintage. The ruler of the feast, in ignorance of its origin, expressed surprise at its quality (~~RP1~~ John 2:10). The miracle was symbolical — a "sign" (~~RP1~~ John 2:11) — and may be contrasted with the first miracle of Moses — turning the water into blood (Exodus 7:20). It points to the contrast between the old dispensation and the new, and to the work of Christ as a transforming, enriching and glorifying of the natural, through Divine grace and power.

After a brief stay at Capernaum (~~RP2~~ John 2:12), Jesus went up to Jerusalem to keep the Passover. There it was His design formally to manifest Himself. Other "signs" He wrought at the feast, leading many to believe on Him — not, however, with a deep or enduring faith (~~RP2~~ John 2:23-25) — but the special act by which He signaled His appearance was His public cleansing of the temple from the irreligious trafficking with which it had come to be associated.

## 2. The First Passover, and Cleansing of the Temple:

### (~~¶12~~ JOHN 2:13-25)

A like incident is related by the Synoptics at the close of Christ's ministry (~~¶12~~ Matthew 21:12,13; ~~¶115~~ Mark 11:15-18; ~~¶95~~ Luke 19:45,46), and it is a question whether the act was actually repeated, or whether the other evangelists, who do not narrate the events of the early ministry, simply record it out of its chronological order. In any case, the act was a fitting inauguration of the Lord's work. A regular market was held in the outer court of the temple. Here the animals needed for sacrifice could be purchased, foreign money exchanged, and the doves, which were the offerings of the poor, be obtained. It was a busy, tumultuous, noisy and unholy scene, and the "zeal" of Jesus burned within Him — had doubtless often done so before — as He witnessed it. Arming Himself with a scourge of cords, less as a weapon of offense, than as a symbol of authority, He descended with resistless energy upon the wrangling throng, drove out the dealers and the cattle, overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and commanded the doves to be taken away. Let them not profane His Father's house (~~¶14~~ John 2:14-16). No one seems to have opposed. All felt that a prophet was among them, and could not resist the overpowering authority with which He spake and acted. By and by, when their courage revived, they asked Him for a "sign" in evidence of His right to do such things. Jesus gave them no sign such as they demanded, but uttered an enigmatic word, and left them to reflect on it, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (~~¶19~~ John 2:19). The authenticity of the saying is sufficiently vouched for by the perverted use made of it at Christ's trial (~~¶6~~ Matthew 26:61 parallel). It is a word based on the foresight which Christ had that the conflict now commencing was to end in His rejection and death. "The true way to destroy the Temple, in the eyes of Jesus, was to slay the Messiah. .... If it is in the person of the Messiah that the Temple is laid in ruins, it is in His person it shall be raised again" (Godet). The disciples, after the resurrection, saw the meaning of the word (~~¶22~~ John 2:22).

## 3. The Visit of Nicodemus:

(~~RR1~~) **JOHN 3:1-12**

As a sequel to these stirring events Jesus had a nocturnal visitor in the person of Nicodemus — a Pharisee, a ruler of the Jews, a “teacher of Israel” (~~RR1~~ John 3:10), apparently no longer young (~~RR1~~ John 3:4). His coming by night argues, besides some fear of man, a constitutional timidity of disposition (compare ~~RR1~~ John 19:39); but the interesting thing is that he did come, showing that he had been really impressed by Christ’s words and works. One recognizes in him a man of candor and uprightness of spirit, yet without adequate apprehensions of Christ Himself, and of the nature of Christ’s kingdom. Jesus he was prepared to acknowledge as a Divinely-commissioned teacher — one whose mission was accredited by miracle (~~RR1~~ John 3:2). He was interested in the kingdom, but, as a morally living man, had no doubt of his fitness to enter into it. Jesus had but to teach and he would understand.

**(1) The New Birth.**

Jesus in His reply laid His finger at once on the defective point in His visitor’s relation to Himself and to His kingdom: “Except one be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God” (~~RR1~~ John 3:3); “Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God” (~~RR1~~ John 3:5). Nicodemus was staggered at this demand for a spiritual new birth. There is reason to believe that proselytes were baptized on being received into the Jewish church, and their baptism was called a “new birth.” Nicodemus would therefore be familiar with the expression, but could not see that it had any applicability to him. Jesus teaches him, on the other hand, that he also needs a new birth, and this, not through water only, but through the Spirit. The change was mysterious, yet plainly manifest in its effects (~~RR1~~ John 3:7,8). If Nicodemus did not understand these “earthly things” — the evidence of which lay all around him — how should he understand “heavenly things,” the things pertaining to salvation?

**(2) “Heavenly Things.”**

These “heavenly things” Jesus now proceeds to unfold to Nicodemus: “As Moses lifted up the serpent,” etc. (~~RR1~~ John 3:14). The “lifting up” is a prophecy of the cross (compare 12:32-34). The brazen serpent is the symbol of sin conquered and destroyed by the death of Christ. What follows in ~~RR1~~ John 3:16-21 is probably the evangelist’s expansion of this theme — God’s love the source of salvation (~~RR1~~ John 3:16), God’s

purpose not the world's condemnation, but its salvation (~~ⲁⲓⲓⲧ~~ John 3:17,18) the self-judgment of sin (~~ⲁⲓⲓⲧ~~ John 3:19 ff).

#### 4. Jesus and John:

### (~~ⲁⲓⲓⲧ~~ JOHN 3:22-36)

Retiring from Jerusalem, Jesus commenced a ministry in Judea (~~ⲁⲓⲓⲧ~~ John 3:22). It lasted apparently about 6 months. The earlier Gospels pass over it. This is accounted for by the fact that the ministry in Judea was still preparatory. Jesus had publicly asserted His Messianic authority. A little space is now allowed to test the result. Meanwhile Jesus descends again to the work of prophetic preparation. His ministry at this stage is hardly distinguishable from John's. He summons to the baptism of repentance. His disciples, not Himself, administer the rite (~~ⲁⲓⲓⲧ~~ John 3:23; 4:2); hence the sort of rivalry that sprang up between His baptism and that of the forerunner (~~ⲁⲓⲓⲧ~~ John 3:22-26). John was baptizing at the time at Aenon, on the western side of the Jordan; Jesus somewhere in the neighborhood. Soon the greater teacher began to eclipse the less. "All men came to Him" (3:26). John's reply showed how pure his mind was from the narrow, grudging spirit which characterized his followers. To him it was no grievance, but the fulfillment of his joy, that men should be flocking to Jesus. He was not the Bridegroom, but the friend of the Bridegroom. They themselves had heard him testify, "I am not the Christ." It lay in the nature of things that Jesus must increase; he must decrease (3:27-30). Explanatory words follow (3:31-36).

## IV. Journey to Galilee — the Woman of Samaria.

### 1. Withdrawal to Galilee:

Toward the close of this Judean ministry the Baptist appears to have been cast into prison for his faithfulness in reproving Herod Antipas for taking his brother Philip's wife (compare ~~ⲁⲓⲓⲧ~~ John 3:24; ~~ⲁⲓⲁⲃ~~ Matthew 14:3-5 parallel). It seems most natural to connect the departure to Galilee in ~~ⲁⲓⲁⲃ~~ John 4:3 with that narrated in ~~ⲁⲓⲁⲃ~~ Matthew 3:13 parallel, though some think the imprisonment of the Baptist did not take place till later. The motive which John gives was the hostility of the Pharisees, but it was the imprisonment of the Baptist which led Jesus to commence, at the time He did, an independent ministry. The direct road to Galilee lay through Samaria; hence the memorable encounter with the woman at that place.



## 2. The Living Water:

Jesus, being wearied, paused to rest Himself at Jacob's well, near a town called Sychar, now 'Askar. It was about the sixth hour — or 6 o'clock in the evening. The time of year is determined by ~~ⲉⲟⲩⲥ~~ John 4:35 to be "four months" before harvest, i.e. December (there is no reason for not taking this literally). It suits the evening hour that the woman of Samaria came out to draw water. (Some, on a different reckoning, take the hour to be noon.) Jesus opened the conversation by asking from the woman a draught from her pitcher. The proverbial hatred between Jews and Samaritans filled the woman with surprise that Jesus should thus address Himself to her. Still greater was her surprise when, as the conversation proceeded, Jesus announced Himself as the giver of a water of which, if a man drank, he should never thirst again (~~ⲉⲟⲩⲥ~~ John 4:13,14). Only gradually did His meaning penetrate her mind, "Sir, give me this water," etc. (~~ⲉⲟⲩⲥ~~ John 4:15). The request of Jesus that she would call her husband led to the discovery that Jesus knew all the secrets of her life. She was before a prophet (~~ⲉⲟⲩⲥ~~ John 4:19). As in the case of Nathanael, the heart-searching power of Christ's word convinced her of His Divine claim.

## 3. The True Worship:

The conversation next turned upon the right place of worship. The Samaritans had a temple of their own on Mount Gerizim; the Jews, on the other hand, held to the exclusive validity of the temple at Jerusalem. Which was right? Jesus in His reply, while pronouncing for the Jews as the custodians of God's salvation (~~ⲉⲟⲩⲥ~~ John 4:22), makes it plain that distinction of places is no longer a matter of any practical importance. A change was imminent which would substitute a universal religion for one of special times and places (~~ⲉⲟⲩⲥ~~ John 4:20). He enunciates the great principle of the new dispensation that God is a Spirit, and they who worship Him must do so in spirit and in truth. Finally, when she spoke of the Messiah, Jesus made Himself definitely known to her as the Christ. To this poor Samaritan woman, with her receptive heart, He unveils Himself more plainly than He had done to priests and rulers (~~ⲉⲟⲩⲥ~~ John 4:26).

## 4. Work at Its Reward:

The woman went home and became an evangelist to her people, with notable results (~~ⲉⲟⲩⲥ~~ John 4:28,39). Jesus abode with them two days and

confirmed the impression made by her testimony (~~4040~~ John 4:40-42). Meanwhile, He impressed on His disciples the need of earnest sowing and reaping in the service of the Kingdom, assuring them of unfailing reward for both sower and reaper (~~4035~~ John 4:35-38). He Himself was their Great Example (~~4034~~ John 4:34).

### *C. THE GALILEAN MINISTRY AND VISITS TO THE FEASTS*

#### **1.** The Scene:

Galilee was divided into upper Galilee and lower Galilee. It has already been remarked that upper Galilee was inhabited by a mixed population — hence called “Galilee of the Gentiles” (~~4045~~ Matthew 4:15). The highroads of commerce ran through it. It was “the way of the sea” (the King James Version) — a scene of constant traffic. The people were rude, ignorant, and superstitious, and were densely crowded together in towns and villages. About 160 BC there were only a few Jews in the midst of a large heathen population; but by the time of Christ the Jewish element had greatly increased. The busiest portion of this busy district was round the Sea of Galilee, at the Northeast corner of which stood Capernaum — wealthy and cosmopolitan. In Nazareth, indeed, Jesus met with a disappointing reception (~~4046~~ Luke 4:16-30; ~~4034~~ Matthew 13:54-57; compare ~~4045~~ John 4:43-45); yet in Galilee generally He found a freer spirit and greater receptiveness than among the stricter traditionalists of Judea.

#### **2.** The Time:

It is assumed here that Jesus returned to Galilee in December, 27 AD, and that His ministry there lasted till late in 29 AD (see “Chronology” above). On the two years’ scheme of the public ministry, the Passover of ~~4040~~ John 6:4 has to be taken as the second in Christ’s ministry — therefore as occurring at an interval of only 3 or 4 months after the return. This seems impossible in view of the crowding of events it involves in so short a time — opening incidents, stay in Capernaum (~~4043~~ Matthew 4:13), three circuits in “all Galilee” (~~4043~~ Matthew 4:23-25 parallel; ~~4040~~ Luke 8:1-4; ~~4035~~ Matthew 9:35-38; ~~4036~~ Mark 6:6), lesser journeys and excursions (Sermon on Mount: Gadara); and the dislocations it necessitates, e.g. the plucking of ears of corn (about Passover time) must be placed after the feeding of the 5,000, etc. It is simpler to adhere to the three years’ scheme.

A division of the Galilean ministry may then fitly be made into two periods — one preceding, the other succeeding the Mission of the Twelve in Matthew 10 parallel. One reason for this division is that after the Mission of the Twelve the order of events is the same in the first three evangelists till the final departure from Galilee.

## **First Period — From the Beginning of the Ministry in Galilee till the Mission of the Twelve**

### **I. Opening Incidents.**

#### **1. Healing of Nobleman's Son:**

(~~404B~~) **JOHN 4:43-54**

From sympathetic Samaria (~~404B~~ John 4:39), Jesus had journeyed to unsympathetic Galilee, and first to Cana, where His first miracle had been wrought. The reports of His miracles in Judea had come before Him (~~404B~~ John 4:45), and it was mainly His reputation as a miracle-worker which led a nobleman — a courtier or officer at Herod's court — to seek Him at Cana on behalf of his son, who was near to death. Jesus rebuked the sign-seeking spirit (~~404B~~ John 4:48), but, on the fervent appeal being repeated, He bade the nobleman go his way: his son lived. The man's prayer had been, "Come down"; but he had faith to receive the word of Jesus (~~404B~~ John 4:50), and on his way home received tidings of his son's recovery. The nobleman, with his whole household, was won for Jesus (~~404B~~ John 4:53). This is noted as the second of Christ's Galilean miracles (~~404B~~ John 4:54).

#### **2. The Visit to Nazareth:**

(~~404B~~) **MATTHEW 4:13;** (~~404B~~) **LUKE 4:16-30**

A very different reception awaited Him at Nazareth, "His own country," to which He next came. We can scarcely take the incident recorded in ~~404B~~ Luke 4:16-30 to be the same as that in ~~403A~~ Matthew 13:54-58, though Matthew's habit of grouping makes this not impossible. The Sabbath had come, and on His entering the synagogue, as was His wont, the repute He had won led to His being asked to read. The Scripture He selected (or which came in the order of the day) was ~~2601~~ Isaiah 61:1 ff (the fact that Jesus was able to read from the synagogue-roll is interesting as bearing on

His knowledge of Hebrew), and from this He proceeded to amaze His hearers by declaring that this Scripture was now fulfilled in their ears (~~Q02~~ Luke 4:21). The “words of grace” he uttered are not given, but it can be understood that, following the prophet’s guidance, He would hold Himself forth as the predicted “Servant of Yahweh,” sent to bring salvation to the poor, the bound, the broken-hearted, and for this purpose endowed with the fullness of the Spirit. The idea of the passage in Isaiah is that of the year of jubilee, when debts were canceled, inheritances restored, and slaves set free, and Jesus told them He had come to inaugurate that “acceptable year of the Lord.” At first He was listened to with admiration, then, as the magnitude of the claims He was making became apparent to His audience, a very different spirit took possession of them. “Who was this that spoke thus?” “Was it not Joseph’s son?” (~~Q02~~ Luke 4:22). They were disappointed, too, that Jesus showed no disposition to gratify them by working before them any of the miracles of which they had heard so much (~~Q03~~ Luke 4:23). Jesus saw the gathering storm, but met it resolutely. He told His hearers He had not expected any better reception, and in reply to their reproach that He had wrought miracles elsewhere, but had wrought none among them, quoted examples of prophets who had done the same thing (Elijah, Elisha, ~~Q04~~ Luke 4:24-28). This completed the exasperation of the Nazarenes, who, springing forward, dragged Him to the brow of the hill on which their city was built, and would have thrown Him down, had something in the aspect of Jesus not restrained them. With one of those looks we read of occasionally in the Gospels, He seems to have overawed His townsmen, and, passing in safety through their midst, left the place (~~Q05~~ Luke 4:28-30).

### 3. Call of the Four Disciples:

(~~Q017~~ MATTHEW 4:17-22; ~~Q016~~ MARK 1:16-22; ~~Q01~~ LUKE 5:1-11)

After leaving Nazareth Jesus made His way to Capernaum (probably Tell Hum), which thereafter seems to have been His headquarters. He “dwelt” there (~~Q03~~ Matthew 4:13). It is called in ~~Q001~~ Matthew 9:1, “his own city.” Before teaching in Capernaum self, however, He appears to have opened His ministry by evangelizing along the shores of the Sea of Galilee (~~Q018~~ Matthew 4:18; ~~Q016~~ Mark 1:16; ~~Q001~~ Luke 5:1), and there, at Bethsaida (on topographical questions, see special articles), He took His first step in gathering His chosen disciples more closely around Him. Hitherto, though

attached to His person and cause, the pairs of fisher brothers, Simon and Andrew, James and John — these last the “sons of Zebedee” — had not been in constant attendance upon Him. Since the return from Jerusalem, they had gone back to their ordinary avocations. The four were “partners” (~~450~~ Luke 5:10). They had “hired servants” (~~4002~~ Mark 1:20); therefore were moderately well off. The time had now come when they were to leave “all,” and follow Jesus entirely.

**a) The Draught of Fishes:**

**(~~4001~~ LUKE 5:1-9)**

Luke alone records the striking miracle which led to the call. Jesus had been teaching the multitude from a boat borrowed from Simon, and now at the close He bade Simon put out into the deep, and let down his nets. Peter told Jesus they had toiled all night in vain, but he would obey His word. The result was an immense draught of fishes, so that the nets were breaking, and the other company had to be called upon for help. Both boats were filled and in danger of sinking. Peter’s cry in so wonderful a presence was, “Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord.”

**b) “Fishers of Men”:**

The miracle gave Jesus opportunity for the word He wished to speak. It is here that Matthew and Mark take up the story. The boats had been brought to shore when, first to Simon and Andrew, afterward to James and John (engaged in “mending their nets,” ~~4001~~ Matthew 4:21; ~~4019~~ Mark 1:19), the call was given: “Come ye after me, and I will make you fishers of men.” At once all was left — boats, nets, friends — and they followed Him. Their experience taught them to have large expectations from Christ.

**4. At Capernaum:**

**(~~4003~~ MATTHEW 4:13; ~~4003~~ LUKE 4:31)**

Jesus is now found in Capernaum. An early Sabbath — perhaps the first of His stated residence in the city — was marked by notable events.

The Sabbath found Jesus as usual in the synagogue — now as teacher. The manner of His teaching is specially noticed: “He taught them as having authority, and not as the scribes” (~~4002~~ Mark 1:22). The scribes gave forth nothing of their own.

**a) Christ's Teaching:**

(~~4012~~ **MARK 1:22,27;** ~~4042~~ **LUKE 4:32**)

They but repeated the dicta of the great authorities of the past. It was a surprise to the people to find in Jesus One whose wisdom, like waters from a clear fountain, came fresh and sparkling from His own lips. The authority also with which Jesus spoke commanded attention. He sought support in the opinion of no others, but gave forth His statements with firmness, decision, dignity and emphasis.

**b) The Demoniac in the Synagogue:**

(~~40123~~ **MARK 1:23-27;** ~~4043~~ **LUKE 4:33-37**)

While Jesus was teaching an extraordinary incident occurred. A man in the assembly, described as possessed by “an unclean spirit” (~~40123~~ Mark 1:23; ~~4043~~ Luke 4:33) broke forth in cries, addressing Jesus by name (“Jesus, thou Nazarene”), speaking of Him as “the Holy One of God,” and asking “What have we to do with thee? Art thou come to destroy us?” The diseased consciousness of the sufferer bore a truer testimony to Christ's dignity, holiness and power than most of those present could have given, and instinctively, but truly, construed His coming as meaning destruction to the empire of the demons. At Christ's word, after a terrible paroxysm, from which, however, the man escaped unhurt (~~4043~~ Luke 4:35), the demon was cast out. More than ever the people were “amazed” at the word which had such power (~~40127~~ Mark 1:27).

**Demon-Possession: Its Reality.**

This is the place to say a word on this terrible form of malady — demon-possession — met with so often in the Gospels. Was it a reality? Or a hallucination? Did Jesus believe in it? It is difficult to read the Gospels, and not answer the last question in the affirmative. Was Jesus, then, mistaken? This also it is hard to believe. If there is one subject on which Jesus might be expected to have clear vision — on which we might trust His insight — it was His relation to the spiritual world with which He stood in so close rapport. Was He likely then to be mistaken when He spoke so earnestly, so profoundly, so frequently, of its hidden forces of evil? There is in itself no improbability — rather analogy suggests the highest probability — of realms of spiritual existence outside our sensible ken. That evil should enter

this spiritual world, and that human life should be deeply implicated with that evil — that its forces should have a mind and will organizing and directing them — are not beliefs to be dismissed with scorn. The presence of such beliefs in the time of Christ is commonly attributed to Babylonian, Persian or other foreign influences. It may be questioned, however, whether the main cause was not something far more real — an actual and permitted “hour and the power of darkness” (~~4253~~ Luke 22:53) in the kingdom of evil, discovering itself in manifestations in the bodies and souls of men, that could be traced only to a supernatural cause (*see DEMONIAIC POSSESSION*). (The present writer discusses the subject in an article in the Sunday School Times for June 4, 1910. It would be presumptuous even to say that the instance in the Gospels have no modern parallels. See a striking paper in Good, Words, edited by Dr. Norman MacLeod, for 1867, on “The English Demoniac.”) It should be noted that all diseases are not, as is sometimes affirmed, traced to demonic influence. The distinction between other diseases and demonic possession is clearly maintained (compare ~~4024~~ Matthew 4:24; 10:1; 11:5, etc.). Insanity, epilepsy, blindness, dumbness, etc., were frequent accompaniments of possession, but they are not identified with it.

**c) Peter’s Wife’s Mother:**

(~~4084~~ **MATTHEW 8:14,15;** ~~4029~~ **MARK 1:29-31;** ~~4048~~ **LUKE 4:38,39**)

Jesus, on leaving the synagogue, entered the house of Peter. In Mark it is called “the house of Simon and Andrew” (1:29). Peter was married (compare ~~4005~~ 1 Corinthians 9:5), and apparently his mother-in-law and brother lived with him in Capernaum. It was an anxious time in the household, for the mother-in-law lay “sick of a fever” — “a great fever,” as Luke the physician calls it. Taking her by the hand, Jesus rebuked the fever, which instantaneously left her. The miracle, indeed, was a double one, for not only was the fever stayed, but strength was at once restored. “She rose up and ministered unto them” (~~4049~~ Luke 4:39).

**d) The Eventful Evening:**

(~~4086~~ **MATTHEW 8:16;** ~~4032~~ **MARK 1:32-34;** ~~4040~~ **LUKE 4:40,41**)

The day’s labors were not yet done; were, indeed, scarce begun. The news of what had taken place quickly spread, and soon the extraordinary

spectacle was presented of 'the whole city' gathered at the door of the dwelling, bringing their sick of every kind to be healed. Demoniacs were there, crying and being rebuked, but multitudes of others as well. The Lord's compassion was unbounded. He rejected none. He labored unweariedly till every one was healed. His sympathy was individual: "He laid his hands on every one of them" (~~<4040>~~ Luke 4:40).

## **II. From First Galilean Circuit till the Choice of the Apostles.**

### **1. The First Circuit:**

(~~<4005>~~ **MARK 1:35-45;** ~~<4040>~~ **LUKE 4:42-44; COMPARE** ~~<4023>~~ **MATTHEW 4:23-25)**

The chronological order in this section is to be sought in Mark and Luke; Matthew groups for didactic purposes. The morning after that eventful Sabbath evening in Capernaum, Jesus took steps for a systematic visitation of the towns and villages of Galilee.

The task He set before Himself was prepared for by early, prolonged, solitary prayer (~~<4005>~~ Mark 1:35; many instances show that Christ's life was steeped in prayer). His disciples followed Him, and reported that the multitudes sought Him. Jesus intimated to them His intention of passing to the next towns, and forthwith commenced a tour of preaching and healing "throughout all Galilee."

#### **a) Its Scope:**

Even if the expression "all Galilee" is used with some latitude, it indicates a work of very extensive compass. It was a work likewise methodically conducted (compare ~~<4005>~~ Mark 6:6: "went round about the villages," literally, "in a circle"). Galilee at this time was extraordinarily populous (compare Josephus, Wars of the Jews, III, iii, 2), and the time occupied by the circuit must have been considerable. Matthew's condensed picture (~~<4023>~~ Matthew 4:23-25) shows that Christ's activity during this period was incredibly great. He stirred the province to its depths. His preaching and miracles drew enormous crowds after Him. This tide of popularity afterward turned, but much of the seed sown may have produced fruit at a later day.

#### **b) Cure of the Leper:**



(~~4182~~ **MATTHEW 8:2-4;** ~~4104~~ **MARK 1:40-45;** ~~4152~~ **LUKE 5:12-16**)

The one incident recorded which seems to have belonged to this tour was a sufficiently typical one. While Jesus was in a certain city a man “full of leprosy” (~~4152~~ Luke 5:12) came and threw himself down before Him, seeking to be healed. The man did not even ask Jesus to heal him, but expressed his faith, “If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.” The man’s apparent want of importunity was the very essence of his importunity. Jesus, moved by his earnestness, touched him, and the man was made whole on the spot. The leper was enjoined to keep silence — Jesus did not wish to pass for a mere miracle-worker — and bade the man show himself to the priests and offer the appointed sacrifices (note Christ’s respect for the legal institutions). The leper failed to keep Christ’s charge, and published his cure abroad, no doubt much to his own spiritual detriment, and also to the hindrance of Christ’s work (~~4105~~ Mark 1:45).

## 2. Capernaum Incidents:

His circuit ended, Jesus returned to Capernaum (~~4100~~ Mark 2:1; literally, “after days”). Here again His fame at once drew multitudes to see and hear Him. Among them were now persons of more unfriendly spirit. Pharisees and doctors, learning of the new rabbi, had come out of “every village of Galilee and Judea and Jerusalem” (~~4157~~ Luke 5:17), to hear and judge of Him for themselves. The chief incidents of this visit are the two now to be noted.

### a) Cure of the Paralytic:

(~~4192~~ **MATTHEW 9:2-8;** ~~4100~~ **MARK 2:1-12;** ~~4157~~ **LUKE 5:17-26**)

In a chamber crowded till there was no standing room, even round the door, Jesus wrought the cure upon the paralytic man. The scene was a dramatic one. From Christ’s words “son,” literally, “child” (~~4105~~ Mark 2:5), we infer that the paralytic was young, but his disablement seems to have been complete. It was no easy matter, with the doorways blocked, to get the man brought to Jesus, but his four bearers (~~4103~~ Mark 2:3) were not easily daunted. They climbed the fiat roof, and, removing part of the covering above where Jesus was, let down the man into the midst. Jesus, pleased with the inventiveness and perseverance of their faith, responded to their wish. But, first, that the spiritual and temporal might be set in their right relations, and the attitude of His hearers be tested, He spoke the

higher words: “Son, thy sins are forgiven” (~~4006~~ Mark 2:5). At once the temper of the scribes was revealed. Here was manifest evasion. Anyone could say, “Thy sins are forgiven.” Worse, it was blasphemy, for “who can forgive sins but one, even God?” (~~4007~~ Mark 2:7). Unconsciously they were conceding to Christ the Divine dignity He claimed. Jesus perceives at once the thoughts of the cavilers, and proceeds to expose their malice.

Accepting their own test, He proves His right to say, “Thy sins are forgiven,” by now saying to the palsied man, “Take up thy bed and walk” (~~4009~~ Mark 2:9,11). At once the man arose, took his bed, and went forth whole. The multitude were “amazed” and “glorified God” (~~4012~~ Mark 2:12).

## **b) Call and Feast of Matthew:**

(~~4009~~ MATTHEW 9:9-13; ~~4013~~ MARK 2:13-17; ~~4017~~ LUKE 5:27-32)

The call of Matthew apparently took place shortly after the cure of the paralytic man. The feast was possibly later (compare the connection with the appeal of Jairus, ~~4018~~ Matthew 9:18), but the call and the feast are best taken together, as they are in all the three narratives.

### **(1) The Call.**

Matthew is called “Levi” by Luke, and “Levi, the son of Alphaeus” by Mark. By occupation he was a “publican” (~~4017~~ Luke 5:27), collector of custom-dues in Capernaum, an important center of traffic. There is no reason to suppose that Matthew was not a man of thorough uprightness, though naturally the class to which he belonged was held in great odium by the Jews. Passing the place of toll on His way to or from the lake-side, Jesus called Matthew to follow Him. The publican must by this time have seen and heard much of Jesus, and could not but keenly feel His grace in calling one whom men despised. Without an instant’s delay, he left all, and followed Jesus. From publican, Matthew became apostle, then evangelist.

### **(2) The Feast.**

Then, or after, in the joy of his heart, Matthew made a feast for Jesus. To this feast he invited many of his own class — “publicans and sinners” (~~4010~~ Matthew 9:10). Scribes and Pharisees were loud in their remonstrances to the disciples at what seemed to them an outrage on all propriety. Narrow hearts cannot understand the breadth of grace. Christ’s reply was

conclusive: “They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick,” etc. (~~<4017>~~ Mark 2:17, etc.).

### (3) Fasting and Joy.

Another line of objection was encountered from disciples of the Baptist. They, like the Pharisees, “fasted oft” (~~<4094>~~ Matthew 9:14), and they took exception to the unconstrained way in which Jesus and His disciples entered into social life. Jesus defends His disciples by adopting a metaphor of John’s own (~~<4139>~~ John 3:29), and speaking of Himself as the heavenly bridegroom (~~<4129>~~ Mark 2:19). Joy was natural while the bridegroom was with them; then, with a sad forecast of the end, He alludes to days of mourning when the bridegroom should be taken away (~~<4120>~~ Mark 2:20). A deeper answer follows. The spirit of His gospel is a free, spontaneous, joyful spirit, and cannot be confined within the old forms. To attempt to confine His religion within the outworn forms of Judaism would be like putting a patch of undressed cloth on an old garment, or pouring new wine into old wineskins. The garment would be rent; the wineskins would burst (~~<4121>~~ Mark 2:21,22 parallel). The new spirit must make forms of its own.

### 3. The Unnamed Jerusalem Feast:

#### (JOHN 5)

At this point is probably to, be introduced the visit to Jerusalem to attend “a feast,” or, according to another reading, “the feast” of the Jews, recorded in John 5. The feast may, if the article is admitted, have been the Passover (April), though in that case one would expect it to be named; it may have been Purim (March), only this is not a feast Jesus might be thought eager to attend; it may even have been Pentecost (June). In this last case it would succeed the Sabbath controversies to be mentioned later. Fortunately, the determination of the actual feast has little bearing on the teaching of the chapter.

#### a) The Healing at Bethesda:

#### (~~<4131>~~ JOHN 5:1-16)

Bethesda (“house of mercy”) was the name given to a pool, fed by an intermittent spring, possessing healing properties, which was situated by the sheep-gate (not “market,” the King James Version), i.e. near the

temple, on the East Porches were erected to accommodate the invalids who desired to make trial of the waters (the mention of the angel, ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 5:4, with part of 5:3, is a later gloss, and is justly omitted in the Revised Version (British and American)). On one of these porches lay an impotent man. His infirmity was of long standing — 38 years. Hope deferred was making his heart sick, for he had no friend, when the waters were troubled, to put him into the pool. Others invariably got down before him. Jesus took pity on this man. He asked him if he would be made whole; then by a word of power healed him. The cure was instantaneous (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 5:8,9). It was the Sabbath day, and as the man, at Christ's command, took up his bed to go, he was challenged as doing that which was unlawful. The healed man, however, rightly perceived that He who was able to work so great a cure had authority to say what should and should not be done on the Sabbath. Meeting the man after in the temple, Jesus bade him "sin no more" — a hint, perhaps, that his previous infirmity was a result of sinful conduct (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 5:14).

#### **b) Son and Father:**

(~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 5:17-29) Jesus Himself was now challenged by the authorities for breaking the Sabbath. Their strait, artificial rules would not permit even of acts of mercy on the Sabbath. This led, on the part of Jesus, to a momentous assertion of His Divine dignity. He first justified Himself by the example of His Father, who works continually in the upholding and government of the universe (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 5:17) — the Sabbath is a rest from earthly labors, for Divine, heavenly labor (Westcott) — then, when this increased the offense by its suggestion of "equality" with the Father, so that His life was threatened (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 5:18), He spoke yet more explicitly of His unique relationship to the Father, and of the Divine prerogatives it conferred upon Him. The Jews were right: if Jesus were not a Divine Person, the claims He made would be blasphemous. Not only was He admitted to intimacy with the Divine counsel (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 5:20,21; compare ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ Matthew 11:27), but to Him, He averred, was committed the Divine power of giving life (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 5:21,26), of judgment (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 5:22,27), of resurrection — spiritual resurrection now (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 5:24,25), resurrection at the last day (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 5:28,29). It was the Father's will that the Son should be honored even as Himself (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 5:23).

**c) The Threefold Witness:**(~~Ⓜ~~John 5:30-47)These stupendous claims are not made without adequate attestation. Jesus cites a threefold witness:

- (1)** the witness of the Baptist, whose testimony they had been willing for a time to receive (~~Ⓜ~~John 5:33,15);
- (2)** the witness of the Father, who by Christ's works supported His witness to Himself (~~Ⓜ~~John 5:36-38);
- (3)** the witness of the Scriptures, for these, if read with spiritual discernment, would have led to Him (~~Ⓜ~~John 5:39,45-47).

Moses, whom they trusted, would condemn them. Their rejection of Jesus was due, not to want of light, but to the state of the heart: "I know you, that ye have not the love of God in yourselves" (~~Ⓜ~~John 5:42); "How can ye believe," etc. (~~Ⓜ~~John 5:44).

#### **4. Sabbath Controversies:**

Shortly after His return to Galilee, if the order of events has been rightly apprehended, Jesus became involved in new disputes with the Pharisees about Sabbath-keeping. Possibly we hear in these the echoes of the charges brought against Him at the feast in Judea. Christ's conduct, and the principles involved in His replies, throw valuable light on the Sabbath institution.

##### **a) Plucking of the Ears of Grain:**

(~~Ⓜ~~Matthew 12:1-8; ~~Ⓜ~~Mark 2:23-28; ~~Ⓜ~~Luke 6:1-5)The first dispute was occasioned by the action of the disciples in plucking ears of grain and rubbing them in their hands as they passed through the grainfields on a Sabbath (the note of time "second-first," in ~~Ⓜ~~Luke 6:1 the King James Version, is omitted in the Revised Version (British and American). In any case the ripened grain points to a time shortly after the Passover). The law permitted this liberty (~~Ⓜ~~Deuteronomy 23:25), but Pharisaic rigor construed it into an offense to do the act on the Sabbath (for specimens of the minute, trivial and vexatious rules by which the Pharisees converted the Sabbath into a day of wretched constraint, see Farrar's *Life of Christ*, Edersheim's *Jesus the Messiah*, and similar works). Jesus, in defending His disciples, first quotes Old Testament precedents (David and the showbread, an act done apparently on the Sabbath, ~~Ⓜ~~1 Samuel 21:6; the priests'

service on the Sabbath — “One greater than the temple” was there, <sup><4016></sup>Matthew 12:6), in illustration of the truth that necessity overrides positive enactment; next, falls back on the broad principle of the design of the Sabbath as made for man — for his highest physical, mental, moral and spiritual well-being: “The sabbath was made for man,” etc. (<sup><4027></sup>Mark 2:27). The claims of mercy are paramount. The end is not to be sacrificed to the means. The Son of Man, therefore, asserts lordship over the Sabbath (<sup><4028></sup>Mark 2:28 parallel).

#### **b) The Man with the Withered Hand:**

(<sup><4020></sup>Matthew 12:10-14; <sup><4001></sup>Mark 3:1-6; <sup><4006></sup>Luke 6:6-11)The second collision took place on “another sabbath” (<sup><4006></sup>Luke 6:6) in the synagogue. There was present a man with a withered hand. The Pharisees themselves, on this occasion, eager to entrap Jesus, seem to have provoked the conflict by a question, “Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath day?” (<sup><4020></sup>Matthew 12:10). Jesus met them by an appeal to their own practice in permitting the rescue of a sheep that had fallen into a pit on the Sabbath day (<sup><4021></sup>Matthew 12:11,12), then, bidding the man stand forth, retorted the question on themselves, “Is it lawful on the sabbath day to do good, or to do harm? to save a life, or to kill?” (<sup><4004></sup>Mark 3:4) — an allusion to their murderous intents. On no reply being made, looking on them with holy indignation, Jesus ordered the man to stretch forth his hand, and it was at once perfectly restored. The effect was only to inflame to “madness” (<sup><4001></sup>Luke 6:11) the minds of His adversaries, and Pharisees and Herodians (the court-party of Herod) took counsel to destroy Him (<sup><4006></sup>Mark 3:6 parallel).

#### **c) Withdrawal to the Sea:**

(<sup><4025></sup>Matthew 12:15-21; <sup><4007></sup>Mark 3:7-9)Jesus, leaving this scene of unprofitable conflict, quietly withdrew with His disciples to the shore, and there continued His work of teaching and healing. People from all the neighboring districts flocked to His ministry. He taught them from a little boat (<sup><4009></sup>Mark 3:9), and healed their sick. Matthew sees in this a fulfillment of the oracle which is to be found in <sup><2401></sup>Isaiah 42:1-4.

### **5. The Choosing of the Twelve:**

(<sup><4005></sup>Matthew 10:1-4; <sup><4003></sup>Mark 3:13-19; <sup><4002></sup>Luke 6:12-16; <sup><4013></sup>Acts 1:13)The work of Jesus was growing on His hands, and friends and enemies were rapidly taking sides. The time accordingly had come for

selecting and attaching to His person a definite number of followers — not simply disciples — who might be prepared to carry on His work after His departure. This He did in the choice of twelve apostles. The choice was made in early morning, on the Mount of Beatitudes, after a night spent wholly in prayer (<sup><062></sup>Luke 6:12).

### **a) The Apostolic Function:**

“Apostle” means “one sent.” On the special function of the apostle it is sufficient to say here that those thus set apart were chosen for the special end of being Christ’s witnesses and accredited ambassadors to the world, able from personal knowledge to bear testimony to what Christ had been, said and done — to the facts of His life, death and resurrection (compare <sup><022></sup>Acts 1:22,23; 2:22-32; 3:15; 10:39; <sup><618></sup>1 Corinthians 15:3-15, etc.); but, further, as instructed by Him, and endowed with His Spirit (compare <sup><244></sup>Luke 14:49; <sup><346></sup>John 14:16,17,26, etc.), of being the depositories of His truth, sharers of His authority (compare <sup><001></sup>Matthew 10:1; <sup><085></sup>Mark 3:15), messengers of His gospel (compare <sup><758></sup>2 Corinthians 5:18-21), and His instruments in laying broad and strong the foundations of His church (compare <sup><020></sup>Ephesians 2:20; 3:5). So responsible a calling was never, before or after, given to mortal men.

### **b) The Lists**

Four lists of the apostles are given — in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Acts (1:13, omitting Judas). The names are given alike in all, except that “Judas, the son (or brother) of James” (<sup><066></sup>Luke 6:16; <sup><013></sup>Acts 1:13) is called by Matthew Lebbaeus, “and by Mark Thaddaeus.” The latter names are cognate in meaning and all denote the same person. “Bartholomew” (son of Tolmai) is probably the Nathanael of <sup><047></sup>John 1:47 (compare 21:2). The epithet “Cananaean” (<sup><004></sup>Matthew 10:4; <sup><068></sup>Mark 3:18) marks “Simon” as then or previously a member of the party of the Zealots (<sup><065></sup>Luke 6:15). In all the lists Peter, through his gifts of leadership, stands first; Judas Iscariot, the betrayer, stands last. There is a tendency to arrangement in pairs: Peter and Andrew; James and John; Philip and Bartholomew; Thomas and Matthew; lastly, James, the son of Alphaeus, Judas, son or brother of James, Simon the Zealot and Judas Iscariot. The list contains two pairs of brothers (three, if “brother” be read with Judas), and at least one pair of friends (Philip and Nathanael).

### **c) The Men:**

All the apostles were men from the humbler ranks, yet not illiterate, and mostly comfortably circumstanced. All were Galileans, except the betrayer, whose name “Iscariot” i.e. “man of Kerioth,” marks him as a Judean. Of some of the apostles we know a good deal; of others very little; yet we are warranted in speaking of them all, Judas excepted, as men of honest minds, and sincere piety. The band held within it a number of men of strongly contrasted types of character. Allusion need only be made to the impetuous Peter, the contemplative John, the matter-of-fact Philip, the cautious Thomas, the zealous Simon, the conservative Matthew, the administrative Judas. The last-named — Iscariot — is the dark problem of the apostolate. We have express testimony that Jesus knew him from the beginning (~~4166~~ John 6:64). Yet He chose him. The character of Judas, when Jesus received him, was doubtless undeveloped. He could not himself suspect the dark possibilities that slept in it. His association with the apostles, in itself considered, was for his good. His peculiar gift was, for the time, of service. In choosing him, Jesus must be viewed as acting for, and under the direction of, the Father (~~4159~~ John 5:19; 17:12). See special articles on the several apostles.

### **III.** From the Sermon on the Mount till the Parables of the Kingdom — a Second Circuit.

#### **1.** The Sermon on the Mount:

The choice of the apostles inaugurates a new period of Christ’s activity. Its first most precious fruit was the delivery to the apostles and the multitudes who thronged Him as He came down from the mountain (~~4167~~ Luke 6:17) of that great manifesto of His kingdom popularly known as the Sermon on the Mount. The hill is identified by Stanley (Sinai and Palestine, 368) and others with that known as “the Horns of Hattin,” where “the level place” at the top, from which Christ would come down from one of the higher horns, exactly suits the conditions of the narrative. The sick being healed, Jesus seated Himself a little higher up, His disciples near Him, and addressed the assembly (compare ~~4178~~ Matthew 7:28,29). The season of the year is shown by the mention of the “lilies” to be the summer. Its Scope. His words were weighty. His aim was at the outset to set forth in terms that were unmistakable the principles, aims and dispositions of His kingdom; to expound its laws; to exhibit its righteousness, both positively, and in contrast with Pharisaic formalism and hypocrisy. Only the leading ideas can be indicated here (*see BEATITUDES; SERMON ON MOUNT; ETHICS*



*OF JESUS*). Matthew, as is his wont, groups material part of which is found in other connections in Luke, but it is well to study the whole in the well-ordered form in which it appears in the First Gospel.

**a) The Blessings:**

(~~405b~~ **MATTHEW 5:1-6;** ~~403b~~ **LUKE 6:20-26**)

In marked contrast with the lawgiving of Sinai, Christ's first words are those of blessing. Passing at once to the dispositions of the heart, He shows on what inner conditions the blessings of the kingdom depend. His beatitudes (poverty of spirit, mourning, meekness, hunger and thirst after righteousness, etc.) reverse all the world's standards of judgment on such matters. In the possession of these graces consists true godliness of character; through them the heirs of the kingdom become the salt of the earth, the light of the world. The obligation rests on them to let their light shine (compare ~~402b~~ Mark 4:21-23; ~~406b~~ Luke 8:16; 11:33).

**b) True Righteousness — the Old and the New Law:**

(~~405b~~ **MATTHEW 5:17-48;** ~~407b~~ **LUKE 6:27-36**)

Jesus defines His relation to the old law — not a Destroyer, but a Fulfiller — and proceeds to exhibit the nature of the true righteousness in contrast to Pharisaic literalism and formalism. Through adherence to the latter they killed the spirit of the law. With an absolute authority — “But I say unto you” — Jesus leads everything back from the outward letter to the state of the heart. Illustrations are taken from murder, adultery, swearing, retaliation, hatred of enemies, and a spiritual expansion is given to every precept. The sinful thought or desire holds in it the essence of transgression. The world's standards are again reversed in the demands for nonresistance to injuries, love of enemies and requital of good for evil.

**c) Religion and Hypocrisy — True and False Motive:**

(~~400b~~ Matthew 6:1-18; compare ~~210b~~ Luke 11:1-8) Pursuing the contrast between the true righteousness and that of the scribes and Pharisees, Jesus next draws attention to motive in religion. The Pharisees erred not simply in having regard only to the letter of the Law, but in acting in morals and religion from a false motive. He had furnished the antidote to their literalism; He now assails their ostentation and hypocrisy. Illustrations are

taken from almsgiving, prayer and fasting, and in connection with prayer the Lord's Prayer is given as a model (Luke introduces this in another context, 11:1-4).

**d) The True Good and Cure for Care:**

(~~4169~~ Matthew 6:19-34; compare ~~4113~~ Luke 11:34-36; 12:22-34) The true motive in religious acts is to please God; the same motive should guide us in the choice of what is to be our supreme good. Earthly treasure is not to be put above heavenly. The kingdom of God and His righteousness are to be first in our desires. The eye is to be single. The true cure for worldly anxiety is then found in trust of the heavenly Father. His children are more to God than fowls and flowers, for whom His care in Nature is so conspicuously manifest. Seeking first the kingdom they have a pledge — no higher conceivable — that all else they need will be granted along with it (this section on trust, again, Luke places differently, 12:22-34).

**e) Relation to the World's Evil — the Conclusion:**

(~~4101~~ Matthew 7:1-29; ~~4167~~ Luke 6:37-49; compare 11:9-13): Jesus finally proceeds to speak of the relation of the disciple to the evil of the world. That evil has been considered in its hostile attitude to the disciple (~~4158~~ Matthew 5:38 ff); the question is now as to the disciple's free relations toward it. Jesus inculcates the duties of the disciple's bearing himself wisely toward evil — with charity, with caution, with prayer, in the spirit of ever doing as one would be done by — and of being on his guard against it. The temptation is great to follow the worldly crowd, to be misled by false teachers, to put profession for practice. Against these perils the disciple is energetically warned. True religion will ever be known by its fruits. The discourse closes with the powerful similitude of the wise and foolish builders. Again, as on an earlier occasion, Christ's auditors were astonished at His teaching, and at the authority with which He spoke (~~4178~~ Matthew 7:28,29).

**2. Intervening Incidents:**

A series of remarkable incidents are next to be noticed.

**a) Healing of the Centurion's Servant:**

(~~4181~~ Matthew 8:1,5-13; ~~4101~~ Luke 7:1-10)

**(1)** The healing of the centurion's servant apparently took place on the same day as the delivery of the Sermon on the Mount (~~<471>~~ Luke 7:1,2).

It had been a day of manifold and exhausting labors for Jesus. A walk of perhaps 7 miles brought Him back to Capernaum, the crowds accompanying. Yet no sooner, on His return, does He hear a new appeal for help than His love replies, "I will come and heal him." The suppliant was a Roman centurion — one who had endeared himself to the Jews (~~<471>~~ Luke 7:5) — and the request was for the healing of a favorite servant, paralyzed and tortured with pain. First, a deputation sought Christ's good offices, then, when Jesus was on the way, a second message came, awakening even Christ's astonishment by the magnitude of its faith. The centurion felt he was not worthy that Jesus should come under his roof, but let Jesus speak the word only, and his servant would be healed. "I have not found so great faith," Jesus said, "no, not in Israel." The word was spoken, and, on the return of the messengers, the servant was found healed.

**b)** The Widow of Nain's Son Raised:

(~~<471>~~ Luke 7:11-17) The exciting events of this day gathered so great a crowd round the house where Jesus was as left Him no leisure even to eat, and His friends, made anxious for His health, sought to restrain Him (~~<471>~~ Mark 3:20,21). It was probably to escape from this local excitement that Jesus, "soon afterwards," is found at the little town of Nain, a few miles Southeast of Nazareth. A great multitude still followed Him. Here, as He entered the city, occurred the most wonderful of the works He had yet wrought. A young man — the only son of a widowed mother — was being carried out for burial. Jesus, in compassion, stopped the mournful procession, and, in the calm certainty of His word being obeyed, bade the young man arise. On the instant life returned, and Jesus gave the son back to his mother. The amazement of the people was tenfold intensified. They felt that the old days had come back: that God had visited His people. It was apparently during the journey or circuit which embraced this visit to Nain, and as the result of the fame it brought to Jesus (~~<471>~~ Luke 7:17,18; note the allusion to the dead being raised in Christ's reply to John), that the embassy was sent from the Baptist in prison to ask of Jesus whether He was indeed He who should come, or would they look for another.

**c)** Embassy of John's Disciples — Christ and His Generation:

(~~4112~~ MATTHEW 11:2-30; ~~4378~~ LUKE 7:18-35)

It was a strange question on the lips of the forerunner, but is probably to be interpreted as the expression of perplexity rather than of actual doubt. There seems no question but that John's mind had been thrown into serious difficulty by the reports which had reached him of the work of Jesus. Things were not turning out as he expected. It was the peaceful, merciful character of Christ's work which stumbled John. The gloom of his prison wrought with his disappointment, and led him to send this message for the satisfaction of himself and his disciples.

(1) Christ's Answer to John.

If doubt there was, Jesus treated it tenderly. He did not answer directly, but bade the two disciples who had been sent go back and tell John the things they had seen and heard — the blind receiving their sight, the lame walking, the deaf cured, the dead raised, the Gospel preached. Little doubt the Messiah had come when works like these — the very works predicted by the prophets (~~2385~~ Isaiah 35:5,6) — were being done. Blessed were those who did not find occasion of stumbling in Him. Jesus, however, did more. By his embassy John had put himself in a somewhat false position before the multitude. But Jesus would not have His faithful follower misjudged. His was no fickle spirit. Jesus nobly vindicated him as a prophet and more than a prophet; yea, a man than whom a greater had not lived. Yet, even as the new dispensation was higher than the old, one "but little" in the kingdom of heaven — one sharing Christ's humble, loving, self-denying disposition — was greater even than John (~~4111~~ Matthew 11:11).

(2) A Perverse People — Christ's Grace.

The implied contrast between Himself and John led Jesus further to denounce the perverse spirit of His own generation. The Pharisees and lawyers (~~4113~~ Luke 7:30) had rejected John; they were as little pleased with Him. Their behavior was like children objecting to one game because it was merry, and to another because it was sad. The flood of outward popularity did not deceive Jesus. The cities in which His greatest works were wrought — Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum — remained impenitent at heart. The heavier would be their judgment; worse even than that on Tyre and Sidon, or on Sodom itself. Over against their unbelief Jesus reasserts His dignity and declares His grace (~~4125~~ Matthew 11:25-30). All authority was His; He alone knew and could reveal the Father (no claims in

John are higher). Let the heavy laden come to Him, and He would give them rest (parts of these passages appear in another connection in <sup><2012></sup>Luke 10:12-21).

#### **d) The First Anointing — the Woman Who Was a Sinner:**

(<sup><2073></sup>Luke 7:36-50) Yet another beautiful incident connected with this journey is preserved by Luke — the anointing of Jesus in Simon's house by a woman who was a sinner. In Nain or some other city visited by Him, Jesus was invited to dine with a Pharisee named Simon. His reception was a cold one (<sup><2074></sup>Luke 7:44-46). During the meal, a woman of the city, an outcast from respectable society — one, however, as the story implies, whose heart Jesus had reached, and who, filled with sorrow, love, shame, penitence, had turned from her life of sin, entered the chamber. There, bathing Christ's feet with her tears, wiping them with her tresses, and imprinting on them fervent kisses, she anointed them with a precious ointment she had brought with her. Simon was scandalized. Jesus could not be a right-thinking man, much less a prophet, or He would have rebuked this misbehavior from such a person. Jesus met the thought of Simon's heart by speaking to him the parable of the Two Debtors (<sup><2074></sup>Luke 7:41,42). Of two men who had been freely forgiven, one 500, the other 50 shillings, which would love his creditor most? Simon gave the obvious answer, and the contrast between his own reception of Jesus and the woman's passionate love was immediately pointed out. Her greater love was due to the greater forgiveness; though, had Simon only seen it, he perhaps needed forgiveness even more than she.

### **3. Second Galilean Circuit — Events at Capernaum:**

(<sup><2081></sup>Luke 8:1-4,19-21; <sup><2022></sup>Matthew 12:22-50; <sup><2082></sup>Mark 3:22-35 compare <sup><2114></sup>Luke 11:14-36) Her faith saved her and she was dismissed in peace. But again the question arose, "Who is this that even forgiveth sins?" Luke introduces here (<sup><2081></sup>Luke 8:1-4) a second Galilean circuit of Jesus, after the return from which a new series of exciting incidents took place at Capernaum.

#### **a) Galilee Revisited:**

(<sup><2081></sup>Luke 8:1-4) The circuit was an extensive one — "went about through cities and villages (literally, "according to city and village"), preaching." During this journey Jesus was attended by the Twelve, and by devoted

women (Mary Magdalene, Joanna, wife of Herod's steward, Susanna, and others), who ministered to Him of their substance (<sup><080></sup>Luke 8:2,3). At the close of this circuit Jesus returned to Capernaum.

### **b) Cure of Demoniac — Discourse on Blasphemy:**

Jesus, no doubt, wrought numerous miracles on demoniacs (compare <sup><080></sup>Luke 8:1,2; out of Mary Magdalene He is said to have cast 7 demons — perhaps a form of speech to indicate the severity of the possession). The demoniac now brought to Jesus was blind and dumb. Jesus cured him, with the double result that the people were filled with amazement: "Can this be the son of David?" (<sup><023></sup>Matthew 12:23), while the Pharisees blasphemed, alleging that Jesus cast out demons by the help of Beelzebub (Greek, [Beelzeboul]), the prince of the demons (see under the word). A quite similar incident is narrated in <sup><082></sup>Matthew 9:32-34; and Luke gives the discourse that follows in a later connection (11:14 ff). The accusation may well have been repeated more than once. Jesus, in reply, points out, first, the absurdity of supposing Satan to be engaged in warring against his own kingdom (<sup><085></sup>Matthew 18:25 ff parallel; here was plainly a stronger than Satan); then utters the momentous word about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. All other blasphemies — even that against the Son of Man (<sup><022></sup>Matthew 12:32) — may be forgiven, for they may proceed from ignorance and misconception; but deliberate, perverse rejection of the light, and attributing to Satan what was manifestly of God, was a sin which, when matured — and the Pharisees came perilously near committing it — admitted of no forgiveness, either in this world or the next, for the very capacity for truth in the soul was by such sin destroyed. Mark has the strong phrase, "is guilty of an eternal sin" (3:29). Pertinent words follow as to the root of good and evil in character (<sup><023></sup>Matthew 12:33-37). *See* **BLASPHEMY**. The Sign of Jonah. Out of this discourse arose the usual Jewish demand for a "sign" (<sup><028></sup>Matthew 12:38; compare <sup><029></sup>Luke 11:29-32), which Jesus met by declaring that no sign would be given but the sign of the prophet Jonah — an allusion to His future resurrection. He reiterates His warning to the people of His generation for their rejection of greater light than had been enjoyed by the Ninevites and the Queen of Sheba. Two incidents, not dissimilar in character, interrupted this discourse — one the cry of a woman in the audience (if the time be the same, <sup><027></sup>Luke 11:27,28), "Blessed is the womb that bare thee," etc., to which Jesus replied, "Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep

it”; the other, a message that His mother and brethren (doubtless anxious for His safety) desired to speak with Him.

### c) Christ’s Mother and Brethen:

To this, stretching out His hand toward His disciples, Jesus answered, “Behold, my mother and my brethren” (⌌Mark 3:34), etc. Kinship in the spiritual kingdom consists in fidelity to the will of God, not in ties of earthly relationship.

### 4. Teaching in Parables:

(⌌Matthew 13:1-52; ⌌Mark 4:1-34; ⌌Luke 8:4-15; 13:18-21) On the same day on which the preceding discourses were delivered, Jesus, seeing the multitudes, passed to the shore, and entering a boat, inaugurated a new method in His public teaching. This was the speaking in parables. Similitude, metaphor, always entered into the teaching of Jesus (compare ⌌Matthew 7:24-27), and parable has once been met with (⌌Luke 7:41,42); now parable is systematically employed as a means of imparting and illustrating important truths, while yet veiling them from those whose minds were hostile and unreceptive (⌌Mark 4:10-12; ⌌Luke 8:9,10). The parable thus at once reveals and conceals. The motive of this partially veiled teaching was the growing hostility of the Pharisees. In its nature the parable (from a verb signifying “to place side by side”) is a representation in some form of earthly analogy of truths relating to Divine and eternal things (*see PARABLE*). The parables of the kingdom brought together in Matthew 13 form an invaluable series, though not all were spoken in public (compare ⌌Matthew 13:36-52), and some may belong to a later occasion (compare ⌌Luke 13:18-21). Mark adds the parable of the Seed Growing Secretly (4:26-29). Of three of the parables (the Sower, the Tares, the Dragnet), Jesus Himself gives the interpretation. Parables of the Kingdom. In series the parables at once mirror the origin, mixed character and development of the kingdom in its present imperfect earthly condition, and the perfection which awaits it after the crisis at the end. In the parable of the Sower is represented the origin of the kingdom in the good seed of the word, and the varied soils on which that seed falls; in the Seed Growing Secretly, the law of orderly growth in the kingdom; in the parable of the Tares, the mixed character of the subjects of the kingdom; in those of the Mustard Seed and Leaven, the progress of the kingdom — external growth, internal transformative effect; in those of the Treasure and Pearl

the finding and worth of the kingdom; in that of the Dragnet the consummation of the kingdom. Jesus compares His disciples, if they understand these things, to householders bringing out of their treasure “things new and old” (~~4182~~ Matthew 13:52).

#### **IV.** From the Crossing to Gadara to the Mission of the Twelve — a Third Circuit.

##### **1.** Crossing of the Lake — Stilling of the Storm:

(~~4188~~ Matthew 8:18-27; ~~4185~~ Mark 4:35-41; ~~4182~~ Luke 8:22-25; compare 9:57-62) It was on the evening of the day on which He spoke the parables — though the chronology of the incident seems unknown to Luke (8:22) — that Jesus bade His disciples cross over to the other side of the lake. At this juncture He was accosted by an aspirant for discipleship. Matthew gives two cases of aspirants; Luke (but in a different connection, 9:57-62), three. Luke’s connection (departure from Galilee) is perhaps preferable for the second and third; but the three may be considered together. The three aspirants may be distinguished as,

**(a)** The forward disciple: he who in an atmosphere of enthusiasm offered himself under impulse, without counting the cost. The zeal of this would-be follower Jesus cheeks with the pathetic words, “The foxes have holes,” etc. (~~4181~~ Matthew 8:20; ~~4188~~ Luke 9:58).

**(b)** The procrastinating disciple. The first candidate needed repression; the second needs impulsion. a) Aspirants for Discipleship: He would follow Jesus, but first let him bury his father. There had come a crisis, however, when the Lord’s claim was paramount: “Leave the dead to bury their own dead” (~~4182~~ Matthew 8:22). There are at times higher claims than mere natural relationships, to which, in themselves, Jesus was the last to be indifferent.

**(c)** The wavering disciple.

The third disciple is again one who offers himself, but his heart was too evidently still with the things at home. Jesus, again, lays His finger on the weak spot, “No man, having put his hand to the plow, and looking back,” etc. (~~4182~~ Luke 9:62). As mentioned, the latter two cases tally better with a final departure from Galilee than with a temporary crossing of the lake. b) The Storm Calmed: The inland lake was exposed to violent and sudden



tempests. One of these broke on the disciples' boat as they sailed across. Everyone's life seemed in jeopardy. Jesus, meanwhile, in calmest repose, was asleep on a cushion in the stern (~~4038~~ Mark 4:38). The disciples woke Him almost rudely: "Teacher, carest thou not that we perish?" Jesus at once arose, and, reproving their want of faith, rebuked wind and waves ("Peace, be still"). Immediately there was a great calm. It was a new revelation to the disciples of the majesty of their Master. "Who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?"

## 2. The Gadarene (Gerasene) Demoniac:

(~~4038~~ Matthew 8:28-34; ~~4040~~ Mark 5:1-20; ~~4035~~ Luke 8:26-39) The lake being crossed, Jesus and His disciples came into the country of the Gadarenes (Matthew), or Gerasenes (Mark, Luke) — Gadara being the capital of the district (on the topography, compare Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, 380-81). From the lake shore rises a mountain in which are ancient tombs. Here Jesus was met by a demoniac (Matthew mentions two demoniacs: M. Henry's quaint comment is, "If there were two, there was one." Possibly one was the fiercer of the two, the other figuring only as his companion). The man, as described, was a raving maniac of the worst type (~~4038~~ Mark 5:3-5), dwelling in the tombs, wearing no clothes (~~4037~~ Luke 8:27), of supernatural strength, wounding himself, shrieking, etc. Really possessed by "an unclean spirit," his consciousness was as if he were indwelt by a "legion" of demons, and from that consciousness he addressed Jesus as the Son of God come for their tormenting. In what follows it is difficult to distinguish what belongs to the broken, incoherent consciousness of the man, and the spirit or spirits who spake through him. In the question, "What is thy name?" (~~4039~~ Mark 5:9) Jesus evidently seeks to arouse the victim's shattered soul to some sense of its own individuality. On Jesus commanding the unclean spirit to leave the man, the request was made that the demons might be permitted to enter a herd of swine feeding near. The reason of Christ's permission, with its result in the destruction of the herd ("rushed down the steep into the sea") need not be too closely scrutinized. It may have had an aspect of judgment on the (possibly) Jewish holders of the swine; or it may have had reference to the victim of the possession, as enabling him to realize his deliverance. Whatever the difficulties of the narrative, none of the rationalistic explanations afford any sensible relief from them. The object of the miracle may be to exclude rationalistic explanations, by giving a manifest attestation of the reality of the demon

influence. When the people of the city came they found the man fully restored — “clothed and in his right mind.” Yet, with fatal shortsightedness, they besought Jesus to depart from their borders. The man was sent home to declare to his friends the great things the Lord had done to him.

### 3. Jairus’ Daughter Raised — Woman with Issue of Blood:

(~~Q188~~ Matthew 9:18-26; ~~Q192~~ Mark 5:21-43; ~~Q180~~ Luke 8:40-56) Repelled by the Gerasenes, Jesus received a warm welcome on His return to Capernaum on the western shore (~~Q192~~ Mark 5:21). It was probably at this point that Matthew gave the feast formerly referred to. It was in connection with this feast, Matthew himself informs us (9:18), that Jairus, one of the rulers of the synagogue, made his appeal for help. His little daughter, about 12 years old (~~Q180~~ Luke 8:42), was at the point of death; indeed, while Jesus was coming, she died. The ruler’s faith, though real, was not equal to the centurion’s, who believed that Jesus could heal without being present.

#### a) Jairus’ Appeal and Its Result:

Jesus came, and having expelled the professional mourners, in sacred privacy, only the father and mother, with Peter, James and John being permitted to enter the death-chamber, raised the girl to life. It is the second miracle on record of the raising from the dead.

#### b) The Afflicted Woman Cured:

On the way to the ruler’s house occurred another wonder — a miracle within a miracle. A poor woman, whose case was a specially distressing one, alike as regards the nature of her malady, the length of its continuance, and the fruitlessness of her application to the physicians, crept up to Jesus, confident that if she could but touch the border of His garment, she would be healed. The woman was ignorant; her faith was blended with superstition; but Jesus, reading the heart, gave her the benefit she desired. It was His will, however, that, for her own good, the woman thus cured should not obtain the blessing by stealth. He therefore brought her to open confession, and cheered her by His commendatory word.

### 4. Incidents of Third Circuit:

(~~1027~~ **MATTHEW 9:27-38; 13:53-58;** ~~1001~~ **MARK 6:1-6**)

At this point begins apparently a new evangelistic tour (~~1025~~ Matthew 9:35; ~~1006~~ Mark 6:6), extending methodically to “all the cities and villages.” To it belong in the narratives the healing of two blind men (compare the case of Bartimeus, recorded later); the cure of a demoniac who was dumb — a similar case to that in ~~1022~~ Matthew 12:22; and a second rejection at Nazareth (Matthew, Mark). The incident is similar to that in ~~1046~~ Luke 4:16-30, and shows, if the events are different, that the people’s hearts were unchanged. Of this circuit Matthew gives an affecting summary (9:35-38), emphasizing the Lord’s compassion, and His yearning for more laborers to reap the abundant harvest.

**5. The Twelve Sent Forth — Discourse of Jesus:**

(**MATTHEW 10;** ~~1002~~ **MARK 6:7-13;** ~~1001~~ **LUKE 9:1-6;**  
**COMPARE** ~~1002~~ **LUKE 10:2-24; 12:2-12, ETC.)**

Partly with a view to the needs of the rapidly growing work and the training of the apostles, and partly as a witness to Israel (~~1006~~ Matthew 10:6,23), Jesus deemed it expedient to send the Twelve on an independent mission. The discourse in Matthew attached to this event seems, as frequently, to be a compilation. Parts of it are given by Luke in connection with the mission of the Seventy (~~1001~~ Luke 10:1 ff; the directions were doubtless similar in both cases); parts on other occasions (~~1017~~ Luke 12:2-12; 21:12-17, etc.; compare ~~1039~~ Mark 13:9-13).

The Twelve were sent out two by two. Their work was to be a copy of the Master’s — to preach the gospel and to heal the sick. To this end they were endowed with authority over unclean spirits, and over all manner of sickness. They were to go forth free from all encumbrances — no money, no scrip, no changes of raiment, no staff (save that in their hand, ~~1008~~ Mark 6:8), sandals only on their feet, etc.

**a) The Commission:**

They were to rely for support on those to whom they preached. They were for the present to confine their ministry to Israel. The saying in ~~1023~~ Matthew 10:23, “Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come,” apparently has reference to the judgment on the nation, not to the final coming (compare 16:28).

## **b) Counsels and Warnings:**

The mission of the Twelve was the first step of Christianity as an aggressive force in society. Jesus speaks of it, accordingly, in the light of the whole future that was to come out of it. He warns His apostles faithfully of the dangers that awaited them; exhorts them to prudence and circumspection (“wise as serpents,” etc.); holds out to them Divine promises for consolation; directs them when persecuted in one place to flee to another; points out to them from His own case that such persecutions were only to be expected. He assures them of a coming day of revelation; bids them at once fear and trust God; impresses on them the duty of courage in confession; inculcates in them supreme love to Himself. That love would be tested in the dearest relations, In itself peace, the gospel would be the innocent occasion of strife, enmity and division among men. Those who receive Christ’s disciples will not fail of their reward.

When Christ had ended His discourse He proceeded with His own evangelistic work, leaving the disciples to inaugurate theirs (~~4008~~ Matthew 11:1).

## **Second Period — After the Mission of the Twelve till the Departure from Galilee**

### **I. From the Death of the Baptist till the Discourse on Bread of Life.**

#### **1. The Murder of the Baptist and Herod’s Alarms:**

(~~4044~~ **MATTHEW 14:1-12;** ~~4064~~ **MARK 6:14-29;** ~~4007~~ **LUKE 9:7-9;**  
**COMPARE 3:18-20)**

Shortly before the events now to be narrated, John the Baptist had been foully murdered in his prison by Herod Antipas at the instigation of Herodias, whose unlawful marriage with Herod John had unsparingly condemned. Josephus gives as the place of the Baptist’s imprisonment the fortress of Macherus, near the Dead Sea (Ant., XVIII, v, 2); or John may have been removed to Galilee. Herod would ere this have killed John, but was restrained by fear of the people (~~4045~~ Matthew 14:5). The hate of Herodias, however, did not slumber. Her relentless will contrasts with the vacillation of Herod, as Lady Macbeth in Shakspeare contrasts with Macbeth. A birthday feast gave her the opening she sought for. Her daughter Saleme, pleasing Herod by her dancing, obtained from him a

promise on oath to give her whatever she asked. Prompted by Herodias, she boldly demanded John the Baptist's head. The weak king was shocked, but, for his oath's sake, granted her what she craved. The story tells how the Baptist's disciples reverently buried the remains of their master, and went and told Jesus. Herod's conscience did not let him rest. When rumors reached him of a wonderful teacher and miracle-worker in Galilee, he leaped at once to the conclusion that it was John risen from the dead. Herod cannot have heard much of Jesus before. An evil conscience makes men cowards.

Another Passover drew near (~~4006~~ John 6:4), but Jesus did not on this occasion go up to the feast.

Returning from their mission, the apostles reported to Jesus what they had said and done (~~4090~~ Luke 9:10); Jesus had also heard of the Baptist's fate, and of Herod's fears, and now proposed to His disciples a retirement to a desert place across the lake, near Bethsaida (on the topography, compare Stanley, op. cit., 375, 381).

## 2. The Feeding of the Five Thousand:

(~~4043~~ **MATTHEW 14:13-21;** ~~4060~~ **MARK 6:30-44;** ~~4090~~ **LUKE 9:10-17;**  
~~4006~~ **JOHN 6:1-14)**

As it proved, however, the multitudes had observed their departure, and, running round the shore, were at the place before them (~~4063~~ Mark 6:33). The purpose of rest was frustrated, but Jesus did not complain. He pitied the shepherdless state of the people, and went out to teach and heal them. The day wore on, and the disciples suggested that the fasting multitude should disperse, and seek victuals in the nearest towns and villages. This Jesus, who had already proved Philip by asking how the people should be fed (~~4005~~ John 6:5), would not permit. With the scanty provision at command — 5 loaves and 2 fishes — He fed the whole multitude. By His blessing the food was multiplied till all were satisfied, and 12 baskets of fragments, carefully collected, remained over. It was astupendous act of creative power, no rationalizing of which can reduce it to natural dimensions.

## 3. Walking on the Sea:

(~~4142~~ **MATTHEW 14:22-33**; ~~4065~~ **MARK 6:45-52**; ~~4065~~ **JOHN 6:15-21**)

The enthusiasm created by this miracle was intense (~~4044~~ John 6:14). Matthew and Mark relate (Luke here falls for a time out of the Synopsis) that Jesus hurriedly constrained His disciples to enter into their boat and recross the lake — this though a storm was gathering — while He Himself remained in the mountain alone in prayer. John gives the key to this action in the statement that the people were about to take Him by force and make Him a king (6:15). Three hours after midnight found the disciples still in the midst of the lake, “distressed in rowing” (~~4068~~ Mark 6:48), deeply anxious because Jesus was not, as on a former occasion, with them. At last, at the darkest hour of their extremity, Jesus was seen approaching in a way unlooked-for — walking on the water. Every new experience of Jesus was a surprise to the disciples. They were at first terrified, thinking they saw a spirit, but straightway the well-known voice was heard, “Be of good cheer: it is I; be not afraid.” In the rebound of his feelings the impulsive Peter asked Jesus to permit him to come to Him on the water (Matthew). Jesus said “Come,” and for the first moment or two Peter did walk on the water; then, as he realized his unwonted situation, his faith failed, and he began to sink. Jesus, with gentle chiding, caught him, and assisted him back into the boat. Once again the sea was calmed, and the disciples watch found themselves safely at land. To their adoring minds the miracle of the loaves was eclipsed by this new marvel (~~4062~~ Mark 6:52).

#### 4. Gennesaret — Discourse on the Bread of Life:

(~~4048~~ **MATTHEW 14:34-36**; ~~4063~~ **MARK 6:53-56**; ~~4062~~ **JOHN 6:22-71**)

On the return to Gennesaret the sick from all quarters were brought to Jesus — the commencement apparently of a new, more general ministry of healing (~~4065~~ Mark 6:56). Meanwhile — here we depend on John — the people on the other side of the lake, when they found that Jesus was gone, took boats hastily, and came over to Capernaum. They found Jesus apparently in the synagogue (6:59). In reply to their query, “Rabbi, when camest thou hither?” Jesus first rebuked the motive which led them to follow Him — not because they had seen in His miracles “signs” of higher blessings, but because they had eaten of the loaves and were filled (6:26) — then spoke to them His great discourse on the bread from heaven. “Work,” He said, “for the food which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of man shall give unto you” (6:27). When asked to authenticate His

claims by a sign from heaven like the manna, He replied that the manna also (given not by Moses but by God) was but typical bread, and surprised them by declaring that He Himself was the true bread of life from heaven (6:35,51). The bread was Christ's flesh, given for the life of the world; His flesh and blood must be eaten and drunk (a spiritual appropriation through faith, 6:63), if men were to have eternal life. Jesus of set purpose had put His doctrine in a strong, testing manner. The time had come when His hearers must make their choice between a spiritual acceptance of Him and a break with Him altogether. What He had said strongly offended them, both on account of the claims implied (6:42), and on account of the doctrine taught, which, they were plainly told, they could not receive because of their carnality of heart (6:43,44,61-64). Many, therefore, went back and walked no more with Him (6:60,61,66); but their defection only evoked from the chosen Twelve a yet more confident confession of their faith. "Would ye also go away?"

#### Peter's First Confession.

Peter, as usual, spoke for the rest: "Lord, to whom shall we go? .... We have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God" (~~4166~~ John 6:69). Here, and not first at Caesarea Philippi (~~4066~~ Matthew 16:16), is Peter's brave confession of his Master's Messiahship. Twelve thus confessed Him, but even of this select circle Jesus was compelled to say, "One of you (Judas) is a devil" (~~4050~~ John 6:70,71).

### II. From Disputes with the Pharisees till the Transfiguration.

The discourse in Capernaum seems to mark a turning-point in the Lord's ministry in Galilee. Soon after we find Him ceasing from public teaching, and devoting Himself to the instruction of His apostles (~~4052~~ Matthew 15:21; ~~4074~~ Mark 7:24, etc.).

#### 1. Jesus and Tradition — Outward and Inward Purity:

(~~4050~~ **MATTHEW 15:1-20;** ~~4070~~ **MARK 7:1-23**)

Meanwhile, that Christ's work in Galilee was attracting the attention of the central authorities, is shown by the fact that scribes and Pharisees came up from Jerusalem to watch Him. They speedily found ground of complaint against Him in His unconventional ways and His total disregard of the traditions of the elders. They specially blamed Him for allowing His

disciples to eat bread with “common,” i.e. unwashed hands. Here was a point on which the Pharisees laid great stress (<sup><4003></sup>Mark 7:3,4). Ceremonial ablutions (washing “diligently,” Greek “with the fist”; “baptizings” of person and things) formed a large part of their religion. These washings were part of the “oral tradition” said to have been delivered to Moses, and transmitted by a succession of elders. Jesus set all this ceremonialism aside. It was part of the “hypocrisy” of the Pharisees (<sup><4006></sup>Mark 7:6). When questioned regarding it, He drew a sharp distinction between God’s commandment in the Scriptures and man’s tradition, and accused the Pharisees (instancing “Corban” (which see), in support, <sup><4070></sup>Mark 7:10-12) of making “void” the former through the latter. This led to the wider question of wherein real defilement consisted. Christ’s rational position here is that it did not consist in anything outward, as in meats, but consisted in what came from within the man: as Jesus explained afterward, in the outcome of his heart or moral life: “Out of the heart of men evil thoughts proceed,” etc. (<sup><4072></sup>Mark 7:20-23). Christ’s saying was in effect the abrogation of the old ceremonial distinctions, as Mark notes: “making all meats clean” (<sup><4079></sup>Mark 7:19). The Pharisees, naturally, were deeply offended at His sayings, but Jesus was unmoved. Every plant not of the Father’s planting must be rooted up (<sup><4073></sup>Mark 7:13).

## 2. Retirement to Tyre and Sidon — the Syrophoenician Woman:

(<sup><4052></sup>**MATTHEW 15:21-28;** <sup><4074></sup>**MARK 7:24-30**)

From this point Jesus appears, in order to escape notice, to have made journeys privately from place to place. His first retreat was to the borders, or neighborhood, of Tyre and Sidon. From <sup><4073></sup>Mark 7:31 it is to be inferred that He entered the heathen territory. He could not, however, be hid (<sup><4074></sup>Mark 7:24). It was not long ere, in the house into which He had entered, there reached Him the cry of human distress. A woman came to Him, a Greek (or Gentile, Greek-speaking), but Syrophoenician by race. Her “little daughter” was grievously afflicted with an evil spirit. Flinging herself at His feet, and addressing Him as “Son of David,” she besought His mercy for her child. At first Jesus seemed — yet only seemed — to repel her, speaking of Himself as sent only to the lost sheep of Israel, and of the unmeetness of giving the children’s loaf to the dogs (the Greek softens the expression, “the little dogs”). With a beautiful urgency which won for her the boon she sought, the woman seized on the word as an



argument in her favor. “Even the dogs under the table eat of the children’s crumbs.” The child at Jesus’ word was restored.

### 3. At Decapolis — New Miracles:

(~~4159~~ **MATTHEW 15:29-39;** ~~40751~~ **MARK 7:31-37; 8:1-10**)

Christ’s second retreat was to Decapolis — the district of the ten cities — East of the Jordan. Here also He was soon discovered, and followed by the multitude. Sufferers were brought to Him, whom He cured (~~4159~~ Matthew 15:30). Later, He fed the crowds.

The miracle of the deaf man is attested only by Mk. The patient was doubly afflicted, being deaf, and having an impediment in his speech. The cure presents several peculiarities — its privacy (~~4153~~ Matthew 15:33); the actions of Jesus in putting his fingers into his ears, etc. (a mode of speech by signs to the deaf man); His “sign,” accompanied with prayer, doubtless occasioned by something in the man’s look; the word Ephphatha (~~4154~~ Matthew 15:34) — “Be opened.”

#### a) The Deaf Man:

(~~4102~~ **MARK 7:32-37**)

The charge to those present not to blazon the deed abroad was disregarded. Jesus desired no cheap popularity.

#### b) Feeding of Four Thousand:

(~~4152~~ **MATTHEW 15:32-39;** ~~41001~~ **MARK 8:1-9**)

The next miracle closely resembles the feeding of the Five Thousand at Bethsaida, but the place and numbers are different; 4,000 instead of 5,000; 7 loaves and a few fishes, instead of 5 loaves and 2 fishes; 7 baskets of fragments instead of 12 (Mark’s term denotes a larger basket). There is no reason for doubting the distinction of the incidents (compare ~~4169~~ Matthew 16:9,10; ~~4189~~ Mark 8:19,20).

### 4. Leaven of the Pharisees, etc. — Cure of Blind Man:

(~~406~~ **MATTHEW 16:1-12;** ~~4081~~ **MARK 8:11-26**)

Returning to the plain of Gennesaret (Magdala, ~~4159~~ Matthew 15:39 the King James Version; parts of Dalmanutha, ~~4080~~ Mark 8:10), Jesus soon found Himself assailed by His old adversaries. Pharisees and Sadducees were now united. They came “trying” Jesus, and asking from Him a “sign from heaven” — some signal Divine manifestation. “Sighing deeply” (Mark) at their caviling spirit, Jesus repeated His word about the sign of Jonah. The times in which they lived were full of signs, if they, so proficient in weather signs, could only see them. To be rid of such questioners, Jesus anew took boat to Bethsaida. On the way He warned His disciples against the leaven of the spirit they had just encountered. The disciples misunderstood, thinking that Jesus referred to their forgetfulness in not taking bread (Mark states in his graphic way that they had only one loaf). The leaven Christ referred to, in fact, represented three spirits:

- (1) the Pharisaic leaven — formalism and hypocrisy;
- (2) the Sadducean leaven — rationalistic skepticism;
- (3) the Herodian leaven (~~4085~~ Mark 8:15) — political expediency and temporizing.

Arrived at Bethsaida, a miracle was wrought on a blind man resembling in some of its features the cure of the deaf man at Decapolis. In both cases Jesus took the patients apart; in both physical means were used — the spittle (“spit on his eyes,” ~~4023~~ Mark 8:23); in both there was strict injunction not to noise the cure abroad. Another peculiarity was the gradualness of the cure. It is probable that the man had not been blind from his birth, else he could hardly have recognized men or trees at the first opening. It needed that Jesus should lay His hands on Him before he saw all things clearly.

5. At Caesarea Philippi — The Great Confession — First Announcement of Passion:

(~~4063~~ **MATTHEW 16:13-28;** ~~4027~~ **MARK 8:27-30;** ~~4098~~ **LUKE 9:18-27**)

The next retirement of Jesus with His disciples was to the neighborhood of Caesarea Philippi, near the source of the Jordan. This was the northernmost point of His journeyings. Here, “on the geographical frontier

between Judaism and heathenism” (Liddon), our Lord put the momentous question which called forth Peter’s historical confession.

**(1) The Voices of the Age and the External Truth.**

The question put to the Twelve in this remote region was: “Who do men say that the Son of man is?” “Son of man,” as already said, was the familiar name given by Jesus to Himself, to which a Messianic significance might or might not be attached, according to the prepossessions of His hearers. First the changeful voices of the age were recited to Jesus: “Some say John the Baptist; some, Elijah,” etc. Next, in answer to the further question: “But who say ye that I am ?” there rang out from Peter, in the name of all, the unchanging truth about Jesus: “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” In clearness, boldness, decision, Peter’s faith had attained a height not reached before. The confession embodies two truths:

**(1)** the Divinity,

**(2)** the Messiahship, of the Son of man. Jesus did honor to the confession of His apostle. Not flesh and blood, but the Father, had revealed the truth to him.

Here at length was “rock” on which He could build a church. Reverting to Peter’s original name, Simon Bar-Jonah, Jesus declared, with a play on the name “Peter” ([*petros*], “rock,” “piece of rock”) He had before given him (<sup>4014</sup>John 1:42), that on this “rock” ([*petra*]), He would build His church, and the gates of [*Hades*] (hostile evil powers) would not prevail against it (<sup>4018</sup>Matthew 16:18). The papacy has reared an unwarrantable structure of pretensions on this passage in supposing the “rock” to be Peter personally and his successors in the see of Rome (none such existed; Peter was not bishop of Rome). It is not Peter the individual, but Peter the confessing apostle — Peter as representative of all — that Christ names “rock”; that which constituted him a foundation was the truth he had confessed (compare <sup>4021</sup>Ephesians 2:20). This is the first New Testament mention of a “church” ([*ekklesia*]). The Christian church, therefore, is founded

**(1)** on the truth of Christ’s Divine Sonship;

**(2)** on the truth of His Messiah-ship, or of His being the anointed prophet, priest and king of the new age. A society of believers confessing these truths is a church; no society which denies these truths deserves the name. To this confessing community Jesus, still addressing

Peter as representing the apostolate (compare <sup><1818></sup>Matthew 18:18), gives authority to bind and loose — to admit and to exclude. Jesus, it is noted, bade His disciples tell no man of these things (<sup><161></sup>Matthew 16:20; <sup><181></sup>Mark 8:30; <sup><191></sup>Luke 9:21).

## (2) The Cross and the Disciple.

The confession of Peter prepared the way for an advance in Christ's teaching. From that time, Matthew notes, Jesus began to speak plainly of His approaching sufferings and death (16:21). There are in all three solemn announcements of the Passion (<sup><1621></sup>Matthew 16:21-23; 17:22,23; 20:17-19 parallel). Jesus foresaw, and clearly foretold, what would befall Him at Jerusalem. He would be killed by the authorities, but on the third day would rise again. On the first announcement, following His confession, Peter took it upon him to expostulate with Jesus: "Be it far from thee, Lord," etc. (<sup><1622></sup>Matthew 16:22), an action which brought upon him the stern rebuke of Jesus: "Get thee behind me, Satan," etc. (<sup><1623></sup>Matthew 16:23). The Rock-man, in his fall to the maxims of a worldly expediency, is now identified with Satan, the tempter. This principle, that duty is only to be done when personal risk is not entailed, Jesus not only repudiates for Himself, but bids His disciples repudiate it also. The disciple, Jesus says, must be prepared to deny himself, and take up his cross. The cross is the symbol of anything distressing or painful to bear. There is a saving of life which is a losing of it, and what shall a man be profited if he gain the whole world, and forfeit his (true, higher) life? As, however, Jesus had spoken, not only of dying, but of rising again, so now He encourages His disciples by announcing His future coming in glory to render to every man according to His deeds. That final coming might be distant (compare <sup><1836></sup>Matthew 24:36); but (so it seems most natural to interpret the saying <sup><1628></sup>Matthew 16:28 parallel) there were those living who would see the nearer pledge of that, in Christ's coming in the triumphs and successes of His kingdom (compare <sup><1901></sup>Mark 9:1; <sup><1927></sup>Luke 9:27; <sup><1864></sup>Matthew 26:64).

## 6. The Transfiguration — the Epileptic Boy:

(<sup><1901></sup>MATTHEW 17:1-20; <sup><1902></sup>MARK 9:2-29; <sup><1908></sup>LUKE 9:28-43)

About eight days after the announcement of His passion by Jesus, took place the glorious event of the transfiguration. Jesus had spoken of His future glory, and here was pledge of it. In strange contrast with the scene

of glory on the summit of the mountain was the painful sight which met Jesus and His three companions when they descended again to the plain.

**a) The Glory of the Only Begotten:**

Tradition connects the scene of the transfiguration with Mount Tabor, but it more probably took place on one of the spurs of Mount Hermon. Jesus had ascended the mountain with Peter, James and John, for prayer. It was while He was praying the wonderful change happened. For once the veiled glory of the only begotten from the Father (~~<B14>~~ John 1:14) was permitted to burst forth, suffusing His person and garments, and changing them into a dazzling brightness. His face did shine as the sun; His raiment became white as light (“as snow,” the King James Version, Mark). Heavenly visitants, recognized from their converse as Moses and Elijah, appeared with Him and spoke of His decease (Luke). A voice from an enveloping cloud attested: “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.” Little wonder the disciples were afraid, or that Peter in his confusion should stammer out: “It is good for us to be here: if thou wilt, I will make here three tabernacles (booths).” This, however, was not permitted. Earth is not heaven. Glimpses of heavenly glory are given, not to wean from duty on earth, but to prepare for the trials connected therewith.

**b) Faith’s Entreaty and Its Answer:**

The spectacle that met the eyes of Jesus and the chosen three as they descended was distressing in the extreme. A man had brought his epileptic boy — a sore sufferer and dumb — to the disciples to see if they could cast out the evil spirit that possessed him, but they were not able. Their failure, as Jesus showed, was failure of faith; none the less did their discomfiture afford a handle to the gainsayers, who were not slow to take advantage of it (~~<B14>~~ Mark 9:14). The man’s appeal was now to Jesus, “If thou canst do anything,” etc. (~~<B22>~~ Mark 9:22). The reply of Jesus shifted the “canst” to the right quarter, “If thou canst (believe)” (Mark 9: 23). Such little faith as the man had revived under Christ’s word: “I believe; help thou mine unbelief.” The multitude pressing around, there was no call for further delay. With one energetic word Jesus expelled the unclean spirit (~~<B25>~~ Mark 9:25). The first effect of Christ’s approach had been to induce a violent paroxysm (~~<B20>~~ Mark 9:20); now the spirit terribly convulsed the frame it was compelled to relinquish. Jesus, taking the boy’s hand, raised him up, and he was found well. The lesson drawn to the disciples was the

omnipotence of faith (~~<4079>~~ Matthew 17:19,20) and power of prayer (~~<4028>~~ Mark 9:28,29).

### III. From Private Journey through Galilee till Return from the Feast of Tabernacles.

#### 1. Galilee and Capernaum:

Soon after the last-mentioned events Jesus passed privately through Galilee (~~<4080>~~ Mark 9:30), returning later to Capernaum. During the Galilean journey Jesus made to His disciples His 2nd announcement of His approaching sufferings and death, accompanied as before by the assurance of His resurrection. The disciples still could not take in the meaning of His words, though what He said made them “exceeding sorry” (~~<4073>~~ Matthew 17:23).

#### a) Second Announcement of Passion:

(~~<4072>~~ MATTHEW 17:22,23; ~~<4080>~~ MARK 9:30-33; ~~<4094>~~ LUKE 9:44,45)

The return to Capernaum was marked by an incident which raised the question of Christ’s relation to temple institutions. The collectors of tribute for the temple inquired of Peter: “Doth not your teacher pay the half-shekel?” (Greek [*didrachma*], or double drachm, worth about 32 cents or is. 4d.).

#### b) The Temple Tax:

(~~<4072>~~ MATTHEW 17:24-27)

The origin of this tax was in the half-shekel of atonement-money of Exodus 30:11-16, which, though a special contribution, was made the basis of later assessment (~~<4094>~~ 2 Chronicles 24:4-10; in Nehemiah’s time the amount was one-third of a shekel, ~~<4082>~~ Nehemiah 10:32), and its object was the upkeep of the temple worship (Schurer). The usual time of payment was March, but Jesus had probably been absent and the inquiry was not made for some months later. Peter, hasty as usual, probably reasoning from Christ’s ordinary respect for temple ordinances, answered at once that He did pay the tax. It had not occurred to him that Jesus might have something to say on it, if formally challenged. Occasion therefore was taken by Jesus gently to reprove Peter. Peter had but recently acknowledged Jesus to be the Son of God. Do kings of the earth take tribute of their own sons? The half-shekel was suitable to the subject-relation, but not to the relation of a son.

Nevertheless, lest occasion of stumbling be given, Jesus could well waive this right, as, in His humbled condition, He had waived so many more. Peter was ordered to cast his hook into the sea, and Jesus foretold that the fish he would bring up would have in its mouth the necessary coin (Greek, [*stater*], about 64 cents or 2s. 8d.). The tax was paid, yet in such a way as to show that the payment of it was an act of condescension of the king's Son.

**c) Discourse on Greatness and Forgiveness:**

(~~4081~~ **MATTHEW 18:1-35;** ~~4085~~ **MARK 9:33-50;** ~~4046~~ **LUKE 9:46-50**)

On the way to Capernaum a dispute had arisen among the disciples as to who should be greatest in the Messianic kingdom about to be set up. The fact of such disputing showed how largely even their minds were yet dominated by worldly, sensuous ideas of the kingdom. Now, in the house (~~4083~~ Mark 9:33), Jesus takes occasion to check their spirit of ambitious rivalry, and to inculcate much-needed lessons on greatness and kindred matters.

**(1) Greatness in Humility.**

First, by the example of a little child, Jesus teaches that humility is the root-disposition of His kingdom. It alone admits to the kingdom, and conducts to honor in it. He is greatest who humbles himself most (~~4084~~ Matthew 18:4), and is the servant of all (~~4085~~ Mark 9:35). He warns against slighting the "little ones," or causing them to stumble, and uses language of terrible severity against those guilty of this sin.

**(2) Tolerance.**

The mention of receiving little ones in Christ's name led John to remark that he had seen one casting out demons in Christ's name, and had forbidden him, because he was not of their company. "Forbid him not," Jesus said, "for there is no man who shall do a mighty work in my name, and be able quickly to speak evil of me. For he that is not against us is for us" (~~4089~~ Mark 9:39,40).

**(3) The Erring Brother.**

The subject of offenses leads to the question of sins committed by one Christian brother against another. Here Christ inculcates kindness and

forbearance; only if private representations and the good offices of brethren fail, is the matter to be brought before the church; if the brother repents he is to be unstintedly forgiven (“seventy times seven,” ~~<4182>~~Matthew 18:22). If the church is compelled to interpose, its decisions are valid (under condition, however, of prayer and Christ’s presence, ~~<4183>~~Matthew 18:18-20).

#### (4) Parable of the Unmerciful Servant.

To enforce the lesson of forgiveness Jesus speaks the parable of the Unmerciful Servant (~~<4183>~~Matthew 18:23-35). Himself forgiven much, this servant refuses to forgive his fellow a much smaller debt. His lord visits him with severest punishment. Only as we forgive others can we look for forgiveness.

### 2. The Feast of Tabernacles — Discourses, etc.:

#### (JOHN 7 THROUGH 10:21)

The Gospel of John leaves a blank of many months between chapters 6 and 7, covered only by the statement, “After these things, Jesus walked in Galilee” (7:1). In this year of His ministry Jesus had gone neither to the feast of the Passover nor to Pentecost. The Feast of Tabernacles was now at hand (October). To this Jesus went up, and John preserves for us a full record of His appearance, discourses and doings there.

#### a) The Private Journey — Divided Opinions:

#### (~~<4101>~~JOHN 7:1-10)

The brethren of Jesus, still unpersuaded of His claims (~~<4105>~~John 7:5), had urged Jesus to go up with them to the feast. “Go up,” in their sense, included a public manifestation of Himself as the Messiah. Jesus replied that His time for this had not yet come. Afterward He went up quietly, and in the midst of the feast appeared in the temple as a teacher. The comments made about Jesus at the feast before His arrival vividly reflect the divided state of opinion regarding Him. “He is a good man,” thought some. “Not so,” said others, “but He leadeth the multitude astray.” His teaching evoked yet keener division. While some said, “Thou hast a demon” (~~<4107>~~John 7:20), others argued, “When the Christ shall come, will he do more signs?” etc. (~~<4109>~~John 7:31). Some declared, “This is of a truth the



prophet,” or “This is the Christ”; others objected that the Christ was to come out of Bethlehem, not Galilee (~~<B74>~~ John 7:40-42). Yet no one dared to take the step of molesting Him.

**b) Christ’s Self-Witness:**

**(~~<B74>~~ JOHN 7:14-52)**

Christ’s wisdom and use of the Scriptures excited surprise. Jesus met this surprise by stating that His knowledge was from the Father, and with reference to the division of opinion about Him laid down the principle that knowledge of the truth was the result of the obedient will: “If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God” (~~<B77>~~ John 7:17). It was objected that they knew who Jesus was, and whence He came. In a sense, Jesus replied, this was true; in a deeper sense, it was not. He came from the Father, whom they knew not (~~<B78>~~ John 7:28,29). The last and great day of the feast — the eighth (~~<B79>~~ Numbers 29:35) — brought with it a new self-attestation. Jesus stood and cried, “If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me .... from within him shall flow rivers of living water” (~~<B75>~~ John 7:37,38). The words are understood to have reference to the ceremony of pouring out a libation of water at this feast — the libation, in turn, commemorating the gift of water at the striking of the rock. The evangelist interprets the saying of the Spirit which believers should receive. Meanwhile, the chief priests and Pharisees had sent officers to apprehend Jesus (~~<B73>~~ John 7:32), but they returned without Him. “Why did ye not bring him?” The reply was confounding, “Never man so spake” (~~<B76>~~ John 7:45,46). The retort was the poor one, “Are ye also led astray?” In vain did Nicodemus, who was present, try to put in a moderating word (~~<B75>~~ John 7:50,51). It was clear to what issue hate like this was tending.

**c) The Woman Taken in Adultery:**

**(JOHN 8)**

The discourses at the feast are at this point interrupted by the episode of the woman taken in adultery (~~<B80>~~ John 8:1-11), which, by general consent, does not belong to the original text of the Gospel. It is probably, however, an authentic incident, and illustrates, on the one hand, the eagerness of the official classes to find an accusation against Jesus, and, on the other, the

Saviour's dignity and wisdom in foiling such attempts, His spirit of mercy and the action of conscience in the accusers. In His continued teaching, Jesus put forth even higher claims than in the foregoing discourse. As He had applied to Himself the water from the rock, so now He applied to Himself the symbolic meaning of the two great candelabra, which were lighted in the temple court during the feast and bore reference to the pillar of cloud and fire. "I am the light of the world," said Jesus (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 8:12). Only a Divine being could put forth such a claim as that. The Jews objected that they had only His witness to Himself. Jesus replied that no other could bear adequate witness of Him, for He alone knew whence He came and whither He went (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 8:14). But the Father also had borne witness of Him (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 8:18). This discourse, delivered in the "treasury" of the temple (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 8:20), was soon followed by another, no man yet daring to touch Him. This time Jesus warns the Jews of the fate their unbelief would entail upon them: "Ye shall die in your sins" (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 8:24). Addressing Himself next specially to the Jews who believed in Him, He urged them to continuance in His word as the condition of true freedom. Resentment was again aroused at the suggestion that the Jews, Abraham's seed, were not free. Jesus made clear that the real bondage was that of sin; only the Son could make spiritually free (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 8:34-36). Descent from Abraham meant nothing, if the spirit was of the devil (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 8:39-41). A new conflict was provoked by the saying, "If a man keep my word, he shall never see death" (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 8:51). Did Jesus make Himself greater than Abraham? The controversy that ensued resulted in the sublime utterance, "Before Abraham was born, I am" (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 8:58). The Jews would have stoned Him, but Jesus eluded them, and departed.

#### **d) The Cure of the Blind Man:**

### **(JOHN 9)**

The Feast of Tabernacles was past, but Jesus was still in Jerusalem. Passing by on a Sabbath (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 9:14), He saw a blind man, a beggar (~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 9:8), well known to have been blind from his birth. The narrative of the cure and examination of this blind man is adduced by Paley as bearing in its inimitable circumstantiality every mark of personal knowledge on the part of the historian. The man, cured in strange but symbolic fashion by the anointing of his eyes with clay (thereby apparently sealing them more firmly), then washing in the Pool of Siloam, became an object of immediate interest, and every effort was made by the Pharisees to shake his testimony

as to the miracle that had been wrought. The man, however, held to his story, and his parents could only corroborate the fact that their son had been born blind, and now saw. The Pharisees themselves were divided, some reasoning that Jesus could not be of God because He had broken the Sabbath — the old charge; others, Nicodemus-like, standing on the fact that a man who was a sinner could not do such signs (~~<B>~~John 9:15,16). The healed man applied the logic of common-sense: “If this man were not from God, he could do nothing” (~~<B>~~John 9:33). The Pharisees, impotent to deny the wonder, could only cast him out of the synagogue. Jesus found him, and brought him to full confession of faith in Himself (~~<B>~~John 9:35-38).

**e) The Good Shepherd:**

**(~~<B>~~JOHN 10:1-21)**

Yet another address of Jesus is on record arising out of this incident. In continuation of His reply to the question of the Pharisees in John (9:40), “Are we also blind?” Jesus spoke to them His discourse on the Good Shepherd. Flocks in eastern countries are gathered at night into an enclosure surrounded by a wall or palisade. This is the “fold,” which is under the care of a “porter,” who opens the closely barred door to the shepherds in the morning. As contrasted with the legitimate shepherds, the false shepherds “enter not by the door,” but climb over some other way. The allusion is to priests, scribes, Pharisees and generally to all, in any age, who claim an authority within the church unsanctioned by God (Godet). Jesus now gathers up the truth in its relation to Himself as the Supreme Shepherd. From His fundamental relation to the church, He is not only the Shepherd, but the Door (10:7-14). To those who enter by Him there is given security, liberty, provision (10:9). In his capacity as Shepherd Christ is preeminently all that a faithful shepherd ought to be. The highest proof of His love is that, as the Good Shepherd, He lays down His life for the sheep (10:11,15,17). This laying down of His life is not an accident, but is His free, voluntary act (10:17,18). Again there was division among the Jews because of these remarkable sayings (10:19-21).

**Chronological Note.**

Though John does not mention the fact, there is little doubt that, after this visit to Jerusalem, Jesus returned to Galilee, and at no long interval from

His return, took His final departure southward. The chronology of this closing period in Galilee is somewhat uncertain. Some would place the visit to the Feast of Tabernacles before the withdrawal to Caesarea Philippi, or even earlier (compare Andrews, *Life of our Lord*, etc.); but the order adopted above appears preferable.

## *D. LAST JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM — JESUS IN PERAEA*

Departure from Galilee:

An interval of two months elapses between ~~<901>~~ John 10:21 and 22 — from the Feast of Tabernacles (October) till the Feast of the Dedication (December). This period witnessed the final withdrawal of Jesus from Galilee. Probably while yet in Galilee He sent forth the seventy disciples to prepare His way in the cities to which He should come (~~<901>~~ Luke 10:1). Repulsed on the borders of Samaria (~~<915>~~ Luke 9:51-53), He passed over into Peraea (“beyond Jordan”), where he exercised a considerable ministry. The record of this period, till the entry into Jerusalem, belongs in great part to Luke, who seems to have had a rich special source relating to it (9:51 through 19:27). The discourses in Luke embrace many passages and sections found in other connections in Matthew, and it is difficult, often, to determine their proper chronological place, if, as doubtless sometimes happened, portions were not repeated.

### **I. From Leaving Galilee till the Feast of the Dedication.**

#### **1. Rejected by Samaria:**

#### **(~~<915>~~ LUKE 9:51-55)**

Conscious that He went to suffer and die, Jesus steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem. His route was first by Samaria — an opportunity of grace to that people — but here, at a border village, the messengers He sent before Him, probably also He Himself on His arrival, were repulsed, because of His obvious intention to go to Jerusalem (~~<915>~~ Luke 9:53). James and John wished to imitate Elijah in calling down fire from heaven on the rejecters, but Jesus rebuked them for their thought (the Revised Version (British and American) omits the reference to Elijah, and subsequent clauses, ~~<915>~~ Luke 9:55,56).

#### **2. Mission of the Seventy:**

~~(<sup>2001</sup>)~~ **LUKE 10:1-20**

In the present connection Luke inserts the incidents of the three aspirants formerly considered (9:57-62; compare p. 1645). It was suggested that the second and third cases may belong to this period.

A new and significant step was now taken by Jesus in the sending out of 70 disciples, who should go before Him, two by two, to announce His coming in the cities and villages He was about to visit. The number sent indicates how large a following Jesus had now acquired. (Some see a symbolical meaning in the number 70, but it is difficult to show what it is.) The directions given to the messengers are similar to those formerly given to the Twelve (~~(<sup>2001</sup>)~~ Luke 9:1-5; compare Matthew 10); a passage also found in Matthew in a different connection (11:21-24) is incorporated in this discourse, or had originally its place in it (11:13-15). In this mission Jesus no longer made any secret of His Messianic character. The messengers were to proclaim that the kingdom of God was come nigh to them in connection with His impending visit (~~(<sup>2009</sup>)~~ Luke 10:9). The mission implies that a definite route was marked out by Jesus for Himself (compare ~~(<sup>2132</sup>)~~ Luke 13:22), but this would be subject to modification according to the reception of His emissaries (~~(<sup>2000</sup>)~~ Luke 10:10,11,16). The circuit need not have occupied a long time with so many engaged in it. The results show that it aroused strong interest. Later the disciples returned elated with their success, emphasizing their victory over the demons (~~(<sup>2007</sup>)~~ Luke 10:17). Jesus bade them rejoice rather that their names were written in heaven (~~(<sup>2001</sup>)~~ Luke 10:20). Again a passage is inserted (~~(<sup>2002</sup>)~~ Luke 10:21,22) found earlier in ~~(<sup>2025</sup>)~~ Matthew 11:25-27; compare also ~~(<sup>2023</sup>)~~ Luke 10:23,24, with ~~(<sup>2036</sup>)~~ Matthew 13:16,17.

### 3. The Lawyer's Question — Parable of Good Samaritan:

~~(<sup>2025</sup>)~~ **LUKE 10:25-37**

Jesus had now passed "beyond the Jordan," i.e. into Peraea, and vast crowds waited on His teaching (compare ~~(<sup>2001</sup>)~~ Matthew 19:1 f; ~~(<sup>2001</sup>)~~ Mark 10:1; ~~(<sup>2001</sup>)~~ Luke 12:1). At one place a lawyer put what he meant to be a testing question, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Jesus referred him to the great commandments of love to God and one's neighbor, eliciting the further query, "And who is my neighbor?" In reply Jesus spoke to him the immortal parable of the Good Samaritan, and asked who proved

neighbor to him who fell among the robbers. The lawyer could give but one answer, "He that showed mercy on him." "Go," said Jesus, "and do thou likewise."

The incident of Martha and Mary, which Luke inserts here (~~2108~~Luke 10:38-42), comes in better later, when Jesus was nearer Bethany.

#### 4. Discourses, Parables, and Miracles:

### (LUKE 11 THROUGH 14)

At this place Luke brings together a variety of discourses, warnings and exhortations, great parts of which have already been noticed in earlier contexts. It does not follow that Luke has not, in many cases, preserved the original connection. This is probably the case with the Lord's Prayer (~~2108~~Luke 11:1-4), and with portions of what Matthew includes in the Sermon on the Mount (e.g. 11:9-13,13-36; 12:22-34; compare ~~2134~~Luke 13:24-27 with ~~4173~~Matthew 7:13,14,22,23), and in other discourses (e.g. ~~2142~~Luke 11:42-52 = ~~4233~~Matthew 23:23-36; ~~2172~~Luke 12:2-12 = ~~4106~~Matthew 10:26-33; ~~2122~~Luke 12:42-48 = ~~4145~~Matthew 24:45-51; ~~2138~~Luke 13:18-21, parables of Mustard Seed and Leaven = ~~4031~~Matthew 13:31,32, etc.).

#### a) Original to Luke:

Of matter original to Luke in these chapters may be noted such passages as that on the Friend at Midnight (11:5-8), the incident of the man who wished Jesus to bid his brother divide his inheritance with him, to whom Jesus spoke the parable of the Rich Fool (12:13-21), the parable of the Barren Fig Tree, called forth by the disposition to regard certain Galileans whom Pilate had slain in a tumult at the temple, and eighteen on whom the tower of Siloam had fallen, as sinners above others (13:1-9: "Nay," said Jesus, "but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish"), and most of the teaching in Luke 14, referred to below. In 11:37,38, we have the mention of a Pharisee inviting Jesus to dine, and of his astonishment at the Lord's neglect of the customary ablutions before eating. ~~2153~~Luke 11:53 gives a glimpse of the fury to which the scribes and Pharisees were aroused by the severity of Christ's denunciations. They "began to press upon him vehemently .... laying wait for him, to catch something out of his mouth." In 13:31 ff it is told how the Pharisees sought to frighten Jesus from the district by telling Him that Herod would fain kill Him. Jesus bade them tell

that “fox” that His work would go on uninterrupted in the brief space that remained (“day” used enigmatically) till He was “perfected” (13:32). The woe on Jerusalem (13:34,35) is given by Matthew in the discourse in chapter 23.

### **b) The Infirm Woman — the Dropsied Man:**

Of the miracles in this section, the casting out of the demon that was mute (~~Q114~~ Luke 11:14 ff) is evidently the same incident as that already noted in ~~Q122~~ Matthew 12:22 ff. Two other miracles are connected with the old accusation of Sabbath breaking. One was the healing in a synagogue on the Sabbath day of a woman bowed down for 18 years with “a spirit of infirmity” (~~Q130~~ Luke 13:10-17); the other was the cure on the Sabbath of a man afflicted with dropsy at a feast in the house of a ruler of the Pharisees to which Jesus had been invited (~~Q141~~ Luke 14:1-6). The motive of the Pharisee’s invitation, as in most such cases, was hostile (~~Q141~~ Luke 14:1). In both instances Jesus met the objection in the same way, by appealing to their own acts of humanity to their animals on the Sabbath (~~Q155~~ Luke 13:15,16; 14:5).

### **c) Parable of the Great Supper:**

This feast at the Pharisee’s house had an interesting sequel in the discourse it led Jesus to utter against vainglory in feasting, and on the spirit of love which would prompt to the table being spread for the helpless and destitute rather than for the selfish enjoyment of the select few, closing, in answer to a pious ejaculation of one of the guests, with the parable of the Great Supper (~~Q147~~ Luke 14:7-24). The parable, with its climax in the invitation to bring in the poor, and maimed, and blind, and those from the highways and hedges, was a commentary on the counsels He had just been giving, but it had its deeper lesson in picturing the rejection by the Jews of the invitation to the feast God had made for them in His kingdom, and the call that would be given to the Gentiles to take their place.

### **d) Counting the Cost:**

The injunctions to the multitudes as to the sacrifice and cross-bearing involved in discipleship are pointed by the examples of a man building a tower, and a king going to war, who count the cost before entering on their enterprises (~~Q145~~ Luke 14:25-35).

## **5. Martha and Mary:**

At or about this time — perhaps before the incidents in Luke 14 — Jesus paid the visit to Jerusalem at the Feast of the Dedication described in ~~<B102>~~John 10:22-39. This seems the fitting place for the introduction of the episode of Martha and Mary which Luke narrates a little earlier (10:38-42). The “village” into which Jesus entered was no doubt Bethany (~~<B100>~~John 11:1). The picture given by Luke of the contrasted dispositions of the two sisters — Martha active and “serving” (compare ~~<B102>~~John 12:2), Mary retiring and contemplative — entirely corresponds with that in John. Martha busied herself with preparations for the meal; Mary sat at Jesus’ feet, and heard His word. To Martha’s complaint, as if her sister were idling, Jesus gave the memorable answer, “One thing is needful: for Mary hath chosen the good part,” etc. (~~<B102>~~Luke 10:42).

## 6. Feast of the Dedication:

### (~~<B102>~~JOHN 10:22-39)

The Feast of the Dedication, held in December, was in commemoration of the cleansing of the temple and restoration of its worship after its profanation by Antiochus Epiphanes (164 BC). Great excitement was occasioned by the appearance of Jesus at this feast, and some asked, “How long dost thou hold us in suspense? If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly.” Jesus said He had told them, and His works attested His claim, but they were not of His true flock, and would not believe. To His own sheep He gave eternal life. The Jews anew wished to stone Him for claiming to be God. Jesus replied that even the law called the judges of Israel “gods” (~~<B102>~~Psalm 82:6, “I said, Ye are gods, and all of you sons of the Most High”): how could it then be blasphemy for Him whom the Father had sanctified and sent into the world to say of Himself, “I am the Son of God”? The Jews sought to take Him, but He passed from their midst.

## II. From the Abode at Bethabara till the Raising of Lazarus.

After leaving Jerusalem Jesus went beyond Jordan again to the place where John at first baptized (~~<B100>~~John 10:40; compare 1:28, called in the King James Version “Bethabara,” in the Revised Version (British and American) “Bethany,” distinct from the Bethany of John 11). There He “abode,” implying a prolonged stay, and many resorted to Him. This spot, sacred to Jesus by His own baptism, may be regarded now as His headquarters from



which excursions would be made to places in the neighborhood. Several of the incidents recorded by Luke are probably connected with this sojourn.

### 1. Parables of Lost Sheep, Lost Piece of Silver, Prodigal Son:

#### (LUKE 15)

The stronger the opposition of scribes and Pharisees to Jesus became, the more by natural affinity did the classes regarded as outcast feel drawn to Him. He did not repel them, as the Pharisees did, but ate and drank with them. Publicans and sinners gathered to His teaching, and He associated with them. The complaining was great: "This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them." The defense of Jesus was in parables, and the Pharisees' reproach may be thanked for three of the most beautiful parables Jesus ever spoke — the Lost Sheep (compare <sup><01812></sup>Matthew 18:12-14), the Lost Piece of Silver, and the Prodigal Son (Luke 15). Why does the shepherd rejoice more over the one lost sheep brought back than over the ninety-nine that have not gone astray? Why does the woman rejoice more over the recovery of her lost drachma than over all the coins safe in her keeping? Why does the father rejoice more over the prodigal son come back in rags and penitence from the far country than over the obedient but austere brother that had never left the home? The stories were gateways into the inmost heart of God. There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety-nine just persons that need no repentance (<sup><01517></sup>Luke 15:7).

### 2. Parables of the Unjust Steward and the Rich Man and Lazarus:

#### (LUKE 16)

Two other parables, interspersed by discourses (in part again met with in other connections, compare <sup><01613></sup>Luke 16:13 with <sup><01615></sup>Matthew 6:24; <sup><01616></sup>Luke 16:16 with <sup><01112></sup>Matthew 11:12; <sup><01618></sup>Luke 16:18 with <sup><01612></sup>Matthew 5:32; 19:9, etc.), were spoken at this time — that of the Unjust Steward (<sup><01611></sup>Luke 16:1-9) and that of the Rich Man and Lazarus (<sup><01619></sup>Luke 16:19-31). The dishonest steward, about to be dismissed, utilized his opportunities, still dishonestly, to make friends of his master's creditors; let the "children of light" better his example by righteously using mammon to make friends for themselves, who shall receive them into everlasting habitations. The rich man, pampered in luxury, let the afflicted Lazarus

starve at his gate. At death — in Hades — the positions are reversed: the rich man is in torment, stripped of all he had enjoyed; the poor man is at rest in Abraham's bosom, compensated for all he suffered. It is character, not outward estate, that determines destiny. The unmerciful are doomed. Even a messenger from the unseen world will not save men, if they hear not Moses and the prophets (~~Q161~~ Luke 16:31).

In this connection Luke (17:1-10) places exhortations to the disciples on occasions of stumbling, forgiveness, the power of faith, renunciation of merit ("We are unprofitable servants"), some of which are found elsewhere (compare ~~Q186~~ Matthew 18:6,7,15,21, etc.).

### 3. The Summons to Bethany — Raising of Lazarus:

#### (JOHN 11)

While Jesus was in the trans-Jordanic Bethabara, or Bethany, or in its neighborhood, a message came to Him from the house of Martha and Mary in the Judean Bethany (on the Mount of Olives, about 2 miles East from Jerusalem), that His friend Lazarus ("he whom thou lovest") was sick. The conduct of Jesus seemed strange, for He abode still two days where He was (~~Q106~~ John 11:6). As the sequel showed, this was only for the end of a yet more wonderful manifestation of His power and love, to the glory of God (~~Q104~~ John 11:4). Meanwhile Lazarus died, and was buried. When Jesus announced His intention of going into Judea, the disciples sought hard to dissuade Him (~~Q108~~ John 11:8); but Jesus was not moved by the fears they suggested. He reached Bethany (a distance of between 20 and 30 miles) on the fourth day after the burial of Lazarus (~~Q117~~ John 11:17), and was met on the outskirts by Martha, and afterward by Mary, both plunged in deepest sorrow. Both breathed the same plaint: "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died" (~~Q121~~ John 11:21,32). To Martha Jesus gave the pledge, "Thy brother shall rise again," strengthening the faith she already had expressed in Him (~~Q122~~ John 11:22) by announcing Himself as "the resurrection, and the life" (~~Q125~~ John 11:25,26); at Mary's words He was deeply moved, and asked to be taken to the tomb. Here, it is recorded, "Jesus wept" (~~Q135~~ John 11:35), the only other instance of His weeping in the Gospels being as He looked on lost Jerusalem (~~Q141~~ Luke 19:41). The proof of love was manifest, but some, as usual, suggested blame that this miracle-worker had not prevented His friend's death (~~Q137~~ John 11:37). Arrived at the rock-tomb, Jesus, still groaning in Himself, caused the stone

at its mouth to be removed, and, after prayer, spoke with a loud voice, “Lazarus, come forth” (~~<B14>~~ John 11:43). The spirit returned, and the man who had been dead came forth bound with his grave-clothes. He was released and restored to his sisters.

Even this mighty deed did not alter the mind of the Pharisees, who held a council, and decided, on the advice of Caiaphas (~~<B15>~~ John 11:50), that for the safety of the nation it was “expedient” that this man should die.

The circumstantiality of this beautiful narrative speaks irresistibly for its historical truth, and the objections raised by critical writers center really in their aversion to the miraculous as such.

### **III. From the Retirement to Ephraim till the Arrival at Bethany.**

#### **1. Retreat to Ephraim:**

#### **(~~<B15>~~ JOHN 11:54-57)**

The hostility of the ruling classes was now so pronounced that, in the few weeks that remained till Jesus should go up to the Passover, He deemed it advisable to abide in privacy at a city called Ephraim (situation uncertain). That He was in secrecy during this period is implied in the statement (~~<B15>~~ John 11:57) that if anyone knew where He was, he was to inform the chief priests and Pharisees. The retirement would be for Jesus a period of preparation for the ordeal before Him, as the wilderness had been for the commencement of His ministry.

#### **2. The Journey Resumed:**

On His leaving this retreat to resume His advance to Jerusalem the narratives again become rich in incident and teaching.

#### **3. Cure of the Lepers:**

#### **(~~<B16>~~ LUKE 17:11-19)**

It is not easy to define the route which brought Jesus again to the border line between Samaria and Galilee (~~<B16>~~ Luke 17:11), but, in traversing this region, He was met by ten lepers, who besought Him for a cure. Jesus bade them go and show themselves to the priests, and on the way they were

cleansed. Only one of the ten, and he a Samaritan, returned to give thanks and glorify God. Gratitude appeared in the unlikely quarter.

#### 4. Pharisaic Questionings:

At some point in this journey the Pharisees sought to entrap Jesus on the question of divorce.

##### a) Divorce:

(~~<09B>~~ **MATTHEW 19:3-12**, ~~<40B>~~ **MARK 10:1-12**)

Was it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? (~~<09B>~~ Matthew 19:3). Jesus in reply admitted the permission to divorce given by Moses (~~<40B>~~ Mark 10:3-5), but declared that this was for the hardness of their hearts, and went back to the original institution of marriage in which the two so joined were declared to be “one flesh.” Only one cause is admissible as a ground of separation and remarriage (~~<09B>~~ Matthew 19:9; compare 5:31,32; Mark has not even the exception, which is probably, however, implied). Comments follow to the disciples in Matthew on the subject of continence (~~<40B>~~ Matthew 19:10-12).

*See **DIVORCE**.*

##### b) Coming of the Kingdom:

(~~<27A>~~ **LUKE 17:20-37**)

Another question asked by the Pharisees of Jesus was as to when the kingdom of God should come. The expectation excited by His own ministry and claims was that it was near; when should it appear? Rebuking their worldly ideas, Jesus warned them that the kingdom did not come “with observation” — was not a “Lo, there! Lo, here!”; it was “within” them, or “in their midst,” though they did not perceive it. In the last decisive coming of the Son of Man there would be no dubiety as to His presence (~~<27A>~~ Luke 17:24,25). He adds exhortations as to the suddenness of His coming, and the separations that would ensue (~~<27B>~~ Luke 17:26-37), which Matthew gives as part of the great discourse on the Last Things in chapter 24.

##### c) Parable of the Unjust Judge:

(~~◀DRTB~~ **LUKE 18:1-8**)

In close connection with the foregoing, as furnishing the ground for the certainty that this day of the Son of Man would come, Jesus spoke the parable of the Unjust Judge. This judge, though heedless of the claims of right, yet yielded to the widow's importunity, and granted her justice against her adversary. How much more surely will the righteous, long-suffering God avenge His own elect, who cry unto Him day and night (~~◀DRTB~~ Luke 18:7,8)! Yet men, in that supreme hour, will almost have lost faith in His coming (~~◀DRTB~~ Luke 18:8).

A series of sayings and incidents at this time throw light upon the spirit of the kingdom.

**5. The Spirit of the Kingdom:**

The spirit of self-righteousness is rebuked and humble penitence as the condition of acceptance is enforced in the parable of the Pharisee and Publican.

**a) Parable of Pharisee and Publican:**

(~~◀DRTB~~ **LUKE 18:9-14**)

The Pharisee posing in his self-complacency at his fastings and tithes, and thanking God for his superiority to others, is set in vivid contrast to the abased publican, standing afar off, and able only to say, "God, be thou merciful to me a sinner" (~~◀DRTB~~ Luke 18:13). Yet it was he who went down to his house "justified" (~~◀DRTB~~ Luke 18:14).

**b) Blessing of the Babies:**

(~~◀DRTB~~ **MATTHEW 19:13-15;** ~~◀DRTB~~ **MARK 10:13-16;** ~~◀DRTB~~ **LUKE 18:15-17**)

A similar lesson is inculcated in the beautiful incident of the blessing of the babes. The disciples rebuked the mothers for bringing their little ones, but Jesus, "moved with indignation" (Mark), received and blessed the babes, declaring that to such (to them and those of like spirit) belonged the kingdom of heaven. "Suffer the little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me," etc.

**c) The Rich Young Ruler:**

(~~4096~~ **MATTHEW 19:16-30;** ~~4107~~ **MARK 10:17-31;** ~~4188~~ **LUKE 18:18-30**)

A third illustration — this time of the peril of covetousness — is afforded by the incident of the rich young ruler. This amiable, blameless, and evidently sincere young man (“Jesus looking upon him loved him,” ~~4101~~ Mark 10:21) knelt, and addressing Jesus as “Good Teacher,” asked what he must do to inherit eternal life. Jesus first declined the term “good,” in the easy, conventional sense in which it was applied, then referred the ruler to the commandments as the standard of doing. All these, however, the young man averred he had observed from his youth up. He did not know himself. Jesus saw the secret hold his riches had upon his soul, and revealed it by the searching word, “If thou wouldest be perfect, go, sell that which thou hast,” etc. (~~4021~~ Matthew 19:21; compare Mk, “One thing thou lackest,” etc.). This was enough. The young man could not yield up his “great possessions,” and went away sorrowing. Jesus bases on his refusal earnest warnings against the love of riches, and points out, in answer to a question of Peter, that loss for His sake in this life is met with overwhelmingly great compensations in the life to come.

## 6. Third Announcement of the Passion:

(~~4117~~ **MATTHEW 20:17-19;** ~~4102~~ **MARK 10:32-34; 18:31-33**)

Not unconnected with the foregoing teachings is the third solemn announcement to the disciples, so hard to be persuaded that the kingdom was not immediately to be set up in glory, of His approaching sufferings and death, followed by resurrection. The disciples had been “amazed” and “afraid” (Mk) at something strange in the aspect and walk of Jesus as they Luke were on the way, going to Jerusalem (compare ~~4151~~ Luke 9:51). His words gave the explanation. With them should be taken what is said in a succeeding incident of His baptism of suffering (~~4108~~ Mark 10:38,39; compare ~~4121~~ Luke 12:50).

## 7. The Rewards of the Kingdom:

The spirit of the kingdom and sacrifice for the kingdom have already been associated with the idea of reward, but the principles underlying this reward are now made the subject of special teaching.

First by the parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard the lesson is inculcated that reward in the kingdom is not according to any legal rule, but is

governed by a Divine equity, in accordance with which the last may often be equal to, or take precedence of, the first.

**a) Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard:**

**(~~400~~) MATTHEW 20:1-17)**

The laborers were hired at different hours, yet all at the end received the same wage. The murmuring at the generosity of the householder of those who had worked longest betrayed a defectiveness of spirit which may explain why they were not more highly rewarded. In strictness, the kingdom is a gift of grace, in the sum total of its blessings one and the same to all.

**b) The Sons of Zebedee:**

**(~~400~~) MATTHEW 20:20-28; (~~400~~) MARK 10:35-45)**

Still there are distinctions of honor in God's kingdom, but these are not arbitrarily made. This is the lesson of the reply of Jesus to the plea of the mother of the sons of Zebedee, James and John, with, apparently, the concurrence of the apostles themselves, that they might sit one on the right hand and the other on the left hand in His kingdom. It was a bold and ambitious request, and naturally moved the indignation of the other apostles. Still it had its ground in a certain nobility of spirit. For when Jesus asked if they were able to drink of His cup and be baptized with His baptism, they answered, "We are able." Jesus told them they should share that lot of suffering, but to sit on His right hand and on His left were not favors that could be arbitrarily bestowed, but would be given to those for whom it had been prepared of His Father — the preparation having regard to character and fitness, of which the Father alone was judge. Jesus went on to rebuke the spirit which led one to seek prominence over another, and laid down the essential law, "Whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister," enforcing it by His own never-to-be-forgotten example, "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom, for many" (~~400~~) Matthew 20:28; (~~400~~) Mark 10:45).

**8. Jesus at Jericho:**

Accompanied by a great throng, possibly of pilgrims to the feast, Jesus drew near to the influential city of Jericho, in the Jordan valley, about 17 miles distant from Jerusalem. Here two notable incidents marked His progress.

**a) The Cure of Bartimeus:**

(~~4119~~ **MATTHEW 20:29-34;** ~~4106~~ **MARK 10:46-82;** ~~4185~~ **LUKE 18:35-43)**

As they approached the city (Luke) (Matthew and Mark place the incident as they “went out”) a blind beggar, Bartimeus, hearing that “Jesus the Nazarene” (Mark) passed by, loudly called on Him as the “Son of David” to have mercy on him. The multitude would have restrained the man, but their rebukes only made him the more urgent in his cries. Jesus stopped in His way, called the blind man to Him, then, when he came, renewing his appeal, healed him. The cry of the beggar shows that the Davidic descent, if not the Messiahship, of Jesus was now known. Matthew varies from the other evangelists in speaking of “two blind men,” while Matthew and Mark, as noted, make the cure take place on leaving, not on entering the city. Not improbably there are two healings, one on entering Jericho, the other on going from the city, and Matthew, after his fashion, groups them together (Luke’s language is really indefinite; literally, “as they were near to Jericho”).

**b) Zaccheus the Publican:**

(~~4201~~ **LUKE 19:1-10)**

The entrance of Jesus into Jericho was signaled by a yet more striking incident. The chief collector of revenue in the city was Zaccheus, rich, but held in opprobrium (“a sinner”) because of his occupation. Being little of stature, Zaccheus had climbed into the branches of a sycamore tree to see Jesus as He passed. To his amazement, and that of the crowd, Jesus stopped on His way, and called Zaccheus by name to hasten to come down, for that day He must abide at his house. Zaccheus joyfully received Him, and, moved to a complete change in his views of duty, declared his purpose of giving half his goods to the poor, and of restoring fourfold anything he might have taken by false accusation. It was a revolution in the man’s soul, wrought by love. “Today,” Jesus testified, “is salvation come



to this house ..... For the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost.”

**c) Parable of the Pounds:**

(~~<291b>~~ **LUKE 19:11-27**)

The expectations of the multitude that the kingdom of God should immediately appear led Jesus to speak the parable of the Pounds, forewarning them that the consummation they looked for might be longer delayed than they thought, and impressing on them the need of loyalty, faithfulness and diligence, if that day, when it came, was not to prove disastrous to them. The nobleman went into a “far country” to receive a kingdom, and his ten servants were to trade with as many pounds (each = 100 drachmas) in his absence. On his return the faithful servants were rewarded in proportion to their diligence; the faithless one lost what he had; the rebellious citizens were destroyed. Thus Jesus fore-shadowed the doom that would overtake those who were plotting against Him, and checked hopes that disregarded the moral conditions of honor in His kingdom.

**Arrival at Bethany.**

From Jericho Jesus moved on to Bethany, the abode of Lazarus and his sisters. To His halt here before His public entrance into Jerusalem the next events belong.

***E. THE PASSION WEEK — BETRAYAL, TRIAL AND CRUCIFIXION***

**Importance of the Last Events:**

We reach now the closing week and last solemn events of the earthly life of Jesus. The importance attached to this part of their narratives is seen by the space the evangelists devote to it. Of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark fully one-third is devoted to the events of the Passion Week and their sequel in the resurrection; Luke has several chapters; John gives half his Gospel to the same period. It is obvious that in the minds of the evangelists the crucifixion of Jesus is the pivot of their whole narrative — the denouement to which everything tends from the first.

**I. The Events Preceding the Last Super.**

**1. The Chronology:**

The arrival in Bethany is placed by John “six days before the Passover” (12:1). Assuming that the public entry into Jerusalem took place on the Sunday, and that the 14th of Nisan fell on the following Thursday, this would lead to the arrival being placed on the Friday or Saturday preceding, according to the mode of reckoning. It is in the highest degree unlikely that Jesus would journey from Jericho on the Jewish Sabbath; hence He may be supposed to have arrived on the Friday evening. The supper at which the anointing by Mary took place would be on the Saturday (Sabbath) evening. Matthew and Mark connect it with events two days before the Passover (~~40B~~ Matthew 26:2; ~~414B~~ Mark 14:1), but parenthetically, in a way which leaves the other order open.

## 2. The Anointing at Bethany:

(~~40B~~ MATTHEW 26:6-13; ~~414B~~ MARK 14:3-9; ~~820B~~ JOHN 12:1-9)

This beautiful deed occurred at a supper given in honor of Jesus at the house of one Simon, a leper (Matthew and Mark) — probably cured by Jesus — at which Martha, Mary and Lazarus were guests. Martha aided in serving (~~812B~~ John 12:2). In the course of the meal, or at its close, Mary brought a costly box of nard (valued by Judas at “300 shillings,” about \$50, or 10 pounds; compare the American Revised Version margin on ~~800B~~ John 6:7), and with the perfume anointed the head (Matthew, Mark) and feet (John) of Jesus, wiping His feet with her hair (Matthew and Mark, though not mentioning the “feet,” speak of the “body” of Jesus). Indignation, instigated by Judas (John), was at once awakened at what was deemed wanton waste. How much better had the money been given to the poor! Jesus vindicated Mary in her loving act — a prophetic anointing for His burial — and declared that wherever His gospel went, it would be spoken of for a memorial of her. It is the hearts from which such acts come that are the true friends of the poor. The chief priests were only the further exasperated at what was happening, and at the interest shown in Lazarus, and plotted to put Lazarus also to death (~~820B~~ John 12:10).

## 3. The Entry into Jerusalem:

(~~2008~~ **MATTHEW 21:1-11;** ~~4110~~ **MARK 11:1-11;** ~~2093~~ **LUKE 19:29-44;**  
~~6121~~ **JOHN 12:12-19)**

On the day following — Palm Sunday — Jesus made His public entry as Messiah into Jerusalem. All the evangelists narrate this event. The Mount of Olives had to be crossed from Bethany, and Jesus sent two disciples to an adjacent village — probably Bethphage (this seems to have been also the name of a district) — where an ass and its colt would be found tied. These they were to bring to Him, Jesus assuring them of the permission of the owners. Garments were thrown over the colt, and Jesus seated Himself on it. In this humble fashion (as Matthew and John note, in fulfillment of prophecy, Zec 9:9), He proceeded to Jerusalem, from which a multitude, bearing palm branches, had already come out to meet Him (John). Throngs accompanied Him, going before and after; these, spreading their garments, and strewing branches in the way, hailed Him with hosannas as the Son of David, the King of Israel, who came in the name of the Lord. Very different were the feelings in the breasts of the Pharisees. “Behold,” they said, “how ye prevail nothing; lo, the world is gone after him” (~~6129~~ John 12:19). They bade Jesus rebuke His disciples, but Jesus replied that if they were silent, the very stones would cry out (~~2094~~ Luke 19:40).

Jesus Weeping over Jerusalem — Return to Bethany.

One incident in this progress to Jerusalem is related only by ~~2094~~ Luke 19:41-44. As at a bend in the road Jerusalem became suddenly visible, Jesus paused and wept over the city, so blind to its day of visitation, and so near to its awful doom. Not His own sufferings, but the thought of Jerusalem’s guilt and woes, filled Him with anguish. On reaching the city, Mark’s testimony is explicit that He did no more than enter the temple, and ‘look round on all things’ (~~4111~~ Mark 11:11). Then eventide having come, He returned to Bethany with the Twelve.

#### 4. Cursing of the Fig Tree — Second Cleansing of Temple:

(~~4112~~ **MATTHEW 21:12-22;** ~~4112~~ **MARK 11:12-26;** ~~2095~~ **LUKE 19:45-48)**

The morning of Monday found Jesus and His disciples again on their way to the city. Possibly the early hours had been spent by Jesus in solitary prayer, and, as they went, it is recorded that “he hungered.” A fig tree from which, from its foliage, fruit might have been expected, stood invitingly by the wayside, but when Jesus approached it, it was found to have nothing

but leaves — a striking symbol of the outwardly religious, but spiritually barren Jewish community. And in this sense Jesus used it in pronouncing on it the word of doom, “No man eat fruit from thee henceforward for ever” (Mark). Next morning (Tuesday), as the disciples passed, the tree was found withered from the roots. Matthew combines the events of the cursing and the withering, placing both on the second day, but Mark more accurately distinguishes them. Jesus used the surprise of the disciples as the occasion of a lesson on the omnipotence of faith, with added counsels on prayer.

### Were There Two Cleansings?

Pursuing His journey on the first morning, Jesus reached the temple, and there, as His first act, is stated by Matthew and Mark to have cleansed the temple of the traders. It is a difficult question whether this is a second cleansing, or the same act as that recorded by John at the beginning of the ministry (~~4013~~ John 2:13-22; see above), and here narrated out of its chronological order. The acts are at least quite similar in character and significance. In favor of a second cleansing is the anger of the priests and scribes (~~4118~~ Mark 11:18; ~~4097~~ Luke 19:47), and their demand next day for His authority. No other incidents are recorded of this visit to the temple, except the healing of certain blind and lame, and the praises of the children, “Hosanna to the son of David” — an echo of the previous day’s proceedings (~~4214~~ Matthew 21:14-16). In the evening He went back to Bethany.

### 5. The Eventful Tuesday:

Far different is it with the third day of these visits of Jesus to the temple — the Tuesday of the Passion Week. This is crowded with parables, discourses, incidents, so numerous, impressive, tragical, as to oppress the mind in seeking to grasp how one short day could embrace them all. It was the last day of the appearance of Jesus in the temple (~~4126~~ John 12:36), and marks His final break with the authorities of the nation, on whom His words of denunciation (Matthew 23) fell with overwhelming force. The thread of the day’s proceedings may thus be briefly traced.

#### a) The Demand for Authority — Parables:

(~~¶123~~ **MATTHEW 21:23 THROUGH 22:14;** ~~¶1127~~ **MARK 11:27  
THROUGH 12:12;** ~~¶201~~ **LUKE 20:1-18)**

On His first appearance in the temple on the Tuesday morning, Jesus was met by a demand from the chief priests, scribes and elders (representatives of the Sanhedrin), for the authority by which He acted as He did. Jesus met them by a counterquestion, “The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from men?” The dilemma was obvious. If John was Divinely accredited, why did they not accept his testimony to Jesus? Yet they feared to say his mission was of men, for John was universally esteemed a prophet. They could therefore only lamely reply: “We cannot tell” (the King James Version). Matters had now come to an issue, and Jesus, reverting to the method of parable, set forth plainly their sin and its results to themselves and others.

The Two Sons — the Wicked Husbandmen — the Marriage of the King’s Son.

The parables spoken on this occasion were: that of the Two Sons, one who said “I go not,” but afterward repented and went, the other who said, “I go, sir,” but went not — pointing the moral that the publicans and harlots went into the kingdom of God before the self-righteous leaders who rejected the preaching of John (~~¶128~~ Matthew 21:28-32); that of the Wicked Husbandmen, who slew the servants, and finally the son, sent to them, and were at length themselves destroyed, the vineyard being given to others — a prophecy of the transferring of the kingdom to the Gentiles (Matthew, Mark, Luke); and that of the Marriage of the King’s Son (~~¶122~~ Matthew 22:2-14), akin to that of the Great Supper in ~~¶146~~ Luke 14:16-24 in its gathering in of the outcasts to take the place of those who had been bidden, but distinguished from it by the feature of the wedding garment, the lack of which meant being thrust into the outer darkness. The Pharisees easily perceived that these parables were spoken of them (~~¶145~~ Matthew 21:45; ~~¶122~~ Mark 12:12; ~~¶209~~ Luke 20:19), and were correspondingly enraged, yet dared not touch Jesus for fear of the people.

**b) Ensnaring Questions, etc.:**

(~~¶126~~ **MATTHEW 22:1-46;** ~~¶123~~ **MARK 12:13-37;** ~~¶209~~ **LUKE 20:19-44)**

The attempt was next made on the part of the Pharisees, Herodians and Sadducees — now joined in a common cause — to ensnare Jesus by

captious and compromising questions. These attempts He met with a wisdom and dignity which foiled His adversaries, while He showed a ready appreciation of a candid spirit when it presented itself, and turned the point against His opponents by putting a question on the Davidic sonship of the Messiah.

**(1) Tribute to Caesar — the Resurrection — the Great Commandment.**

First the Pharisees with the Herodians sought to entrap Him by raising the question of the lawfulness of tribute to Caesar. By causing them to produce a denarius bearing Caesar's image and superscription, Jesus obtained from them a recognition of their acceptance of Caesar's authority, and bade them render Caesar's things to Caesar, and God's to God. The Sadducees next tried Him with the puzzle of the wife who had seven husbands, leading up to denial of the resurrection; but Jesus met them by showing that marriage relations have no place in the resurrection life, and by pointing to the implication of a future life in God's word to Moses, "I am the God of Abraham," etc. God "is not the God of the dead, but of the living," a fact which carried with it all the weight of resurrection, as needed for the completion of the personal life. The candid scribe, who came last with His question as to which commandment was first of all, had a different reception. Jesus met him kindly, satisfied him with His answer, and pronounced him "not far from the kingdom of God" (~~4123b~~ Mark 12:34).

**(2) David's Son and Lord.**

The adversaries were silenced, but Jesus now put to them His own question. If David in Psalm 110 could say "Yahweh saith unto my lord, Sit thou on my right hand," etc., how was this reconcilable with the Christ being David's son? The question was based on the acceptance of the oracle as spoken by David, or one of his house, of the Messiah, and was intended to suggest the higher nature of Christ as one with God in a Divine sovereignty. David's son was also David's Lord.

**c) The Great Denunciation:**

**(MATTHEW 23; ~~4128~~ MARK 12:38-40; ~~4216~~ LUKE 20:45-47;  
COMPARE ~~42139~~ LUKE 11:39-52)**

At this point, in audience of the multitudes and of His disciples in the temple, Jesus delivered that tremendous indictment of the scribes and

Pharisees, with denunciations of woes upon them for their hypocrisy and iniquity of conduct, recorded most fully in Matthew 23. A more tremendous denunciation of a class was never uttered. While conceding to the scribes and Pharisees any authority they lawfully possessed (23:2,3), Jesus specially dwelt on their divorce of practice from precept. They said and did not (23:3). He denounced their perversion of the right, their tyranny, their ostentation, their keeping back others from the kingdom, their zeal in securing proselytes, only to make them, when gained, worse than themselves, their immoral casuistry, their scruples about trifles, while neglecting essentials, their exaltation of the outward at the expense of the inward, their building the tombs of the prophets, while harboring the spirit of those that killed the prophets. He declared them to be foul and corrupt to the last degree: ‘sons of Gehenna’ (23:15,33). So awful a condition meant ripeness for doom. On them, through that law of retribution which binds generation with generation in guilt and penalty, would come all the righteous blood shed since the days of Abel (the allusion to “Zachariah son of Barachiah,” 23:35, is unmistakably to <sup><1401></sup>2 Chronicles 24:21 — this being the last book in the Hebrew Canon — but “Barachiah” seems a confusion with Zec 1:1, perhaps through a copyist’s gloss or error). At the close indignation melts into tenderness in the affecting plaint over Jerusalem — “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, .... how often would I have gathered thy children together,” etc. (<sup><1237></sup>Matthew 23:37-39) — words found in Luke in an earlier context (13:34,35), but assuredly also appropriate here. For other parts of the discourse found earlier, compare <sup><2113></sup>Luke 11:39-52. All seems to have been gathered up afresh in this final accusation. It can be imagined that the anger of the Pharisees was fierce at such words, yet they did not venture openly to touch Him.

**d) The Widow’s Offering:**

(<sup><4124></sup>MARK 12:41-44; <sup><2201></sup>LUKE 21:1-4)

Before finally leaving the temple, Jesus seems to have passed from the outer court into the women’s court, and there to have sat down near the receptacles provided for the gifts of the worshippers. Many who were wealthy cast of their gold and silver into the treasury, but the eye of Jesus singled out one poor widow who, creeping up, cast in two mites (Greek [*lepta*], the smallest of coins), which made up but a farthing. It was little, but it was her all, and Jesus immortalized her poor offering by declaring that, out of her want, she had given more than the wealthiest there. Gifts

were measured in His sight by the willingness that prompted them, and by the sacrifice they entailed.

**e) The Visit of the Greeks:**

**(~~8121~~) JOHN 12:20-36)**

It is perhaps to this crowded day, though some place it earlier in the week (on Sunday or Monday), that the incident should be referred of the request of certain Greeks to see Jesus, as related in ~~8121~~ John 12:20 ff. Who these Greeks were, or whence they came, is unknown, but they were evidently proselytes to the Jewish faith, and men of a sincere spirit. Their request was made through Philip of Bethsaida, and Philip and Andrew conveyed it to Jesus. It is not said whether their wish was granted, but we can hardly doubt that it was. Jesus evidently saw in the incident a prelude of that glory that should accrue to Himself through all men being drawn to Him (~~8123~~ John 12:23,32). But He saw as clearly that this “glorifying” could only be through His death (~~8124~~ John 12:24,33), and He universalized it into a law of His Kingdom that, as a grain of wheat must fall into the earth and die if it is to be multiplied, so only through sacrifice can any life be made truly fruitful (~~8125~~ John 12:24,25). The thought of death, however, always brought trouble to the soul of Jesus (~~8127~~ John 12:27), and a voice from the Father was given to comfort Him. The multitude thought it thundered, and failed to apprehend the meaning of the voice, or His own words about being “lifted up” (~~8129~~ John 12:29,34).

**f) Discourse on the Last Things:**

**(MATTHEW 24; MARK 13; ~~8216~~ LUKE 21:5-36)**

Jesus had now bidden farewell to the temple. As He was going out, His disciples — or one of them (Mark) — called His attention to the magnificence of the buildings of the temple, eliciting from Him the startling reply that not one stone should be left upon another that should not be thrown down. Later in the evening, when seated on the Mount of Olives on their return journey, in view of the temple, Andrew, James and John (Mark) asked Him privately when these things should be, and what would be the signs of their fulfillment. In Matthew the question is put more precisely, “When shall these things be? And what shall be the sign of thy coming ([*parousia*]), and of the end of the world?” (or “consummation of



the age”). It is in answer to these complex questions that Jesus spoke His great discourse on the destruction of Jerusalem and His final coming, some of the strands in which it is difficult now to disentangle. In the extended report in Matthew 24 certain passages appear which are given elsewhere by Luke (compare <sup><171></sup>Luke 17:20-37). It may tend to clearness if a distinction be observed between the nearer event of the destruction of Jerusalem — also in its way a coming of the Son of Man — and the more remote event of the final [*parousia*]. The former, to which <sup><145></sup>Matthew 24:15-28 more specially belong, seems referred to by the “these things” in 24:34, which, it is declared, shall be fulfilled in that generation. Of the final [*parousia*], on the other hand, it is declared in 24:36 that “of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels of heaven, neither the Son, but the Father only” (compare <sup><132></sup>Mark 13:32). The difficulty occasioned by the immediately of <sup><129></sup>Matthew 24:29 is relieved by recalling the absence of perspective and grouping of future events in all apocalyptic prophecy — the consummation ever rising as the background of the immediate experience which is its prelude. The discourse then divides itself into a general part (<sup><144></sup>Matthew 24:4-14), delineating the character of the entire period till the consummation (false Christs and prophets, wars, tribulations, apostasies, preaching of the gospel to all nations, etc.); a special part relating to the impending destruction of the city, with appropriate warnings (<sup><145></sup>Matthew 24:15-28); and a closing part (<sup><132></sup>Matthew 24:32-51) relating mainly to the final [*parousia*], but not without reference to preceding events in the extension of Christ’s kingdom, and ingathering of His elect (<sup><140></sup>Matthew 24:30,31). Warning is given of the suddenness of the coming of the Son of Man, and the need of being prepared for it (<sup><145></sup>Matthew 24:37-51). The whole is a massive prophecy, resting on Christ’s consciousness that His death would be, not the defeat of His mission, but the opening up of the way to His final glorification and triumph.

### **g) Parables of Ten Virgins, Talents and Last Judgment:**

#### **(MATTHEW 25)**

To this great discourse on the solemnities of the end, Jesus, still addressing His disciples, added three memorable parables of instruction and warning (Matthew 25) — the first, that of the Ten Virgins, picturing, under the figure of virgins who went to meet the bridegroom with insufficient provision of oil for their lamps, the danger of being taken unawares in waiting for the Son of Man; the second, that of the Talents, akin to the

parable in Luke of the Pounds (19:11-27), emphasizing the need of diligence in the Lord's absence; the third, that of the Sheep and Goats, or Last Judgment, showing how the last division will be made according as discipleship is evinced by loving deeds done to those in need on earth — such deeds being owned by Christ the King as done to Himself. Love is thus declared to be the ultimate law in Christ's kingdom (compare 1 Corinthians 13); the loveless spirit is reprobated. "These shall go away into eternal punishment: but the righteous into eternal life" (~~4056~~ Matthew 25:46).

## 6. A Day of Retirement:

### (COMPARE ~~41236~~ JOHN 12:36)

~~42157~~ Luke 21:37,38 might suggest that Jesus taught in the temple every day till the Thursday of the Passover; if, however, the denunciation took place, as nearly all agree, on Tuesday, an exception must be made of the Wednesday, which Jesus probably spent in retirement in Bethany in preparation of spirit for His last great conflict (others arrange differently, and put some of the preceding events in this day). The summary in ~~41236~~ John 12:36-43 connects the blindness of mind of the Pharisees with Isaiah's vision (~~2060~~ Isaiah 6:10), and with the prophecy of the rejected Servant (~~2501~~ Isaiah 53:1).

## 7. An Atmosphere of Plotting — Judas and the Priests:

### (~~4181~~ MATTHEW 26:1-5,14-16; ~~4140~~ MARK 14:1,2,10,11; ~~4221~~ LUKE 22:1-6)

The plot for the destruction of Jesus was meanwhile maturing. Two days before the Passover (Tuesday evening), Jesus forewarned the disciples of His approaching betrayal and crucifixion (~~4181~~ Matthew 26:2); and probably at that very hour a secret meeting of the chief priests and elders was being held in the court of the house of the high priest, Caiaphas (Matthew), to consult as to the means of putting Him to death. Their resolve was that it should not be done on the feast day, lest there should be a tumult; but the appearance of Judas, who since the anointing had seemingly meditated this step, speedily changed their plans. For the paltry sum of 30 pieces of silver (shekels of the sanctuary, less than \$20 or 4 pounds; the price of a slave, Exodus 21:32; compare Zec 11:12), the recreant disciple, perhaps

persuading himself that he was really forcing Jesus to an exercise of His Messianic power, agreed to betray his Lord. The covenant of infamy was made, and the traitor now only waited his opportunity to carry out his project.

## II. From the Last Supper till the Cross.

### 1. The Chronology:

A question of admitted difficulty arises in the comparison of the Synoptics and John as to the dates of the Last Supper and of the crucifixion. The Synoptics seem clearly to place the Last Supper on the evening of the 14th of Nisan (in Jewish reckoning, the beginning of the 15th), and to identify it with the ordinary paschal meal (~~4187~~ Matthew 26:17-19). The crucifixion then took place on the 15th. John, on the contrary, seems to place the supper on the day before the Passover (13:1), and the crucifixion on the 14th, when the Passover had not yet been eaten (18:28; 19:14). Many, on this ground, affirm an irreconcilable discrepancy between John and the Synoptics, some (e.g. Meyer, Farrar, less decisively Sanday) preferring Jn; others (Strauss, Baur, Schmiedel, etc.) using the fact to discredit Jn. By those who accept both accounts, various modes of reconciliation are proposed. A favorite opinion (early church writers; many moderns, as Godet, Westcott, Farrar) is that Jesus, in view of His death, anticipated the Passover, and ate His parting meal with His disciples on the evening of the 13th; others (e.g. Tholuck, Luthardt, Edersheim, Andrews, D. Smith), adhering to the Synoptics, take the view, here shared, that the apparent discrepancy is accounted for by a somewhat freer usage of terms in John. Details of the discussion must be sought in the works on the subject. The case for the anticipatory view is well given in Westcott, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, 339 ff; and in Farrar, Life of Christ, Excur. X; a good statement of that for the Synoptics may be seen in Andrews, Life of our Lord; compare Tholuck, Commentary on John, on 13:1; Luthardt, Commentary on John, on 13:1; 18:28; D. Smith, Days of His Flesh, App. II. The language of the Synoptists (“the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the passover,” ~~4142~~ Mark 14:12) leaves no doubt that they intended to identify the Last Supper with the regular Passover, and it is hardly conceivable that they could be mistaken on so vital a point of the apostolic tradition. This also was the view of the churches of Asia Minor, where John himself latterly resided. On the other hand, the phrase to “eat the passover” in ~~4188~~ John 18:28 may very well, in John’s usage, refer to

participation in the special sacrifices which formed a chief feature of the proceedings on the 15th. The allusion in <sup><B10></sup>John 13:1 need mean no more than that, the Passover now impending, Jesus, loving His disciples to the end, gave them a special token of that love during the meal that ensued. The “preparation of the passover” in <sup><B14></sup>John 19:14,31 most naturally refers to the preparation for the Sabbath of the Passover week, alluded to also by the Synoptics (<sup><A26></sup>Matthew 27:62; <sup><A152></sup>Mark 15:42; <sup><A284></sup>Luke 23:54). The objections based on rabbinical regulations about the Sabbath are convincingly met by Tholuck (see also Andrews). We assume, therefore, that our Lord ate the Passover with His disciples at the usual time — the evening of the 14th of Nisan (i.e. the beginning of the 15th).

## 2. The Last Supper:

**(<sup><A87></sup>MATTHEW 26:17-35; <sup><A142></sup>MARK 14:12-31; <sup><A217></sup>LUKE 22:7-38;  
JOHN 13; COMPARE <sup><A123></sup>1 CORINTHIANS 11:23-25)**

In the scene in the upper chamber, at the observance of the Last Supper, we enter the holy of holies of this part of the Lord's history. It is difficult, in combining the narratives, to be sure of the order of all the particulars, but the main events are clear. They may be exhibited as follows:

### a) The Preparation:

On “the first day of unleavened bread” — Thursday, 14th of Nisan — Jesus bade two of His disciples (Luke names Peter and John) make the needful preparations for the observance of the Passover. This included the sacrificing of the lamb at the temple, and the securing of a guest-chamber. Jesus bade the disciples follow a man whom they would meet bearing a pitcher, and at the house where he stopped they would find one willing to receive them. The master of the house, doubtless a disciple, at once gave them “a large upper room furnished and ready” (Mark); there they made ready.

### b) Dispute about Precedence — Washing of the Disciples' Feet — Departure of Judas:

Evening being come, Jesus and the Twelve assembled, and took their places for the meal. We gather from <sup><B123></sup>John 13:23 that John reclined next to Jesus (on the right), and the sequel shows that Judas and Peter were near on the other side. It was probably this arrangement that gave rise to

the unseemly strife for precedence among the disciples narrated in <sup><2224></sup>Luke 22:24-30. The spirit thus displayed Jesus rebuked, as He had more than once had occasion to do (compare <sup><4093></sup>Mark 9:33-37); then (for here may be inserted the beautiful incident in <sup><6131></sup>John 13:1 ff), rising from the table, He gave them an amazing illustration of His own precept, “He that is chief (let him become) as he that doth serve ..... I am in the midst of you as he that serveth” (<sup><2226></sup>Luke 22:26,27), in divesting Himself of His garments, girding Himself with a towel, and performing the act of a servant in washing His disciples’ feet. Peter’s exclamation must have expressed the feelings of all: “Lord, dost thou wash my feet?” The act of the Divine Master was a wonderful lesson in humility, but Jesus used it also as a parable of something higher. “If I wash thee not (i.e. if thou art not cleansed by the receiving of my word and spirit, which this washing symbolizes), thou hast no part with me”; then on Peter’s further impulsive protest, “Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head,” the word: “He that is bathed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit” (i.e. sanctification of the inner man is once for all, but there is need for cleansing from the sins of the daily walk). Resuming His place at the table, He bade them imitate the example He had just given them.

Is it I?

An ominous word had accompanied the reply to Peter, “Ye are not all clean” (<sup><6130></sup>John 13:10,11). As the supper proceeded, the meaning of this was made plain. Judas, who had already sold his Master, was at the table with the rest. He had permitted Jesus to wash his feet, and remained unmoved by that surpassing act of condescending love. Jesus was “troubled in spirit” and now openly declared, “One of you shall betray me” (the Greek word means literally, “deliver up”: compare <sup><2214></sup>Luke 22:4,6, and the Revised Version margin throughout). It was an astounding announcement to the disciples, and from one and another came the trembling question, “Lord, is it I?” Jesus answered that it was one of those dipping his hand with Him in the dish (Mark), and spoke of the woe that would overtake the betrayer (“Good were it for that man if he had not been born”). John, at a sign from Peter, asked more definitely, “Who is it?” (John). Jesus said, but to John only, it was he to whom He would give a sop, and the sop was given to Judas. The traitor even yet sought to mask his treachery by the words, “Is it I, Rabbi?” and Jesus replied, though still not aloud, “Thou hast said” (Matthew); then, as Satanic passion stirred the breast of Judas, He added, “What thou doest, do quickly” (John). Judas at

once rose and went out — into the night (~~4133~~ John 13:30). The disciples, not comprehending his abrupt departure, thought some errand had been given him for the feast or for the poor. Jesus was relieved by his departure and spoke of the glory coming to Himself and to His Father, and of love as the mark of true discipleship (~~4133~~ John 13:31-35).

### c) The Lord's Supper:

The forms of the observance of the Passover by the Jews are given elsewhere (*see PASSOVER*). Luke alone of the New Testament writers speaks of 2 cups (22:17,20); in Jewish practice 4 cups were used. The "Western" text, Codex Bezae (D), omits Luke's 2nd cup, from which some (compare Sanday, Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes)) infer duplication, but this is not necessary. Luke's 1st cup (~~42217~~ Luke 22:17) may be that with which the paschal supper opened; the 2nd cup — that mentioned by all the writers — was probably the 3rd Jewish cup, known as "the cup

of blessing" (compare ~~41016~~ 1 Corinthians 10:16). Some, however, as Meyer, make it the 4th cup. It is implied in Matthew, Mark, John, that by this time Judas had gone. Left thus with His own, the essentials of the paschal meal being complete, Jesus proceeded, by taking and distributing bread and wine, associating them with His body and blood, soon to be offered in death upon the cross, to institute that sacred rite in which, through all ages since (though its simplicity has often been sadly obscured) His love and sacrifice have been commemorated by His church. There are variations of phrase in the different accounts, but in the essentials of the sacramental institution there is entire agreement. Taking bread, after thanks to God, Jesus broke it, and gave it to the disciples with the words, "This is my body"; the cup, in like manner, after thanksgiving, He gave them with the words, "This is my blood of the covenant (in Luke and Paul, "the new covenant in my blood") which is poured out for many" (Matthew adds, "unto remission of sins"). Luke and Paul add what is implied in the others: "This do in remembrance of me" (~~42219~~ Luke 22:19; ~~41124~~ 1 Corinthians 11:24). Nothing could more plainly designate the bread and wine as holy symbols of the Lord's body and blood, offered in death for man's redemption, and sealing in His blood a new covenant with God; nor, so long as the rite is observed in its Divine simplicity, as Jesus instituted it, will it be possible to expunge from His death the character of a redeeming sacrifice. In touching words Jesus intimated that He would no more drink of the fruit of the vine

till He drank it new with them in their Father's Kingdom (on the doctrinal aspects, *see EUCHARIST; SACRAMENT; LORD'S SUPPER*).

**d) The Last Discourses — Intercessory Prayer:**

The Supper was over, and parting was imminent, but Jesus did not leave the holy chamber till He had poured out His inmost heart in those tender, consolatory, profoundly spiritual addresses which the beloved disciple has preserved for us in John 14; 15; and 16, followed by the wonderful closing intercessory prayer of John 17. He was leaving them, but their hearts were not to be disquieted, for they would see Him again (14:18; 16:16 ff), and if, ere long, He would part with them again in visible form, it was only outwardly He would be separated from them, for He would send them the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, who would take His place, to guide them into all truth, and bring all things to their remembrance that He had said to them (14:16,17; 15:26; 16:7-14). If He went away, it was to prepare a place for them, and He would come again to receive them to Himself in His Father's house (14:1-3); let them meanwhile show their love to Him by keeping His commandments (14:15,23,14). In the Spirit He Himself and the Father would dwell in the souls that loved Him (14:21-23). The intimacy of their union with Him would be like that of branches in the vine; only by abiding in Him could they bring forth fruit (15:1 ff). They would have tribulations (15:18 ff; 16:1,2), but as His dying bequest He left them His own peace (14:27); that would sustain their hearts in all trial (16:33). With many such promises did He comfort them in view of the terrible ordeal through which they were soon to pass; then, addressing His Father, He prayed for their holy keeping, and their final admission to His glory (17:9-18,24).

These solemn discourses finished, Jesus and His disciples sang a hymn (the "Hallel") and departed to go to the Mount of Olives. Comparing the evangelists, one would infer that the conversation in which Jesus foretold the denial of Peter at least commenced before they left the chamber (<sup>4223</sup> Luke 22:31 ff; John connects it, probably through relation of subject, with the exposure of Judas, 13:36-38); but it seems to have continued on the way (Matthew, Mark).

**e) The Departure and Warning:**

Jesus had spoken of their being "offended" in Him that night. In his exaltation of spirit, Peter declared that though all should be offended in Him, he would never be offended. Jesus, who had already warned Peter



that Satan sought to have him, that he might sift him as wheat (<sup><4228></sup>Luke 22:31; but “I made supplication for thee,” etc.), now told him that before the cock should crow, he would thrice deny Him. Peter stoutly maintained that he would die rather than be guilty of so base an act — so little did he or the others (<sup><4165></sup>Matthew 26:35; <sup><4143></sup>Mark 14:31) know themselves! The enigmatic words in <sup><4226></sup>Luke 22:36 about taking scrip and sword point metaphorically to the need, in the times that were coming upon them, of every lawful means of provision and self-defence; the succeeding words show that “sword” is not intended to be taken literally (22:38).

### 3. Gethsemane — the Betrayal and Arrest:

(<sup><4136></sup>**MATTHEW 26:36-56;** <sup><4143></sup>**MARK 14:32-53;**  
<sup><4224></sup>**LUKE 22:39-53;** <sup><4181></sup>**JOHN 18:1-12)**

Descending to the valley, Jesus and His disciples, crossing the brook Kidron (“of the cedars”), entered the “garden” (John) known as Gethsemane (“oil-press”), at the foot of the Mount of Olives. Here took place the agony, which is the proper commencement of the Passion, the betrayal by Judas and the arrest of Jesus.

During the evening the thoughts of Jesus had been occupied mainly with His disciples; now that the hour had come when the things predicted concerning Him should have fulfillment (<sup><4225></sup>Luke 22:37: “your hour, and the power of darkness,” 22:53), it was inevitable that mind and spirit should concentrate on the awful bodily and mental sufferings that lay before Him.

#### a) Agony in the Garden:

It was not the thought of physical suffering alone — from that also the pure and sensitive humanity of Jesus shrank with natural horror — but death to Him, the Holy One and Prince of Life, had an indescribably hateful character as a hostile power in humanity, due to the judgment of God on sin, and now descending upon Him through the workings of the vilest of human passions in the religious heads of His nation. What anguish to such an One, filled with love and the desire to save, to feel Himself rejected, betrayed, deserted, doomed to a malefactor’s cross — alone, yet not alone, for the Father was with Him! (<sup><4162></sup>John 16:32). The burden on His spirit when He reached Gethsemane was already, as the language used shows, all but unendurable — “amazed,” “sore troubled,” “My soul is exceeding



sorrowful even unto death” (Mark). There, bidding the other disciples wait, He took with Him Peter, and James, and John, and withdrew into the recesses of the garden. Leaving these also a little behind, He sank on the ground in solitary “agony” (Luke), and “with strong crying and tears” (~~387~~ Hebrews 5:7), poured out His soul in earnest supplication to His Father. “Let this cup pass away from me” — it could not be, but thus the revulsion of His nature was expressed — “howbeit not what I will, but what thou wilt.” The passage in Luke (22:44), “His sweat became as it were great drops of blood,” etc., though omitted in certain manuscripts, doubtless preserves a genuine trait. Returning to the three, He found them overpowered with sleep: even the support of their wakeful sympathy was denied Him! “Watch and pray,” He gently admonished them, “that ye enter not into temptation.” A second and third time the same thing happened — wrestling with God on His part, sleep on theirs, till, with Divine strengthening (~~224~~ Luke 22:41), victory was attained, and calm restored. “Sleep on now,” He said to His disciples (the crisis is past; your help can avail no more): “Arise, let us be going” (the future has to be faced; the betrayer is at hand. See the remarkable sermon of F.W. Robertson, II, sermon 22).

### **b) Betrayal by Judas — Jesus Arrested:**

The crisis had indeed arrived. Through the darkness, even as Jesus spoke, was seen flashing the light of torches and lanterns, revealing a mingled company of armed men — Roman soldiers, temple officers (John), others — sent by the chief priests, scribes and elders, to apprehend Jesus. Their guide was Judas. It had been found impracticable to lay hands on Jesus in public, but Judas knew this retreat (~~382~~ John 18:2), and had arranged, by an act of dastardly treachery, to enable them to effect the capture in privacy. The sign was to be a kiss. With an affectation of friendship, only possible to one into whose heart the devil had truly entered (~~223~~ Luke 22:3; ~~377~~ John 13:27), Judas advanced, and hailing Jesus as “Master,” effusively kissed Him (~~159~~ Matthew 26:49; ~~145~~ Mark 14:45 margin). Jesus had asked, “Betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?” (Luke); now He said, “Friend, do that for which thou art come” (Matthew). The soldiers essayed to take Jesus, but on their first approach, driven back as by a supernatural power, they fell to the ground (Jn). A proof thus given of the voluntariness of His surrender (compare ~~153~~ Matthew 26:53: “Thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father,” etc.), Jesus, remarking only on the iniquity of secret violence when every day they had opportunity to take Him in the temple,

submitted to be seized and bound. At this point Peter, with characteristic impetuosity, remembering, perhaps, his pledge to die, if need be, with Jesus, drew a sword, and cut off the right ear of the high priest's servant, Malchus (John gives the names). If he thought his deed justified by what Jesus had earlier said about "swords" (<sup>422b</sup> Luke 22:36,38), he was speedily undeceived by Jesus' rebuke (Matthew 116:52; <sup>418b</sup> John 18:11), and by His healing of the ear (Luke; the last miracle of Jesus before His death). How little this flicker of impulsive boldness meant is shown by the general panic that immediately followed. "All the disciples," it is related, "left him, and fled" (Matthew, Mark). Mark tells of a young man who had come upon the scene with only a linen cloth cast about his naked body, and who fled, leaving the cloth behind (14:51,52). Not improbably the young man was Mark himself.

#### 4. Trial before the Sanhedrin:

(<sup>418f</sup> MATTHEW 26:57-75; 27:1-10; <sup>414f</sup> MARK 14:53-72; 15:1;  
<sup>425a</sup> LUKE 22:54-71; <sup>418d</sup> JOHN 18:12-27; COMPARE <sup>4118</sup> ACTS  
 1:18,19):

It would be about midnight when Jesus was arrested, and He was at once hurried to the house of Caiaphas, the high priest, where in expectation of the capture, a company of chief priests, scribes and elders — members of the Sanhedrin — were already assembled. Here the first stage in the trial of Jesus took place.

The legal and constitutional questions connected with the trial of Jesus are considered in the article on *JESUS CHRIST, ARREST AND TRIAL OF*; see also Dr. Taylor Innes, *The Trial of Jesus Christ*; on the powers of the Sanhedrin, see *SANHEDRIN*, and compare Schurer, *Jewish People*, etc., II, 1, pp. 163 ff. There seems little doubt that, while certain judicial forms were observed, the trial was illegal in nearly every particular. The arrest itself was arbitrary, as not rounded on any formal accusation (the Sanhedrin, however, seems to have arrogated to itself powers of this kind; compare <sup>440c</sup> Acts 4:1 ff); but the night session, lack of definite charge, search for testimony, interrogation of accused, haste in condemnation, were unquestionably in flagrant violation of the established rules of Jewish judicial procedure in such cases. It is to be remembered that the death of Jesus had already been decided on by the heads of the Sanhedrin, so that the trial was wholly a means to a foregone conclusion. On the historical

side, certain difficulties arise. John seems to make the first interrogation of Jesus take place before Annas, father-in-law to Caiaphas (on Annas, see below; though deposed 15 years before, he retained, in reality, all the dignity and influence of the high-priesthood; compare ~~CRD~~ Luke 3:2; ~~406~~ Acts 4:6); after which He is sent to Caiaphas (~~CRD~~ John 18:13,14,19-24). The narrative is simplified if either

(1) ~~CRD~~ John 18:19-23 are regarded as a preliminary interrogatory by Annas till matters were prepared for the arraignment before Caiaphas; or

(2) 18:24 is taken as retrospective (in the sense of “had sent,” as in the King James Version), and the interrogation is included in the trial by Caiaphas (compare 18:19: “the high priest”). Annas and Caiaphas may be presumed from the account of Peter’s denials to have occupied the same official residence; else Annas was present on this night to be in readiness for the trial. The frequently occurring term “chief priests” denotes the high priests, with those who had formerly held this rank, and members of their families (compare Schurer, *op. cit.*, 203 ff). They formed, with the scribes, the most important element in the Sanhedrin.

**a)** Before Annas and Caiaphas — the Unjust Judgment:

First Jesus was led before Annas, then by him, after a brief interview, was transferred, still bound, to Caiaphas. Annas had been deposed, as above noticed, much earlier (15 AD), but still retained the name and through his sons and relations, as long as he lived, exercised much of the authority of high priest. Like all those holding this high office, he and Caiaphas were Sadducees. Annas — if he is the questioner in ~~CRD~~ John 18:19-23 — asked Jesus concerning His disciples and His teaching. Such interrogation was unlawful, the duty of the accuser, in Jewish law, being to produce witnesses; properly, therefore, Jesus referred him to His public teaching in the temple, and bade him ask those who heard Him there. An officer standing by struck Jesus with his hand for so speaking: an indignity which Jesus endured with meek remonstrance (18:22,23).

**(1)** An Illegal Session.

Meanwhile a company of the Sanhedrin had assembled (23 sufficed for a quorum), and Jesus was brought before this tribunal, which was presided over by Caiaphas. A hurried search had been made for witnesses (this, like

the night session, was illegal), but even the suborned testimony thus obtained (“false witnesses”) was found useless for the purpose of establishing, constructively or directly, a charge of blasphemy against Jesus. At length two witnesses were produced who gave a garbled version of the early saying of Jesus (<sup><4129></sup>John 2:19) about destroying the temple and rebuilding it in three days. To speak against the temple might be construed as speaking against God (compare <sup><4236></sup>Matthew 23:16,21; <sup><4483></sup>Acts 6:13,14), but here too the witnesses broke down through lack of agreement. At all costs, however, must Jesus be condemned: the unprecedented course therefore was taken of seeking a conviction from the mouth of the accused Himself. Rising from his seat, the high priest adjured Jesus by the living God to tell them whether He was the Christ, the Son of God (in Mark, “Son of the Blessed”). In using this title, Caiaphas had evidently in view, as in <sup><4158></sup>John 5:18; 10:33, a claim to equality with God. The supreme moment had come, and Jesus did not falter in His reply: “Thou hast said.” Then, identifying Himself with the Son of Man in Daniel’s vision (<sup><2073></sup>Daniel 7:13,14), He solemnly added, “Henceforth (from His resurrection on) ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven.” It was enough. Without even the pretense of inquiry into the truth or falsehood of the claim, the high priest rent his garments, exclaiming, “He hath spoken blasphemy,” and by assent of all Jesus was adjudged worthy of death. Abuse and insult followed. The minions of the Sanhedrin were permitted to spit on the condemned One, smite Him, blindfold and mock Him, saying, “Prophecy unto us, thou Christ: who is he that struck thee?” Then, with further blows, He was led away (<sup><4068></sup>Matthew 26:68).

## **(2) A Morning Confirmation.**

To give color of judicial sanction to these tumultuous and wholly irregular night proceedings, a more formal meeting of the Sanhedrin was convened as soon as day had dawned (<sup><4208></sup>Matthew 27:1; <sup><4150></sup>Mark 15:1; <sup><4226></sup>Luke 22:66-71). Probably the irregularities were held to be excused by the urgency of the occasion and the solemnities of the feast. Jesus was again brought forward; new questions were put which He declined to answer. Possibly a new avowal of His Messiahship was made (more probably Luke includes in this scene, the only one he records, some of the particulars of the earlier proceedings). The judgment of the past night was confirmed.

### **b) The Threefold Denial:**

While this greatest moral tragedy of the trial and condemnation of Jesus was in process, a lesser, but still awful, tragedy in the history of a soul was being enacted in the court of the same building (from this the chamber in which the Sanhedrin sat was visible), in the threefold denial of his Master by the apostle Peter. Peter, who had followed “afar off” (Luke), had gained access to the court through an unnamed disciple, whom it is easy to identify with John (~~4885~~ John 18:15). As he stood warming himself at a fire which had been kindled, the maid who had admitted them (John), gazing attentively at Peter, said boldly, “Thou also wast with Jesus the Galilean” (~~4886~~ Matthew 26:69). Unnerved, and affrighted by his surroundings, Peter took the readiest mode of escape in denial. “I know him not.” His heart must have sunk within him as he framed the words, and the crowing of a cock at the moment (Mark — perhaps an hour after midnight), reminding him of his Master’s warning, completed his discomfiture. Guiltily he withdrew to the porch, only a little after to be accosted by another (the maid had spoken to her neighbors, Mark), with the same charge. More afraid than ever, he declared again, “I know not this man,” and, seeing he was not believed, strengthened the denial with an oath. Yet a third time, an hour later, a bystander (or several, Mark), this time founding on his Galilean speech, pronounced, “Of a truth thou art one of them.” Peter, to clear himself, cursed and swore, anew disclaiming knowledge of his Lord. To this depth had the boastful apostle fallen — as low, it might seem, as Judas! But there was a difference. As Peter spoke the cock again crew — the cockcrow which gives its form to three of the narratives (Mark alone mentions the double cockcrowing). At the same instant, either from within, or as He was being led forth, Jesus turned and looked on His erring disciple. That look — so full of pity, sorrow, reproach — could never be forgotten! Its effect was instantaneous: “Peter went out, and wept bitterly.”

### c) Remorse and Suicide of Judas:

Peter’s heartfelt repentance has its counterfoil in the remorse of Judas, which, bitter as it also was, cannot receive the nobler name. First, Judas sought to return the 30 shekels paid him as the price of blood (“I betrayed innocent blood”); then, when callously rebuffed by the priests and elders, he flung down the accursed money in the sanctuary, and went and hanged himself. Matthew and Acts seem to follow slightly divergent traditions as to his end and the purchase of the potter’s field. The underlying facts probably are that the priests applied the money, which they could not put

into the treasury (Matthew), to the purchase of the field, where, either before or after the purchase, Judas destroyed himself (Acts: falling and bursting asunder), assigning it as a place to bury strangers in. Its connection with Judas is attested by its name, “Akeldama,” “the field of blood.”

The Jews might condemn, but they had no power to execute sentence of death (~~470B~~ John 18:31). This power had been taken from them by the Romans, and was now vested in the Roman governor. The procurator of Judea was Pontius Pilate, a man hated by the Jews for his ruthless tyranny (*see* PILATE), yet, as the Gospels show him, not without a sense of right, but vacillating and weak-willed in face of mob clamor, and risk to his own interests.

### 5. Trial before Pilate:

(~~470B~~ MATTHEW 27:2,11-31; ~~4150B~~ MARK 15:1-20; ~~4231B~~ LUKE 23:1-25;  
~~4183B~~ JOHN 18:28-40; 19:1-16)

His residence in Jerusalem (“Praetorium,” the English Revised Version “palace”) was probably Herod’s former palace (thus Schurer, G.A. Smith, etc.), on the tessellated pavement (~~4193B~~ John 19:13) in the semicircular front of which was placed the tribunal (*[bema]*) from which judgments were delivered. It was to this place Jesus was now brought. The events took place when it was “early” (~~4183B~~ John 18:28), probably between 6 a.m. and 7 a.m. (compare ~~4194B~~ John 19:14, Roman computation).a) The Attitude of the Accusers: Jesus was taken within the Pretorium, but His accusers were too scrupulous about defilement at the Passover festival (~~4183B~~ John 18:28) to enter the building. Pilate therefore came out to hear their accusation. They would fain have had him endorse their condemnation without further inquiry, but this he would not do. They would not have it that it was a simple question of their law, yet had to justify their demand for a death sentence (~~4183B~~ John 18:31). They based, therefore, on the alleged revolutionary character of Christ’s teaching, His forbidding to pay tribute to Caesar (a false charge), His claim to be a king (~~4231B~~ Luke 23:2,5), to all which charges Jesus answered not a word (~~4153B~~ Mark 15:3,5). At a later stage, after Pilate, who knew very well that no mere sedition against the Roman power had called forth all this passion (witness the choice of Barabbas), had repeatedly declared that he found no crime in Jesus (~~4154B~~ Mark 15:14; ~~4231B~~ Luke 23:4,14,22; ~~4183B~~ John 18:38; 19:4,6), the real

spring of their action was laid bare: “We have a law, and by that law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God” (<sup><B107></sup>John 19:7). When it was seen how this declaration made Pilate only the more unwilling to yield to their rage, return was made to the political motive, now in the form of personal threat: “If thou release this man, thou art not Caesar’s friend” (<sup><B102></sup>John 19:12). This was Pilate’s weak point, and the Jews knew it. The clamor grew ever louder, “Crucify him, crucify him.” Hate of Jesus and national degradation could go no farther than in the cry, “We have no king but Caesar” (<sup><B105></sup>John 19:15).b) The Attitude of Pilate: Pilate was from the first impressed with the innocence of Jesus, and was sincerely anxious, as his actions showed, to save Him from the terrible and ignominious death His implacable enemies were bent on inflicting upon Him. His crime was that, as Roman judge, he finally, against his own convictions, through fear of a charge of disloyalty to Caesar, yielded up to torture and death One whom he had pronounced guiltless, to gratify the brutal passions of a mob. By Pilate’s own admissions, Christ’s death was, not a punishment for any crime, but a judicial murder. First, through private examination, Pilate satisfied himself that the kingship Jesus claimed (“Thou sayest”) carried with it no danger to the throne of Caesar. Jesus was a king indeed, but His kingdom was not of this world; was not, like earthly kingdoms, supported by violence; was founded on the truth, and gathered its subjects from those that received the truth (<sup><B135></sup>John 18:36,37). The indifference to the name of truth which the jaded mind of Pilate confessed (“What is truth?”) could not hide from him the nobility of soul of the Holy One who stood before him. He declared publicly, “I find no fault in this man,” and thereafter sought means of saving Him, at least of shifting the responsibility of His condemnation from himself to others.

**(1) Jesus Sent to Herod.** Hearing in the clamor round the judgment seat that Jesus was a Galilean, and remembering that Herod Antipas, who had jurisdiction in that region, was in the city, Pilate’s first expedient was to send Jesus to Herod, to be examined by him (<sup><D215></sup>Luke 23:6-11). This act of courtesy had the effect of making Herod and Pilate, who had been at enmity, again friends (<sup><D212></sup>Luke 23:12); otherwise it failed of its object. Herod was pleased enough to see One he had so often heard about — even thought in his flippancy that a miracle might be done by Him — but when Jesus, in presence of “that fox” (<sup><D132></sup>Luke 13:32), refused to open His mouth in answer to the accusations heaped upon Him, Herod, with his soldiers, turned the matter into jest, by



clothing Jesus in gorgeous apparel, and sending Him back as a mocking to Pilate.

**(2)** “Not This Man, but Barabbas.” Pilate’s next thought was to release Jesus in pursuance of a Jewish custom of setting free a prisoner at the feast, and to this end, having again protested that no fault had been found in Him, offered the people the choice between Jesus and a notorious robber and murderer called Barabbas, then in prison. Just then, as he sat on the judgment seat, a message from his wife regarding a dream she had (“Have thou nothing to do with that righteous man,” ~~4179~~ Matthew 27:19) must strongly have influenced his superstitious mind. Pilate could hardly have conceived that the multitude would prefer a murderer to One so good and pure; but, instigated by the priests, they perpetrated even this infamy, shouting for the release of Barabbas and the crucifixion of Jesus.

**(3)** “Ecce Homo.” Pilate’s weakness now began to reveal itself. He proposed to “chastise” (scourge) Jesus — why “chastise,” if He was innocent? — then release Him. But this compromise, as was to be anticipated, only whetted the eagerness for blood, and the cries grew ever louder, “Crucify him.” Pilate, however, as if yielding to the storm, did deliver Jesus to be scourged (scourging — a fearful infliction — preceded crucifixion), the cruelty being aggravated by the maltreatment of the soldiers, who, outstripping former mockeries, put on His head a crown of thorns, arrayed Him in a purple robe, and rained blows upon His bleeding face and form. It seems to have been a design of Pilate to awake pity, for once again he brought Jesus forth, and in this affecting guise, with new attestation of His innocence, presented Him to the people in the words, “Behold, the man!” (~~4180~~ John 19:5). How hideous the mockery, at once to declare of such an one, “I find no crime in him,” and to exhibit Him to the crowd thus shamefully abused! No pity dwelt in these hearts, however, and the shouts became still angrier, “Crucify him.”

**(4)** A Last Appeal — Pilate Yields.

The words of the leaders, “He made himself the Son of God,” spoken as a reason for putting Jesus to death (~~4181~~ John 19:7), struck a new fear into the heart of Pilate. It led him again to enter the Pretorium, and inquire of this strange prisoner, unlike any he had ever seen, “Whence art thou?” Jesus



was silent. “Knowest thou not,” asked Pilate, “that I have power to release thee, and have power to crucify thee?” Jesus answered only that he, Pilate, had no power over Him at all save what was given him of God; the greater therefore was the crime of those who had subjected Him to this abuse of Divinely given power. Again Pilate went out and sought to release Him, but was met by the fierce cries that foreboded complaint to Caesar (~~489D~~ John 19:12). A tumult seemed imminent, and Pilate succumbed. Here probably (though possibly after the choice of Barabbas) is to be placed the washing of his hands by Pilate — a vain disclaiming of his responsibility — recorded in ~~417B~~ Matthew 27:24, and the awful answer of the people, “His blood be on us, and on our children” (27:25). Pilate now ascends the judgment seat, and, fully conscious of the iniquity of his procedure, pronounces the formal sentence which dooms Jesus to the cross. The trial over, Jesus is led again into the Pretorium, where the cruel mockery of the soldiers is resumed in intensified form. The Holy One, thorn-crowned, clad in purple, a reed thrust into His hand, is placed at the mercy of the whole band, who bow the knee in ridicule before Him (“Hail, King of the Jews”), spit upon Him in contempt, smite Him on the head with the reed (Matthew, Mark). Then, stripped of the robe, His own garments are put on Him, in preparation for the end.c) The Attitude of Jesus: In all this hideous scene of cruelty, injustice, and undeserved suffering, the conspicuous feature in the bearing of Jesus is the absolute calmness, dignity and meekness with which He endures the heaviest wrongs and insults put upon Him. The picture in ~~281D~~ Isaiah 53:7,8 is startling in its fidelity: “When he was afflicted he opened not his mouth; as a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and as a sheep that before its shearers is mute, so he opened not his mouth. By oppression and judgment he was taken away,” etc. There is no return of the perturbation of Gethsemane. As if the strength won there had raised Him into a peace that nothing could shake, He passed through the frightful physical exhaustion, mental strain, agony of scourging, suffering from wounds and blows, of that terrible night and morning, with unbroken fortitude and unembittered spirit. Not a word of complaint passes His lips; He makes no reply to accusations; when reviled, He reviles not again; He takes all with submission, as part of the cup the Father has given Him to drink. It is a spectacle to move the stoniest heart. Well to remember that it is the world’s sin, in which all share, that mingled the bitter draught! III. The Crucifixion and Burial. 1. The Crucifixion: (~~417B~~ Matthew 27:31-56; ~~415D~~ Mark 15:20-41; ~~423B~~ Luke 23:26-49; ~~619C~~ John 19:16-37) Crucifixion was the form of punishment reserved by the Romans for slaves, foreigners and

the vilest criminals, and could not be inflicted on a Roman citizen. With its prolonged and excruciating torture, it was the most agonizing and ignominious death which the cruelty of a cruel age could devise. Jewish law knew nothing of it (the ‘hanging on a tree’ of <sup><R22></sup>Deuteronomy 21:22,23, was after death; compare <sup><R13></sup>Galatians 3:13), yet to it the Jewish leaders hounded Pilate on to doom their Messiah. The cross was no doubt of the usual Roman shape (*see* **CROSS**). The site of Golgotha, “the place of a skull” (in Luke “Calvary,” the Latinized form), is quite uncertain. It may have been a slight mound resembling a skull (thus Meyer, Luthardt, Godet, etc.), but this is not known. It is only plain that it was outside the wall, in the immediate vicinity of the city (see note below on sepulcher). The time of the crucifixion was about 9 a.m. (<sup><H15></sup>Mark 15:25). The day (Friday) was the “preparation” for the Sabbath of the Passover week (Matthew, Mark, Luke; compare <sup><H14></sup>John 19:14,31).

#### **a) On the Way:**

It was part of the torment of the victim of this horrible sentence that he had to bear his own cross (according to some only the patibulum, or transverse beam) to the place of execution. As Jesus, staggering, possibly fainting, under this burden, passed out of the gate, a stranger coming from the country, Simon, a man of Cyrene, was laid hold of, and compelled to carry the cross (such an one would not be punctilious about rabbinical rules of travel, especially as it was not the regular Sabbath). Jesus, however, was not wholly unpitied. In the crowd following Him were some women of Jerusalem, who bewailed and lamented Him. The Lord, turning, bade these weep, not for Him, but for themselves and for their children. “If they do these things in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?” (<sup><R7></sup>Luke 23:27-31).

#### **b) Between the Thieves — the Superscription — the Seamless Robe:**

Golgotha being reached, the crucifixion at once took place under the care of a centurion and a quaternion of soldiers. With ruthless blows, hands and feet were nailed to the wood, then the cross was reared (the perpendicular part may, as some think, have first been placed in position). As if to emphasize, from Pilate’s point of view, the irony of the proceedings, two robbers were crucified with Jesus, on right and left, an undesigned fulfillment of prophecy (<sup><R2></sup>Isaiah 53:12). It was doubtless when being raised upon the cross that Jesus uttered the touching prayer — His 1st

word on the cross (its genuineness need not be questioned, though some ancient manuscripts omit) — “Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do” (Luke). Above His head, according to custom, was placed a tablet with His accusation, written in three languages, Hebrew, Greek and Latin. The chief priests took offense at the form, “This is the King of the Jews,” and wished the words changed to, “He said, I am King,” etc., but Pilate curtly dismissed their complaint: “What I have written I have written” (John). Whether Jesus still wore the crown of thorns is doubtful. The garments of the Crucified were divided among the soldiers, but for His inner garment, woven without seam, they cast lots (compare ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 22:18). A draught of wine mingled with an opiate (gall or myrrh), intended to dull the senses, was offered, but refused.

**c) The Mocking — the Penitent Thief — Jesus and His Mother:**

The triumph of Christ’s enemies now seemed complete, and their glee was correspondingly unrestrained. Their victim’s helplessness was to them a disproof of His claims. Railing, and wagging their heads, they taunted Him, “If thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross”; “He saved others; himself he cannot save.” At first the robbers who were crucified with Him (possibly only one) joined in this reproach, but ere long there was a change. The breast of one of the malefactors opened to the impression of the holiness and meekness of Jesus, and faith took the place of scorn. He rebuked his neighbor for reviling One who had “done nothing amiss”; then, addressing Jesus, he prayed: “Jesus, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom.” The reply of Jesus — His 2nd word on the cross — surpassed what even the penitent in these strange circumstances could have anticipated “Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise” (Luke). A not less touching incident followed — perhaps preceded — this rescue of a soul in its last extremity. Standing near the cross was a group of holy women, one of them the mother of Jesus Himself (~~John~~ John 19:25: Mary the mother of Jesus, Mary’s sister, Mary the wife of Clopas — some identify the two latter — Mary Magdalene). Mary, whose anguish of spirit may be imagined, was supported by the disciple John. Beholding them — His 3rd word from the cross — Jesus tenderly commended His mother to the care of John; to Mary, “Woman, behold, thy son”; to John, “Behold, thy mother.” From that time Mary dwelt with John. Three hours passed, and at noon mocking was hushed in presence of a startling natural change. The sun’s light failed (Luke), and a deep darkness, lasting for 3 hours, settled over the land. The darkness was preternatural in its time and occasion,

whatever natural agencies may have been concerned in it. The earthquake a little later (Matthew) would be due to the same causes. It was as if Nature veiled itself, and shuddered at the enormity of the crime which was being perpetrated.

**d) The Great Darkness — the Cry of Desertion:**

But the outer gloom was only the symbol of a yet more awful darkness that, toward the close of this period, overspread the soul of Jesus Himself. Who shall fathom the depths of agony that lay in that awful cry — the 4th from the cross — that burst loudly from the lips of Jesus, “Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani” — “My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me” (or, “Why didst thou forsake me?”) — words borrowed from ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 22:1! It was before remarked that death was not a natural event to Jesus, but ever had in it to His mind its significance as a judgment of God on sin. Here it was not simply death that He experienced in its most cruel form, but death bereft of the sensible comforts of the Father’s presence. What explanation of that mystery can be found which does not take into account with Isaiah 53 (compare ~~John~~ John 1:29) His character as Sin-Bearer, even as the unbroken trust with which in His loneliness He clings to God (“My God”) may be felt to have in it the element of atonement? On this, however, the present is not the place to dwell.

**e) Last Words and Death of Jesus:**

The end was now very near. The victim of crucifixion sometimes lingered on in his agony for days; but the unexampled strain of body and mind which Jesus had undergone since the preceding day brought an earlier termination to His sufferings. Light was returning, and with it peace; and in the consciousness that all things were now finished (~~John~~ John 19:28), Jesus spoke again — the 5th word — “I thirst” (John). A sponge filled with vinegar was raised on a reed to His lips, while some who had heard His earlier words (“Eli, Eli,” etc.), and thought He called for Elijah, said, “Let us see whether Elijah cometh to save him” (Matthew). With a last effort, Jesus cried aloud — 6th and memorable word — “It is finished,” then, in a final utterance — the 7th — commended His spirit to God: “Father into thy hands I commend my spirit” (Luke). Following on this word, bowing His head, He surrendered Himself to death. It will be seen that of the 7 words spoken from the cross, 3 are preserved by Luke alone (1st, 2nd, 7th), 3 by John alone (3rd, 5th, 6th), while the 4th cry (“Eli, Eli,” etc.)

occurs only in the first 2 evangelists (Matthew and Mark, however, speak of Jesus “crying with a loud voice” at the close).

**f) The Spear Thrust — Earthquake and Rending of the Veil:**

Jesus had died; the malefactors still lived. It was now 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and it was desired that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the approaching Sabbath. Permission was therefore obtained from Pilate for the soldiers to break the legs of the crucified (*crurifragium*), and so hasten death. When it was discovered that Jesus was already dead, a soldier, possibly to make sure, pierced His side with a spear, and John, who was present, notices as a special fact that “there came out blood and water” (19:34). Whether this means, as Stroud and others have contended, that Jesus literally died of rupture of the heart, or what other physiological explanation may be given of the phenomenon, to which the apostle elsewhere attaches a symbolical significance (~~1~~ 1 John 5:6), need not be here discussed (*see BLOOD AND WATER*). This, however, was not the only startling and symbolically significant fact attending the death of Jesus. A great darkness had preluded the death; now, at the hour of His termination, the veil of the temple (i.e. of the inner shrine) was rent from top to bottom — surely a sign that the way into the holiest of all was now opened for mankind (~~8~~ Hebrews 9:8,12) — and a great earthquake shook the city and rent the rocks. Matthew connects with this the statement that from the tombs thus opened “many bodies of the saints .... were raised; and coming forth out of the tombs after his resurrection they entered into the holy city and appeared unto many” (27:52,53). There is nothing in itself improbable, though none of the other evangelists mention it, in such an early demonstration being given of what the Lord's death and resurrection meant for believers. In other ways the power of the cross was revealed. A dying robber had been won to penitence; now the centurion who commanded the soldiers was brought to the avowal, “Truly this was the Son of God” (Matthew, Mark; in Luke, “a righteous man”). The mood of the crowd, too, was changed since the morning; they “returned, smiting their breasts” (~~23~~ Luke 23:48). “Afar off,” speechless with sorrow, stood the women who had followed Jesus from Galilee, with other friends and disciples. The evangelists name Mary Magdalene, Mary, the mother of James and Joses, Salome (Mark), and Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward (Luke).

**2. The Burial:**

**(~~425~~) MATTHEW 27:57-66; COMPARE 28:11-15; (~~415~~) MARK 15:42-47; (~~428~~) LUKE 23:50-56; (~~418~~) JOHN 19:38-42)**

Jesus had conquered hearts on His cross; now His death reveals friends from the wealthier classes, hitherto kept back by fear (~~418~~ John 19:38,39), who charge themselves with His honorable burial. One was Joseph of Arimathea, a just man, “looking for the kingdom of God,” of whom the interesting fact is recorded that, though a member of the Sanhedrin, “he had not consented to their counsel and deed” (Luke); the other was Nicodemus, he who came to Jesus by night (~~411~~ John 3:1,2; 19:39), mentioned again only in ~~415~~ John 7:50-52, where, also as a member of the Sanhedrin, he puts in a word for Jesus.

**a) The New Tomb:**

Joseph of Arimathea takes the lead. “Having dared,” as Mark says (15:43, Gr), he begged the body of Jesus from Pilate, and having obtained it, bought linen cloth wherein to wrap it, and reverently buried it in a new rock-tomb of his own (Matthew, Mark), “where never man had yet lain” (Luke). John furnishes the further particulars that the tomb was in a “garden,” near where Jesus was crucified (19:41,42). He tells also of the munificence of Nicodemus, who brought as much as 100 pounds (about 75 lbs. avoirdupois) of spices — “a mixture of myrrh and aloes” (19:39), with which to enwrap the body of Jesus. This is not to be thought of as an “anointing”: rather, the spices formed a powder strewn between the folds of the linen bandages (compare Luthardt, Commentary on ~~410~~ John 19:40). The body, thus prepared, was then placed in the tomb, and a great stone rolled to tile entrance. The burial was of necessity a very hurried one, which the holy women who witnessed it — Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joseph — are specially mentioned (Matthew, Mark) — purposed to supplement by an anointing when the Sabbath was past (compare ~~428~~ Luke 23:56).

**b) The Guard of Soldiers:**

Though Jesus was dead, the chief priests and Pharisees were far from easy in their minds about Him. Mysterious words of His had been quoted about His building of the temple in three days; possibly Judas had told something about His sayings regarding His death and rising again on the 3rd day; in any case, His body was in the hands of His disciples, and they might remove it, and create the persuasion that He had risen. With this plea they went to Pilate, and asked from him a watch of soldiers to guard the tomb.

To make assurance doubly sure, they sealed the tomb with the official seal. The result of their efforts was only, under Providence, to provide new evidence of the reality of the resurrection!

The uncertainty attaching to the site of Golgotha attaches also to the site of Joseph's rock-tomb. Opinion is about equally divided in favor of, and against, the traditional site, where the Church of the Holy Sepulchre now stands. A principal ground of uncertainty is whether that site originally lay within or without the second wall of the city (compare Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, 457 ff; G.A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 576; a good conspectus of the different opinions, with the authorities, is given in Andrews, Part VII).

### *F. THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION*

The Resurrection a Fundamental Fact:

The resurrection of Jesus, with its completion in the ascension, setting the seal of the Father's acceptance on His finished work on earth, and marking the decisive change from His state of humiliation to that of exaltation, may be called in a true sense the corner stone of Christianity (compare ~~Acts 1~~1 Corinthians 15:14,17). It was on the preaching of Christ crucified and risen that the Christian church was founded (e.g. ~~Acts 2~~Acts 2:32-36; ~~Acts 1~~1 Corinthians 15:3,4). Professor Harnack would distinguish between "the Easter faith" (that Jesus lives with God) and "the Easter message," but the church never had any Easter faith apart from the Easter message. The subversion of the fact of the resurrection is therefore a first task to which unbelief addresses itself. The modern spirit rules it out a priori as miraculous. The historical fact is denied, and innumerable theories (imposture, theories of swoon, of hallucination, mythical theories, spiritualistic theories, etc.) are invented to explain the belief. None of these theories can stand calm examination (see the writer's work, The Resurrection of Jesus). The objections are but small dust of the balance compared with the strength of the evidence for the fact. From the standpoint of faith, the resurrection of Jesus is the most credible of events. If Jesus was indeed such an One as the gospel history declares Him to be, it was impossible that death should hold Him (~~Acts 2~~Acts 2:24). The resurrection, in turn, confirms His claim to be the Son of God (~~Romans 1~~Romans 1:4).



## 1. The Resurrection:

**(MATTHEW 28; MARK 16; LUKE 24; JOHN 20; 21; ~~<43B>~~1  
CORINTHIANS 15:3-8)**

With the narratives of the resurrection are here included as inseparably connected, those of the appearances of Jesus in Jerusalem and Galilee. The accounts will show that, while the body of Jesus was a true body, identical with that which suffered on the cross (it could be seen, touched, handled), it exhibited attributes which showed that Jesus had entered, even bodily, on a new phase of existence, in which some at least of the ordinary limitations of body were transcended. Its condition in the interval between the resurrection and the ascension was an intermediate one — no longer simply natural, yet not fully entered into the state of glorification. “I am not yet ascended .... I ascend” (~~<43B>~~John 20:17); in these two parts of the one saying the mystery of the resurrection body is comprised.

### **a) The Easter Morning — the Open Tomb:**

The main facts in the resurrection narratives stand out clearly. “According to all the Gospels,” the arch-skeptic Strauss concedes, “Jesus, after having been buried on the Friday evening, and lain during the Sabbath in the grave, came out of it restored to life at daybreak on Sunday” (New Life of Jesus, I, 397, English translations). Discrepancies are alleged in detail as to the time, number, and names of the women, number of angels, etc.; but most of these vanish on careful examination. The Synoptics group their material, while John gives a more detailed account of particular events.

### **(1) The Angel and the Keepers.**

No eye beheld the actual resurrection, which took place in the early morning, while it was still dark. Matthew records that there was “a great earthquake,” and tells of the descent of an angel of the Lord, who rolled away the stone, and sat upon it. Before his dazzling aspect the keepers became as dead men, and afterward fled. The chief priests bribed them to conceal the facts, and say the body had been stolen (~~<43B>~~Matthew 28:2-4,11-15).

### **(2) Visit of the Women.**

The first intimation of the resurrection to the disciples was the discovery of the empty tomb by the women who had come at early dawn (~~<43B>~~Matthew



28:1; ~~416B~~ Mark 16:2; ~~424B~~ Luke 24:1; ~~430B~~ John 20:1) with spices, prepared to anoint the body of Jesus (~~416B~~ Mark 16:1; compare ~~428B~~ Luke 23:56).

Apparently ignorant of the guard, the women were concerned on their way as to who should roll away the stone from the door of the tomb (~~416B~~ Mark 16:3), and were much surprised to find the stone rolled away, and the tomb open. There is no need for supposing that the women mentioned all came together. It is much more probable that they came in different groups or companies — perhaps Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, or these with Salome, first (Matthew, Mark; compare the “we” of ~~430B~~ John 20:2); then Joanna and other members of the Galilean band (Luke). (On the appearance of Jesus to Mary, see below.)

### (3) The Angelic Message.

As the women stood, perplexed and affrighted, at the tomb, they received a vision of angels (Matthew and Mark speak only of one angel; Luke and John mention two; all allude to the dazzling brightness), who announced to them that Jesus had risen (“He is not here; for he is risen; .... come, see the place where the Lord lay”), and bade them tell His disciples that He went before them to Galilee, where they should see Him (Matthew, Mark; Luke, who does not record the Galilean appearances, omits this part, and recalls the words spoken by Jesus in Galilee, concerning His death and resurrection; compare ~~416B~~ Matthew 16:21). The women departed with “trembling and astonishment” (Mark), yet “with great joy” (Matthew). Here the original Mark breaks off (~~416B~~ Mark 16:8), the remaining verses being an appendix. But it is granted that Mark must originally have contained an account of the report to the disciples, and of an appearance of Jesus in Galilee.

#### **b) Visit of Peter and John — Appearance to Mary:**

#### **(JOHN; COMPARE ~~416B~~ MARK 16:9,10; ~~424B~~ LUKE 24:12,24)**

The narrative in John enlarges in important respects those of the Synoptics. From it we learn that Mary Magdalene (no companion is named, but one at least is implied in the “we” of 20:2), concluding from the empty tomb that the body of Jesus had been removed, at once ran to carry the news to Peter and John (“They have taken away the Lord out of the tomb, and we know not where they have laid him”). These apostles lost no time in hastening to the spot. John, who arrived first, stooping down, saw the linen cloths lying,

while Peter, entering, beheld also the napkin for the head rolled up in a place by itself. After John likewise had entered (“He saw, and believed”), they returned to their home. Meanwhile Mary had come back disconsolate to the tomb, where, looking in, she, like the other women, had a vision of two angels. It was then that Jesus addressed her, “Why weepest thou?” At first she thought it was the gardener, but on Jesus tenderly naming her, “Mary,” she recognized who it was, and, with the exclamation, “Rabboni” (“Teacher”), would have clasped Him, but He forbade: “Touch me not,” etc. (~~A17~~ John 20:17, margin “Take not hold on me”), i.e. “Do not wait, but hasten to tell my disciples that I am risen, and ascend to my Father” (the ascension-life had already begun, altering earlier relations).

### Report to the Disciples — Incredulity.

The appearance of Jesus to the other women (~~A189~~ Matthew 28:9,10) is referred to below. It is probable that, on the way back, Mary Magdalene rejoined her sisters, and that the errand to the disciples — or such of them as could be found — was undertaken together. Their report was received with incredulity (~~A241~~ Luke 24:11; compare ~~A161~~ Mark 16:11). The visit of Peter referred to in ~~A242~~ Luke 24:12 is doubtless that recorded more precisely in John.

### c) Other Easter-Day Appearances (Emmaus, Jerusalem):

Ten appearances of Jesus altogether after His resurrection are recorded, or are referred to; of these five were on the day of resurrection. They are the following:

- (1) The first is the appearance to Mary Magdalene above described.
- (2) The second is an appearance to the women as they returned from the tomb, recorded in ~~A189~~ Matthew 28:9,10. Jesus met them, saying, “All hail,” and as they took hold of His feet and worshipped Him, He renewed the commission they had received for the disciples. Some regard this as only a generalization of the appearance to Mary Magdalene, but it seems distinct.
- (3) An appearance to Peter, attested by both ~~A26~~ Luke 24:34 and Paul (~~A156~~ 1 Corinthians 15:5). This must have been early in the day, probably soon after Peter’s visit to the tomb. No particulars are given of this interview, so marked an act of grace of the risen Lord to His repentant apostle. The news of it occasioned much excitement among the disciples (~~A26~~ Luke 24:34).

(4) The fourth was an appearance to two disciples on their way from Jerusalem to Emmaus — a village about two hours distant (◀D12 Luke 24:12-35; ▶H12 Mark 16:12,13). They were conversing on the sad events of the last few days, and on the strange tidings of the women's vision of angels, when Jesus overtook them, and entered into conversation with them. At first they did not recognize Him — a token, as in Mary's case, of change in His appearance — though their hearts burned within them as He opened to them the Scriptures about Christ's sufferings and glory. As the day was closing, Jesus abode with them to the evening meal; then, as He blessed and brake the bread, "Their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight" (◀D24 Luke 24:30,31). They hastily rose, and returned to the company of disciples at Jerusalem. According to ▶H13 Mark 16:13, their testimony, like that of the women, was not at first believed.

(5) The fifth appearance was that to "the eleven," with others, in the evening — an appearance recorded by Luke (24:36 ff), and John (20:19-23), and alluded to by Paul (▶H15 1 Corinthians 15:5). The disciples from Emmaus had just come in, and found the company thrilling with excitement at the news that the Lord had appeared to Simon (Luke). The doors were closed for fear of the Jews, when suddenly Jesus appeared in their midst with the salutation, "Peace be unto you" (Luke, John; doubt is unnecessarily cast on ▶D26 Luke 24:36,40, by their absence from some Western texts). The disciples were affrighted; they thought they had seen a spirit (Luke); "disbelieved for joy" (◀D24 Luke 24:41). To remove their fears, Jesus showed them His hands and His feet (in Jn, His side), and ate before them (Luke). He then breathed on them, saying, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit," and renewed the commission formerly given to remit and retain sins (John; compare ▶H17 Matthew 18:17,18). The breathing was anticipative of the later effusion of the Spirit at Pentecost (compare ▶H19 John 7:39; Acts 2); the authority delegated depends for its validity on the possession of that Spirit, and its exercise according to the mind of Christ (compare e.g. ▶H18 1 Corinthians 5:3). The incident strikingly illustrates at once the reality of Christ's risen body, and the changed conditions under which that body now existed.

**d) The Second Appearance to the Eleven — the Doubt of Thomas:**

Eight days after this first appearance — i.e. the next Sunday evening — a second appearance of Jesus to the apostles took place in the same chamber

and under like conditions (“the doors being shut”). The peculiar feature of this second meeting was the removal of the doubt of Thomas who, it is related, had not been present on the former occasion. Thomas, devoted (compare <sup><B116></sup>John 11:16), but of naturally questioning temperament (<sup><B145></sup>John 14:5), refused to believe on the mere report of others that the Lord had risen, and demanded indubitable sensible evidence for himself. Jesus, at the second appearance, after salutation as before, graciously gave the doubting apostle the evidence he asked: “Reach hither thy finger, and see my hands,” etc. (<sup><B17></sup>John 20:27), though, as the event proved, the sign was not needed. The faith and love of the erst-while doubter leaped forth at once in adoring confession: “My Lord and my God.” It was well; but Jesus reminded him that the highest faith is not that which waits on the evidence of sense (“Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed,” <sup><B19></sup>John 20:29).

#### e) The Galilean Appearances:

The scene now shifts for the time to Galilee. Jesus had appointed to meet with His disciples in Galilee (<sup><B32></sup>Matthew 26:32; <sup><B17></sup>Mark 16:7; compare <sup><B148></sup>Mark 14:28). Prior, however, to this meeting — that recorded in <sup><B36></sup>Matthew 28:16-20, probably to be identified with the appearance “to above five hundred brethren at once” mentioned by Paul (<sup><B51></sup>1 Corinthians 15:6) — there is another appearance of Jesus to seven disciples at the Lake of Galilee, of which the story is preserved in <sup><B200></sup>John 21:1-23.

#### (1) At the Sea of Tiberias — the Draught of Fishes — Peter’s Restoration.

The chapter which narrates this appearance of Jesus at the Lake of Galilee (“Sea of Tiberias”) is a supplement to the Gospel, but is so evidently Johannine in character that it may safely be accepted as from the pen of the beloved disciple (thus Lightfoot, Meyer, Godet, Alford, etc.). The appearance itself is described as the third to the disciples (<sup><B214></sup>John 21:14), i.e. the third to the apostles collectively, and in Jn’s record seven disciples are stated to have been present, of whom five are named — Peter, Thomas, Nathaniel (probably to be identified with Bartholomew), and the sons of Zebedee, James and John. The disciples had spent the night in fishing without result. In the morning Jesus — yet unrecognized — appeared on the beach, and bade them cast down their net on the right side of the boat. The draught of fishes which they took revealed to John the presence of the Master. “It is the Lord,” he said to Peter, who at once flung himself into

the lake to go to Jesus. On landing, the disciples found a fire of coals, with fish placed on it, and bread; and Jesus Himself, after more fish had been brought, distributed the food, and, it seems implied, Himself shared in the meal. Still a certain awe — another indication of a mysterious change in Christ's appearance — restrained the disciples from asking openly, "Who art thou?" (~~4912~~ John 21:12). It was not long, however ("when they had broken their fast"), before Jesus sufficiently disclosed Himself in the touching episode of the restoration of Peter (the three-fold question, "Lovest thou me?" answering to the three-fold denial, met by Peter's heartfelt, "Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee," with the words of reinstatement, "Feed my lambs," "Feed my sheep"). In another way, Jesus foretold that Peter would have the opportunity of taking back his denial in the death by which he should glorify God (~~4918~~ John 21:18,19; tradition says he was crucified head-downward). Curious inquiries were set aside, and attention recalled to duty, "Follow thou me" (~~4922~~ John 21:22).

## **(2) On the Mountain — the Great Commission — Baptism.**

Though only the eleven apostles are named in Matthew's account (~~4936~~ Matthew 28:16), the fact of an 'appointment' for a definite time and place ("the mountain"), and the terms in which the message was given to the "disciples," suggests a collective gathering such as is implied in Paul's "above five hundred brethren at once" (~~4936~~ 1 Corinthians 15:6). The company being assembled, Jesus appeared; still, at first, with that element of mystery in His appearance, which led some to doubt (~~4937~~ Matthew 28:17). Such doubt would speedily vanish when the Lord, announcing Himself as clothed with all authority in heaven and earth, gave to the apostles the supreme commission to "make disciples of all the nations" (~~4938~~ Matthew 28:18-20; compare ~~4965~~ Mark 16:15, "Go ye into all the world" etc.). Discipleship was to be shown by baptism "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (one name, yet threefold), and was to be followed by instruction in Christ's commands. Behind the commission, world-wide in its scope, and binding on every age, stands the word of never-failing encouragement, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Doubts of the genuineness of these august utterances go as a rule with doubt of the resurrection itself.

It will be noticed that the Lord's Supper and Baptism are the only sacraments instituted by Jesus in His church.

### f) Appearance to James:

Paul records, as subsequent to the above, an appearance of Jesus to James, known as “the Lord’s brother” (<sup><657></sup>1 Corinthians 15:7; compare <sup><809></sup>Galatians 1:19). No particulars are given of this appearance, which may have occurred either in Galilee or Jerusalem. James, so far as known, was not a believer in Jesus before the crucifixion (compare <sup><808></sup>John 7:3); after the ascension he and the other brethren of Jesus are found in the company of the disciples (<sup><404></sup>Acts 1:14), and he became afterward a chief “pillar” of the church at Jerusalem (<sup><809></sup>Galatians 1:19; 2:9). This appearance may have marked the turning-point.

### g) The Last Meeting:

The final appearance of Jesus to the apostles (<sup><657></sup>1 Corinthians 15:7) is that which Luke in the closing verses of his Gospel (<sup><244></sup>Luke 24:44-53), and in <sup><408></sup>Acts 1:3-12, brings into direct relation with the ascension. In the Gospel Luke proceeds without a break from the first appearance of Jesus to “the eleven” to His last words about “the promise of my Father”; but Acts 1 shows that a period of 40 days really elapsed during which Jesus repeatedly “appeared” to those whom He had chosen. This last meeting of Jesus with His apostles was mainly occupied with the Lord’s exposition of the prophetic Scriptures (<sup><244></sup>Luke 24:44-46), with renewed commands to preach repentance and forgiveness of sins in His name, “beginning from Jerusalem” (<sup><247></sup>Luke 24:47,48; compare <sup><408></sup>Acts 1:8), and with the injunction to tarry in Jerusalem till the Spirit should be given (<sup><249></sup>Luke 24:49; compare <sup><408></sup>Acts 1:4,5). Then He led them forth to Olivet, “over against Bethany,” and, while blessing them, “was carried up into heaven” (<sup><250></sup>Luke 24:50,51; compare <sup><408></sup>Acts 1:10,12).

## 2. The Ascension:

**(<sup><250></sup>LUKE 24:50-53; <sup><408></sup>ACTS 1:6-14; COMPARE <sup><409></sup>MARK 16:19)**

Jesus had declared, “I ascend unto my Father” (<sup><807></sup>John 20:17), and Luke in Acts 1 narrates the circumstances of that departure. Jesus might simply have “vanished” from the sight of His disciples, as on previous occasions, but it was His will to leave them in a way which would visibly mark the final close of His association with them. They are found, as in the Gospel, “assembled” with Him at Jerusalem, where His final instructions are given. Then the scene insensibly changes to Olivet, where the ascension is located

(~~<4012>~~ Acts 1:12). The disciples inquire regarding the restoration of the kingdom to Israel (even yet their minds are held in these temporal conceptions), but Jesus tells them that it is not for them to know times and seasons, which the Father had set within His own authority (~~<4007>~~ Acts 1:7). Far more important was it for them to know that within the next days they should receive power from the Holy Spirit to be witnesses for Him to the uttermost part of the earth (~~<4008>~~ Acts 1:8). Even as He spake, He was taken up, and a cloud received Him out of their sight (~~<4009>~~ Acts 1:9). Then, as the apostles stood gazing upward, two heavenly messengers appeared, who comforted them with the assurance that in like manner as they had seen Jesus ascend into heaven, so also would He come again. For that return the church still prays and waits (compare ~~<6220>~~ Revelation 22:20).

*See, further, ASCENSION.*

Retracing their steps to Jerusalem, the apostles joined the larger company of disciples in the “upper room” where their meetings seem to have been habitually held, and there, with one accord, to the number of about 120 (~~<4015>~~ Acts 1:15), they all continued steadfastly in prayer till “the promise of the Father” (~~<0249>~~ Luke 24:49; ~~<4004>~~ Acts 1:4) was, at Pentecost, bestowed upon them.

## **PART IV. EPILOGUE: THE APOSTOLIC TEACHING**

### *1. After the Ascension:*

The earthly life of Jesus is finished. With His resurrection and ascension a new age begins. Yet the work of Christ continues. As Luke expressively phrases it in ~~<4004>~~ Acts 1:1,2, the Gospels are but the records of “all that Jesus began both to do and to teach, until the day in which he was received up.” It is beyond the scope of this article to trace the succeeding developments of Christ’s activity through His church and by His Spirit; in order, however, to bring the subject to a proper close, it is necessary to glance, even if briefly, at the light thrown back by the Spirit’s teachings, after the ascension, on the significance of the earthly life itself, and at the enlargement of the apostles’ conceptions about Christ, consequent on this, as seen in the Epistles and the Apocalypse.

### *2. Revelation through the Spirit:*

It was the promise of Jesus that, after His departure, the Spirit would be given to His disciples, to teach them all things, and bring to their

remembrance all that He had said to them (~~4346~~ John 14:26). It was not a new revelation they were to receive, but illumination and guidance of their minds into the meaning of what they had received already (~~4343~~ John 16:13-15). This promise of the Spirit was fulfilled at Pentecost (Acts 2). Only a few personal manifestations of Jesus (~~4075~~ Acts 7:55,56; 22:17,18; 23:11) are recorded after that event — the two chief being the appearance to Paul on the way to Damascus (~~4338~~ 1 Corinthians 15:8; compare ~~4098~~ Acts 9:3 ff, etc.), and the appearance in vision to John in Patmos (~~4010~~ Revelation 1:10 ff). The rest was internal revelation (compare ~~4812~~ Galatians 1:12,16; ~~4017~~ Ephesians 1:17; 3:3-5). The immense advance in enlargement and clearness of view — aided, no doubt, by Christ's parting instructions (~~4244~~ Luke 24:44-48; ~~4002~~ Acts 1:2) — is already apparent in Peter's discourses at Pentecost; but it is not to be supposed that much room was not left for after-growth in knowledge, and deepened insight into the connection of truths. Peter, e.g., had to be instructed as to the admission of the Gentiles (~~4401~~ Acts 10:11); the apostles had much gradually to learn as to the relations of the law (compare Acts 15; 21:20 ff; Galatians 2, etc.); Paul received revelations vastly widening the doctrinal horizon; both John and Paul show progressive apprehension in the truth about Christ.

### *3. Gospels and Epistles:*

It is therefore a question of much interest how the apostolic conceptions thus gained stand related to the picture of Jesus we have been studying in the Gospels. It is the contention of the so-called "historical" (anti-supernaturalistic) school of the day that the two pictures do not correspond. The transcendental Christ of Paul and John has little in common, it is affirmed, with the Man of Nazareth of the Synoptic Gospels. Theories of the "origins of Christianity" are concocted proceeding on this assumption (compare Pfleiderer, Weizsacker, Bousset, Wernle, etc.). Such speculations ignore the first conditions of the problem in not accepting the self-testimony of Jesus as to who He was, and the ends of His mission into the world. When Jesus is taken at His own valuation, and the great fact of His resurrection is admitted, the alleged contradictions between the "Jesus of history" and the "Christ of faith" largely disappear.

### *4. Fact of Christ's Lordship:*

It is forgotten how great a change in the center of gravity in the conception of Christ's person and work was necessarily involved in the facts of



Christ's death, resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of power. The life is not ignored — far from it. Its influence breathes in every page, e.g. of Paul's epistles. But the weakness, the limitations, the self-suppression — what Paul in Phil 2:7 calls the "emptying" — of that earthly life have now been left behind; the rejected and crucified One has now been vindicated, exalted, has entered into His glory. This is the burden of Peter's first address at Pentecost: "God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified" (~~<4125>~~ Acts 2:36). Could anything look quite the same after that? The change is seen in the growing substitution of the name "Christ" for "Jesus" (see at beginning of article), and in the habitual speaking of Jesus as "Lord."

### *5. Significance of Christ's Person:*

With belief in the lordship of Jesus went necessarily an enlarged conception of the significance of His person. The elements were all there in what the disciples had seen and known of Jesus while on earth (~~<4014>~~ John 1:14; ~~<6101>~~ John 1:1-3), but His exaltation not only threw back light upon His claims while on earth — confirmed, interpreted, completed them — but likewise showed the ultimate ground of these claims in the full Divine dignity of His person. He who was raised to the throne of Divine dominion; who was worshipped with honors due to God only; who was joined, with Father and with Holy Spirit as, coordinately, the source of grace and blessing, must in the fullest sense be Divine. There is not such a thing as honorary Godhead. In this is already contained in substance everything taught about Jesus in the epistles: His preexistence (the Lord's own words had suggested this, ~~<4358>~~ John 8:58; 17:5, etc.), His share in Divine attributes (eternity, etc.), in Divine works (creation, etc., ~~<4616>~~ 1 Corinthians 8:6; ~~<51016>~~ Colossians 1:16,17; ~~<8002>~~ Hebrews 1:2; ~~<6108>~~ Revelation 1:8; 3:14, etc.), in Divine worship (Phil 2:9-11; ~~<611>~~ Revelation 5:11,12, etc.), in Divine names and titles (~~<8008>~~ Hebrews 1:8, etc.). It is an extension of the same conception when Jesus is represented as the end of creation — the "Head" in whom all things are finally to be summed up (~~<4010>~~ Ephesians 1:10; compare ~~<8016>~~ Hebrews 2:6-9). These high views of the person of Christ in the Epistles are everywhere assumed to be the possession of the readers.

Jesus had furnished His disciples with the means of understanding His death as a necessity of His Messianic vocation, endured for the salvation of the world; but it was the resurrection and exaltation which shed light on the utmost meaning of this also. Jesus died, but it was for sins. He was a

propitiation for the sin of the world (~~<4025>~~ Romans 3:25; ~~<4012>~~ 1 John 2:2; 4:10). He was `made sin' for us (~~<4021>~~ 2 Corinthians 5:21).

### *6. Significance of the Cross and Resurrection:*

The strain of Isaiah 53 runs through the New Testament teaching on this theme (compare ~~<4019>~~ 1 Peter 1:19; 2:22-25, etc.). Jesus' own word "ransom" is reproduced by Paul (~~<4026>~~ 1 Timothy 2:6). The song of the redeemed is, "Thou didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe," etc. (~~<4029>~~ Revelation 5:9). Is it wonderful, in view of this, that in the apostolic writings — not in Paul only, but in Pet, in Jn, in He, and Rev, equally — the cross should assume the decisive importance it does? Paul only works out more fully in relation to the law and the sinner's justification a truth shared by all. He himself declares it to be the common doctrine of the churches (~~<4028>~~ 1 Corinthians 15:3,4).

### *7. Hope of the Advent:*

The newer tendency is to read an apocalyptic character into nearly all the teaching of Jesus (compare Schweitzer, Quest of the Historical Jesus). This is an exaggeration, but that Jesus taught His disciples to look for His coming again, and connected with that coming the perfection of His kingdom, is plain to every reader of the Gospels. It will not be denied that the apostolic church retained this feature of the teaching of Jesus. In accordance with the promise in ~~<4011>~~ Acts 1:11, it looked for the glorious reappearing of its Lord. The Epistles are full of this hope. Even John gives it prominence (~~<4028>~~ 1 John 2:28; 3:2). In looking for the parousia as something immediately at hand, the early believers went even beyond what had been revealed, and Paul had to rebuke harmful tendencies in this direction (2 Thessalonians 2). The hope might be cherished that the coming would not long be delayed, but in face of the express declarations of Jesus that no one, not the angels, not even the Son, knew of that day and hour (~~<4023>~~ Matthew 24:36; ~~<4032>~~ Mark 13:32), and that the Father had set these things in His own authority (~~<4007>~~ Acts 1:7; compare also such intimations as in ~~<4030>~~ Matthew 13:30; 24:14; 25:19; 28:19; ~~<4011>~~ Luke 19:11, etc.), none could affirm this with certainty. Time has proved — proved it even in the apostolic age (~~<4028>~~ 2 Peter 3:3,4) — that the Advent was not so near as many thought. In part, perhaps, the church itself may be to blame for the delay. Still to faith the Advent remains the great fixed event of the future, the event which overshadows all others — in that sense is ever near — the

polesstar of the church's confidence that righteousness shall triumph, the dead shall be raised, sin shall be judged and the kingdom of God shall come.

## LITERATURE.

The literature on the life and teaching of Jesus is so voluminous, and represents such diverse standpoints, that it would be unprofitable to furnish an extended catalogue of it. It may be seen prefixed to any of the larger books. On the skeptical and rationalistic side the best account of the literature will be found in Schweitzer's book, *From Reimarus to Wrede* (English translation, *Quest of the Historical Jesus*). Of modern believing works may be specially named those of Lange, Weiss, Ellicott Edersheim, Farrar, D. Smith. Dr. Sanday's book, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, surveys a large part of the field, and is preparatory to an extended *Life* from Dr. Sanday's own pen. His article in HDB has justly attracted much attention. Schurer's *Hist of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (ET, 5 volumes; a new German edition has been published) is the best authority on the external conditions. The works on New Testament Biblical theology (Reuss, Weiss, Schmid, Stevens, etc.) deal with the teaching of Jesus; see also Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus* (ET). Works and articles on the Chronology, on Harmony of the Gospels, on geography and topography (compare especially Stanley, G.A. Smith) are legion. A good, comprehensive book on these topics is Andrews, *Life of our Lord* (revised edition). The present writer has published works on *The Virgin Birth of Christ* and *The Resurrection of Jesus*. On the relations of gospel and epistle, see J. Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*.

*See also the various articles in this Encyclopedia, on GOSPELS; THE PERSON OF CHRIST; ETHICS OF JESUS; VIRGIN BIRTH; JESUS CHRIST, ARREST AND TRIAL OF; RESURRECTION; ASCENSION; PHARISEES; SADDUCEES; HEROD; JERUSALEM, etc.*

*James Orr*

## JESUS CHRIST, THE ARREST AND TRIAL OF

This subject is of special interest, not only on account of its inherent importance, but more particularly on account of its immediately preceding, and leading directly up to what is the greatest tragedy in human history, the crucifixion of our Lord. It has also the added interest of being the only

proceeding on record in which the two great legal systems of antiquity, the Jewish and the Roman, which have most largely influenced modern legislation and jurisprudence, each played a most important part.

### *1. Jewish and Roman Law:*

The coexistence of these two systems in Judea, and their joint action in bringing about the tremendous results in question, were made possible by the generous policy pursued by Rome in allowing conquered nations to retain their ancient laws, institutions and usages, in so far as they were compatible with Roman sovereignty and supremacy. Not only so, but, in a large degree, they permitted these laws to be administered by the officials of the subject peoples. This privilege was not granted absolutely, but was permitted only so long as it was not abused. It might be withdrawn at any time, and the instances in which this was, done were by no means rare.

Of the matters considered in this article, the arrest of Jesus and the proceedings before Annas, Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin took place professedly under Jewish law; the proceedings before Pilate and the reference to Herod, under Roman law.

### *2. Difficulties of the Subject:*

It is very difficult to construct from the materials in the four Gospels a satisfactory continuous record of the arrest, and of what may be called the twofold trial of Jesus. The Gospels were written from different viewpoints, and for different purposes, each of the writers selecting such particulars as seemed to him to be of special importance for the particular object he had in view. Their reports are all very brief, and the proper chronological order of the various events recorded in different Gospels must, in many cases, be largely a matter of conjecture. The difficulty is increased by the great irregularities and the tumultuous character of the proceedings; by our imperfect knowledge of the topography of Jerusalem at this time (29 AD); also by the fact that the reports are given mainly in popular and not in technical language; and when the latter form is used, the technical terms have had to be translated into Greek, either from the Hebrew or from the Latin.

### *3. Illustrations of Difficulties:*

For instance, opinions are divided as to where Pilate resided when in Jerusalem, whether in the magnificent palace built by Herod the Great, or

in the castle of Antonia; as to where was the palace occupied by Herod Antipas during the Passover; whether Annas and Caiaphas occupied different portions of the same palace, or whether they lived in adjoining or different residences; whether the preliminary examination of Jesus, recorded by John, was before Annas or Caiaphas, and as to other similar matters. It is very satisfactory, however, to know that, although it is sometimes difficult to decide exactly as to the best way of harmonizing the different accounts, yet there is nothing irreconcilable or contradictory in them, and that there is no material point in the history of the very important proceedings falling within the scope of this article which is seriously affected by any of these debatable matters.

For a clear historical statement of the events of the concluding day in the life of our Lord before His crucifixion, see the article on JESUS CHRIST. The present article will endeavor to consider the matters relating to His arrest and trial from a legal and constitutional point of view.

## I. THE ARREST.

During the last year of the ministry of Jesus, the hostility of the Jews to Him had greatly increased, and some six months before they finally succeeded in accomplishing their purpose, they had definitely resolved to make away with Him. At the Feast of Tabernacles they sent officers (the temple-guards) to take Him while He was teaching in the temple (~~ⲉⲩⲧⲉ~~ John 7:32); but these, after listening to His words, returned without having made the attempt, giving as a reason that “never man so spake” (~~ⲉⲩⲧⲉ~~ John 7:46).

After His raising of Lazarus, their determination to kill Him was greatly intensified. A special meeting of the council was held to consider the matter. There Caiaphas, the high priest, strongly advocated such a step on national grounds, and on the ground of expediency, quoting in support of his advice, in a cold-blooded and cynical manner, the Jewish adage that it was expedient that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. Their plans to this end were frustrated, for the time being, by Jesus withdrawing Himself to the border of the wilderness, where He remained with His disciples (~~ⲉⲩⲧⲉ~~ John 11:47-54).

On His return to Bethany and Jerusalem, six days before the Passover, they were deterred from carrying out their design on account of His manifest popularity with the people, as evidenced by His triumphal entry into

Jerusalem on the first day of the Passover week (Palm Sunday), and by the crowds who thronged around Him, and listened to His teachings in the temple, and who enjoyed the discomfiture of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Herodians, as they successively sought to entangle Him in His talk.

Two days before the Passover, at a council meeting held in the palace of Caiaphas, they planned to accomplish their purpose by subtlety, but “not during the feast, lest a tumult arise among the people” (~~ⲁⲓⲃⲃ~~ Matthew 26:3-5; ~~ⲁⲓⲔⲁ~~ Mark 14:1,2). While they were in this state of perplexity, to their great relief Judas came to them and agreed to betray his Master for money (~~ⲁⲓⲃⲃ~~ Matthew 26:14-16; ~~ⲁⲓⲔⲁ~~ Mark 14:10,11).

### *1. Preparatory Steps:*

This time they determined not to rely solely upon their own temple-guards or officers to execute their warrant or order of arrest, fearing that these officials, being Jews, might again be fascinated by the strange influence which Jesus exercised over His countrymen, or that His followers might offer resistance. They therefore applied to Pilate, the Roman procurator (governor), for the assistance of a band of Roman soldiers. He granted them a cohort (Greek: [*speira*], 400 to 600 men) from the legion then quartered in the castle of Antonia, which adjoined and overlooked the temple-area. The final arrangements as to these would probably be completed while Judas was at the supper room. It has been suggested that the whole cohort would not go, but only a selection from them. However, it is said that Judas “received the band (cohort) of soldiers” (~~ⲁⲓⲃⲃ~~ John 18:3), and that they were under the command of a chief captain (Greek: [*chiliarch*], Latin tribune, ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲃ~~ John 18:12). If there had not been more than 100 soldiers, they would not have been under the command of a captain, but the chief officer would have been a centurion. The amazing popularity of Jesus, as shown by His triumphal entry into the city, may have led the authorities to make such ample provision against any possible attempt at rescue.

The Garden of Gethsemane, in which Judas knew that Jesus would be found that night, was well known to him (~~ⲁⲓⲃⲃ~~ John 18:2); and he also knew the time he would be likely to find his Master there. Thither at the proper hour he led the band of soldiers, the temple officers and others, and also some of the chief priests and elders themselves; the whole being described as “a great multitude with swords and staves” (~~ⲁⲓⲃⲃ~~ Matthew 26:47).

Although the Easter full moon would be shining brightly, they also carried “lanterns and torches” (~~<488B>~~ John 18:3), in order to make certain that Jesus should not escape or fail to be recognized in the deep shade of the olive trees in the garden.

## *2. The Arrest in the Garden:*

On their arrival at the garden, Jesus came forward to meet them, and the traitor Judas gave them the appointed signal by kissing Him. As the order or warrant was a Jewish one, the temple officers would probably be in front, the soldiers supporting them as reserves. On Jesus announcing to the leaders that He was the one they sought, what the chief priests had feared actually occurred. There was something in the words or bearing of Jesus which awed the temple officers; they were panic-stricken, went backward, and fell to the ground. On their rallying, the impetuous Peter drew his sword, and cut off the ear of one of them, Malchus, the servant of the high priest (~~<488B>~~ John 18:6-10).

On this evidence of resistance the Roman captain and soldiers came forward, and with the assistance of the Jewish officers bound Jesus. Under the Jewish law this was not lawful before condemnation, save in exceptional cases where resistance was either offered or apprehended.

Even in this trying hour the concern of Jesus was more for others than for Himself, as witness His miracle in healing the ear of Malchus, and His request that His disciples might be allowed their liberty (~~<488B>~~ John 18:8). Notwithstanding His efforts, His followers were panic-stricken, probably on account of the vigorous action of the officers and soldiers after the assault by Peter, “and they all left him and fled” (~~<414B>~~ Mark 14:50).

It is worthy of note that Jesus had no word of blame or censure for the Roman officers or soldiers who were only doing their sworn duty in supporting the civil authorities; but His pungent words of reproach for not having attempted His arrest while He was teaching openly in the temple were reserved for “the chief priests, and captains of the temple, and elders” (~~<427B>~~ Luke 22:52), who had shown their inordinate zeal and hostility by taking the unusual, and for those who were to sit as judges on the case, the improper and illegal course of accompanying the officers, and themselves taking part in the arrest.

### *3. Taken to the City:*

The whole body departed with their prisoner for the city. From the first three Gospels one might infer that they went directly to the palace of Caiaphas, the high priest. In the Fourth Gospel, however, we are told that they took him first to Annas (~~<B1813>~~ John 18:13).

Why they did so we are not informed, the only statement made being that he was the father-in-law of Caiaphas (~~<B1813>~~ John 18:13). He had been the high priest from 7 AD to 15 AD, when he was deposed by Valerius Gratus, the Roman procurator. He was still the most influential member of the Sanhedrin, and, being of an aggressive disposition, it may be that it was he who had given instructions as to the arrest, and that they thought it their duty to report first to him.

Annas, however, sent Jesus bound to Caiaphas (~~<B1824>~~ John 18:24). Having delivered over their prisoner, the Roman soldiers would proceed to their quarters in the castle, the temple officials retaining Jesus in their charge.

Meanwhile, the members of the Sanhedrin were assembling at the palace of the high priest, and the preliminary steps toward the first or Jewish trial were being taken.

## **II. THE JEWISH TRIAL.**

### *1. The Jewish Law:*

It is the just boast of those countries whose jurisprudence had its origin in the common law of England, that their system of criminal law is rounded upon the humane maxims that everyone is presumed to be innocent until he is proved to be guilty, and that no one is bound to criminate himself. But the Jewish law went even farther in the safeguards which it placed around an accused person. In the Pentateuch it is provided that one witness shall not be sufficient to convict any man of even a minor offense. "One witness shall not rise up against a man for any iniquity, or for any sin, in any sin that he sinneth: at the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall a matter be established" (~~<B1915>~~ Deuteronomy 19:15).

### *2. The Mishna:*

These principles of the Mosaic law were elaborated and extended in the system which grew up after the return from Babylon. It was begun by the



men of the Great Synagogue, and was afterward completed by the Sanhedrin which succeeded them. Up to the time of our Lord, and for the first two centuries of the Christian era, their rules remained largely in an oral or unwritten form, until they were compiled or codified in the Mishna by Rabbi Judah and his associates and successors in the early part of the 3rd century. It is generally conceded by both Jewish and Christian writers that the main provisions, therein found for the protection of accused persons, had been long incorporated in the oral law and were recognized as a part of it in the time of Annas and Caiaphas.

### *3. Criminal Trials:*

The provisions relating to criminal trials, and especially to those in which the offense was punishable by death, were very stringent and were all framed in the interest of the accused. Among them were the following: The trial must be begun by day, and if not completed before night it must be adjourned and resumed by day; the quorum of judges in capital cases was 23, that being the quorum of the Grand Council; a verdict of acquittal, which required only a majority of one, might be rendered on the same day as the trial was completed; any other verdict could only be rendered on a subsequent day and required a majority of at least two; no prisoner could be convicted on his own evidence; it was the duty of a judge to see that the interests of the accused were fully protected.

The modern practice of an information or complaint and a preliminary investigation before a magistrate was wholly unknown to the Jewish law and foreign to its genius. The examination of the witnesses in open court was in reality the beginning of a Jewish trial, and the crime for which the accused was tried, and the sole charge he had to meet, was that which was disclosed by the evidence of the witnesses.

### *4. The Trial of Jesus:*

Let us see how far the foregoing principles and rules were followed and observed in the proceedings before the high priest in the present instance. The first step taken in the trial was the private examination of Jesus by the high priest, which is recorded only in ~~<BR>~~John 18:19-23. Opinions differ as to whether this examination was conducted by Annas at his residence before he sent Jesus to Caiaphas (~~<BR>~~John 18:24), or by the latter after Jesus had been delivered up to him.

Caiaphas was actually the high priest at the time, and had been for some years. Annas had been deposed from the office about 14 years previously by the Roman procurator; but he was still accorded the title (~~4006~~ Acts 4:6). Many of the Jews did not concede the right of the procurator to depose him, and looked upon him as still the rightful high priest. He is also said to have been at this time the vice-president of the Sanhedrin. The arguments as to which of them is called the high priest by John in this passage are based largely upon two different renderings of ~~41824~~ John 18:24. In the King James Version the verse reads "Now Annas had sent him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest," a reading based upon the Textus Receptus of the New Testament which implies that Jesus had been sent to Caiaphas before the examination. On the other hand, the Revised Version (British and American), following the Greek text adopted by Nestle and others, reads, "Annas therefore sent him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest," implying that Annas sent him to Caiaphas on account of what had taken place in the examination.

However, it is not material which of these two leading members of the Sanhedrin conducted the examination. The same may also be said as to the controversy regarding the residence of Annas at the time, whether it was in some part of the official palace of the high priest or elsewhere. The important matters are the fact, the time, and the manner of the examination by one or other of these leading members of the council, not the precise place where, or the particular person by whom, it was conducted.

### *5. The Preliminary Examination:*

The high priest (whether Annas or Caiaphas) proceeded to interrogate Jesus concerning His disciples and His doctrine (~~41819~~ John 18:19). Such a proceeding formed no part of a regular Jewish trial, and was, moreover, not taken in good faith; but with a view to entrapping Jesus into admissions that might be used against Him at the approaching trial before the council. It appears to have been in the nature of a private examination, conducted probably while the members of the council were assembling. The dignified and appropriate answer of Jesus pointedly brought before the judge the irregularity he was committing, and was a reminder that His trial should begin with the examination of the witnesses: "I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue, and in the temple, whither the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing. Why askest thou me? Ask them which heard me, what I have said unto them: behold, they know what I

said” (~~<BR>~~John 18:20,21 the King James Version). The reply to this was a blow from one of the officers, an outrageous proceeding which appears to have passed unrebuked by the judge, and it was left to Jesus Himself to make the appropriate protest.

### *6. The Night Trial:*

The next proceeding was the trial before the council in the palace of Caiaphas, attended at least by the quorum of 23. This was an illegal meeting, since a capital trial, as we have seen, could not either be begun or proceeded with at night. Some of the chief priests and elders, as previously stated, had been guilty of the highly improper act for judges, of taking part in and directing the arrest of Jesus. Now, “the chief priests and the whole council” spent the time intervening between the arrest and the commencement of the trial in something even worse: they “sought false witness against Jesus, that they might put him to death” (~~<BR>~~Matthew 26:59). This, no doubt, only means that they then collected their false witnesses and instructed them as to the testimony they should give. For weeks, ever since the raising of Lazarus, they had been preparing for such a trial, as we read: “So from that day forth they took counsel that they might put him to death” (~~<BR>~~John 11:53).

Caiaphas, as high priest and president of the Sanhedrin, presided at the meeting of the council. The oath administered to witnesses in a Jewish court was an extremely solemn invocation, and it makes one shudder to think of the high priest pronouncing these words to perjured witnesses, known by him to have been procured by the judges before him in the manner stated.

### *7. False Witnesses:*

But even this did not avail. Although “many bare false witness against him,” yet on account of their having been imperfectly tutored by their instructors, or for other cause, “their witness agreed not together” (~~<BR>~~Mark 14:56), and even these prejudiced and partial judges could not find the concurring testimony of two witnesses required by their law (~~<BR>~~Deuteronomy 19:15).

The nearest approach to the necessary concurrence came at last from two witnesses, who gave a distorted report of a figurative and enigmatic statement made by Jesus in the temple during His early ministry: “Destroy

this temple, and in three days I will raise it up” (~~4119~~ John 2:19). The explanation is given: “He spake of the temple of his body” (~~4121~~ John 2:21). The testimony of the two witnesses is reported with but slight variations in the two first Gospels as follows: “This man said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days” (~~4161~~ Matthew 26:61); and “We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another made without hands” (~~4148~~ Mark 14:58). Whether these slightly different statements represent the discrepancies in their testimony, or on account of some other variations or contradictions, the judges reluctantly decided that “not even so did their witness agree together” (~~4149~~ Mark 14:59).

### *8. A Browbeating Judge:*

Caiaphas, having exhausted his list of witnesses, and seeing the prosecution on which he had set his heart in danger of breaking down for the lack of legal evidence, adopted a blustering tone, and said to Jesus, “Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee? But Jesus held his peace” (~~4162~~ Matthew 26:62,63), relying on the fact that the prosecution had utterly failed on account of the lack of agreement of two witnesses on any of the charges. As a final and desperate resort, Caiaphas had recourse to a bold strategic move to draw from Jesus an admission or confession on which he might base a condemnation, similar to the attempt which failed at the preliminary examination; but this time fortifying his appeal by a solemn adjuration in the name of the Deity. He said to Jesus: “I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou art the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Henceforth ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven” (~~4163~~ Matthew 26:63,64). Caiaphas, although knowing that under the law Jesus could not be convicted on His own answers or admissions, thereupon in a tragic manner “rent his garments, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy: what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard the blasphemy: what think ye? They answered and said, He is worthy of death” (~~4165~~ Matthew 26:65,66).

The night session then broke up to meet again after daybreak in order to ratify the decision just come to, and to give a semblance of legality to the trial and verdict. The closing scene was one of disorder, in which they spat in their prisoner’s face and buffeted him (~~4167~~ Matthew 26:67,68; ~~4223~~ Luke 22:63-65).

### *9. The Morning Session:*

The following morning, “as soon as it was day,” the council reassembled in the same place, and Jesus was led into their presence (~~4266~~ Luke 22:66). There were probably a number of the council present who had not attended the night session. For the benefit of these, and perhaps to give an appearance of legality to the proceeding, the high priest began the trial anew, but not with the examination of witnesses which had proved such a failure at the night session. He proceeded at once to ask substantially the same questions as had finally brought out from Jesus the night before the answer which he had declared to be blasphemy, and upon which the council had “condemned him to be worthy of death” (~~4146~~ Mark 14:64). The meeting is mentioned in all the Gospels, the details of the examination are related by Luke alone. When asked whether He was the Christ, He replied, “If I tell you, ye will not believe: and if I ask you, ye will not answer. But from henceforth shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God” (~~4275~~ Luke 22:67-69). This answer not being sufficient to found a verdict of blasphemy upon, they all cried out, “Art thou then the Son of God?” To this He gave an affirmative answer, “Ye say that I am. And they said, What further need have we of witness? for we ourselves have heard from his own mouth” (~~4270~~ Luke 22:70,71).

### *10. Powers of the Sanhedrin:*

It will be observed that neither at the night nor at the morning session was there any sentence pronounced upon Jesus by the high priest. There was on each occasion only what would be equivalent to a verdict of guilty found by a jury under our modern criminal practice, but no sentence passed upon the prisoner by the presiding judge. When Judea lost the last vestige of its independence and became a Roman province (6 AD), the Sanhedrin ceased to have the right to inflict Capital punishment or to administer the law of life and death. This jurisdiction was thenceforth transferred to the Roman procurator. The Sanhedrin submitted very reluctantly to this curtailment of its powers. A few years later it exercised it illegally and in a very riotous manner in the case of Stephen (~~4178~~ Acts 7:58). Annas, however, of all men, had good reason not to violate this law, as his having done so during the absence of the procurator was the cause of his being deposed from the office of high priest by Valerius Gratus (15 AD).

The proceedings may have been taken before the high priest in the hope that Pilate might be induced to accept the verdict of the Sanhedrin as conclusive that Jesus had been guilty of an offense punishable by death under the Jewish law.

### *11. Condemnation for Blasphemy:*

Now what was the precise crime or crimes for which Jesus was tried at these two sittings of the council? The first impression would probably be that there was no connection between the charge of destroying the temple and building another in three days, and His claiming to be the Son of God. And yet they were closely allied in the Jewish mind. The Jewish nation being a pure theocracy, the overthrow of the temple, the abode of the Divine Sovereign, would mean the overthrow of Divine institutions, and be an act of treason against the Deity. The profession of ability to build another temple in three days would be construed as a claim to the possession of supernatural power and, consequently, blasphemy. As to the other claim which He Himself made and confessed to the council, namely, that He was the Christ, the Son of God, none of them would have any hesitation in concurring in the verdict of the high priest that it was rank blasphemy, when made by one whom they regarded simply as a Galilean peasant.

### *12. Summary:*

To sum up: The Jewish trial of our Lord was absolutely illegal, the court which condemned Him being without jurisdiction to try a capital offense, which blasphemy was under the Jewish law. Even if there had been jurisdiction, it would have been irregular, as the judges had rendered themselves incompetent to try the case, having been guilty of the violation of the spirit of the law that required judges to be unprejudiced and impartial, and carefully to guard the interests of the accused. Even the letter of the law had been violated in a number of important respects. Among these may be mentioned:

- (1) some of the judges taking part in and directing the arrest;
- (2) the examination before the trial and the attempt to obtain admissions;
- (3) endeavors of the judges to procure the testimony of false witnesses;

- (4) commencing and continuing the trial at night;
- (5) examining and adjuring the accused in order to extort admissions from Him;
- (5) rendering a verdict of guilty at the close of the night session, without allowing a day to intervene;
- (7) holding the morning session on a feast day, and rendering a verdict at its close; and
- (8) rendering both verdicts without any legal evidence.

### III. THE ROMAN TRIAL.

Early on the morning of Friday of the Passover week, as we have already seen, “the chief priests with the elders and scribes, and the whole council” held a consultation (Mark), in the palace of the high priest; and after the examination of Jesus and their verdict that He was guilty of blasphemy, they took counsel against Him “to put him to death” (Mt), this being, in their judgment, the proper punishment for the offense of which they had pronounced Him guilty.

#### *1. Taken before Pilate:*

For the reasons already mentioned, they came to the conclusion that it would be necessary to invoke the aid of the Roman power in carrying out this sentence. They thereupon bound Jesus, and led Him away and delivered Him up to Pilate, who at this time probably occupied, while in Jerusalem, the magnificent palace built by Herod the Great. Jesus was taken into the judgment hall of the palace or Pretorium; His accusers, unwilling to defile themselves by entering into a heathen house and thereby rendering themselves unfit to eat the Passover, remained outside upon the marble pavement.

#### *2. Roman Law and Procedure:*

The proceedings thus begun were conducted under a system entirely different from that which we have thus far been considering, both in its nature and its administration. The Jewish law was apart of the religion, and in its growth and development was administered in important cases by a large body of trained men, who were obliged to follow strictly a well-defined procedure. The Roman law, on the other hand, had its origin and

growth under the stern and manly virtues and the love of justice which characterized republican Rome, and it still jealously guarded the rights and privileges of Roman citizens, even in a conquered province. Striking illustrations of this truth are found in the life of Paul (see ~~<416>~~ Acts 16:35-39; 22:24-29; 25:10-12). The lives and fortunes of the natives in an imperial province like Judea may be said to have been almost completely at the mercy of the Roman procurator or governor, who was responsible to his imperial master alone, and not even to the Roman senate. Pilate therefore was well within the mark when, at a later stage of the trial, being irritated at Jesus remaining silent when questioned by him, he petulantly exclaimed: "Speakest thou not unto me? knowest thou not that I have power to release thee, and have power to crucify thee?" (~~<690>~~ John 19:10). While, however, the procurator was not compelled in such cases to adhere strictly to the prescribed procedure, and had a wide discretion, he was not allowed to violate or depart from the established principles of the law.

On this occasion, Pilate, respecting the scruples of the chief priests about entering the palace, went outside at their request, apparently leaving Jesus in the Pretorium. He asked them the usual formal question, put at the opening of a Roman trial: "What accusation bring ye against this man?"

### *3. Full Trial Not Desired:*

They answered and said unto him, If he were not an evil-doer, we should not have delivered him up unto thee" (~~<689>~~ John 18:29 f the King James Version). Pilate could see at once that this was a mere attempt to evade the direct question he had asked, and was not such an accusation as disclosed any offense known to the Roman law. Affecting to treat it with disdain, and as something known only to their own law, he said, "Take him yourselves, and judge him according to your law. The Jews said unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death" (~~<688>~~ John 18:31).

### *4. Final Accusation:*

Perceiving that Pilate would not gratify their desire to have Jesus condemned on the verdict which they had rendered, or for an offense against their own law only, "they began to accuse him, saying, We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself is Christ a king" (~~<231>~~ Luke 23:2). This was an accusation containing three charges, much like a modern indictment containing three counts. Pilate appears to have been satisfied that there was



nothing in the first two of these charges; but the third was too serious to be ignored, especially as it was a direct charge of majestas or treason, the greatest crime known to the Roman law, and as to which the reigning emperor, Tiberius, and his then favorite, Sejanus, were particularly sensitive and jealous. The charges in this case were merely oral, but it would appear to have been in the discretion of the procurator to receive them in this form in the case of one who was not a Roman citizen.

### *5. Examination, Defence and Acquittal:*

The accusers having been heard, Pilate returned to the Pretorium to examine Jesus regarding the last and serious accusation. The Four Gospels give in the same words the question put to him by Pilate, "Art thou the King of the Jews?" The first three record only the final affirmative answer, "Thou sayest," which if it stood alone might have been taken as a plea of guilty; but John gives the intervening discussion which explains the matter fully. He tells us that Jesus did not answer the question directly, but asked Pilate, "Sayest thou this of thyself, or did others tell it thee concerning me?" (~~EBRS~~ John 18:34) (apparently not having been outside when the charges were made). On being told that it came from the chief priests, He went on to explain that His kingdom was not of this world, but was a spiritual kingdom. Being again asked if He was a king, He replied in effect, that He was a king in that sense, and that His subjects were those who were of the truth and heard His voice (~~EBRS~~ John 18:35-37). Pilate, being satisfied with His explanation, "went out again unto the Jews," and apparently having taken Jesus with him, he mounted his judgment seat or movable tribunal, which had been placed upon the tessellated pavement, and pronounced his verdict, "I find in him no fault at all" (~~EBRS~~ John 18:38 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "I find no crime in him").

### *6. Fresh Accusations:*

According to the Roman law, this verdict of acquittal should have ended the trial and at once secured the discharge of Jesus; but instead it brought a volley of fresh accusations to which Jesus made no reply. Pilate hesitated, and hearing a charge that Jesus had begun His treasonable teaching in Galilee, the thought occurred to him that he might escape from his dilemma by sending Jesus for trial to Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee, who

was then in Jerusalem for the feast, which he accordingly did (<sup><237></sup>Luke 23:7).

### *7. Reference to Herod:*

Herod had long been desirous to see Jesus — “hoped to see some miracle done by him,” and “questioned him in many words; but he answered him nothing.” The chief priests and scribes, who had followed him from the Pretorium to the Maccabean palace, which Herod was then occupying, “stood, vehemently accusing” Jesus (<sup><238></sup>Luke 23:8-10). “That fox,” however, as Jesus had called him (<sup><239></sup>Luke 13:32), was too astute to intermeddle in a trial for treason, which was a dangerous proceeding, and possibly he was aware that Pilate had already acquitted Him; in which case a retrial by him would be illegal. He and his soldiers, probably irritated at the refusal of Jesus to give him any answer, mocked Him, and arraying Him in a gorgeous robe, no doubt in ridicule of His claim to be a king, sent Him back to Pilate. This reference to Herod in reality formed no effective part of the trial of Jesus, as Herod declined the jurisdiction, although Pilate sought to make use of it in his subsequent discussion with the chief priests. The only result was that Herod was flattered by the courtesy of Pilate, the enmity between them ceased, and they were made friends (<sup><241></sup>Luke 23:11,12,15).

### *8. Jesus or Barabbas:*

On their return, Pilate resumed his place on the judgment seat outside. What followed, however, properly formed no part of the legal trial, as it was a mere travesty upon law as well as upon justice. Pilate resolved to make another attempt to secure the consent of the Jews to the release of Jesus. To this end he summoned not only the chief priests and the rulers, but “the people” as well (<sup><243></sup>Luke 23:13), and after mentioning the failure to prove any of the charges made against Jesus, he reminded them of the custom of releasing at the feast a prisoner selected by them, and offering as a compromise to chastise or scourge Jesus before releasing Him. At this point Pilate’s anxiety to release Jesus was still further increased by the message he received from his wife concerning her disturbing dream about Jesus and warning him to “have .... nothing to do with that righteous man” (<sup><279></sup>Matthew 27:19). Meanwhile, the chief priests and elders were busily engaged in canvassing the multitude to ask for the release of Barabbas, the notable robber, and destroy Jesus (<sup><271></sup>Matthew 27:20). When Pilate urged

them to release Jesus, they cried out all together, “Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas”; and upon a further appeal on behalf of Jesus they cried, “Crucify, crucify him.” A third attempt on his part met with no better result (~~4238~~ Luke 23:18-23).

### *9. Behold the Man!:*

The Fourth Gospel alone records a final attempt on the part of Pilate to save Jesus. He scourged Him, it has been suggested, with a view to satisfying their desire for His punishment, and afterward appealing to their pity. He allowed his soldiers to repeat what they had seen done at Herod’s palace, and place a crown of thorns upon His head, array Him in a purple robe, and render mock homage to Him as king of the Jews. Pilate went out to the Jews with Jesus thus arrayed and bleeding. Again declaring that he found no fault in Him, he presented Him, saying, “Behold, the man!” This was met by the former cry, “Crucify him, crucify him.” Pilate replied, “Take him yourselves .... for I find no crime in him.” The Jews referred him to their law by which He deserved death because He made Himself the Son of God. This alarmed Pilate’s superstitious fears, who by this time appears to have wholly lost control of himself. He took Jesus into the palace and said to Him, “Whence art thou? But Jesus gave him no answer.” Irritated at His silence, Pilate reminded Him of his absolute power over Him. The mysterious answer of Jesus as to the source of power still further alarmed him, and he made new efforts to secure His discharge (~~890~~ John 19:1-9).

### *10. Pilate Succumbs to Threats:*

The Jews were well aware that Pilate was arbitrary and cruel, but they had also found that he was very sensitive as to anything that might injuriously affect his official position or his standing with his master, the emperor. As a last resort they shouted to him, “If thou release this man, thou art not Caesar’s friend: every one that maketh himself a king speaketh against Caesar” (~~892~~ John 19:12). The prospect of a charge of his aiding and abetting such a crime as treason, in addition to the other charges that a guilty conscience told him might be brought against him, proved too much for the vacillating procurator. He brought Jesus out, and sat down again upon the judgment seat placed upon the pavement. He made one more appeal, “Shall I crucify your King?” The chief priests gave the hypocritical answer, “We have no king but Caesar” (~~895~~ John 19:15). Pilate finally succumbed to their threats and clamor; but took his revenge by placing

upon the cross the superscription that was so galling to them, “*THE KING OF THE JEWS*.”

### *11. Pilate Washes His Hands:*

Then occurred the closing scene of the tragedy, recorded only in the First Gospel, when Pilate washed his hands before the multitude (a Jewish custom), saying to them, “I am innocent of the blood of this righteous man; see ye to it.” The reply was that dreadful imprecation, “His blood be on us, and on our children” (<sup>4174</sup>Matthew 27:24,25).

### *12. The Sentence:*

Pilate resumes his place upon the judgment seat, the fatal sentence at last falls from his lips, and Jesus is delivered up to be crucified.

Now, how far were these proceedings in accordance with the Roman law under which they purported to have been taken and conducted? In the first place, Pilate, as procurator, was the proper officer to try the charges brought against Jesus.

### *13. Review:*

In the next place he acted quite properly in declining to entertain a charge which disclosed no offense known to the Roman law, or to pass a sentence based on the verdict of the Sanhedrin for an alleged violation of the Jewish law. He appears to have acted in accordance with the law, and indeed in a judicial and praiseworthy manner in the trial and disposition of the threefold indictment for treason (unless it be a fact that Jesus was not present when these accusations were brought against Him outside the Pretorium, which would be merely an irregularity, as they were made known to him later inside). Pilate’s initial mistake, which led to all the others, was in not discharging Jesus at once, when he had pronounced the verdict of acquittal.

All the subsequent proceedings were contrary to both the letter and the spirit of the law. Although Pilate took his place upon the judgment seat, his acts, properly speaking, were not those of a judge, and had no legal force or value; but were rather the futile attempts of a weak and vacillating politician to appease an angry mob thirsting for the blood of an innocent countryman. The carrying out of a sentence imposed in such

circumstances, and under such conditions, may not inaptly be described as a judicial murder.

*John James Maclaren*

## **JESUS, GENEALOGY OF**

*See GENEALOGY OF JESUS.*

## **JESUS JUSTUS**

<je'-zus> <jus'-tus> [ Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰουδστος, *Iesous ho legomenos Ioustos*], “Jesus that is called Justus,” ~~Col~~ Colossians 4:11):

### **1. A JEW BY BIRTH:**

One of three friends of Paul — the others being Aristarchus and Mark — whom he associates with himself in sending salutations from Rome to the church at Colosse. Jesus Justus is not mentioned elsewhere in the New Testament, and there is nothing more known about him than is given in this passage in Colossians, namely, that he was by birth a Jew — “of the circumcision” — that he had been converted to Christ, and that he was one of the inner circle of intimate friends and associates of the apostle during his first Roman captivity.

### **2. HE REMAINS TRUE TO PAUL:**

The words also contain the information that at a stage in Paul's imprisonment, when the welcome extended to him by the Christians in Rome on his arrival there had lost its first warmth, and when in consequence, probably, of their fear of persecution, most of them had proved untrue and were holding aloof from him, J. J. and his two friends remained faithful. It would be pressing this passage unduly to make it mean that out of the large number — hundreds, or perhaps even one or two thousands — who composed the membership of the church in Rome at this time, and who within the next few years proved their loyalty to Christ by their steadfastness unto death in the Neronian persecution, all fell away from their affectionate allegiance to Paul at this difficult time. The words cannot be made to signify more than that it was the Jewish section of the church in Rome which acted in this unworthy manner — only temporarily, it is to be hoped. But among these Jewish Christians, to such dimensions had this defection grown that Aristarchus, Mark and J. J. alone were the apostle's

fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God. These three alone, at that particular time — from among the Jewish Christians — were helping him in the work of the gospel in Rome. That this defection refers to the Jewish section of the church and not to the converts from among the Gentiles, is evident from many considerations. It seems to be proved, for example by verse 14 of the same chapter (i.e. <sup><1044></sup>Colossians 4:14), as well as by <sup><5024></sup>Philemon 1:24, in both of which passages Paul names Demas and Luke as his fellow-laborers; and Luke was not a Jew by birth. But in the general failure of the Christians in Rome in their conduct toward Paul, it is with much affection and pathos that he writes concerning Aristarchus, Mark, and J. J., “These only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, men that have been a comfort unto me.”

*John Rutherford*

## JETHER

<sup><je'-ther></sup> ([<sup><r ty, yether></sup>], “abundance”):

(1) Exodus 4:18 the Revised Version margin, King James Version, margin.

*See JETHRO.*

(2) Gideon’s eldest son (<sup><0080></sup>Judges 8:20), who was called upon by his father to slay Zebah and Zalmunnah, but “feared, because he was yet a youth.” The narrative there (<sup><0084></sup>Judges 8:4 ff) should be connected with that of <sup><0063></sup>Judges 6:34, where Gideon is followed by his clan, and not with that of Judges 7, where he has 300 picked men. The captives would be taken to Orpah, Gideon’s home, and slain there.

(3) Father of Amasa (<sup><1006></sup>1 Kings 2:5,32); he was an Ishmaelite according to <sup><1317></sup>1 Chronicles 2:17 = “Ithra, the Israelite” of <sup><1075></sup>2 Samuel 17:25, where “the Ishmaelite” should be read for “the Israelite.”

(4) A Jerahmeelite (<sup><1312></sup>1 Chronicles 2:32 twice).

(5) A Judahite (<sup><1347></sup>1 Chronicles 4:17).

(6) A man of Asher (<sup><1378></sup>1 Chronicles 7:38) = “Ithran” of <sup><1375></sup>1 Chronicles 7:37.

*David Francis Roberts*

## JETHETH

<je'-theth> ([t̥t̥θ] yetheth), meaning unknown): a chief (or clan) of Edom (<sup><0360></sup>Genesis 36:40 parallel <sup><0351></sup>1 Chronicles 1:51), but probably a mistake for “Jether” = “Ithran” (<sup><0335></sup>Genesis 36:26).

## JETHLAH

<jeth'-la> ([hl̥ t̥ʲi] yithlah).

See *ITHLAH*.

## JETHRO

<jeth'-ro>, <je'-thro> ([w̥θt̥ʲi] yithro), “excellence,” Exodus 3:1; 4:18b; 18:1-12 (in 4:18a, probably a textual error, [r̥t̥ʲi, yether], “Iether,” the King James Version margin, the Revised Version margin); Septuagint always [̣' Ioθọ́p, *Iothor*): The priest of Midian and father-in-law (chothen) of Moses.

### 1. HIS RELATION TO REUEL AND HOBAB:

It is not easy to determine the relation of Jethro to Reuel and Hobab. If we identify Jethro with Reuel as in Exodus 2:18; 3:1 (and in Ant, III, iii; V, ii, 3), we must connect “Moses’ father-in-law” in <sup><04029></sup>Numbers 10:29 immediately with “Reuel” (the King James Version “Raguel”), and make Hobab the brother-in-law of Moses. But while it is possible that chothen may be used in the wider sense of a wife’s relative, it is nowhere translated “brother-in-law” except in <sup><04016></sup>Judges 1:16; 4:11 (“father-in-law,” the King James Version, the Revised Version margin). If we insert, as Ewald suggests (HI, II, 25), “Jethro son of” before “Reuel” in Exodus 2:18 (compare the Septuagint, verse 16, where the name “Jethro” is given), we would then identify Jethro with Hobab, the son of Reuel, in <sup><04029></sup>Numbers 10:29, taking “Moses’ father-in-law” to refer back to Hobab. Against this identification, however, it is stated that Jethro went away into his own country without any effort on the part of Moses to detain him (Exodus 18:27), whereas Hobab, though at first he refused to remain with the Israelites, seems to have yielded to the pleadings of Moses to become their guide to Canaan (<sup><04029></sup>Numbers 10:29-32; <sup><04016></sup>Judges 1:16, where Kittel reads “Hobab the Kenite”; 4:11). It may be noted that while the father-in-

law of Moses is spoken of as a “Midianite” in Exodus, he is called a “Kenite” in <sup>10016</sup>Judges 1:16; 4:11. From this Ewald infers that the Midianites were at that time intimately blended with the Amalekites, to which tribe the Kenites belonged (HI, II, 44).

## **2. HIS HEARTY RECEPTION OF MOSES:**

When Moses fled from Egypt he found refuge in Midian, where he received a hearty welcome into the household of Jethro on account of the courtesy and kindness he had shown to the priest's 7 daughters in helping them to water their flock. This friendship resulted in Jethro giving Moses his daughter, Zipporah, to wife (Exodus 2:15-21). After Moses had been for about 40 years in the service of his father-in-law, the angel of the Lord appeared to him in the burning bush as he was keeping the flock at Horeb, commanding him to return to Egypt and deliver his enslaved brethren out of the hands of Pharaoh (Exodus 3:1 ff). With Jethro's consent Moses left Midian to carry out the Divine commission (Exodus 4:18).

## **3. HIS VISIT TO MOSES IN THE WILDERNESS:**

When tidings reached Midian of “all that God had done for Moses, and for Israel” in delivering them from Egyptian bondage, Jethro, with a natural pride in the achievements of his relative, set out on a visit to Moses, taking Zipporah and her two sons with him (Exodus 18:1-12). On learning of his father-in-law's arrival at the “mount of God,” Moses went out to meet him, and after a cordial exchange of courtesies they retired to Moses' tent, where a pleasant interview took place between them. We are told of the interest Jethro felt in all the particulars of the great deliverance, how he “rejoiced for all the goodness which Yahweh had done to Israel,” and how the conviction was wrought within him that Yahweh was “greater than all gods; yea, in the thing wherein they dealt proudly against them” (Exodus 18:11). In this condition so expressed there is evidently a reference to the element by which the Egyptians thought in their high-handed pursuit they would be able to bring back Israel into bondage, but by which they were themselves overthrown.

It is worth noting that in the religious service in which Jethro and Moses afterward engaged, when Jethro, as priest, offered a burnt offering, and Aaron with all the elders of Israel partook of the sacrificial feast,



prominence was given to Jethro over Aaron, and thus a priesthood was recognized beyond the limits of Israel.

#### 4. HIS WISE COUNSEL:

This visit of Jethro to Moses had important consequences for the future government of Israel (Exodus 18:13-27). The priest of Midian became concerned about his son-in-law when he saw him occupied from morning to night in deciding the disputes that had arisen among the people. The labor this entailed, Jethro said, was far too heavy a burden for one man to bear. Moses himself would soon be worn out, and the people, too, would become weary and dissatisfied, owing to the inability of one judge to overtake all the cases that were brought before him. Jethro, therefore, urged Moses to make use of the talents of others and adopt a plan of gradation of judges who would dispose of all cases of minor importance, leaving only the most difficult for him to settle by a direct appeal to the will of God. Moses, recognizing the wisdom of his father-in-law's advice, readily acted upon his suggestion and appointed "able men out of all Israel, and made them heads over the people, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens." Thereafter, Jethro returned to his own country.

#### 5. HIS CHARACTER AND INFLUENCE:

The story of Jethro reveals him as a man of singular attractiveness and strength, in whom a kind, considerate disposition, a deeply religious spirit, and a wise judgment all met in happy combination. And this ancient priest of Midian made Israel and all nations his debtors when he taught the distinction between the legislative and the judicial function, and the importance of securing that all law be the expression of the Divine will, and that its application be entrusted only to men of ability, piety, integrity and truth (Exodus 18:21).

*James Crichton*

### JETUR

<je'-tur> ([rWfy] yeTur], meaning uncertain): a "son" of Ishmael (<02515>Genesis 25:15 parallel <1031>1 Chronicles 1:31); against this clan the two and a half tribes warred (<1358>1 Chronicles 5:18 f); they are the Itureans of New Testament times.

*See ITURAEA.*

## JEUEL

<je'-el> <ju'-el> ([<sup>1306</sup> a<sup>1306</sup>W[y] ye'-u'-el], meaning unknown):

- (1) A man of Judah (<sup>1306</sup>1 Chronicles 9:6); the name is not found in the parallel of <sup>1312</sup>Nehemiah 11:24.
- (2) A Levite, the King James Version “Jeiel” (<sup>1493</sup>2 Chronicles 29:13).
- (3) A companion of Ezra, the King James Version “Jeiel” (Ezr 8:13).
- (4) The name occurs also as Kethibh in <sup>1308</sup>1 Chronicles 9:35; <sup>1481</sup>2 Chronicles 26:11.

*See JEIEL, (2), (6).*

## JEUSH

<je'-ush> ([<sup>1306</sup> v<sup>1306</sup>W[y] ye`ush], probably “he protects,” “he comes to help”; see HPN, 109; Kethibh is [<sup>1306</sup> vy[y] ye`ish], in <sup>1306</sup>Genesis 36:5,14; <sup>1370</sup>1 Chronicles 7:10):

- (1) A “son” of Esau (<sup>1306</sup>Genesis 36:5,14,18; <sup>1306</sup>1 Chronicles 1:35). “The name is thought by some to be identical with that, of an Arabian lion-god Yagut ....., meaning ‘helper,’ whose antiquity is vouched for by inscriptions of Thamud” (Skinner, Gen, 432).
- (2) A Benjamite (<sup>1370</sup>1 Chronicles 7:10), but probably a Zebulunite. See Curtis, Chronicles, 145 ff.
- (3) A descendant of King Saul, the King James Version “Jehush” (<sup>1389</sup>1 Chronicles 8:39).
- (4) A Gershonite Levite (<sup>1330</sup>1 Chronicles 23:10,11).
- (5) A son of King Rehoboam (<sup>1419</sup>2 Chronicles 11:19).

*David Francis Roberts*

## JEUZ

<je'-uz> [6W[y] ye`-uts] “he counsels”): The eponym of a Benjamite family (<380>1 Chronicles 8:10).

## JEW, JEWESS, JEWISH

<ju>, <joo>, <ju'-ish>, <joo'-ish> ([ydWwhy] yehudhi] plural [pydWwhy] yehudhim]; [᾿Ιουδαῖοι, Ioudaioi]; feminine adjective [tydWwhy] yehudhith]; [᾿Ιουδαϊκός, Ioudaikos]): “Jew” denotes originally an inhabitant of Judah (<246>2 Kings 16:6 applies to the two tribes of the Southern Kingdom), but later the meaning was extended to embrace all descendants of Abraham. In the Old Testament the word occurs a few times in the singular. (<1708>Esther 2:5; 3:4, etc.; <2649>Jeremiah 34:9; Zec 8:23); very frequently in the plural in Ezra and Nehemiah, Esther, and in Jeremiah and Daniel. The adjective in the Old Testament applies only to the “Jews’ language” or speech (<2836>2 Kings 18:26,28 parallel <6134>Nehemiah 13:24; <2391>Isaiah 36:11,13). “Jews” (always plural) is the familiar term for Israelites in the Gospels (especially in John), Acts, Epistles, etc. “Jewess” occurs in <1348>1 Chronicles 4:18; <4460>Acts 16:1; 24:24. In <3014>Titus 1:14 a warning is given against “Jewish fables” (in Greek the adjective is found also in <824>Galatians 2:14). The “Jews’ religion” ([Ioudaismos]) is referred to in <8013>Galatians 1:13,14. On the “Jews’ language,” *see LANGUAGES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT*; on the “Jews’ religion,” *see ISRAEL, RELIGION OF*.

*James Orr*

## JEWEL

<ju'-el>, <joo'-el>: An ornament of gold, silver or of precious stones in the form of armlet, bracelet, anklet, nose-ring, etc. Oriental dress yields itself freely to such adornment, to which there are many allusions in Scripture. a frequent term in Hebrew is *keli* (“utensil,” “vessel”), coupled with mention of “gold” or “silver” or both (<1253>Genesis 24:53; Exodus 3:22; 11:2; 12:35; 35:22; <9938>1 Samuel 6:8,15, etc.; the Revised Version (British and American) in <4327>2 Chronicles 32:27 translations “vessels”). In <2010>Song of Solomon 1:10, where the King James Version has “rows (of jewels),” the Revised Version (British and American) has “plaits (of hair)”; in <2001>Song of Solomon 7:1, the word is from a root *chalah*, meaning “to

adorn.” In 3 instances in the King James Version “jewel” represents the Hebrew *nezem* (<sup><1112></sup>Proverbs 11:22; <sup><2181></sup>Isaiah 3:21; <sup><2162></sup>Ezekiel 16:12); the American Standard Revised Version changes <sup><1112></sup>Proverbs 11:22 to “ring” (Septuagint here = “earring”), and both the English Revised Version and the American Standard Revised Version have “ring” in <sup><2162></sup>Ezekiel 16:12. The familiar phrase in <sup><2487></sup>Malachi 3:17, “in that day when I make up my jewels,” becomes in the English Revised Version, “in the day that I do make, even a peculiar treasure” (margin “or, wherein I do make a peculiar treasure”), and in the American Standard Revised Version, “even mine own possession, in the day that I make” (margin “or, do this”).

*See, further, ORNAMENT; DRESS; STONES, PRECIOUS.*

*James Orr*

## JEWRY

<sup><ju'-ri></sup>, <sup><joo'-ri></sup>: In <sup><2183></sup>Daniel 5:13 the King James Version, where the Revised Version (British and American) has “Judah”; in the New Testament, in two places in the King James Version, <sup><2215></sup>Luke 23:5; <sup><2301></sup>John 7:1, where the Revised Version (British and American) has correctly “Judaea” (*Ioudaia*) (which see).

## JEWS

<sup><juz></sup>, <sup><jooz></sup>.

*See JEW.*

## JEZANIAH

<sup><jez-a-ni'-a></sup> ([<sup>W</sup>hynɿ" y] yezanyahu], probably “Yahweh hears”; compare **JAAZANIAH**): In <sup><2418></sup>Jeremiah 40:8, and also 42:1 where Septuagint has “Azariah,” as in 43:2 (see Driver, Jer) = **JAAZANIAH**,

(1) (which see).

## JEZEBEL

<sup><jez'-e-bel></sup> [<sup>l</sup> bzyaj̥ iʒebhel], “unexalted,” “unhusbanded” (?); [<sup>ʔ</sup> Iεζάβελ, *Iezabel*]; see BDB; <sup><1161></sup>1 Kings 16:31; 18:4,13,19; 19:1,2; 21:5 ff; <sup><2197></sup>2 Kings 9:7 ff,30 ff; <sup><6121></sup>Revelation 2:20): Daughter of Ethbaal, king of

the Zidonians, i.e. Phoenicians, and queen of Ahab, king of Northern Israel. Ahab (circa 874-853 BC) carried out a policy, which his father had perhaps started, of making alliances with other states. The alliance with the Phoenicians was cemented by his marriage with Jezebel, and he subsequently gave his daughter Athaliah in marriage to Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah. His own union with Jezebel is regarded as a sin in <sup><1168></sup>1 Kings 16:31, where the Massoretic Text is difficult, being generally understood as a question. The Septuagint translations: “and it was not enough that he should walk in the sins of Jeroboam ben Nebat, he also took to wife Jezebel,” etc. The Hebrew can be pointed to mean, “And it was the lightest thing for him to walk in the sins of Jeroboam ben Nebat, he also took to wife Jezebel, and went and served Baal and worshipped him,” i.e. all the other sins were light as compared with the marriage with Jezebel and the serving of Baal (compare <sup><3116></sup>Micah 6:16). Is this a justifiable view to take of the marriage? One answer would be that Ahab made a wise alliance; that Baal-worship was not non-Hebrew, that Ahab named his children not after Baal but after Yahweh (compare Ahaziah, Jehoram, Athaliah), and that he consulted the prophets of Yahweh (compare <sup><1226></sup>1 Kings 22:6); further, that he only did what Solomon had done on a much larger scale; it may be added too that Ahab was in favor of religious toleration, and that Elijah and not the king is the persecutor. What then can be said for the unfavorable Verdict of the Hebrew historians? That verdict is based on the results and effects of the marriage, on the life and character of Jezebel, and in that life two main incidents demand attention.

## 1. PERSECUTION OF YAHWEH’S PROPHETS:

This is not described; it is only referred to in <sup><1180></sup>1 Kings 18:4, “when Jezebel cut off the prophets of Yahweh”; and this shows the history of the time to be incompletely related. In <sup><1189></sup>1 Kings 18:19 we are further told that “450 prophets of Baal ate at her table” (commentators regard the reference to “400 prophets of the Asherah” as an addition). In <sup><1190></sup>1 Kings 19:1 Ahab tells Jezebel of the slaughter of the prophets of Baal by Elijah, and then Jezebel (19:2) sends a messenger to Elijah to threaten his life. This leads to the prophet’s flight, an object which Jezebel had in view, perhaps, for she would hardly dare to murder Elijah himself. <sup><1207></sup>2 Kings 9:7 regards the massacre of Ahab’s family as a punishment for the persecution of the prophets by Jezebel

## 2. JEZEBEL'S PLOT AGAINST NABOTH (1 KINGS 21):

Ahab expresses a desire to possess the vineyard neighboring upon his palace in Jezreel, owned by Naboth, who refuses to part with the family inheritance though offered either its money value or a better vineyard in exchange. Ahab is depressed at this, and Jezebel, upon finding the cause of his melancholy feelings, asks him sarcastically if he is not king, suggesting that as king his wishes should be immediately granted by his subjects. She thereupon plots to secure him Naboth's vineyard. Jezebel sends letters sealed in Ahab's name to the elders of Naboth's township, and bids them arrange a public fast and make Naboth "sit at the head of the people" (Revised Version margin), a phrase taken by some to mean that he is to be arraigned, while it is explained by others as meaning that Naboth is to be given the chief place. Two witnesses — a sufficient number for that purpose — are to be brought to accuse Naboth of blasphemy and treason. This is done, and Naboth is found guilty, and stoned to death. The property is confiscated, and falls to the king (<sup><1200></sup>1 Kings 21:1-16). Elijah hears of this, and is sent to threaten Ahab with Divine vengeance; dogs shall lick his dead body (<sup><1219></sup>1 Kings 21:19). But in <sup><1220></sup>1 Kings 21:20-23 this prophecy is made, not concerning Ahab but against Jezebel, and 21:25 attributes the sins of Ahab to her influence over him.

The prophecy is fulfilled in <sup><1219></sup>2 Kings 9:30-37. Ahaziah and Jehoram had succeeded their father Ahab; the one reigned for 2 years (<sup><1225></sup>1 Kings 22:51), the other 12 years (<sup><1218></sup>2 Kings 3:1). Jehu heads a revolt against the house of Ahab, and one day comes to Jezreel. Jezebel had "painted her eyes, and attired her head," and sees Jehu coming. She greets him sarcastically as his master's murderer. according to Massoretic Text, Jehu asks, "Who is on my side? who?" but the text is emended by Klostermann, following Septuagint in the main, "Who art thou that thou shouldest find fault with me?" i.e. thou art but a murderess thyself. She is then thrown down and the horses tread upon her (reading "they trod" for "he trod" in <sup><1213></sup>2 Kings 9:33). When search is afterward made for her remains, they are found terribly mutilated. Thus was the prophecy fulfilled. (Some commentaries hold that Naboth's vineyard and Ahab's garden were in Samaria, and Naboth a Jezreelite. The words, "which was in Jezreel," of <sup><1201></sup>1 Kings 21:1 are wanting in Septuagint, which has "And Naboth had a vineyard by the threshing-floor of Ahab king of Samaria." But compare <sup><1216></sup>1 Kings 18:45; 21:23; <sup><1219></sup>2 Kings 8:29; 9:10,15 ff,30 ff.)

See *AHAB; JEHU*.

### 3. JEZEBEL'S CHARACTER:

The character of Jezebel is seen revived in that of her daughter, Athaliah of Judah (2 Kings 11); there is no doubt that Jezebel was a powerful personality. She brought the worship of the Phoenician Baal and Astarte with her into Hebrew life, and indirectly introduced it into Judah as well as into the Northern Kingdom. In judging her connection with this propagation, we should bear in mind that she is not a queen of the 20th century; she must be judged in company with other queens famous in history. Her religious attitude and zeal might profitably be compared with that of Mary, queen of Scots. It must also be remembered that the introduction of any religious change is often resented when it comes from a foreign queen, and is apt to be misunderstood, e.g. the attitude of Greece to the proposal of Queen Olga have an authorized edition of the Bible in modern Greek.

On the other hand, although much may be said that would be favorable to Jezebel from the religious standpoint, the balance is heavy against her when we remember her successful plot against Naboth. It is not perhaps blameworthy in her that she upheld the religion of her native land, although the natural thing would have been to follow that of her adopted land (compare <sup><8116></sup>Ruth 1:16 f). The superiority of Yahweh-worship was not as clear then as it is to us today. It may also be held that Baal-worship was not unknown in Hebrew life (compare <sup><065></sup>Judges 6:25 f), that Baal of Canaan had become incorporated with Yahweh of Sinai, and that there were pagan elements in the worship of the latter. But against all this it must be clear that the Baal whom Jezebel attempted to introduce was the Phoenician Baal, pure and simple; he was another god, or rather in him was presented an idea of God very different from Yahweh. And further, "in Phoenicia, where wealth and luxury had been enjoyed on a scale unknown to either Israel or the Canaanites of the interior, there was a refinement, if one may so speak, and at the same time a prodigality of vicious indulgences, connected with the worship of Baal and Astarte to which Israel had hitherto been a stranger ..... It was like a cancer eating into the vitals or a head and heart sickness resulting in total decay (<sup><2306></sup>Isaiah 1:6). In Israel, moral deterioration meant political as well as spiritual death. The weal of the nation lay in fidelity to Yahweh alone, and in His pure worship" (HPM, section symbol 213).

The verdict of the Hebrew historian is thus substantiated. Jezebel is an example — an extreme one no doubt — of the bad influence of a highly developed civilization forcing itself with all its sins upon a community less highly civilized, but possessed of nobler moral and religious conceptions. She has parallels both in family and in national life. For a parallel to Elijah's attitude toward Jezebel compare the words of Carlyle about Knox in *On Heroes and Hero-Worship*, IV, especially the section, "We blame Knox for his intolerance," etc.

In <sup>(1121)</sup>Revelation 2:20, we read of Iezabel, "the woman Jezebel, who calleth herself a prophetess"; not "thy wife" (i.e. the wife of the bishop) the Revised Version margin, but as Moffat (*Expositor's Greek Testament*) aptly renders, "that Jezebel of a woman alleging herself a prophetess." Some members of the church at Thyatira "under the sway of an influential woman refused to separate from the local guilds where moral interests, though not ostensibly defied, were often seriously compromised ..... Her lax principles or tendencies made for a connection with foreign and compromising associations which evidently exerted a dangerous influence upon some weaker Christians in the city." Her followers "prided themselves upon their enlightened liberalism (<sup>(1124)</sup>Revelation 2:24)." Moffat rejects both the view of Schurer (*Theol. Abhandlungen*, 39 f), that she is to be identified with the Chaldean Sibyl at Thyatira, and also that of Selwyn making her the wife of the local asiarch. "It was not the cults but the trade guilds that formed the problem at Thyatira." See also Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament*, section symbol 73, note 7; *AHAB; BAAL; ELIJAH*.

*David Francis Roberts*

## JEZELUS

<je-ze'-lus>, <jez'-e-lus> ([<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup>Ιεζήλος, *Iezelos*]):

(1) In 1 Esdras 8:32; called "Jahaziel" in Ezr 8:5.

(2) In 1 Esdras 8:35; called "Jehiel" in Ezr 8:9.

## JEZER

<je'-zer> ([<sup>rxy</sup> <sup>xy</sup>, *yecher*], "form" or "purpose"): A "son" of Naphtali (<sup>(1434)</sup>Genesis 46:24; <sup>(1434)</sup>Numbers 26:49; <sup>(13713)</sup>1 Chronicles 7:13).



## JEZERITES, THE

<je'-zer-its>, ([yriḵ]h" , ha-yitsri] (collective with article)): Descendants of “Jezer” (<sup><Q349></sup>Numbers 26:49).

## JEZIAH

<je-zi'-a>.

*See* IZZIAH.

## JEZIEL

<je'-zi-el>, <je-zi'-el> (Kethibh is [l aḇzy] yezu'el], or [l aḇy] yezo'el]; Qere [l aḇzy] yezī'el] = “God gathers,” perhaps): One of David’s Benjamite recruits at Ziklag (<sup><3123></sup>1 Chronicles 12:3).

## JEZLIAH

<jez-lia>.

*See* IZLIAH.

## JEZOAR

<je-zo'-ar>.

*See* IZHAR.

## JEZRAHIAH

<jez-ra-hi'-a>.

*See* IZRAHIAH.

## JEZREEL

<jez'-re-el>, <jez'-rel> ([l a[rī]y, yizre'e'l], “God soweth”):

(1) A city on the border of the territory of Issachar (<sup><Q693></sup>Joshua 19:18).

## 1. TERRITORY:

It is named with Chesulloth and Shunem (modern Iksal and Solam). It remained loyal to the house of Saul, and is mentioned as part of the kingdom over which Abner set Ishbosheth (<sup><1019></sup>2 Samuel 2:9). From Jezreel came the tidings of Saul and Jonathan's death on Gilboa, which brought disaster to Mephibosheth (<sup><1014></sup>2 Samuel 4:4). The city plays no important part in the history till the time of Ahab. Attracted, doubtless, by the fine position and natural charms of the place, he made it one of his royal residences, building here a palace (<sup><1200></sup>1 Kings 21:1). This was evidently on the eastern wall; and the gate by which Jehu entered was over-looked by the quarters of Queen Jezebel (<sup><1191></sup>2 Kings 9:30 f). The royal favor naturally enhanced the dignity of the city, and "elders" and "nobles" of Jezreel are mentioned (<sup><1208></sup>1 Kings 21:8, etc.). Under the influence of Jezebel, an institution for the worship of Baal was founded here, from which, probably, the men were drawn who figured in the memorable contest with Elijah on Carmel (<sup><1201></sup>2 Kings 10:11). "The tower in Jezreel" was part of the defenses of the city. It commanded a view of the approach up the valley from Beth-shean — the way followed by the hordes of the East, who, from time immemorial, came westward for the rich pasture of the plain (<sup><1197></sup>2 Kings 9:17). It was necessary also to keep constant watch, as the district East of the Jordan was always more unsettled than that on the West; and danger thence might appear at any moment. The garden of Naboth seems to have lain to the East of the city (<sup><1192></sup>2 Kings 9:21), near the royal domain, to which Ahab desired to add it as a garden of herbs (<sup><1200></sup>1 Kings 21:1 ff). **See NABOTH.** This was the scene of the tragic meetings between Elijah and Ahab (<sup><1217></sup>1 Kings 21:17 ff), and between Jehu and Joram and Ahaziah (<sup><1192></sup>2 Kings 9:21). Joram had returned to Jezreel from Ramoth-gilead to be healed of his wounds (<sup><1195></sup>2 Kings 9:15). By the gateway the dogs devoured Jezebel's body (<sup><1191></sup>2 Kings 9:31 ff). Naboth had been stoned to death outside the city (<sup><1213></sup>1 Kings 21:13). Josephus lays the scene by the fountain of Jezreel, and here, he says, the dogs licked the blood washed from the chariot of Ahab (Ant., VIII, xv, 6). This accords with <sup><1219></sup>1 Kings 21:19; but 22:38 points to the pool at Samaria.

## 2. IDENTIFICATION:

The site of Jezreel must be sought in a position where a tower would command a view of the road coming up the valley from Beth-shean. It has long been the custom to identify it with the modern village, Zer'in, on the

northwestern spur of Gilboa. This meets the above condition; and it also agrees with the indications in Eusebius, Onomasticon as lying between Legio (Lejjun) and Scythopolis (Beisan). Recently, however, Professor A.R.S. Macalister made a series of excavations here, and failed to find any evidence of ancient Israelite occupation. This casts doubt upon the identification, and further excavation is necessary before any certain conclusion can be reached. For the “fountain which is in Jezreel,” *see HAROD, WELL OF*.

(2) An unidentified town in the uplands of Judah (<sup><6156></sup>Joshua 15:56), the home of Ahinoam (<sup><9278></sup>1 Samuel 27:3, etc.).

*W. Ewing*

## JEZREEL, VALE OF

*See ESDRAELON, PLAIN OF.*

## JEZREELITE

<jez'-re-el-it>, <jez'-rel-it> [*yl à[<sup>eɪ</sup>h*" , ha-yizre`e`li]): applied to Naboth, a native of Jezreel

(1) (<sup><1200></sup>1 Kings 21:1, etc.).

## JEZREELITESS

<jez'-re-el-it-es>, <jez'-rel-it-es> ([*tyl à[<sup>eɪ</sup>i*, yizre`e`lith], “of Jezreel,” feminine): Applied to Ahinoam, one of David’s first two wives, a native of Jezreel in Judah (<sup><9278></sup>1 Samuel 27:3; 30:5; <sup><1012></sup>2 Samuel 2:2; 3:2; <sup><3301></sup>1 Chronicles 3:1).

## JEZRIELUS

<jez-ri-e'-lus> ([*Ἰεζριήλος*, *Iezrielos*]; the King James Version Hierielus; 1 Esdras 9:27): Corresponding to “Jehiel” in Ezr 10:26.

## JIBSAM

<jib'-sam>.

*See IBSAM.*

## JIDLAPH

<jid'-laf> ([tɪ dʲi yidhlaph] perhaps “he weeps”): A “son” of Nahor (<sup><0222></sup>Genesis 22:22).

## JIMNA, JIMNAH

<jim'-na> ([hn̩m̩ji yimnah], perhaps = “good fortune”): A “son” of Asher (<sup><0467></sup>Genesis 46:17, the King James Version “Jimnah”; <sup><0244></sup>Numbers 26:44, the King James Version “Jimna”), whereas the Revised Version (British and American) has *IMNAH* (which see).

## JIMNITES, THE

<jim'-nits>, (same as “Jimna,” only collective with the definite article; <sup><0244></sup>Numbers 26:44 the King James Version, where the Revised Version (British and American) has “Imnites”): Descendants of Jimna or Imna.

## JIPHTAH

<jif'-ta> ([ɟ ʔp̩ji yiphtach]).

See *IPHTAH*.

## JIPHTAHEL

<jif'-tha-el>.

See *IPHTAHEL*.

## JOAB

<jo'-ab> ([baw̩ʔ yo'-abh], “Yahweh is father”; [ʾ ʔwáβ, *Ioab*]):

(1) Son of Zeruiah, David’s sister. He was “captain of the host” (compare <sup><0193></sup>2 Samuel 19:13) under David.

### 1. JOAB AND ABNER:

(a) Joab is first introduced in the narrative of the war with Abner, who supported the claims of Ishbosheth to the throne against those of David (<sup><0193></sup>2 Samuel 2:8 through 3:1). The two armies met, and on Abner’s

suggestion a tournament took place between 12 men from each side; a general engagement follows, and in this Joab's army is victorious. Asahel, Joab's brother, is killed in his pursuit of Abner, but the latter's army is sorely pressed, and he appeals to Joab for a cessation of hostilities. Joab calls a halt, but declares that he would not cease had Abner not made his plea.

**(b)** ~~<10R2>~~ 2 Samuel 3:12-29. Abner visits David at Hebron, and makes an alliance with David. He then leaves the town, apparently under royal protection. Joab is absent at the time, but returns immediately after Abner's departure, and expostulates with David for not avenging Asahel's death, and at the same time attributes a bad motive to Abner's visit. He sends a message, no doubt in the form of a royal command, for Abner to return; the chief does so, is taken aside "into the midst of the gate" (or as Septuagint and commentators read, "into the side of the gate," ~~<10R2>~~ 2 Samuel 3:27), and slain there by Joab. David proclaims his own innocence in the matter, commands Joab as well as the people to mourn publicly for the dead hero (~~<10R3>~~ 2 Samuel 3:31), composes a lament for Abner, and pronounces a curse upon Joab and his descendants (~~<10R3>~~ 2 Samuel 3:30 is regarded as an editorial note, and commentators change 3:39).

## 2. THE AMMONITE WAR: DEATH OF URIAH:

**(a)** ~~<1000>~~ 2 Samuel 10:1-14; ~~<1390>~~ 1 Chronicles 19:1-15. David sends ambassadors with his good wishes to Hanun on his ascending the throne of the Ammonites; these are ill-treated, and war follows, David's troops being commanded by Joab. On finding himself placed between the Ammonites on the one hand, and their Syrian allies on the other, he divides his army, and himself leads one division against the Syrians, leaving Abishai, his brother, to fight the Ammonites; the defeat of the Syrians is followed by the rout of the ammonites.

**(b)** ~~<1005>~~ 2 Samuel 10:15-19; ~~<1396>~~ 1 Chronicles 19:16-19 describes a second war between Hadarezer and David. Joab is not mentioned here.

**(c)** ~~<1006>~~ 2 Samuel 11:1 narrates the resumption of the war against the Ammonites; Joab is in command, and the town of Rabbah is besieged. Here occurs the account of David's sin with Bathsheba, omitted by Chronicles. David gets Joab to send Uriah, her husband, to Jerusalem, and when he refuses to break the soldier's vow (11:6-13), Joab is used

to procure Uriah's death in the siege, and the general then sends news of it to David (11:14-27). After capturing the 'water-city' of Rabbah, Joab sends for David to complete the capture and lead the triumph himself (12:26-29).

### 3. JOAB AND ABSALOM:

(a) The next scene depicts Joab attempting and succeeding in his attempt to get Absalom restored to royal favor. He has noticed that "the king's heart is toward Absalom" (~~1041~~2 Samuel 14:1), and so arranges for "a wise woman" of Tekoa to bring a supposed complaint of her own before the king, and then rebuke him for his treatment of Absalom. The plan succeeds. David sees Joab's hand in it, and gives him permission to bring Absalom to Jerusalem. But the rebel has to remain in his own house, and is not allowed to see his father (~~1041~~2 Samuel 14:1-24).

(b) Absalom attempts to secure Joab's intercession for a complete restoration to his father's confidence. Joab turns a deaf ear to the request until his field is put on fire by Absalom's command. He then sees Absalom, and gets David to receive his prodigal son back into the royal home (~~1048~~2 Samuel 14:28-33).

(c) Absalom revolts, and makes Amasa, another nephew of David, general instead of Joab (~~1072~~2 Samuel 17:24 f). David flees to Mahanaim, followed by Absalom. Joab is given a third of the army, the other divisions being led by Abishai and Ittai. He is informed that Absalom has been caught in a tree (or thicket), and expostulates with the informer for not having killed him. Although he is reminded of David's tender plea that Absalom be kindly dealt with, he dispatches the rebel himself, and afterward calls for a general halt of the army. When David gives vent to his feelings of grief, he is sternly rebuked by Joab, and the rebuke has its effect (2 Samuel 17 through 19:8a).

### 4. JOAB AND AMASA:

~~1098~~2 Samuel 19:8b-15. On David's return to Jerusalem, Amasa is made "captain of the host" instead of Joab (19:13). Then Sheba revolts, Amasa loses time in making preparation for quelling it, and Abishai is bidden by David to take the field (20:6). The Syriac version reads "Joab" for "Abishai" in this verse, and some commentators follow it, but Septuagint

supports Massoretic Text. Joab seems to have accompanied Abishai; and when Amasa meets them at Gibeon, Joab, on pretense of kissing his rival, kills him. He then assumes command, is followed by Amasa's men, and arranges with a woman of Abel beth-maacah to deliver to him Sheba's head. The revolt is then at an end.

## 5. JOAB'S DEATH:

Joab subsequently opposed David's suggestion of a census, but eventually carried it out (~~1024~~2 Samuel 24:1-9; ~~1320~~1 Chronicles 21:1-6), yet ~~1320~~1 Chronicles 21:6 and 27:24 relate that he did not carry it out fully. He was one of Adonijah's supporters in his claim to the throne (~~1007~~1 Kings 1:7,19,41). For this he had to pay the penalty with his life, being slain at the altar in the "Tent of Yahweh" (~~1028~~1 Kings 2:28-34) by Benaiah, who acted upon Solomon's orders. His murderer became his successor as head of the army. ~~1005~~1 Kings 2:5 makes David advise Solomon not to forget that Joab slew Abner and Amasa, and ~~1114~~1 Kings 11:14-22 contains a reference to the dread of his name in Edom. ~~1310~~1 Chronicles 11:6 makes him win his spurs first at the capture of Jerusalem, but 2 Samuel 2; 3 are previous in time to this event (compare ~~1006~~2 Samuel 5:6-10), and ~~1308~~1 Chronicles 11:8 makes him repair the city, while ~~1358~~1 Chronicles 26:28 refers to a dedication of armor by him.

## 6. JOAB'S CHARACTER:

In summing up Joab's character, we must remember the stirring times in which he lived. That he was a most able general, there is no doubt. He was, however, very jealous of his position, and this accounts for Amasa's murder, if not partially for that of Abner too: if he was afraid that Abner would supplant him, that fear may be held to be justified, for Amasa, who had not been too loyal to David did take Joab's place for a time. But blood revenge for Asahel's death was perhaps the chief cause. Yet even when judged in the light of those rough times, and in the light of eastern life, the murder of Abner was a foul, treacherous deed (see Trumbull, *Studies in Oriental Social Life*, 129-31).

Joab opposed the census probably because it was an innovation. His rebuke of David's great grief over Absalom's death can only be characterized as just; he is the stern warrior who, after being once merciful and forgiving, will not again spare a deceitful rebel; and yet David shows how a father's

conduct toward a prodigal, rebellious son is not regulated by stern justice. Joab's unswerving loyalty to David leads one to believe that no disloyalty was meant by his support of Adonijah, who was really the rightful heir to the throne. But their plans were defeated by those of the harem, and Joab had to pay the price with his life.

Taken as a whole, his life, as depicted in the very reliable narrative of 2 Samuel and 1 Ki, may be said to be as characteristic of the times as that of David himself, with a truly Homeric ring about it. He was a great man, great in military prowess and also in personal revenge, in his loyalty to the king as well as in his stern rebuke of his royal master. He was the greatest of David's generals, and the latter's success and glory owed much to this noblest of that noble trio whom Zeruiah bore.

(2) A Judahite, father or founder of Ge-harashim (~~<1304>~~ 1 Chronicles 4:14, "valley of craftsmen" the Revised Version margin).

*See GE-HARASHIM.*

(3) A family of returned exiles (Ezr 2:6 parallel ~~<1071>~~ Nehemiah 7:11; Ezr 8:9; 1 Esdras 8:35).

(4) *See* ATROTH-BETH-JOAB.

*David Francis Roberts*

## JOACHAZ

<jo'-a-kaz> ([<sup>ʾ</sup> **Ιωχάζ**, *Iochaz*], [<sup>ʾ</sup> **Ιεχονίας**, *Iechonias*]): Son of Josiah (1 Esdras 1:34). In ~~<4011>~~ Matthew 1:11 "Jechoniah" is the reading.

## JOACIM

<jo'-a-sim>.

*See* JOAKIM.

## JOADANUS

<jo-a-da'-nus> ([<sup>ʾ</sup> **Ιωαδάνας**, *Ioadanos*): In 1 Esdras 9:19, apparently, through some corruption; the same as Gedaliah, a son of Jeshua, the son of Jozadak, in Ezr 10:18.



## JOAH

<jo'-a> ([j awy, yo'ach], “Yahweh is brother”):

(1) Son of Asaph and recorder under King Hezekiah (~~<1288>~~ 2 Kings 18:18,26; ~~<2308>~~ Isaiah 36:3,11,22); he was one of the 3 officers sent by the king to speak to the Assyrian envoys at the siege of Jerusalem (circa 701 BC).

(2) In ~~<1361>~~ 1 Chronicles 6:21 (Hebrew 6); ~~<14912>~~ 2 Chronicles 29:12, a Levite (son of Zimmah) = “Ethan” of ~~<1362>~~ 1 Chronicles 6:42 (Hebrew 27).

(3) a son of Obed-edom (~~<1304>~~ 1 Chronicles 26:4).

(4) Son of Joahaz and recorder under King Josiah (~~<1488>~~ 2 Chronicles 34:8).

## JOAHAZ

<jo'-a-haz> ([zj awy yo'-achaz], “Yahweh has grasped” = “Jehoahaz”):

(1) Father of *JOAH*

(4) (~~<1488>~~ 2 Chronicles 34:8).

(2) the Revised Version (British and American) and Hebrew in ~~<1240>~~ 2 Kings 14:1 for Jehoahaz, king of Israel.

*See JEHOAHAZ.*

(3) the Revised Version (British and American) and Hebrew in ~~<1482>~~ 2 Chronicles 36:2,4 for *JEHOAHAZ*, king of Judah (which see).

## JOAKIM

<jo'-a-kim> ([ ' Iwakéim, Ioakeim]; the King James Version Joacim):

(1) Jehoiakim, king of Judah and Jerusalem (1 Esdras 1:37-39; Baruch 1:3).

(2) Jehoiachin, son of (1) (1 Esdras 1:43).

(3) Son of Jeshua (1 Esdras 5:5), called by mistake son of Zerubbabel; in ~~<1620>~~ Nehemiah 12:10,26 his name occurs as in 1 Esdras, among the priests and Levitea who returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel.

(4) High priest of Jerusalem in the time of Baruch (Baruch 1:7).

(5) High priest in Jerusalem in the days of Judith who, along with “the ancients of the children of Israel,” welcomed the heroine back to the city after the death of Holofernes (Judith 4). He cannot be identified with any of the high priests in the lists given in 1 Chronicles or in Josephus, *Ant*, X, viii, 6. The word means “the Lord hath set up.” It is probably symbolical, and tends with other names occurring in the narrative to establish the supposition that the book was a work of imagination composed to support the faith of the Jews in times of stress and difficulty.

(6) The husband of Susanna (Susanna verses 1 ff), perhaps here also a symbolical name.

*J. Hutchison*

## JOANAN

<jo-a'-nan> (Westcott-Hort, Greek New Testament, [ 'Ἰωάναν, *Ioanan*]; Textus Receptus of the New Testament, [ 'Ἰωάννα, *Ioanna*]; the King James Version, Joanna):

(1) A grandson of Zerubbabel in the genealogy of Jesus according to Luke (3:27).

(2) The son of Eliasib (1 Esdras 9:1 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “Jonas”).

## JOANNA

<jo-an'-a> ([ 'Ἰώαννα, *Ioana*], or [ 'Ἰωάννα, *Ioanna*]): The wife of Chuzas, Herod's steward. She was one of the “women who had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities” which “ministered unto him (King James Version, i.e. Jesus, or “them” the Revised Version (British and American), i.e. Jesus and His disciples) of their substance,” on the occasion of Jesus' tour through Galilee (~~Q82~~ Luke 8:2,3). Along with other women she accompanied Jesus on His last journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, and was present when His body was laid in the sepulcher (~~Q285~~ Luke 23:55). She was thus among those who prepared spices and ointments, who found the grave empty, and who “told these things unto the apostles” (~~Q286~~ Luke 23:56 through 24:10).

*C. M. Kerr*

## JOANNES

<jo-an'-es>, <jo-an'-ez> ([ 'Ἰωάννης, *Ioannes*]; the King James Version, Johannes):

- (1) Son of Acatan (1 Esdras 8:38), called also “Johanan” in Ezr 8:12.
- (2) Son of Bebai (1 Esdras 9:29), called “Jehohanan” in Ezr 10:28.

## JOARIB

<jo'-a-rib> ([ 'Ἰωαρίβ, *Ioarib*]; the King James Version Jarib): Ancestor of Mattathias (1 Macc 14:29), given as “Joarib” in the King James Version of 1 Macc 2:1; he was chief of the first of the 24 courses of priests in the reign of David. Varieties of the name are Jarib, Joarib, and Jehoiarib (~~1340~~ 1 Chronicles 24:7).

## JOASH (1)

<jo'-ash> ([vawʁ yo'ash], “Yahweh is strong” or “Yahweh has bestowed”; [ 'Ἰώας, *Ioas*]):

- (1) Father of Gideon, of the clan of Abiezer and the tribe Manasseh (~~0061~~ Judges 6:11,29,30,31; 7:14; 8:13,19,32). Gideon declares (~~0065~~ Judges 6:15) that the family is the poorest in Manasseh, words similar to those of Saul (~~0026~~ 1 Samuel 9:21), and not to be taken too literally. Joash would be a man of standing and wealth, for Gideon was able to command 10 servants to destroy the altar and the Asherah (~~0067~~ Judges 6:27,34), and also to summon the whole clan to follow him. Further, the altar that Joash had was that used by the community (~~0068~~ Judges 6:28), so that he would be the priest, not only of his own family qua paterfamilias, but also of the community in virtue of his position as chief. When Gideon destroyed the altar and the Asherah or sacred pillar by it, Joash refused to deliver his son to death, declaring that Baal, if he was a god, should avenge himself (compare Elijah in 1 Kings 18).
- (2) Called “the king’s son” (~~1122~~ 1 Kings 22:26; ~~4485~~ 2 Chronicles 18:25; compare ~~2833~~ Jeremiah 36:26; 38:6), or, less probably, “the son of Hammelech,” the Revised Version margin; perhaps a son of Ahab. Micaiah the prophet was handed over to his custody and that of Amon by Ahab.
- (3) A Judahite, descendant of Shelah (~~1342~~ 1 Chronicles 4:22).

(4) A Benjamite recruit of David at Ziklag. Commentators read here, “Joash the son of Shemaiah (or Jehoshamai), the Gibeathite” (~~312~~1 Chronicles 12:3).

(5) In ~~2112~~2 Kings 11:2, etc. = Jehoash, king of Judah.

(6) In ~~2139~~2 Kings 13:9, etc. = Jehoash, king of Northern Israel.

*David Francis Roberts*

## JOASH (2)

([v[~~w~~yo`ash], “Yahweh has aided”):

(1) A Benjamite, or, more probably, a Zebulunite (~~308~~1 Chronicles 7:8).

(2) One of David’s officers; Joash was “over the cellars of oil” (~~378~~1 Chronicles 27:28).

## JOATHAM

<jo’-a-tham> ([<sup>’</sup>Ιωάθαμ, *Ioatham*]): the King James Version for the Revised Version (British and American) “Jotham” (~~409~~Matthew 1:9).

*See JOTHAM (the king).*

## JOB

<job> ([~~b~~waɪ ‘iyobh], meaning of name doubtful; some conjecturing “object of enmity,” others “he who turns,” etc., to God; both uncertain guesses; [<sup>’</sup>Ιώβ, *Iob*]): The titular hero of the Book of Job, represented as a wealthy and pious land-holder who lived in patriarchal times, or at least conditions, in the land of Uz, on the borders of Idumea. Outside of the Book of Job he is mentioned by Ezekiel (~~344~~Ezekiel 14:14,20) as one of 3 great personages whose representative righteousness would presumably avail, if that of any individuals could, to redeem the nation; the other two being Noah, an ancient patriarch, and Daniel, a contemporary of the prophet. It is difficult to determine whether Job was an actual personage or not. If known through legend, it must have been on account of some such experience as is narrated in the book, an experience unique enough to have become a potent household word; still, the power and influence of it is due to the masterly vigor and exposition of the story. It was the Job of literature, rather than the Job of legend, who lived in the hearts of men; a

character so commanding that, albeit fictitious, it could be referred to as real, just as we refer to Hamlet or Othello. It is not the way of Hebrew writers, however, to evolve literary heroes from pure imagination; they crave an authentic basis of fact. It is probable that such a basis, in its essential outlines, existed under the story of Job. It is not necessary to suppose, however, that the legend or the name was known to Israel from ancient times. Job is introduced (~~<BOOK>~~ Job 1:1) as if he had not been known before. The writer, who throughout the book shows a wide acquaintance with the world, doubtless found the legend somewhere, and drew its meanings together for an undying message to his and all times.

*John Franklin Genung*

## **JOB, BOOK OF**

### **I. INTRODUCTORY.**

#### *1. Place in the Canon:*

The greatest production of the Hebrew Wisdom literature, and one of the supreme literary creations of the world. Its place in the Hebrew Canon corresponds to the high estimation in which it was held; it stands in the 3rd section, the “writings” (*kethubhim*) or Hagiographa, next after the two great anthologies Psalms and Proverbs; apparently put thus near the head of the list for weighty reading and meditation. In the Greek Canon (which ours follows), it is put with the poetical books, standing at their head. It is one of 3 Scripture books, the others being Psalms and Proverbs, for which the later Hebrew scholars (the Massoretes) employed a special system of punctuation to mark its poetic character.

#### *2. Rank and Readers:*

The Book of Job was not one of the books designated for public reading in the synagogues, as were the Pentateuch and the Prophets, or for occasional reading at feast seasons, as were the 5 megilloth or rolls. It was rather a book for private reading, and one whose subject-matter would appeal especially to the more cultivated and thoughtful classes. Doubtless it was all the more intimately valued for this detachment from sanctuary associations; it was, like Proverbs, a people’s book; and especially among the cultivators of Wisdom it must have been from its first publication a cherished classic. At any rate, the patriarch Job (though whether from the legend or from the finished book is not clear; *see JOB*) is mentioned as a

well-known national type by ~~3414~~ Ezekiel 14:14,20; and James, writing to Jewish Christians (5:11), refers to the character of patriarch as familiar to his readers. It was as one of the great classic stories of their literature, rather than as embodying a ritual or prophetic standard, that it was so universally known and cherished.

## II. THE LITERARY FRAMEWORK.

In view of the numerous critical questions by which the interpretation of the book has been beclouded — questions of later alterations, additions, corruptions, dislocations — it may be well to say at the outset that what is here proposed is to consider the Book of Job as we have it before us today, in its latest and presumably definitive edition. It will be time enough to remove excrescences when a fair view of the book as it is, with its literary values and relations, makes us sure that there are such; see III, below. Meanwhile, as a book that has reached a stage so fixed and finished that at any rate modern tinkering cannot materially change it, we may consider what its literary framework does to justify itself. And first of all, we may note that preeminently among Scripture books it bears the matured literary stamp; both in style and structure it is a work, not only of spiritual edification, but of finished literary article. This may best be realized, perhaps, by taking it, as from the beginning it purports to be, as a continuously maintained story, with the consistent elements of plot, character scheme, and narrative movement which we naturally associate with a work of the narrator's article

### *1. Setting of Time, Place and Scene:*

The story of the Book of Job is laid in the far-off patriarchal age, such a time as we find elsewhere represented only in the Book of Genesis; a time long before the Israelite state, with its religious, social and political organization, existed. Its place is "the land of Uz," a little-known region Southeast of Palestine, on the borders of Edom; a place remote from the ways of thinking peculiar to Israelite lawgivers, priests and prophets. Its scene is in the free open country, among mountains, wadies, pasture-lands, and rural towns, where the relations of man and man are more elemental and primitive, and where the things of God are more intimately apprehended than in the complex affairs of city and state. It is easy to see what the writer gains by such a choice of setting. The patriarchal conditions, wherein the family is the social and communal unit, enable him

to portray worship and conduct in their primal elements: religious rites of the simplest nature, with the family head the unchallenged priest and intercessor (compare ~~<8004>~~ Job 1:4,5; 42:8), and without the austere exactions of sanctuary or temple; to represent God, as in the old folk-stories, as communicating with men in audible voice and in tempest; and to give to the patriarch or sheikh a function of counsel and succor in the community analogous to that of the later wise man or sage (compare Job 29). The place outside the bounds of Palestine enables him to give an international or rather intercommunal tissue to his thought, as befits the character of the wisdom with which he is dealing, a strain of truth which Israel could and did share with neighbor nations. This is made further evident by the fact that in the discourses of the book, the designation of God is not *Yahweh* (with one exception, ~~<8029>~~ Job 12:9), but '*Elohim* or '*Eloah* or *Shaddai*, appellatives rather than names, common to the Semitic peoples. The whole archaic scene serves to detach the story from complex conditions of civilization, and enables the writer to deal with the inherent and intrinsic elements of manhood.

## *2. Characters and Personality:*

All the characters of the story, Job included, are from non-Palestinian regions. The chief spokes-man of the friends, Eliphaz, who is from Teman, is perhaps intended to represent a type of the standard and orthodox wisdom of the day; Teman, and Edom in general being famed for wisdom (~~<2407>~~ Jeremiah 49:7; ~~<3008>~~ Obadiah 1:8,9). The characters of the friends, while representing in general a remarkable uniformity of tenet, are quite aptly individualized: Eliphaz as a venerable and devout sage who, with his eminent penetrativeness of insight, combines a yearning compassion; Bildad more as a scholar versed in the derived lore of tradition; and Zophar more impetuous and dogmatic, with the dogmatist's vein of intolerance. In Elihu, the young Aramean who speaks after the others, the writer seems endeavoring to portray a young man's positiveness and absoluteness of conviction, and with it a self-conceit that quite outruns his ability. The Satan of the Prologue, who makes the wager with Yahweh, is masterfully individualized, not as the malignant tempter and enemy of mankind, but as a spirit compact of impudent skepticism, who can appreciate no motive beyond self-advantage. Even the wife of Job, with her peremptory disposition to make his affliction a personal issue with God, is not without an authentic touch of the elemental feminine. But high above them all is the character of Job himself, which, with all its stormy alternations of mood,

range of assertion and remonstrance and growth of new conviction, remains absolutely consistent with itself. Nor can we leave unmentioned what is perhaps the hardest achievement of all, the sublime venture of giving the very words of God, in such a way that He speaks no word out of character nor measures His thought according to the standards of men.

### *3. Form and Style:*

The Prologue, Job 1 and 2, a few verses at the beginning of chapter 32 (verses 1-6a), and the Epilogue (42:7-17) are written in narrative prose. The rest of the book (except the short sentences introducing the speakers) is in poetry; a poetic tissue conforming to the type of the later *mashal* (see under *PROVERB*), which, in continuous series of couplets, is admirably adapted alike to imaginative sublimity and impassioned address. Beginning with Job's curse of his day (Job 3), Job and his three friends answer each other back and forth in three rounds of speeches, complete except that, for reasons which the subject makes apparent, Zophar, the third friend, fails to speak the third time. After the friends are thus put to silence, Job speaks three times in succession (Job 26 through 31), and then "the words of Job are ended." At this point (Job 32) a fourth speaker, Elihu, hitherto unmentioned, is introduced and speaks four times, when he abruptly ceases in terror at an approaching whirlwind (37:24). Yahweh speaks from the whirlwind, two speeches, each of which Job answers briefly (40:3-5; 42:1-6), or rather declines to answer. Such, which we may summarize in Prologue (Job 1;2), Body of Discussion (3 through 42:6), and Epilogue (42:7-17), is the literary framework of the book. The substance of the book is in a way dramatic; it cannot, however, be called so truly a drama as a kind of forum of debate; its movement is too rigid for dramatic action, and it lacks besides the give-and-take of dialogue. In a book of mine published some years ago I ventured to call it "the Epic of the Inner Life," epic not so much in the technical sense, as in recognition of an underlying epos which for fundamental significance may be compared to the story underlying the Prometheus Bound of Aeschylus. It will not do, however, to make too much of either of these forms as designating the Book of Job; either term has to be accommodated almost out of recognition, because the Hebrew literary forms were not conceived according to the Greek categories from which our terms "epic" and "dramatic" are derived. A greater limitation on our appreciation of its form, I think, is imposed by those who regard it as a mixture of forms. It is too generally divided between narrative and didactic debate. To the Hebrew mind it was all a



continuous narrative, in which the poetic discussion, though overweighting the current of visualized action, had nevertheless the movement and value of real events. It is in this light, rather than in the didactic, that we may most profitably regard it.

### III. THE COURSE OF THE STORY.

To divide the story of Job into 42 parts, according to the 42 numbered chapters, is in the last degree arbitrary. Nothing comes of it except convenience in reading for those who wish to take their Job in little detached bits. The chapter division was no part of the original, and a very insignificant step in the later apprehension of the original. To divide according to the speeches of the interlocutors is better; it helps us realize how the conflict of views brought the various phases of the thought to expression; but this too, with its tempting, three-times-three, turns out to be merely a framework; it corresponds only imperfectly with the true inwardness of the story's movement; it is rather a scheme than a continuity. We are to bear in mind that this Book of Job is fundamentally the inner experience of one man, as he rises from the depths of spiritual gloom and doubt to a majestic table-land of new insight and faith; the other characters are but ancillary, helps and foils, whose function is subordinate and relative. Hence, mindful of this inwardness of Job's experience, I have ventured to trace the story in 5 main stages, naming them according to the landing-stage attained in each.

#### *A) To Job's Blessing and Curse:*

##### **1. His "Autumn Days":**

The story begins (~~3000~~ Job 1:1-5) with a brief description of Job as he was before his trial began; the elements of his life, outer and inner, on which is to be raised the question of motive. A prosperous landholder of the land of Uz, distinguished far and wide as the greatest (i.e. richest) of the sons of the East, his inner character corresponds: to all appearance nothing lacking, a man "perfect and upright, and one that feared God, and turned away from evil." The typical Hebrew blessings of life were his to the full: wealth, honor, health, family. He is evidently set before us as the perfect example of the validity of the established Wisdom-tenet, that righteousness and Wisdom are identical (see under *PROVERBS, THE BOOK OF*), and that this is manifest in its visible rewards. This period of his life Job describes afterward by retrospect as his "autumn days," when the

friendship or intimacy ([~~dw~~Ṣ, *coah*]) of God was over his tent (see 29:4, and the whole chapter). Nor are we left without a glimpse into his heart: his constant attitude of worship, and his tender solicitude lest, in their enjoyment of the pleasures of life, his sons may have been disloyal to God (~~Job~~ Job 1:4,5). It is easy to see that not Job alone, but Wisdom as embodied in Job, is postulated here for its supreme test.

## 2. The Wager in Heaven:

Nor is the test delayed, or its ground ambiguous when it comes. Satan proposes it. Two scenes are given (~~Job~~ Job 1:6-12; 2:1-6) from the court of God, wherever that is; for they are overheard by the reader, not seen, and of course neither Job nor any inhabitant of earth is aware of them. In these scenes the sons of God, the spirits who rejoiced over creation (38:7), are come together to render report, and Satan, uninvited, enters among them. He is a wandering spirit, unanchored to any allegiance, who roams through the earth, prying and criticizing. There is nothing, it would seem, in which he cannot find some flaw or discount. To Yahweh's question if he has considered Job, the man perfect and upright, he makes no denial of the fact, but raises the issue of motive: "Doth Job fear God for nought?" and urges that Job's integrity is after all only a transparent bargain, a paying investment with only reward in view. It is virtually an arraignment both of God's order and of the essential human character: of God's order in connecting righteousness so intimately with gain; and of the essential human character, virtually denying that there is such a thing as disinterested, intrinsic human virtue. The sneer strikes deep, and Job, the perfect embodiment of human virtue, is its designated victim. Satan proposes a wager, to the issue of which Yahweh commits Himself. The trial of Job is carried out in two stages: first against his property and family, with the stipulation that it is not to touch him; and then, this failing to detach him from his allegiance, against his person in sore disease, with the stipulation that his life is to be spared. Yahweh acknowledges that for once He is consenting to an injustice (2:3), and Satan, liar that he is, uses instrumentalities that men have ascribed to God alone: the first time, tempest and lightning (as well as murderous foray), the second time, the black leprosy, a fell disease, loathsome and deadly, which, in men's minds meant the immediate punitive stroke of God. The evil is as absolute as was the reward; a complete reversal of the order in which men's wisdom had come to trust. But in the immediate result, Yahweh's faith in His noblest

creature is vindicated. Urged by his wife in his extremity to “curse God and die,” Job remains true to his allegiance; and in his staunch utterance, “Yahweh gave, and Yahweh hath taken away; blessed be the name of Yahweh,” Job, as the writer puts it, ‘sinned not, nor attributed aught unbecoming ([hl pTī *tīphalah*], literally, “tasteless”) to God.’ Such is the first onset of Job’s affliction and its result. It remains to be seen what the long issue, days and months of wretchedness, will bring forth.

### 3. The Silent Friends:

We are now to imagine the lapse of some time, perhaps several months (compare ~~80B~~ Job 7:3), during which Job suffers alone, an outcast from house and society, on a leper’s ash-heap. Meanwhile three friends of his who have heard of his affliction make an appointment together and come from distant regions to give him sympathy and comfort (2:11-13). On arriving, however, they find things different from what they had expected; perhaps the ominous nature of his disease has developed since they started. What they find is a man wretched and outcast, with a disease (elephantiasis) which to them can mean nothing but the immediate vengeance of God. The awful sight gives them pause. Instead of condoling with him, they sit silent and dismayed, and for seven days and nights no word is spoken (compare ~~25B~~ Isaiah 53:3). What they were debating with themselves during that time is betrayed by the after-course of the story. How can they bless one whom God has stamped with His curse? To do so would be taking sides with the wicked. Is it not rather their duty to side with God, and be safe, and let sympathy go? By this introduction of the friends and their averted attitude, the writer with consummate skill brings a new element into the story, the element of the Wisdom-philosophy; and time will show whether as a theoretical thing, cold and intellectual, it will retain or repress the natural outwelling of human friendship. And this silence is ominous.

### 4. Whose Way Is Hid:

The man who, in the first onset of trial, blessed Yahweh and set himself to bear in silence now opens his mouth to curse. His curse is directed, not against Yahweh nor against the order of things, but against the day of his birth. It is a day that has ceased to have meaning or worth for him. The day stands for life, for his individual life, a life that in the order of things should carry out the personal promise and fruitage for which it had been

bestowed. And his quarrel with it is that he has lost its clue. Satan unknown to him has sneered because Yahweh had hedged him round with protection and favor (<sup><8110></sup>Job 1:10); but his complaint is that all this is removed without cause, and God has hedged him round with darkness. His way is hid (<sup><8123></sup>Job 3:23). Why then was life given at all? In all this, it will be noted, he raises no train of introspection to account for his condition; he assumes no sinfulness, nor even natural human depravity; the opposite rather, for a baffling element of his case is his shrinking sensitiveness against evil and disloyalty (compare <sup><8125></sup>Job 3:25,26, in which the tenses should be past, with 1:5; see also 6:30; 16:17). His plight has become sharply, poignantly objective; his inner self has no part in it. Thus in this opening speech he strikes the keynote of the real, against which the friends' theories rage and in the end wreck themselves.

### *B) To Job's Ultimatum of Protest:*

#### **1. The Veiled Impeachment:**

With all the gentle regret of having to urge a disagreeable truth the friends, beginning with Eliphaz the wisest and most venerable, enter upon their theory of the case. Eliphaz covers virtually the whole ground; the others come in mainly to echo or emphasize. He veils his reproof in general and implicative terms, the seasoned terms of wisdom in which Job himself is expert (4:3-5); reminds him that no righteous man perishes, but that men reap what they sow (4:7,8); adduces a vision that he had had which revealed to him that man, by the very fact of being mortal, is impure and iniquitous (4:17-19); implies that Job's turbulence of mind precludes him from similar revelations, and jeopardizes his soul (5:1,2); advises him to commit his case to God, with the implication, however, that it is a case needing correction rather than justification, and that the result in view is restored comfort and prosperity. As Job answers with a more passionate and detailed portrayal of his wrong, Bildad, following, abandons the indirect impeachment and attributes the children's death to their sin (8:4), saying also that if Job were pure and upright he might supplicate and regain God's favor (8:5,6). He then goes on to draw a lesson from the traditional Wisdom lore, to the effect that sure destruction awaits the wicked and sure felicity the righteous (<sup><8111></sup>Job 8:11-22). On Job's following this with his most positive arraignment of God's order and claim for light, Zophar replies with impetuous heat, averring that Job's punishment is less than he deserves (<sup><8116></sup>Job 11:6), and reproving him for his presumption in trying to

find the secret of God (<sup><K107></sup>Job 11:7-12). All three of the friends, with increasing emphasis, end their admonitions in much the same way; promising Job reinstatement in God's favor, but always with the veiled implication that he must own to iniquity and entreat as a sinner.

## 2. Wisdom Insipid, Friends Doubtful:

To the general maxims of Wisdom urged against him, with which he is already familiar (compare <sup><K107></sup>Job 13:2), Job's objection is not that they are untrue, but that they are insipid (<sup><K106></sup>Job 6:6,7); they have lost their application to the case. Yet it is pain to him to think that the words of the Holy One should fail; he longs to die rather than deny them (<sup><K109></sup>Job 6:9,10). One poignant element of his sorrow is that the intuitive sense (*tushiyah*; see under *PROVERBS, THE BOOK OF*) is driven away from him; see <sup><K103></sup>Job 6:13. He is irritated by the insinuating way in which the friends beg the question of his guilt; longs for forthright and sincere words (6:25). It is this quality of their speech, in fact, which adds the bitterest drop to his cup; his friends, on whom he had counted for support, are deceitful like a dried-up brook (6:15-20); he feels, in his sick sensitiveness, that they are not sympathizing with him but using him for their cold, calculating purposes (6:27). Thus is introduced one of the most potent motives of the story, the motive of friendship; much will come of it when from the fallible friendships of earth he conquers his way by faith to a friendship in the unseen (compare 16:19; 19:27).

## 3. Crookedness of the Order of things:

With the sense that the old theories have become stale and pointless, though his discernment of the evil of things is undulled by sin (<sup><K100></sup>Job 6:30), Job arrives at an extremely poignant realization of the hardness and crookedness of the world-order, the result both of what the friends are saying and of what he has always held in common with them. It is the view that is forced upon him by the sense that he is unjustly dealt with by a God who renders no reasons, who on the score of justice vouchsafes to man neither insight nor recourse, and whose severity is out of all proportion to man's sense of worth (7:17) or right (9:17) or claim as a creature of His hand (10:8-14). Job 9, which contains Job's direct address to this arbitrary Being, is one of the most tremendous, not to say audacious conceptions in literature; in which a mortal on the threshold of death takes upon himself to read God a lesson in godlikeness. In this part of the story Job reaches his

ultimatum of protest; a protest amazingly sincere, but not blasphemous when we realize that it is made in the interest of the Godlike.

#### **4. No Mediation in Sight:**

The great lack which Job feels in his arraignment of God is the lack of mediation between Creator and creature, the Oppressor and His victim. There is no umpire between them, who might lay his hand upon both, so that the wronged one might have voice in the matter (9:32-35). The two things that an umpire might do: to remove God's afflicting hand, and to prevent God's terror from unmanning His victim (see 13:20-22, as compared with the passage just cited), are the great need to restore normal and reciprocal relations with Him whose demand of righteousness is so inexorable. This umpire or advocate idea, thus propounded negatively, will grow to a sublime positive conviction in the next stage of Job's spiritual progress (16:19; 19:25-27).)

#### *C) To Job's Ultimatum of Faith:*

##### **1. Detecting the Friends' False Note:**

As the friends finish their first round of speeches, in which a remote and arbitrary God is urged upon him as everything, and man so corrupt and blind that he cannot but be a worm and culprit (compare ~~<1874>~~ Job 25:4-6), Job's eyes, which hitherto have seen with theirs, are suddenly opened. His first complaint of their professed friendship was that it was fallible; instead of sticking to him when he needed them most (~~<1864>~~ Job 6:14), and in spite of his bewilderment (~~<1865>~~ Job 6:26), they were making it virtually an article of traffic (~~<1867>~~ Job 6:27), as if it were a thing for their gain. It was not sincere, not intrinsic to their nature, but an expedient. And now all at once he penetrates to its motive. They are deserting him in order to curry favor with God. That motive has prevented them from seeing true; they see only their theoretical God, and are respecting His person instead of responding to the inner dictate of truth and integrity. To his honest heart this is monstrous; they ought to be afraid of taking falseness for God (~~<1813>~~ Job 13:3-12). Nor does his inference stop with thus detecting their false note. If they are "forgers of lies" in this respect, what of all their words of wisdom? they have been giving him "proverbs of ashes" (~~<1832>~~ Job 13:12); the note of false implication is in them all. From this point therefore he pays little attention to what they say; lets them go on to grossly exaggerated

statement of their tenet, while he opens a new way of faith for himself, developing the germs of insight that have come to him.

## **2. Staking All on Integrity:**

Having cut loose from all countenancing of the friends' self-interested motives, Job now, with the desperate sense of taking his life in his hand and abandoning hope, resolves that come what will he will maintain his ways to God's face. This, as he believes, is not only the one course for his integrity, but his one plea of salvation, for no false one shall appear before him. How tremendous the meaning of this resolve, we can think when we reflect how he has just taken God in hand to amend His supposed iniquitous order of things; and that he is now, without mediator, pleading the privilege that a mediator would secure (13:20,21; see 8, above) and urging a hearing on his own charges. The whole reach of his sublime faith is involved in this.

## **3. "If a Man Die":**

In two directions his faith is reaching out; in both negatively at first. One, the belief in an Advocate, has already been broached, and is germinating from negative to positive. The other, the question of life after death, rises here in the same tentative way: using first the analogy of the tree which sprouts again after it is cut down (<sup><1840></sup>Job 14:7-9), and from it inquiring, 'If a man die — might he live again?' and dwelling in fervid imagination on the ideal solution which a survival of death would bring (<sup><1841></sup>Job 14:13-17), but returning to his reluctant negative, from the analogy of drying waters (<sup><1842></sup>Job 14:11) and the slow wearing down of mountains (<sup><1843></sup>Job 14:18,19). As yet he can treat the idea only as a fancy; not yet a hope or a grounded conviction.

## **4. The Surviving Next of Kin:**

The conviction comes by a nobler way than fancy, by the way of his personal sense of the just and God-like order. The friends in their second round of speeches have begun their lurid portrayals of the wicked man's awful fate; but until all have spoken again he is concerned with a far more momentous matter. Dismissing these for the present as an academic exercise composed in cold blood (<sup><1844></sup>Job 16:4,5), and evincing a heart hid from understanding (<sup><1845></sup>Job 17:4), Job goes on to recount in the most bitter terms he has yet used the flagrancy of his wrong as something that

calls out for expiation like the blood of Cain (16:18), and breaks out with the conviction that his witness and voucher who will hear his prayer for mediation is on high (16:19-21). Then after Bildad in a spiteful retort has matched his complaint with a description of the calamities of the wicked (an augmented echo of Eliphaz), and he has pathetically bewailed the treachery of earthly friends (19:13,14,21,22), he mounts, as it were, at a bound to the sublime ultimatum of his faith in an utterance which he would fain see engraved on the rock forever (19:23-29). "I know that my Redeemer liveth," he exclaims; literally, my Go'el ([yl ʔʕ, go'ali]), or next of kin, the person whose business in the old Hebrew idea was to maintain the rights of an innocent wronged one and avenge his blood. He does not recede from the idea that his wrong is from God (compare 19:6,21); but over his dust stands his next of kin, and as the result of this one's intercession Job, in his own integral person, shall see God no more a stranger. So confident is he that he solemnly warns the friends who have falsely impeached him that it is they, not he, who are in peril (19:28,29; compare 13:10,11).

#### *D) To Job's Verdict on Things as They Are:*

### **1. Climax and Subsidence of the Friends' Charge:**

That in this conviction of a living Redeemer Job's faith has reached firm and final ground is evident from the fact that he does not recur to his old doubts at all. They are settled, and settled right. But now, leaving them, he can attend to what the friends have been saying. Zophar, the third speaker, following, presses to vehement, extreme their iterated portrayal of the wicked man's terrific woes; it seems the design of the writer to make them outdo themselves in frantic overstatement of their thesis. As Zophar ceases, and Job has thus, as it were, drawn all their fire, Job refutes them squarely, as we shall presently see. Meanwhile, in the course of his extended refutation, the friends begin a third round of speeches. Eliphaz, who has already taken alarm at the tendency of Job's words, as those of a depraved skeptic and ruinous to devotion (15:4-6), now in the interests of his orthodoxy brings in his bill of particulars. It is the kind of theoretical cant that has had large prevalence in dogmatic religion, but in Job's case atrociously false. He accuses Job of the most heartless cruelties and frauds (22:5-11), and of taking occasion to indulge in secret wickedness when God was not looking (22:12-14); to this it is that he attributes the spiritual darkness with which Job is encompassed. Then in a beautiful exhortation



— beautiful when we forget its unreal condition (22:23) — he ends by holding open to Job The way of reinstatement and peace. This is the last word of the friends that has any weight. Bildad follows Job's next speech indeed very briefly (Job 25), giving a last feeble echo of their doctrine of total depravity; a reply which Job ridicules and carries on in a kind of parody (Job 26). Zophar does not speak a third time at all. He has nothing to say. And this silence of his is the writer's way of making the friends' theory subside ingloriously.

## **2. The Real Cause of Job's Dismay:**

The idea that Job has a defensible cause or sees farther than they is wholly lost on the friends; to them he is simply a wicked man tormented by the consciousness of guilt, and they attribute the tumult of his thoughts to a wrath, or vexation, which blinds and imperils his soul (compare 5:2; 18:4). That is not the cause of his dismay at all, nor is it merely that his personal fate is inscrutable (compare 23:17 margin). He is confounded rather, even to horror, because the probable facts of the world-order prove the utter falsity of all that they allege. Leaving his case, the righteous man's, out of the account, he sees the wicked just as prosperous, just as secure, just as honored in life and death, as the righteous (21:5-15,29-33). The friends ought to see so plain a fact as well as he (21:29). To all outward appearance there is absolutely no diversity of fate between righteous and wicked (21:23-26). The friends' cut-and-dried Wisdom-doctrine and their thrifty haste to justify God (compare 13:7,8) have landed them in a lie; the truth is that God has left His times mysterious to men (24:1). They may as well own to the full the baffling fact of the impunity of wickedness; the whole of Job 24 is taken up with details of it. Wisdom, with its rigid law of reward and punishment, has failed to penetrate the secret. A hard regime of justice, work and wage, conduct and desert, does not sound the deep truth of God's dealings, either with righteous or wicked. What then? Shall Wisdom go, or shall it rise to a higher level of outlook and insight?

## **3. Manhood in the Ore:**

In some such dim inquiry as this, it would seem, Job goes on from where his friends sit silenced to figure some positive solution of things as they are. He begins with himself and his steadfastly held integrity, sealing his utterance by the solemn Hebrew oath (27:2-6), and as solemnly disavowing all part or sympathy with the wicked (27:7; compare 21:16). He has

already found a meaning in his own searching experience; he is being tried for a sublime assay, in which all that is permanent and precious in him shall come out as gold (23:10). But this thought of manhood in the ore is no monopoly of his; it may hold for all. What then of the wicked? In a passage which some have deemed the lost third speech of Zophar (27:8-23), and which, indeed, recounts what all the friends have seen (27:12), he sets forth the case of the wicked in its true light. The gist of it is that the wicked have not the joy of God (27:10), or the peace of a permanent hope. It is in much the same tone as the friends' diatribes, but with a distinct advance from outward disaster toward tendency and futility. The ore is not being purged for a noble assay; and this will work their woe. Then finally, in the celebrated Job 28, comes up the summary of wisdom itself. That remains, after all this testing of motive, a thing intact and elemental; and man's part in it is just what Job's life has been, to fear God and shun evil (28:28).

#### **4. Job Reads His Indictment:**

As the crowning pronouncement on things as they are, Job in his final and longest speech, describes in a beautiful retrospect his past life, from his "autumn days" when the friendship of God was over his tent and he was a counselor and benefactor among men (Job 29), through this contrasted time of his wretchedness and curse-betraying disease, when the most degraded despise him (Job 30), until now as he draws consciously near the grave, he recounts in solemn review the principles and virtues that have guided his conduct — a noble summary of the highest Hebrew ideals of character (Job 31). This he calls, in sublime irony, the indictment which his Adversary has written; and like a prince, bearing it upon his shoulder and binding it to him like a crown, he is ready to take it with him beyond the bourn to the presence of his Judge. With this tremendous proposal, sanctioned Hebrew-fashion by a final curse if it prove false, the words of Job are ended.

#### *E) The Denouement:*

The friends are silenced, not enlightened. They have clung to their hard thesis to the stubborn end; postulating enough overt crime on Job's part to kill him (<sup><KOT></sup>Job 22:5-9), and clinching their hypothesis with their theory of innate depravity (<sup><KOH></sup>Job 4:18,19; 15:14,15; 25:4-6) and spiritual hebetude (<sup><KRD></sup>Job 5:2; 15:26,27; 22:10,11); but toward Job's higher level of honest integrity and exploring faith they have not advanced one inch; and here

they lie, fossilized dogmatists, fixed and inveterate in their odium theologicum — a far cry from the friendship that came from afar to condole and console. Job, on the other hand, staking all on the issue of his integrity, has held on his way in sturdy consistency (compare 17:9), and stood his ground before the enigma of things as they are. Both parties have said their say; the story is evidently ready for its denouement. Job, too, is ready for the determining word, though it would seem he expects it to be spoken only in some unseen tribunal; the friends rather savagely wish that God would speak and reprove Job for his presumption (compare 11:5,11). But how shall the solution be brought about in this land of Uz where all may see? And above all, how shall it affect the parties concerned? A skillfully told story should not leave this out.

### **1. The Self-constituted Interpreter:**

For this determining pronouncement the writer has chosen to have both parties definitely represented, apparently at their best. So, instead of proceeding at once to the summons from the whirlwind, he introduces here a new character, Elihu, a young man, who has listened with growing impatience to the fruitless discussion, and now must set both parties right or burst (<sup><RB219></sup> Job 32:19). It is like the infusion of young blood into a theodicy too arrogant in its antiquity (compare <sup><RB218></sup> Job 8:8-10; 15:10,18; 12:12 margin, or better as question). This character of Elihu is conceived in a spirit of satire, not without a dash of grim humor. His self-confidence, not to say conceit, is strongly accentuated (<sup><RB217></sup> Job 32:11-22); he assumes the umpire function for which Job has pleaded (33:6,7; compare 9:33-35; 13:20-22); and is sure he represents the perfect in knowledge (36:2-4; 37:16). He speaks four times, addressing himself alternately to Job and the friends. His words, though designedly diffuse, are not without wisdom and beauty; he makes less of Job's deep-seated iniquity than do the friends, but blames him for speaking in the wicked man's idiom (34:7-9,36,37), and warns him against inclining more to iniquity than submission (36:21); but his positive contribution to the discussion is the view he holds of the chastening influence of dreams and visions (33:14-18; compare 7:13-15), and of the pains of disease (33:19-28), especially if the sufferer has an "angel (messenger) interpreter" to reveal its meaning, such a one perhaps as Elihu feels himself to be. As he proceeds in his speech, his words indicate that a storm is rising; and so long as it is distant he employs it to descant on the wonders of God in Nature, wonders which to him mean little more than arbitrary marvels of power; but as it approaches nearer and

shows exceptional phenomena as of a theophany, his words become incoherent, and he breaks off with an abject attempt to disclaim his pretensions. Such is the effect, with him, of the near presence of God. It overwhelms, paralyzes, stops the presumptuous currents of life.

## **2. The Whirlwind and the Voice:**

The writer of the book has not committed the literary fatuity of describing the whirlwind, except as Elihu has seen its oncoming, first with conceit of knowledge, then with wild access of terror — a description in which his essentially vapid personality is reflected. For the readers the significance of the whirlwind is in the Voice it encloses, the thing it says. And here the writer has undertaken the most tremendous task ever attempted by the human imagination: to make the Almighty speak, and speak in character. And one fatuity at least he has escaped; he has not made God bandy arguments with men, or piece together the shifting premises of logic. The whole of the two discourses from the whirlwind is descriptive; a recounting of observable phenomena of created nature, from the great elemental things, earth and sea and light and star and storm, to the varied wonders of animal nature — all things in which the questing mind of man may share, laying hold in his degree on its meaning or mystery. Thus, as a sheer literary personation, it fails at no point of the Godlike. It begins with a peremptory dismissal of Elihu: “Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?” (~~xxx~~ Job 38:2). Then Job is bidden gird up his loins like a strong man, and listen and answer. The fact that Job alone, of all the company, can stand, as it were, on common terms with God is premonitory of the outcome. Of the two Divine discourses, the first (Job 38; 39) emphasizes more especially the unsearchable wisdom of creation; and the lesson it brings home to Job is that a being who is great enough — or presumptuous enough — to criticize and censure is great enough to resolve his own criticism (40:2). To this, of course, Job has no answer; he has presented his plea, which he neither adds to nor takes back (40:3-5). Resuming, then, the Voice in the second discourse (40:6 through 41:34) goes on to describe two great beasts, as it were, elemental monsters of Nature: Behemoth — probably the hippopotamus — vast in resisting and overcoming power, yet unaware of it, and easily subduable by man; and Leviathan — probably the crocodile — a wonder of beautiful adaptedness to its function in Nature, yet utterly malignant, unsubduable, untamable. And the lesson brought home to Job by this strange distribution of creative power is that he, who has called in question God’s right to work as He

does, had better undertake to lower human pride and “tread down the wicked where they stand” (40:12), thus demonstrating his ability to save himself and manage mankind (40:14). By this illuminating thought Job’s trenchancy of demand is utterly melted away into contrition and penitence (42:1-6); but one inspiring effect is his, the thing indeed which he has persistently sought (compare 23:3): God is no more a hearsay, such as the friends have defended and his Wisdom has speculated about; his eye sees Him here on earth, and in his still unremoved affliction, no stranger, but a wise and communable Friend, just as his confident faith had pictured he would, in some embodied sphere beyond suffering (19:27).

### **3. The Thing That Is Right:**

Two of the parties in the story have met the august theophany, and it has wrought its effect on them according to the spirit of the man. The self-constituted interpreter, Elihu, has collapsed as suddenly as he swelled up and exhibited himself. The man of integrity, Job, has reached the beatific goal of his quest. What now of the friends who came from far to confirm their Wisdom, and who were so sure they were defending the mind of God? they are not left without a sufficing word, addressed straight to their spokesman Eliphaz (~~38:17~~ Job 42:7); but their way to light is through the man whose honesty they outraged. Eliphaz’ closing words had promised mediatorial power to Job if he would return from iniquity and acquaint himself with God (22:30); Job is now the mediator, though he has held consistently to the terms they reprobated. And the Divine verdict on them is: “Ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath” (42:7). These are the words of the Being who acknowledged that in permitting this whole trial He was ‘swallowing Job up causelessly’ (2:3). Job’s honest and immensely revelatory words, anger, remonstrance, bold arraignment of God’s way and all, were “the thing that is right.” There is no more tremendous Divine pronouncement in all Scripture than this.

### **4. The Restored Situation:**

Here certain myopic students of the Book of Job think the story should end. It offends them, apparently, to see Satan’s work undone; if they had had the making of the story they would have left Job still suffering, as if disinterested virtue could not be its own reward without it. The author, at least the final author, evidently did not think so; in the ideals and sanctions that prevailed in his age he knew better what he was about. It is not my

business to cut the book to modern pattern, but to note what is there. Job is restored to health, to double his former wealth, to family and honor and a ripe old age. These were what the friends predicted for him on condition of his owning to guilt and calling injustice desert; but in no word of his has he intimated that worldly reinstatement was his wish or his object, the contrary rather. And what he sought he obtained, in richer measure than he sought; obtained it still in suffering, and on earth, “in the place where may see” (compare 34:26 margin). It is no discount to the value of this, nor on the other hand is it an essential addition, to express it not only in spiritual terms, but in terms current among men. And one fundamental thing this restored situation shows, or at least takes for granted, namely, that the quarrel has not been with Wisdom itself, its essence or its sanctions, but only with its encroaching false motive. Deepened, not invaded, its Newtonian law that it is well with the righteous, ill with the wicked, remains intact, an external sanction to live by, in spite of temporal exceptions. A spiritual principle of great significance, too, seems to be indicated, as it were, furtively, in the words, “And Yahweh turned the captivity of Job, when he prayed for his friends.” He had stood on his integrity demanding his right, and became a self-loathing penitent; out of dust and ashes he prayed for his friends, and became again such a power in health and wealth as he had been in his “autumn days.”

#### **IV. THE PROBLEM AND THE PURPOSE.**

##### *1. Beyond the Didactic Tether:*

If the foregoing section has rightly shown that the main thrust and interest of the Book of Job lies not in its debate but in its narrative, we have therein the best clue to its problem and its purpose. The sublime self-portrayal of a man who held fast his integrity against God and man and death and darkness tells its own story and teaches its own lesson, beyond the power of didactic propositions or deductions to compass. The book is not a sermon but a vital, throbbing uprising of the human spirit. It is warm with the life of sound manhood; the inner life with its hopes, its doubts, its convictions, its supreme affiance; to impose on this any tether of didacticism is to chili its spirit and make it dogmatic and academic. The reading of its problem which mainly holds the field today is expressed in the question, “Why does God afflict the righteous?” and so the book is resolved into a theodicy, a justification of God’s ways with man. Well the friends of Job do their best to make their interpretation a theodicy, even

outraging palpable fact to do it; they monopolize the didactic element of the poem; but their chief contention is that God does not afflict the righteous but the wicked, and that Job is a flagrant case in point who adds rebellion to his sin (compare 34:37). Job does not know why God afflicts the righteous; he only knows that it is a grievous fact, which to him seems utterly un-Godlike. God knows, undoubtedly, but He does not tell. Yet all the while an answer to the question is shaping itself in personality, in intrinsic manhood, in the sturdy truth and loyalty of Job's spirit. So, going beyond the didactic tether, we may say that in a deeper sense God is justified after all; if such a result of desperate trial is possible in man, it is worth all the rigor of the experiment. But it is as truly an anthropodicy (excuse the word!) as a theodicy; it puts the essential man on a plane above all that Satan can prove by his lying sneers of self-interest, or the friends' poisoning of the wells by their theory of natural depravity. It comes back after all to the story of Job; he lives the answer to the problem, his personality is the teaching.

## *2. What Comes of Limiting the Purpose:*

It is from this point of view that we can best judge of the critical attacks that have been made on the structure and coherence of the Book of Job. The book has suffered its full share of negative disintegration at the hands of the critics; mostly subjective it seems to me, coming from a too restricted view of its problem and purpose, or from lack of that long patient induction which will not be content until it sees all the elements of its creative idea in fitting order and proportion. To limit the purpose to the issue of a debated theodicy, is to put some parts in precarious tenure; accordingly, there are those to whom the Epilogue seems a superfluity, the Prologue an afterthought, Job 28 a fugitive poem put in to fill up — not to go on to still more radical excisions. On the score of regularity of structure, too, this limitation of design has had equally grave results. Elihu has perhaps fared the worst. He must go, the critics almost universally say, because forsooth he was not formally introduced in the Prologue; and naturally enough, as soon as he has received notice to quit, the language which in one view fits him so dramatically to his part begins to bristle with Aramaisms ('of the kindred of Ram,' 32:2) and strange locutions, the alleged marks of a later bungling hand. Then, further, Zophar must needs round out the mechanical three-times-three of structure by coming up the third time; accordingly, Job is levied upon to contribute some of his words (27:13-23) to help him out. I need not go into further detail. The foregoing



section has done something, I hope, to justify my conviction that the book has a homogeneous design and structure just as it is. Whatever its vicissitudes since the first draft was made, it may turn out after all that the last edition is the best.

### *3. The Book's Own Import of Purpose:*

We are not left in the dark as to the large purpose of the Book of Job, if we will follow its own indications consistently. Satan's question at the beginning, "Doth Job fear God for nought?" sets us on the track of it. To give that question a Godlike and not a Satanic answer, to prove in the person of Job That man has it in him to make his life an unbought loyalty to the Divine, is a purpose large enough to include many subsidiary purposes. But behind this appears, on the part of the author, a purpose which relates his story intimately to the intellectual tendencies of his day. The book embodies, especially in theories of the friends, a searching epitome of the status to which the wisdom philosophy of his time had arrived. That philosophy was a nobly founded theory of life; Job himself had been and continued (compare 28:28) thoroughly at one with it. Soundly identified with righteousness and piety, Wisdom had in religious idiom defined the elements of right and wrong living, and had in no uncertain terms fixed its sanctions of reward and penalty. But from a warm, pulsating life it had become an orthodoxy. Its rigid world had room for only two classes of men: the righteous, bound for the sure rewards of life; the wicked, bound for sure failure and destruction. It brooked no real exception to this austere law of being. But two grave evils were invading its system. One was its hard blindness to facts, or, what is as bad, its determination at all hazards to explain them away. From the psalms of the period (compare e.g. Psalms 37; 49; 73) we can see how the evident happiness and prosperity of the wicked was troubling devout minds. The other was that under this prevailing philosophy life was becoming too cold-blooded and calculable a thing, a virtual feeder of self-interest. The doubt lay very near whether conduct so sanctioned was a thing intrinsic and sincere or a thing bought and sold. This equivocal state of things could not long endure. Sooner or later Satan's question of motive must stab it to the heart; and we may be sure that to the author of the book the impulse to ask the question was not all Satanic. The interests of true wisdom, no less than of skepticism, demanded that the question of inner motive be raised and solved. Nay, Yahweh Himself, whom Satan mocked as abettor of the situation, was on trial. Have we not material here, then, for a sublime



purpose, a mighty epic of test and trial and victory? Out of it, not Job alone, but Wisdom must emerge purified, enlightened, spiritualized.

#### *4. Problem of the Intrinsic Man:*

So much for the purpose of the book. The problem corresponds to it. If we take it as the baffling problem of suffering, or more specifically why God afflicts the righteous, the sufficing answer is, Job is why. To give such essential integrity as his its ultimate proof and occasion is worth the injustice and the unmerited pain. In other words, the problem is more deeply concerned with man's intrinsic nature than with God's mysterious dealings. When God created man in His own image, did He endow him most fundamentally with the spirit of commercialism, or with the spirit of unbought loyalty to the Godlike? And when created man was made fallible and mortal, did that mean an inescapable inherent depravity, or was the potency of noblest manhood still left at the center of his being? Here again Job is the embodied answer. The friends, veritable Calvinists before Calvin, urge depravity; they would exalt God by making man His utter contrast. But Job's steadfast integrity proves that man, one man at least, is at heart sound and true. And if one man, then the potency of soundness exists in manhood. The book is indeed a theodicy; but still more truly it is a boldly maintained anthropodicy, a vindication of the intrinsic worth of man.

### **V. CONSIDERATIONS OF AGE AND SETTING.**

#### *1. Shadowy Contacts with History:*

The questions who was the personal author of the Book of Job, and what was its age, are at best only a matter of conjecture; and my revised conjecture, arrived at since I wrote my *Epic of the Inner Life*, must go for what it is worth. It seems to me much better to regard a story so homogeneous and interrelated as in the main the composition of one mind than to distribute it, as some critics do, among various authors, supplementers, and editors. As to its age, there is so little identifiable contact with political or ecclesiastical history that its composition has been ascribed to many periods, from the time of Abraham to late in post-exilic times. The fact that its scene is laid in the patriarchal past and in a land outside of Palestine indicates the author's design to dissociate it from contemporary events and conditions; such contact with these as exist, therefore, must be read between the lines. The book does not hold with full consistency to patriarchal conditions. Job's friends appeal with the

complacency of wisdom-prospered men to the ancient tenure of the land (15:19); and yet, as Job complains, the heartless greed of the landholding class in removing landmarks and oppressing the poor (24:2-12) connotes the prevalence of such outrages as were denounced by Isaiah and Micah before the Assyrian crisis. Such evils would not decrease under Manasseh and Jehoiakim, and might well be portrayed in reminiscence by an exilic writer. On the top of this consideration may be cited the most definite reference to a historical event that the book contains: the passage <sup><18127></sup>Job 12:17-25, which vividly describes, by an eyewitness ("Lo, mine eye hath seen all this," 13:1), a wholesale deportation and humiliation of eminent persons, just like that told of Jehoiachin and his court in <sup><12413></sup>2 Kings 24:13-15. To my mind this is illuminative for the age of the book. It seems to have been written by one who saw the Chaldean deportation of 587 BC. May I be suffered to carry the suggestion a step farther? It will be remembered that the chief personage of that deportation was for 37 years a state prisoner in Babylon, at the end of which time he was "taken from durance and judgment" (compare <sup><25108></sup>Isaiah 53:8 the King James Version) and lived thenceforth honored with kings (<sup><12527></sup>2 Kings 25:27-30 = <sup><26231></sup>Jeremiah 52:31-34). I take him to have been the original of the individualized Servant of Yahweh described and describing himself in Second Isa. In one of his self-descriptions he says that Yahweh has given him "the tongue of them that are taught" (<sup><23041></sup>Isaiah 50:4); in another that Yahweh has made his "mouth like a sharp sword" and himself "a polished shaft" (<sup><23402></sup>Isaiah 49:2). What he said or wrote is of course unidentifiable; but it is certain that in some cultural way he was a hidden power for good to his people. What if this Book of Job were a prison-made book, like Pilgrim's Progress and Don Quixote, but as much greater as the experience that underlay it was more momentous? I do not see but this suggestion is as probable as any that have been made; and some expressions of the book become thereby very striking, as for instance, the reference to prisoners (3:18,19), to the servant longing for release (7:2), the general sense of being despised, the several references to Job as "my servant Job" (1:8; 2:3; 42:7,8), the description of his restoration as a turned captivity, and his successful intercession for the friends (42:10; compare <sup><25312></sup>Isaiah 53:12). I would merely suggest the idea, however, not press it.

## *2. Place in Biblical Literature:*

If the Book of Job is a product of the time of Jehoiachin's imprisonment, it is in worthy and congenial literary company. Isaiah, fostering the faith of a

new-born spiritual “remnant,” had gathered the elements of that sublime vision (<sup>2000</sup>Isaiah 1:1) of Israel’s mission among the nations which a later hand was even now, four generations after, working to supplement and finish, in a prophecy (Isaiah 40 through 66) which, as all recognize, constitutes the closest parallel in spirited idea to our book. Seers, priests and singers had long busied themselves with the literary treasures of the past; drawing out of dusty archives and putting into popular idiom the ancient laws and counsels of Moses (Deuteronomy; see under JOSIAH); Collecting and adapting the old Davidic psalms and composing new ones, as Hezekiah’s reorganization of the worship required. Ezekiel was at Tel Abib planning for the reconstruction of the temple, and perhaps by his use of the name “Job” veiling a cryptic reference (<sup>344</sup>Ezekiel 14:14,20). The affiliations of the Book of Job, however, were more specifically, with the wisdom literature; and long before this the “men of Hezekiah” (<sup>288</sup>Proverbs 25:1) had gathered their aftermath of the Solomonic proverbs, to supplement the maxims which had been the educative pabulum of the people (see under *PROVERBS, BOOK OF*). It was with the care and principle of this diffused instruction, now the most popular vein of literature, that the Book of Job concerned itself. That had become apparent as soon as the maxims were coordinated in an anthology, and an introduction to the collection had been composed, extolling Wisdom as the guide and savior of life. To a spiritually-minded thinker with the Hebrew genius for religion the motivation of Wisdom must sooner or later come. With its values should be apprehended also its unguarded points and tendencies. It was exposed to the one-sided drift of all popular things. In an age when revision and deeper insight were the literary order of the day, Wisdom would come in with the other strains of literature for purification and maturing; and there was not wanting an experience, the basis of an almost unbelievable report (compare <sup>250</sup>Isaiah 53:1) to give depth and poignancy to Job’s personal story of suffering and integrity.

### *3. Parallels and Echoes:*

In the amazing sureness and vigor. of its message the Book of Job stands out unique and alone; but it is by no means without its lesser parallels in faith and doubt, above which it rises like a mountain above its retinue of foothills. Mention has been made above of a number of Psalms (e.g. 37; 49; 73) which with different degrees of assurance witness to the struggle of faith with the problem of the rampant and successful wicked. Psalm 49, one of the psalms of the sons of Korah, is especially noteworthy, because it

expressly employs the popular mashal, that is, the Wisdom vehicle, to convey a corrective lesson about unblest riches, drawing a conclusion not unlike that of <sup><1827></sup>Job 27:8-23, though in milder tone. Not less noteworthy also is the note of suffering and its mysteriousness which pervades many of the psalms, especially of Asaph and Heman; Psalms 88 and 102 might both have been composed with special reference to Hezekiah's sickness and set beside his psalm in Isaiah 38, but also they are so fully in the tone of Job's complaint, especially Psalm 88, that Professor Godet, not unplausibly, conjectures that the Book of Job was written by its author Heman. Hezekiah's deadly sickness itself (Isaiah 38), which was of a leprous nature, banishing him from the house of God, and which was miraculously healed — an experience regarding which Hezekiah's own writing (<sup><2380></sup>Isaiah 38:10-20) is strikingly in the key of Job's complaint — furnishes the nearest parallel to, or adumbration of, Job's affliction; but also in the accounts of the Servant of Yahweh there are hints of a similar stroke of God's judgment (compare <sup><2524></sup>Isaiah 52:14; 53:3). The passage <sup><1877></sup>Job 7:17,18 has been called "a bitter parody" of <sup><1884></sup>Psalms 8:4; it may be so, but the conditions are in utter contrast, and nothing can be concluded as to which is original and which echo. As to expression, the most remarkable parallel to Job, perhaps, is the passage <sup><2404></sup>Jeremiah 20:14-18, in which, like Job, the prophet Jeremiah curses the day of his birth. This curse in Job would naturally be remembered by all readers as one of the most characteristic features of the book; and in like manner the curse in Jeremiah may have stood out in the memory of his disciples, of whom the writer of Job may have been one, and figure in a similar literary situation. Ezekiel's naming of Job along with Noah and Daniel (<sup><2544></sup>Ezekiel 14:14,20), as a type of atoning righteousness, is doubly remarkable if the writer of Job was a contemporary; he may have taken the name from a well-known legend, and there may have underlain it a double meaning, known to an inner circle, referring cryptically to one whose real name it might be impolitic to pronounce. Whenever written, the outline and meaning of Job's momentous experience must have won speedily to a permanent place in the universal Hebrew memory; so that centuries afterward James could write to the twelve tribes scattered abroad (5:11), "Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord."

## LITERATURE.

A.B. Davidson, "The Book or Job" (Cambridge Bible for Schools), 1884; A.S. Peake, "Job" (New Century Bible), 1905; S.R. Driver, The Book of Job in the Revised Version, 1906; J. T. Marshall, The Book of Job, 1904; J.F. Genung., Epic of the Inner Life, 1891; G.G. Bradley, Lectures on Job in Westminster Abbey, 1887; F.C. Cook in The Speaker's Commentary, 1882. Among German writers, A. Dillmann, Hiob erklärt, 1891; K. Budde, Das Buch Hiob übersetzt und erklärt, 1896 (see The Expositor T, VIII, iii); B. Duhm, Das Buch Hiob erklärt, 1897; G. Beer, Der text des Buches Hiob untersucht, 1897; Gibson, "The Book of Job" (Oxford Commentaries), 1899.

*John Franklin Genung*

## JOB, TESTAMENT OF

*See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.*

## JOBAB

<jo'-bab> ([~~bbw~~ yobhabh], perhaps "howling"; [ ' Iωβάβ, Iobab]):

(1) "Son" of Joktan (~~1029~~Genesis 10:29; ~~1023~~1 Chronicles 1:23).

*See TABLE OF NATIONS.*

(2) An Edomite king (~~0363~~Genesis 36:33,14; ~~1044~~1 Chronicles 1:44,45).

(3) King of Madon (~~0610~~Joshua 11:1).

(4) ~~1389~~1 Chronicles 8:9; and

(5) ~~1388~~1 Chronicles 8:18, Benjamites.

The name is confused with that of Job in Septuagint of ~~1827~~Job 42:17.

## JOCHEBED

<jok'-e-bed> ([~~dbkw~~ yokhebhedh], "Yahweh is glory"): Daughter of Levi, wife of Amram and mother of Moses (Exodus 6:20; ~~0269~~Numbers 26:59). According to Exodus 6:20, she was a sister of Kohath, Amram's father.

## JOD

<jod> “y”: [y, *Yodh*], the tenth letter of the Hebrew alphabet.

See *ALPHABET; JOT; YODH*.

## JODA

<jo'-da> (Westcott-Hort, Greek New Testament, [ 'Ιωδά, *Ioda*]; Textus Receptus of the New Testament, [ 'Ιουδά, *Iouda*]):

(1) A Levite, whose sons were “over the works of the Lord,” corresponding to Sudias (1 Esdras 5:26), Hodaviah (Ezr 2:40), Judah (Ezr 3:9), Hodevah (~~<1078>~~ Nehemiah 7:43).

(2) An ancestor of Jesus in Luke’s genealogy (~~<1135>~~ Luke 3:26, the King James Version “Juda”).

## JOED

<jo'-ed> ([d[~~ed~~] yo`edh], “Yahweh is witness”): A “son” of Benjamin (~~<1110>~~ Nehemiah 11:7), wanting in ~~<1307>~~ 1 Chronicles 9:7.

## JOEL (1)

<jo'-el> ([l a~~ed~~] yo`el], popularly interpreted as “Yahweh is God”; but see HPN, 153; BDB, 222a):

(1) The firstborn of Samuel (~~<1002>~~ 1 Samuel 8:2; ~~<1363>~~ 1 Chronicles 6:33 (Hebrew 18), and supplied in the Revised Version (British and American) of ~~<1368>~~ 1 Chronicles 6:28, correctly).

(2) A Simeonite prince (~~<1305>~~ 1 Chronicles 4:35).

(3) A Reubenite chief (~~<1314>~~ 1 Chronicles 5:4,8).

(4) A Gadite chief, perhaps the same as

(3) (~~<1312>~~ 1 Chronicles 5:12). He might be the chief of “a family or clan whose members might be reckoned as belonging to either or both of the tribes” (Curtis, *Chronicles*, 122).

- (5) A Levite ancestor of Samuel (<sup><1365></sup>1 Chronicles 6:36 (Hebrew 21), called “Shaul” in 6:24 (Hebrew 9)).
- (6) A chief of Issachar (<sup><1308></sup>1 Chronicles 7:3).
- (7) One of David’s mighty men (<sup><1313></sup>1 Chronicles 11:38), brother of Nathan. <sup><1235></sup>2 Samuel 23:36 has “Igal son of Nathan,” and the Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus has “son” in 1 Chronicles, a reading which Curtis adopts.
- See IGAL.*
- (8) A Levite (<sup><1317></sup>1 Chronicles 15:7,11,17), probably the Joel of <sup><1328></sup>1 Chronicles 23:8 and 26:22.
- (9) David’s tribal chief over half of Manasseh (<sup><1371></sup>1 Chronicles 27:20).
- (10) A Levite of Hezekiah’s time (<sup><1492></sup>2 Chronicles 29:12).
- (11) One of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:43) = “Juel” of 1 Esdras 9:35.
- (12) A Benjamite “overseer” in Jerusalem (<sup><1619></sup>Nehemiah 11:9).
- (13) [ ’ **Ιωήλ**, *Ioel*], the prophet (<sup><2001></sup>Joel 1:1; <sup><4126></sup>Acts 2:16). See following article.

*David Francis Roberts*

## **JOEL (2)**

([**l** **aw**Q yo’e<sup>l</sup>]; [ ’ **Ιωήλ**, *Ioel*]):

### **I. THE PROPHET.**

The Book of Joel stands second in the collection of the twelve Prophets in the Hebrew Canon. The name ([**l** **aw**Q yo’e<sup>l</sup>]), meaning “Yahweh is God,” seems to have been common, as we find a dozen other persons bearing it at various periods of the Biblical history. Beyond the fact that he was the son of Pethuel, there is no intimation in the book as to his native place, date, or personal history; nor is he mentioned in any other part of the Old Testament; so that any information on these points must be matter of inference, and the consideration of them must follow some examination of the book itself.

## II. THE BOOK.

### *1. Literary Form:*

This takes largely the form of addresses, the occasion and scope of which have to be gathered from the contents. There is no narrative, properly so called, except at one place (~~2018~~ Joel 2:18), “Then was Yahweh jealous for his land,” etc., and even there the narrative form is not continued. Yet, though the earlier portions at least may be the transcript of actual addresses in which the speaker had his audience before him, this would not apply to the later portions, in which also the direct address is still maintained (e.g. ~~2011~~ Joel 3:11, “Haste ye, and come, all ye nations round about”). This form of direct address is, indeed, characteristic of the style throughout (e.g. ~~2012~~ Joel 2:21; 3:4,9,13). There is this also to be said of its literary character, that “the style of Joel is bright and flowing,” his “imagery and language are fine” (Driver, LOT); “his book is a description, clear, well arranged, and carried out with taste and vivacity, of the present distress and of the ideal future. Joel may be reckoned among the classics of Hebrew literature. The need of a commentary for details, as is the case with Amos and Hosea, is here hardly felt” (Reuss, Das Altes Testament).

### *2. Outline of Contents:*

The book in the original consists of 4 chapters, which, however, are in our version reduced to 3, by making the portion which constitutes chapter 3 in the Hebrew the concluding portion (3:28-32) of chapter 2. The book begins in gloom, and its close is bright. Up to ~~2018~~ Joel 2:18 there is some great trouble or a succession of troubles culminating at 2:28-32 (Joel 3 in Hebrew). And the concluding portion, Joel 3 (Joel 4 in Hebrew), in which the prophet projects his view into futurity, begins with judgment but ends with final blessedness. There is a progression in the thought, rising from the solid, sorely smitten earth to a region ethereal, and the stages of advance are marked by sudden, sharp calls (1:2,14; 3:9), or by the blasts of the trumpet which prelude the shifting scenes (2:1,15).

Joel 1 begins with an address, sharp and peremptory, in which the oldest inhabitant is appealed to whether such a calamity as the present has ever been experienced, and all are called to take note so that the record of it may be handed down to remotest posterity. The land has suffered from a succession of disasters, the greatest that could befall an agricultural country, drought and locusts. The two are in fact inextricably connected,



and the features of both are mixed up in the description of their effects. The extent of the disaster is vividly depicted by the singling out of the classes on whom the calamity has fallen, the drinkers of wine, the priests, the vine-dressers, the husbandmen; and, toward the close of the chapter, the lower animals are pathetically introduced as making their mute appeal to heaven for succor (1:18-20). Specially to be noted is the manner in which the priests are introduced (1:9), and how with them is associated the climax of the affliction. The prophet had just said “my land” (1:6), “my vine” and “my fig-tree” (1:7); and, though many modern expositors take the pronoun as referring to the nation or people, it would appear more appropriate, since the people is objectively addressed, to regard the prophet as identifying himself with the God in whose name he is speaking. And then the transition to <sup>(2018)</sup> Joel 1:8 becomes intelligible, in which certainly the land is personified as a female: “Lament like a virgin girded with sackcloth for the husband of her youth.” The underlying idea seems to be the conception of the land as Yahweh’s and of Yahweh as the ba’al “lord,” or husband of people and land. This is the idea so much in evidence in the Book of Hosea, and so much perverted by the people whom he addressed, who ascribed their corn (grain) and wine and oil to the Canaanite Baals. The idea in its purer form is found in the “land Beulah,” “married land” (<sup>(2014)</sup> Isaiah 62:4,5). If it was this that was in Joel’s mind, the mention of the priests comes naturally. The products of the land were Yahweh’s gifts, and the acknowledgment of His lordship was made by offerings of the produce laid on His altar. But if nothing was given, nothing could be offered; the “cutting off” of the meal and drink offerings was the mark of the widowhood and destitution of the land. Hence, the pathetic longing (<sup>(2014)</sup> Joel 2:14) that at least so much may be left as to assure the famished land that the supreme calamity, the loss of God, has not fallen. Thus the visitation is set in a religious light: the graphic description is more than a poetic picture. It is the Lord’s land that is wasted; hence, the summons (<sup>(2014)</sup> Joel 1:14) to “cry unto Yahweh,” and in the verses that follow the supplication by man and beast for deliverance.

Joel 2 up to verse 17 seems to go over the same ground as Joel 1, and it has also two parts parallel respectively to two parts of that chapter: 2:1-11 is parallel to 1:2-12, and 2:12-17 to 1:13-20. The former part in both cases is chiefly descriptive of the calamity, while the latter part is more hortatory. Yet there is an advance; for, whereas in 1:2-12 the attention is fixed on the devastation, in 2:1-11 it is the devastator, the locust, that is particularly

described; also, in 2:12-17 the tone is more intensely religious: “Rend your heart, and not your garments” (2:13). Finally it is to be noted that it is at the close of this portion that we get the first reference to external nations: “Give not thy heritage to reproach, that the nations should use a byword against them: wherefore should they say among the peoples, Where is their God?” (2:17 margin). If the view given above of 1:6-8 be correct, this is merely an expansion of the germinal idea there involved. And so it becomes a pivot on which the succeeding portion turns: “Then was Yahweh jealous for his land, and had pity on his people” (2:18).

There is a sharp turn at ~~2:18~~ Joel 2:18, marked by the sudden variation of the verbal forms. Just as in ~~7:10~~ Amos 7:10, in the midst of the prophet’s discourse, we come upon the narration, “Then Amaziah the priest of Beth-el sent to Jeroboam,” etc., so here we have obviously to take the narrative to be the sequence of the foregoing address, or, more properly speaking, we have to infer that what Joel had counseled had been done. The fast had been sanctified, the solemn assembly had been called, all classes or their representatives had been gathered to the house of the Lord, the supplication had been made, and “then was Yahweh jealous for his land, and had pity on his people.” In point of fact, as the Hebrew student will perceive, all the verbs from 2:15 may be read, with a change of the points, as simple perfects, with the exception of the verbs for “weep” and “say” in 2:17, which might be descriptive imperfects. But no doubt the imperative forms are to be read, expressing as they do more graphically the doing of the thing prescribed. And, this sharp turn having been made, it will be noticed how the discourse proceeds on a higher gradient, forming a counterpart to the preceding context. Step by step, in inverse order, we pass the former points, beginning opposite what was last the “reproach among the nations” (2:19; compare 2:7), passing the destruction of the great army (2:20; compare 2:1-11), then touching upon the various kinds of vegetation affected (2:21-24; compare 1:12,10, etc.), and ending with the reversal of the fourfold devastation with which the prophet began (2:25; compare 1:4). So that what at the outset was announced as a calamity unprecedented and unparalleled, now becomes a deliverance as enduring as God’s presence with His people is forever assured.

Up to this point there has been an observable sequence and connection, so that, while the prophet has steadily progressed upward, we can look down from the point reached and see the whole course that has been traversed. But now in ~~2:28~~ Joel 2:28-32 (Joel 3 in Hebrews) he passes abruptly to what

“shall come to pass afterward.” And yet no doubt there was a connection of thought in his mind, of which we obtain suggestions in the new features of the description. There is “the sound of abundance of rain” (~~1184~~ 1 Kings 18:41) in this pouring out of the Spirit upon all flesh; in the sons and daughters, old men and young, servants and handmaidens, we seem to recognize the representative gathering of ~~2015~~ Joel 2:15 f, those engaged in the priestly function of, supplication here endued with prophetic gifts, “a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation” (Exodus 19:6), all the Lord’s people become prophets (~~04123~~ Numbers 11:29). Again we see the sky overcast and sun and moon darkened before the great and terrible day of the Lord, as if the prophet had said: There shall be greater things than these; a new era is coming in which God’s hand will be laid more heavily upon the world, and His people will be quickened to a clearer vision of His working. The “day of Yahweh” has yet to come in a fuller sense than the locust plague suggested, and there will be a more effective deliverance than from drought and dearth; but then as now there will be found safety in Mt. Zion and Jerusalem. This, however, implies some danger with which Jerusalem has been threatened; a “remnant,” an “escaped” portion involves a disaster or crisis out of which new life comes. And so the prophet goes on in Joel 3 (Joel 4 in Hebrews), still speaking of “those days” and “that time,” to tell us of the greater deliverance from the greater trouble to which he has been alluding. There is nothing in the antecedent chapters to indicate what “that time” and “those days” are, or what the prophet means by bringing again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem. These are questions of interpretation. In the meantime, we may note the general features of the scene now set before us. A great assize is to be held in the valley of Jehoshaphat, in which “all nations” there assembled by Divine summons will be judged for offenses against God’s people and heritage (3:1-8). And again, just as in Joel 1; 2 the prophet exhibited the plague of locusts in two pictures, so here in 3:9-21 the picture of the great assize is transformed into a bloody picture in the same valley, not so much of battle as of slaughter, a treading of the wine-press. There is a confused multitude in “the valley of decision”; sun and moon are darkened, and the stars withdraw their shining; the “day of Yahweh” has finally come; and, when the din is silenced and clear light again falls upon the scene, all is peace and prosperity, the last of the enemies destroyed, and the Lord dwelleth in Zion.

### *3. Interpretation:*

#### **(1) Literal.**

Thus the book forms a fairly intelligible and connected whole when we read in the literal sense of the language. That is to say: a time of continued drought combined with an unprecedented visitation of locusts gives occasion to the prophet to call his people to the recognition of the Divine hand and to earnest supplication that the threatened ruin of people and land may be averted. The removal of the calamity is interpreted as a mark of restored Divine favor and an assurance of prosperity based on God's unchangeable purpose of good to His people. But these great doings of Nature's God suggest yet greater deeds of Israel's God of a more spiritual kind, the outpouring, like copious showers, of Divine blessing, so that the whole community would be set on a higher level of spiritual apprehension. And thus the prophet is led on to speak of the "last things." Judah and Jerusalem, highly distinguished and signally protected, are bound up with a world-wide purpose; Israel, in a word, cannot be conceived apart from non-Israel. And as non-Israel had in the past been an opposing power, in the great "day of Yahweh," wrong should be at last righted, the nations judged, and Israel and Israel's God be glorified. No doubt the interpretation is not without difficulties. We may not be able to detect the motives of the sudden transitions, or to say how much of the purport of the latter part was in the prophet's mind when he was engaged on the former part. And the description of the locust is so highly poetical that there is a temptation to see in it a reference to a great invading army.

#### **(2) Allegorical.**

These considerations, combined with the undoubted eschatological strain of the closing part of the book, led early commentators (and they have had followers in modern times) to an allegorical interpretation of the locust, and to regard the whole book as pointing forward to future history. Thus, in Jerome's time, the 4 names of the locust in 1:4 were supposed to designate

- (1)** the Assyrians and Babylonians,
- (2)** the Medes and Persians,
- (3)** the Macedonians and Antiochus Epiphanes, and

#### (4) the Romans.

But, apart from the consideration that the analogy of prophecy would lead us to look for some actual situation or occurrence of his time as the starting-point of Joel's discourse, a close observation and acquaintance with the habits of the locust confirm the prophet's description, albeit highly figurative and poetical, as minutely accurate in all its details. It is to be observed that, though spoken of as an army (and at the present day the Oriental calls the locust the "army of God"), there is no mention of bloodshed. The designation "the northern one," which has been considered inappropriate because the locust comes from the parched plain of the eastern interior, need not cause perplexity; for the Hebrew, while it has names for the 4 cardinal points of the compass, has none for the intermediate points: Judea might be visited by locusts coming from the Northeast, or, coming from the East, they might strike the country at a point to the North of Palestine and travel southward. So the wind which destroys the locust (~~צפון~~ Joel 2:20) would be a northwesterly wind, driving the forepart into the Dead Sea and the hinder part into the Mediterranean.

#### *4. Indications of Date:*

The Book of Joel has been assigned by different authorities to very various dates, ranging over 4 or 5 centuries; but, as will appear in the sequel, it comes to be a question whether the book is very early or very late, in fact, whether Joel is perhaps the very earliest or the very last or among the last of the writing prophets. This diversity of opinion is due to the fact that there are no direct indications of date in the book itself, and that such indirect indications as it affords are held to be capable of explanation on the one view or the other. It will be noticed also that, to add to the uncertainty, many of the arguments adduced are of a negative kind, i.e. consideration of what the prophet does not mention or refer to, and the argument from silence is notoriously precarious. It will, therefore, be convenient to specify the indications available, and to note the arguments drawn from them in support of the respective dates.

#### **(1) Place in the Canon.**

An argument for a very early date is based upon the place of the book in the, collection of the "twelve" minor prophets.

It stands, in the Hebrew Bible, between Hosea and Amos, who are usually spoken of as the earliest “writing prophets.” It is true that, in the Septuagint collection, the order is different, namely, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah; which may indicate that as early as the time of the formation of the Canon of the Prophets there was uncertainty as to the place of Joel, Obadiah, and Jon, which contain no direct indication of their dates. But, seeing that there has evidently been a regard to some chronological order, the books being arranged according to the Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian periods, it cannot be without significance that Joel has found a place so high up in the collection. The three indisputably post-exilian books stand together at the end. If Joel is late, it must be as late as the latest of these, possibly a great deal later. But if that is so, there was the greater likelihood of its date being known to the collectors. It would be a very hazardous assumption that prophetic books were not read or copied from the time of their first composition till the time they were gathered into a Canon. And, if they were so read and copied, surely the people who handled them took some interest in preserving the knowledge of their origin and authorship.

In this connection, attention is directed to the resemblances to the Book of Amos before which Joel stands. These are regarded by Reuss as favoring the early date. That large and beautiful passage with which the Book of Amos opens dwells upon the thought that the threatenings, which had formerly been uttered against the nations, are about to receive their fulfillment, and that Yahweh could not take back His word. Now it is just such a threatening that fills the last part of the Book of Joel. Indeed Amos begins his book with the very phrase in which Joel opens his closing address, “Yahweh will roar from Zion, and utter his voice from Jerus” (~~300P~~ Amos 1:2; Joel 4:16). At the end of Amos also the happy fertility of Canaan is described in similar terms to those in Joel (~~300P~~ Amos 9:13; ~~200P~~ Joel 3:18). Reuss, moreover, draws attention to the remarkable expression found in Joel, and also, though in modified terms, in two Prophets of the Assyrian period: “Beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruning-hooks into spears,” says Joel (3:10), whereas we have the oracle in ~~200P~~ Isaiah 2:4 and ~~300P~~ Micah 4:3, “They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks”; and it is suggested that, if these were current phrases, they were more likely to have been coined in the form employed by Joel in earlier and less settled times, when sudden alarms of war called the peaceful husbandman to the defense of his

fields and flocks. Further, it is pointed out that Amos reproaches the people of his day for impenitence, although Yahweh had given them “cleanness of teeth” and “want of bread” and had “withholden the rain .... when there were yet three months to the harvest,” and smitten them with blasting and mildew and the palmer worm (<sup><3006></sup>Amos 4:6-9); and all this is the more striking because Joel represents the distress of his day as unprecedented in magnitude.

To all this, advocates of the late date reply that we cannot determine the date of a book by its place in the Canon; for that the collectors were guided by other considerations. As to the resemblances to Amos, it may have been on the strength of these very resemblances that the Book of Joel, bearing no date in itself, was placed beside that of Amos. Moreover, it is maintained, as we shall see presently, that Joel has resemblances to other prophets, some of them confessedly of late date, proving that he was acquainted with writings of a very late time.

## **(2) Language and Style.**

Another argument for an early date is based upon the purity of the language and character of the style. The book is written in what may be described as classical Hebrew, and shows no trace of decadence of language. It is no doubt true that “the style is the man,” as is strikingly illustrated in the very different styles of Amos and Hosea, who were practically contemporaneous; so that arguments of this kind are precarious. Still, it is to be noted, that though there is nothing archaic in the style of Joel, neither is there anything archaic in the style of Amos, who would, by the exclusion of Joel, be our earliest example of written prophecy.

The advocates of the very late date reply that the style of Joel is too good to be archaic; and that his admittedly classic style is to be explained by the supposition that, living at a late time, he was a diligent student of earlier prophetic literature, and molded his style upon the classical.

## **(3) Quotations.**

Here, therefore, must be mentioned an argument much relied on by the advocates of a very late date. It is said that there are so many resemblances in thought and expression to other Old Testament books that it is incredible that so many writers posterior to the early date claimed for Joel should have quoted from this little book or expanded thoughts contained in

it. A very elaborate comparison of Joel with late writers has been made by Holzinger in ZATW, 1889, 89-131; his line of argument being that, while resemblances to undoubtedly early writers may be explained as the work of a writer in the Renaissance imitating older models, the resemblances to others known to be late, such as Jeremiah, Ezekiel, II Isaiah, Psalms, Nehemiah, Chronicles, etc., cannot be so explained if Joel is taken to be early. The principal passages in question are given in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, "Book of Joel," by Professor Driver, who also takes the view that Joel is late.

The list is not, perhaps, so formidable as its length would imply. Both writers confess that from several of the passages no conclusion of any value can be drawn, and that there is always a difficulty in determining priority when similarities in diction are found. Many of the expressions quoted look as if they might have been commonplaces of the prophetic literature; and, if it was possible for a very late writer to quote from so many antecedent writings, it was as possible and much easier for a number of late writers to go back to the very earliest prophets, especially if their words were memorable and germinal. We have heard of the man who objected to Shakespeare because he was full of quotations; and there is perhaps not a line of Gray's "Elegy" that has not been quoted somewhere, while some of his lines have become household words. But the strongest objection to this argument is this: if Joel had the minute acquaintance with antecedent writers and followed them so closely as is implied, he not only varies from them in essential particulars, but falls below them, as we shall see, in his anticipations of the future.

#### **(4) The Situation.**

We have now to look at features of a more concrete and tangible character, which promise to give more positive results. It is maintained by the advocates of the late date that the situation and immediate outlook of the prophet are not only consistent with the late date but preclude any preexilic date altogether. The elements of the situation are these: Whereas all the prophets before the downfall of Samaria (722 BC), and even Jeremiah and Ezekiel, mention the Northern Kingdom, it is not once named or referred to in Joel; for the occurrence of the name "Israel" in 2:27; 3:2,16 cannot support this sense. Judah and Jerusalem fill our prophet's actual horizon (2:1,32; 3:6,16 f.20); no king is mentioned or implied, but the elders with the priests seem to be the prominent and ruling class.



Further, the temple and its worship are central (1:14; 2:15 f) and so important that the cutting off of the meal offering and drink offering is tantamount to national ruin (1:9,13,16; 2:14). Again, there is no mention of the prevailing sins of preexilic times, the high places with their corrupt worship, or indeed of any specific sin for which the people were to humble themselves, while fasting and putting on sackcloth seem to have a special virtue. All the circumstances, it is held, conform exactly to the time of the post-exilic temple and to no other time. The Northern Kingdom was no more, there was no king in Jerusalem, the temple was the center and rallying-point of national life, its ritual the pledge and guarantee of God's presence and favor; the period of legalism had set in. It is confidently averred that at no period prior to the regime inaugurated by Ezra and Nehemiah was there such a conjunction of circumstances.

**(a) Political:**

In reply, it is urged in favor of the early date that there was a period in preexilic time when such a situation existed, namely, the early years of the reign of Joash, when that prince was still an infant; for Jehoiada the priest acted practically as regent after the death of Athaliah, 836 BC (~~<2K>~~ 2 Kings 11:1-17). This would sufficiently account for the absence of mention of a king in the book. At such a time the priesthood must have held a prominent position, and the temple would overshadow the palace in importance. The omission of the Northern Kingdom may be accounted for by the fact that at that time the two kingdoms were on friendly terms; for the two royal houses were connected by marriage, and the kingdoms were in alliance (~~<2K>~~ 2 Kings 3:6 ff; 8:28 ff). Or the omission may have no more significance than the fact that Joel was concerned with an immediate and near present distress and had no occasion to mention the Northern Kingdom. To show how unsafe it is to draw conclusions from such silence, it may be observed that throughout the first 5 chapters of Isa, larger in bulk than the whole Book of Joel, only Judah and Jerusalem are mentioned; and, even if it should be maintained that a part or the whole of these chapters dates from after the deportation of the ten tribes, still it is noteworthy that, when the prophet could have made as good use of a reference to the event as Jeremiah and Ezekiel, he does not do so.

**(b) Religious:**

The fact that there is no mention of specific national sins, and particularly of the worship of the high places, of which preexilic prophets have so much to say, is made much of by advocates of the late date, Dr. A.B. Davidson, e.g., declaring it to be “doubtful whether such a state of things existed at any time prior to the restoration from exile” (Expos, March, 1888); but perhaps this argument proves too much. If we are to deduce the state of religion in Joel’s day from, what he does not say on the subject, it may be doubted whether at any time, either before or after the exile, such a condition prevailed. The post-exilic prophets certainly knew of sins in their time, sins, too, which restrained the rain and blasted the wine and oil and corn (~~3011~~ Haggaï 1:11). For all that Joel says on the subject, the condition of things implied is as consistent with the time of Jehoiada as with that of Nehemiah. And what shall we say of Isaiah’s positive description of the condition of Jerusalem before his time: “the faithful city .... she that was full of justice! righteousness lodged in her” (~~2012~~ Isaiah 1:21)? When was that? So also his promise: “I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counselors as at the beginning: afterward thou shalt be called The city of righteousness, a faithful town” (~~2013~~ Isaiah 1:26). Higher praise could scarcely be bestowed, and there is nothing in the Book of Joel to imply that he assumed so much.

### (c) Ritualistic:

Too much has been made of the references to ritual, as if they necessarily implied a post-exilic date. It is not legitimate here to assume that the idea of centralization of worship originated in Josiah’s days, and that the priestly legislation is post-exilic. The mention of “old men” or “elders” is no such indication. Wellhausen himself maintains that the expression everywhere in Joel means nothing more than “old men”; and, even if it had an official connotation, the official elders are an old tribal institution in Israel. It may be noted here again that in the first 5 chapters of Isaiah elders also are mentioned, and more indubitably in an official sense, although the time was that of the monarchy (~~2014~~ Isaiah 3:2,14). And as to the sanctity of the temple, it will hardly be denied that in the time of Jehoiada the Jerusalem temple was a place of far more importance than any supposed local shrine, and especially when there was a call to a united national supplication (see 2 Kings 11). In point of fact the alleged references to ritual are very few and in most general terms. The “fast” is not denoted by the phrases in the legal codes, and was evidently on the footing of such

observances as are common and instinctive at all times and among all persons (~~0716~~Judges 20:26; ~~0906~~1 Samuel 7:6; ~~3012~~2 Samuel 1:12; ~~3385~~Jonah 3:5 ff). And where in any law-code are priests enjoined to lie all night in sackcloth (~~2013~~Joel 1:13)? Or what prescription in any code requires young and old, bridegroom and bride, to press together into the temple (~~2916~~Joel 2:16)? And why should not any or all of these things have been done in face of a sudden emergency threatening the ruin of an agricultural people? Moreover, Joel, so far from ascribing virtue to these outward marks of humiliation in a legalistic spirit, immediately after mentioning them says: "Rend your heart, and not your garments, and turn unto Yahweh your God" (~~2913~~Joel 2:13).

The only ritual references are to the meal offering and the drink offering (~~2909~~Joel 1:9,13; 2:14), and these were not characteristically post-exilian. Indeed, they may be regarded as primitive forms of offering, the produce of the ground without which, among an agricultural people, we can hardly imagine a system of offerings to exist. They are both ancient. Amos regards the meal offering as well known (Joel 5:22,25), and Isaiah uses the word "vain oblations" in speaking of its abuse (~~2913~~Isaiah 1:13). And though the noun for drink offering is not mentioned in the older prophets, Hosea knows the related verb and the act of pouring out wine to the Lord (~~2909~~Hosea 9:4), and it may be asked whether it is likely that the people performed the act and had no name for the offering itself. Moreover, in an undisputed passage (~~2163~~2 Kings 16:13,15), both offerings are mentioned in the time of Ahaz. As for the contention that our prophet regards these offerings of so much importance that the cessation of them would be fatal, if our interpretation of ~~2908~~Joel 1:8 f above be correct, the earlier date would be much more appropriate. It was not because the offering threatened to cease, but because the thing offered threatened to be cut off, that Joel was so perturbed. The popular view as to the relation of Yahweh to His land was ancient, and had a foundation of truth; and in fact Hosea's teaching would fitly follow and complete that of Joel. Finally it is to be said that Joel's fine forecast of the outpouring of the Spirit, and of the universal extension of prophetic activity is as far removed as possible from the "legalistic" tendency that set in after the exile. And if the argument from silence is of any force at all, it is surely a very remarkable thing that in a book of post-exilian times, there should be no mention of prince or governor, or even of high priest.

### (5) Foreign Nations Mentioned or Omitted.

Allusions to foreign nations, or the absence of allusion, would obviously promise to afford indications of the time of the prophet; and yet here also the allusions have been adduced in support of either of the divergent dates. The facts here are as follows: In the first two chapters, where the prophet, as is generally understood, is speaking of his own time and its pressing distress, there is no mention of any foreign nation, not even the kingdom of the ten tribes. The only expression which has been taken to be significant in this connection is the word translated “the northern” army (~~צבא~~ Joel 2:20), which some refer to the Assyrians, while others explain it of a northern army in late or apocalyptic time. In Joel 3, however, when the prophet is speaking of “those days” and “that time” in the future, when the Lord “shall bring back the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem,” there is to be a gathering of “all nations” in the valley of Jehoshaphat (3:1 f); and later on “all the nations” are summoned to appear in the same valley for judgment (3:11 f). “Tyre, and Sidon, and all the regions of Philistia” are specially reproached (3:4) because they have carried into their temples the sacred treasures, and have sold the children of Judah and Jerusalem unto the “sons of the Grecians” (3:6); in recompense for which their sons and daughters are to be sold into the hand of the children of Judah, to be sold by them to “the men of Sheba, to a nation far off” (3:8). Finally, at the close (3:19 f), “Egypt shall be a desolation, and Edom shall be a desolate wilderness, for the violence done to the children of Judah, because they have shed innocent blood in their land.”

It is acknowledged that, on either hypothesis, there are difficulties in accounting for the presence or absence of names of foreign nations in this presentation. Those who advocate the late date point with confidence to the silence as to the kingdom of the ten tribes, or to the kingdom of Damascus, which, on their hypothesis, had passed away, and the equally significant silence as to Assyria, which had long ago been superseded by the Babylonian and Persians empires of the East. As to the mention of Tyre and Sidon and the coasts of Philistia (~~צור~~ Joel 3:4-6), Driver says: “The particular occasion referred to by Joel must remain uncertain: but the Phoenicians continued to act as slave-dealers long after the age of Amos: and the notice of Javan (Greece) suits better a later time, when Syrian slaves were in request in Greece” (Cambridge Bible, “Joel,” 17). The same writer says on Joel 3:19: “There is so little that is specific in what is said in this verse with reference to either Egypt or Edom, that both countries are

probably named (at a time when the Assyrians and Chaldeans had alike ceased to be formidable to Judah) as typical examples of countries hostile to the Jews.” It is pointed out, moreover, that the enmity of Edom was particularly manifest at a late period when Jerusalem was destroyed by the Chaldeans, and that this was remembered and resented long afterward (Obadiah 1:10-16; <sup><1251></sup>Ezekiel 25:12 ff; 35; <sup><1201></sup>Psalm 137:7).

On the hypothesis of the early date, it is urged that there was no occasion to refer to the Northern Kingdom. If it was friendly, the inclusive name of Israel for the whole people was sufficient to denote this, and that it was not hostile in the early days of Joash has already been pointed out. As to Damascus, it was not till the last years of the reign of Joash that Hazael showed hostility to Jerusalem (<sup><1217></sup>2 Kings 12:17 f); and danger from Assyria had not yet emerged, and appears only faintly in Amos (<sup><2011></sup>Joel 3:11; 6:14). Then it is pointed out that history records how, in the reign of Jehoram, the grandfather of Joash, “Edom revolted from under the hand of Judah, and made a king over themselves” (<sup><1210></sup>2 Kings 8:20; <sup><1208></sup>2 Chronicles 21:8), and the historian adds that the revolt continued “unto this day.” It may well have been that in such a revolt the resident Judeans in the land of Edom suffered the violence referred to in <sup><2019></sup>Joel 3:19. Moreover, the Chronicler mentions that, in the same reign, “Yahweh stirred up against Jehoram the spirit of the Philistines, and of the Arabians that are beside the Ethiopians: and they came up against Judah, and brake into it, and carried away all the substance that was found in the king’s house, and his sons also, and his wives,” etc. (<sup><1216></sup>2 Chronicles 21:16 f). This might be what is referred to in <sup><2014></sup>Joel 3:4-6. If the royal family were carried away there would most probably be a deportation of other prisoners, who, taken by the seaboard Philistines, would, through the great maritime power of the day, be sold to the distant Greeks. And here it is pointed out that Amos singles out the very nations mentioned by Joel: Philistines, Tyre and Sidon and Edom, and reproaches them with offenses such as Joel specifies (Amos 1:6-12). And then, it is added, if the book is as late as Nehemiah, why is nothing said of Samaritans, Moabites, and Ammonites, who showed such marked hostility in his days (<sup><1219></sup>Nehemiah 2:19; 4:7; 6:1)? For Ezekiel also, from whom it is supposed Joel derived his reference to the Edomites, mentions also Moabites and Ammonites as hostile to Israel (<sup><2201></sup>Ezekiel 25:1-11). And so far were Tyre and Sidon from being hostile in the days of Nehemiah that we read of similar arrangements being made with them, as in the time of Solomon, for the supply of materials for the rebuilding of the

temple (Ezr 3:7). And why is not a word said of the Babylonians, at whose hands Israel had suffered so much? So strongly, indeed, are these objections felt by Reuss, that he declares that, should the view of the late origin come to be finally accepted as the more probable, he would decide for a date after the Persian domination, i.e. subsequent to 332 BC. For, he says, the names of peoples introduced at the end of the book, Phoenicians, Egyptians, Philistines, Edomites, must surely in some way have had an actual significance for the author, who cannot out of caprice have passed over Syrians, Assyrians, Chaldeans, and Persians. Accordingly, if we are to have nothing to do with the pre-Assyrian period, we must come down to the late Seleucid and Ptolemean dynasties, by whose hostile collisions Judea was certainly involved in severe trouble. But then, how are we to account for the position of Joel so high up in the collection of prophetic writers? For, on this supposition, we should expect his book to stand in the third division of the Canon.

#### (6) Some Notable Expressions.

There remain to be noticed some significant expressions which have a bearing on the question of date and, at first sight, seem to indicate a late origin. And yet there is a difficulty. For there is no doubt that our familiarity with the details of the great downfall of the Jewish state leads us to think of the destruction of Jerusalem when we read of the captivity or scattering of the people. There is, however, a saying in the Talmud that a greater distress makes a lesser one forgotten; and the question is whether there may not have been national experiences at an earlier time to which such expressions might be applicable: or, in other words, how early such phrases were coined and became current.

#### (a) “Bring Back the Captivity”:

There is, first of all, uncertainty as to the origin of the phrase “bring back the captivity.” Some connect the word “captivity” ([**tWwv**] *shebhuth*), [**tybiv**] *shebhith*) with the verb “to take captive” ([**hby**; *shabhah*]), while others make it the cognate noun of the verb “to return” ([**bWv**, *shubh*]), with which it stands connected in the phrase “bring back the captivity of Judah and Jerus” (~~2000~~ Joel 3:1). In the former case the reference would be to the return of captives taken in war, or the return of exiles from captivity; and that view has led to the translation in our version. On the latter view, the expression would mean the restoration of prosperity, of which use we

have an undoubted example in the words: “Yahweh turned the captivity of Job” (~~1820~~ Job 42:10). We can conceive either of the views to have been the original, and either to be quite early. A main feature of early warfare was the carrying away of prisoners, and the return of such captives was equivalent to a restoration of prosperity. Or again, the relief from any illness or trouble might be expressed by saying that there was a restoration, as e.g. in Scotland a sick person is said to have “got the turn.” As to the significance of the phrase in Joel, it is pointed out by the advocates of the early date that, in Nehemiah’s time, the exile was at an end, and the captivity “brought back” (Psalm 126). On the other side it is said that, though the new order was set up at Jerusalem, there still remained many Israelites in foreign lands, and Joel, not satisfied with the meager community in Palestine, looked forward to a fuller restoration; or otherwise, that the words are used in the wider and more general sense of restored prosperity. That the phrase was in early use, and in the sense of bringing back captives, is seen in ~~3094~~ Amos 9:14 and ~~3061~~ Hosea 6:11. And it may be observed that the phraseology used by Amos to denote going into captivity (Amos 1:5,15; 5:5,27; 7:17) is employed by the Jews to denote the Babylonian captivity, and is even used by modern Jews to express the present dispersion. And yet Amos speaks of an “entire captivity” of people in his day (Amos 1:6,9 margin).

**(b) “Parted My Land”:**

Then again, the expression “parted my land” (~~2082~~ Joel 3:2) does not seem very applicable to the breaking up of the state, for the land was not parted but absorbed in the great eastern empires; nor does Joel single out Assyrians, Babylonians, and Persians, by whom, if by any, a post-exilic parting of the land was effected. The expression would more fitly apply to such movements as the revolt of Edom and Libnah (~~1002~~ 2 Kings 8:22), and the successive losses of territory by which the great dominion of David and Solomon was reduced. This process, described as “cutting Israel short” (literally, “cutting off the ends,” ~~1002~~ 2 Kings 10:32 the King James Version) is recorded as having begun in the time of Jehu, before the reign of Joash, when outlying parts of territory were smitten by Hazael of Damascus; and Joel, speaking in God’s name, may have used the expression “my land” as referring to the whole country.

**(c) “Scattered among the Nations”:**



Whether the expression “scattered among the nations” (<sup><298D></sup>Joel 3:2) would be applicable to the Israelite inhabitants of such conquered territories or to those sold into slavery (<sup><298E></sup>Joel 3:6) may be disputed. The expression certainly suggests rather the dispersion following the downfall of the state. And yet it is noteworthy that, if so, Joel is the only prophet who uses in that sense the verb here employed, a very strange thing if he followed and borrowed from them all; for, both in Jeremiah and Ezk, as well as in Deuteronomy, other verbs are used. Jeremiah indeed uses the verb in comparing Israel to a scattered (or isolated) sheep which the lions have driven away (50:17); but the only other passage in which the word is plainly used of Israel being dispersed among the peoples in all the provinces of Persia is <sup><778B></sup>Esther 3:8.

**(d)** “Reproach of the Nations”:

Then there is the passage: “Give not thy heritage to reproach, that the nations should rule over them” (or “use a byword against them”): “wherefore should they say among the peoples, Where is their God?” (<sup><2917></sup>Joel 2:17,19; compare margin). Here it is to be noted that the idea involved is certainly much older than the time of the exile. In the time of Hezekiah, the ambassadors of Sennacherib delivered their taunting message, which is described as reproaching the living God (<sup><12904></sup>2 Kings 19:4). It was the method of ancient warfare, as is seen in the boasting of Goliath; for it is the same word that is used in that narrative, though rendered in our version “defy” (<sup><9170></sup>1 Samuel 17:10,25 f,36). And, if we read between the lines of the historical books, we shall see how common was this habit of “defying” or “reproaching,” and how sensitive the people were to it (e.g. <sup><1210></sup>1 Kings 20:2 f,5 f,13,18). All this is anterior to the earliest possible date of Joel, and proves that, at an early time, there was a consciousness in Israel that the fortunes of the people were bound up with the honor of the national God. It is not to be overlooked that it is in the early part of the book, when he is concerned with the drought and locust, that Joel uses this expression.

**(e)** “Strangers Passing Through”:

Toward the close of the book it is predicted that, in the time of final glory, strangers shall no longer pass through Jerusalem (<sup><2987></sup>Joel 3:17). This again would certainly be applicable to a late time, after the land had suffered many hostile invasions. Yet it can well be understood how a prophet at a



very early period, thinking of the glorification of Zion, should imagine a state in which no “stranger” or foreigner should have a footing on the sacred soil, and Israel should dwell in solitary and preeminent exclusiveness. If so, the idea again is of a more primitive kind than the late date would suggest, especially if we postulate a prophet who had deeply studied earlier prophets, to whom Jerusalem of the future was the religious metropolis of the world, and Zion the place to which all nations would flow (<sup><2118></sup>Isaiah 2:3; 56:7).

### (f) “Day of Yahweh”:

A word must be said, in conclusion, in regard to the “day of Yahweh” which figures so prominently in the Book of Joel. In whatever sense it may originally have been employed, whether betokening weal or woe, the expression was an ancient one; for Amos refers to it as current in his day (5:18); and almost all the prophets refer to it in one way or another (<sup><3158></sup>Amos 5:18-20; <sup><2122></sup>Isaiah 2:12; 13:6,9; 34:8; <sup><2460></sup>Jeremiah 46:10; <sup><2122></sup>Lamentations 2:22; <sup><2518></sup>Ezekiel 30:3; Obadiah 1:15; <sup><3108></sup>Zephaniah 1:8,18; 2:2,3; Zec 14:1; <sup><3015></sup>Malachi 4:5). So far as it bears upon the date of Joel the question is: How does his usage compare with those of the other prophets? We find that he uses the expression twice in connection with the visitation of the locust (1:15; 2:1), once after speaking of the outpouring of the Spirit (2:31), and once again near the close of the book (3:14). Now, in regard to the earliest occurrences, it will be perceived that Joel is on a lower plane than succeeding prophets. He associates the approach of the day of the Lord with a heavy visitation upon material nature, precisely as the simple Oriental of the present day, on the occurrence of an eclipse, or at a visitation of locust or pestilence, begins to talk of the end of the world. And, though the point of view is shifted, and the horizon wider, at the close, it is to be remarked that the highest point attained is the conception of the day of the Lord as the deliverance and glorification of Israel: there is not a hint of that day being a time of testing and sifting of Israel itself, as in Amos and elsewhere (<sup><3158></sup>Amos 5:18-20; <sup><2122></sup>Isaiah 2:12). In fact, so far is he from going beyond the other prophets in his conception, that we may say Joel leaves the matter at the point where Amos takes it up.

### *5. View of Professor Merx:*

In view of all these perplexing questions, Professor Ad. Merx had some reason for describing the Book of Joel as the “sorrow’s child”

(Schmerzenskind) of Old Testament exegesis; and he published in 1879 a work, *Die Prophetie des Joel und ihre Ausleger von den ältesten Zeiten bis zu den Reformatoren*, in which, besides giving a history of the interpretation, he combated the method hitherto employed, and put forth a novel view of his own. Concluding, on the grounds usually maintained by the advocates of the late date, that Joel is post-exilic, he makes a comparison of the book with preceding prophetic literature, in order to show that Joel derived his ideas from a study of it, and especially that he followed step by step the prophecies of Ezekiel. Now in Ezekiel's outlook, the overflowing of Judea by the northern people, Gog, plays an important part (<sup><280></sup>Ezekiel 38:2,3,16,18; <sup><281></sup>Ezekiel 39:11), and this explains Joel's reference in 2:20.

As to the precise date: not only is the second temple standing but the city is surrounded by a wall (<sup><282></sup>Joel 2:9); and this brings us down to the government of Nehemiah, after 445 BC; and the book of Nehemiah shows that other prophets besides Malachi lived and found acceptance in those days (<sup><283></sup>Nehemiah 6:7,14). The circumstances were these. Not only the exile, but the restoration, is a thing of the past. We are to think of Jerusalem and Judah in the narrowest sense: the elders and all the inhabitants of the land are addressed, a sort of *senatus populusque Romanus*, and with them are the priests presiding over an orderly ritual service at the temple. Judah is unaffected by political movements; the conflict with the Samaritans has died down; Judah is leading a quiet life, of which nothing is recorded because there is nothing to record; and the people of the ten tribes have practically disappeared, being swallowed up among the heathen: This undisturbed period is employed in literary labor, as may be inferred from the well-known notice regarding Nehemiah's collection of books (2 Macc 2:13 f), and from the production of such works as Esther, Jonah, Qoheleth, Malachi, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, etc. The making of books (<sup><284></sup>Ecclesiastes 12:12) had not come to an end.

But now, if the older prophets were seriously studied (compare <sup><285></sup>Daniel 9:2), what impression would they make on the mind of a man like Joel? Was the daily life that followed the time of Nehemiah in any degree a fulfillment of the hopes of a Deutero-Isaiah, a Jeremiah, an Ezekiel, a Zechariah? Could a member of the restored community contemplate without painful feelings the lamentable condition of existence under the Persian government, the limitation of the people to a narrow territory, the separation from those still in the Dispersion, the irritation of the worship of

the half-heathen Samaritans, the mixed marriages and general low condition, as contrasted with the glowing pictures of the prophets who had spoken of the last days? Such a contradiction between prophecy and event must have disturbed the minds of the more thoughtful; and so, while some said, "It is vain to serve God" (<sup>3084</sup>Malachi 3:14), "They that feared Yahweh spake one with another" (<sup>3086</sup>Malachi 3:16), waiting in hope, believing that the present restoration could not be the true and final bringing back of the captivity.

To relieve his mind, Joel will write a book, the result of his study; and it must depict the full and final consummation. Living as he did, however, in quiet times, he had not, like earlier prophets, a historical situation to start from. Here, according to Merx, the genius of Joel comes into play. Seeking for a type of the end of the world, which was to be the antitype, he found one in the deliverance of Israel from Egypt in the distant past. Just as at that great crisis the people were rescued from bondage and brought into a wide and fertile land, so in the end Yahweh would subdue all Israel's enemies and place them in a noble land, uncontaminated by strangers, while He Himself would be enthroned in majesty on Zion. But just as that deliverance was ushered in by plagues, so also will be the "great day of Yahweh"; and as a signal type of the wholesale destruction of Israel's enemies, he seizes upon the plague of locusts and models his introduction upon Exodus 10:4 ff. Joel had, no doubt, seen many a visitation of locusts; but what we have before us in Joel 1 and 2 is not actual description but idealized picture, the groundwork of his eschatology.

Accordingly, in the view of Merx, the whole Book of Joel is one piece. There is no historical transition at 2:10; in fact, there is no historical element in it at all. The end of the book being apocalyptic, the beginning, which forms with it a unity, must also relate to no event in Joel's days, but moves likewise in the period at the close of time. The people addressed are not the men of Joel's day, but those who shall be alive when "that day" is imminent: in a word, the reader is at 1:2 lifted into the air and placed at the beginning of the final judgment, at the moment when the apocalyptic locusts appear as heralds of the day.

Merx's view may be taken as an extreme and somewhat fanciful statement of the case for a late post-exilian date; and it does not seem to have found acceptance by the critics who start from a historical basis. Merx himself is fully aware that it is a revival of the allegorical and typical interpretation

which had its vogue in earlier stages of exposition. But he defends himself on the ground that it was not the ancients who imposed the allegorical interpretation upon Scripture, but the original writers who were the first typologists and allegorists, as is notably seen in later books like Ezekiel and Daniel. Whatever opinion may be held on that subject, we must at least recognize the strongly marked eschatology of the book. But this does not of necessity imply a late date. It is no doubt true that the fully developed eschatology, as we see it in the apocalyptic literature of the extra-canonical books, came in after the cessation of prophecy proper. Yet prophecy, in its earliest phases, contemplated the distant future, and had its support in such an outlook. Professor A.B. Davidson has said: "Isaiah is the creator of the eschatology of the Old Testament and of Christianity, and it comes from his hand in a form so perfect that his successors can hardly add a single touch to it" (Expository Times, V, 297). The ancient oracle, found both in Isaiah and Micah (~~2MP~~ Isaiah 2:2-4; ~~2MP~~ Micah 4:1-5), testifies to the triumphant and far-reaching hope of the older seers; and, before Isaiah's time, both Amos (9:11-15) and Hosea (14:4-8) have their outlook to the final future. The remarkable thing about Joel, which makes the determination of his date so difficult, is that he seems now to go beyond and now to fall short of other prophets. If he is later than Ezekiel and Jeremiah, he has nothing to say of the inclusion of Gentiles in the inheritance of Israel, but contemplates the final destruction of all Israel's enemies. If he is a contemporary of Malachi or later, he is less legalistic than that prophet; and whereas in Malachi we see the beginning of the fading away of prophecy, Joel looks for the time when the Spirit shall be poured out on all flesh, and the sons and daughters shall prophesy (2:28).

### *6. Connection with the New Testament:*

It is this last element in the prophecy of Joel that links his book particularly with the New Testament, for Peter quoted Joel's words in this passage as fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, when the Spirit was poured forth on the assembled multitude (~~4EP~~ Acts 2:16 ff). Yet, even as the Old Testament prophets one after another caught up the idea, unfolding and expanding it, so the New Testament writers see the approach of the day of the Lord in their own time (~~2MP~~ 1 Thessalonians 5:2; ~~2MP~~ 2 Peter 3:10); for that day is always coming, always near, though still in the future. Paul saw the whole creation groaning and travailing in pain, as Joel did, and the pouring out of the Spirit at Pentecost was part of, and also more than, the effusion seen by Joel. What Joel said he said truly, though he could not say all. For "that

day” has grown in significance as the ages have rolled on; men have seen its approach in the various commotions and upheavals of the world, depicting its features in the colors of the changing times, now praying for it, now dreading its approach; and how far from precision are our thoughts in regard to it still! Yet, early or late, unerring is the sure word of prophecy in its essential burden. The concrete historical situations crumble away and leave the eternal truth as fresh as ever: “Yahweh reigneth; let the earth rejoice” (~~1970~~ Psalm 97:1); it is the hopeful burden of Old Testament prophecy, for “righteousness and justice are the foundation of thy throne” (~~1994~~ Psalm 89:14).

## LITERATURE

(Besides that cited above). — Credner, *Der Proph. Joel ubersetzt u. erklart* (1831); Wuensche, *Die Weissagungen des Proph. Joel ubersetzt u. erklart* (1872); the commentary on the Minor Prophets by Pusey, Orelli, Keil, Wellhausen, G.A. Smith; Meyrick in *Speaker’s Commentary*; Nowack, in *Handkommentar zum Altes Testament*; Marti, in *Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Altes Testament*.

*James Robertson*

## JOELAH

<jo-e’-la> ([hl a[~~w~~ yo`e’lah], perhaps = [hl [w] yo`elah], “may he avail!”): One of David’s recruits at Ziklag (~~1317~~ 1 Chronicles 12:7 (Hebrew 8)); a Benjamite or perhaps a Judean (see Curtis, *Chronicles*, 195 f).

## JOEZER

<jo-e’-zer> ([rz[~~w~~ yo`ezer], “Yahweh is help”): One of David’s Benjamite recruits at Ziklag, though perhaps a Judean (~~1316~~ 1 Chronicles 12:6 (Hebrew 7)).

## JOGBEHAH

<jog’-be-ha> ([hj Bg; yoghbechah]): A city in Gilead assigned to Gad and fortified by that tribe (~~0625~~ Numbers 32:35). It lay on the line along which Gideon chased the Midianites (~~0781~~ Judges 8:11), and the indication there leaves no doubt that it is represented today by Ajbeihat. The name attaches to 3 groups of ruins which date from Roman times. The position is

about 7 miles Northwest of `Amman, and about midway between that city and the town of es-SalT. It stands 3,468 ft. above the level of the Mediterranean.

## LITERATURE.

Oliphant, Land of Gilead, 232; Baedeker-Socin, Palestine.

### JOGLI

<jog'-li> ([yl ʝj; yoghli], perhaps = "led into exile"): Father of Bukki, a Danite chief (<sup>Q622</sup>Numbers 34:22).

### JOHA

<jo'-ha> ([aj wʝ yocha], meaning unknown, but perhaps = [j awʝ yo'ach] "Joah"; see HPN, 283, note 4):

- (1) A Benjamite (<sup>Q86</sup>1 Chronicles 8:16).
- (2) One of David's mighty men (<sup>Q146</sup>1 Chronicles 11:45).

### JOHANAN

<jo-ha'-nan> ([ˈnj wʝ yochanan], "Yahweh has been gracious"; [<sup>Q146</sup>Ἰωανάν, Ioanan]; compare *JEHOHANAN*):

- (1) Son of Kareah, and one of "the captains of the forces who were in the fields" (i.e. probably guerrilla bands), who allied with Gedaliah, governor of Judah, after the fall of Jerusalem, 586 BC (<sup>Q273</sup>2 Kings 25:23; <sup>Q417</sup>Jeremiah 40:7 through 43:7). He warned Gedaliah of the plot of Ishmael ben Nethaniah, who was instigated by the Ammonite king Baalis, to murder the governor; but the latter refused to believe him nor would he grant Johanan permission to slay Ishmael (<sup>Q418</sup>Jeremiah 40:8-16). After Ishmael had murdered Gedaliah and also 70 northern pilgrims, Johanan went in pursuit. He was joined by the unwilling followers of Ishmael, but the murderer escaped. Thereupon Johanan settled at Geruth-Chimham near Bethlehem (Jeremiah 41). As Ishmael's plan was to take the remnant to the land of Ammon, so that of Johanan and his fellow-chiefs was to go to Egypt. They consulted the Divine oracle through Jeremiah, and received the answer that they should remain in Judah (Jeremiah 42). But the prophet

was accused of giving false counsel and of being influenced by Baruch. The chiefs then resolved to go to Egypt, and forced Jeremiah and Baruch to accompany them (Jeremiah 43).

(2) The eldest son of King Josiah (<sup><1315></sup>1 Chronicles 3:15), apparently = “Jehoahaz” (<sup><1231></sup>2 Kings 23:30-33).

(3) Son of Elieoenai, and a Davidic post-exilic prince (<sup><1312></sup>1 Chronicles 3:24).

(4) Father of the Azariah who was priest in Solomon’s time (<sup><1319></sup>1 Chronicles 6:9,10 (Hebrew 5:35,36)).

(5) A Benjamite recruit of David at Ziklag, but perhaps a Judean (<sup><1310></sup>1 Chronicles 12:4 (Hebrew 5)).

(6) A Gadite recruit of David at Ziklag (<sup><1312></sup>1 Chronicles 12:12 (Hebrew 13)).

(7) Hebrew has “Jehohanan,” an Ephraimite chief (<sup><1482></sup>2 Chronicles 28:12).

(8) A returned exile (Ezr 8:12) = “Joannes” (1 Esdras 8:38, the King James Version “Johannes”).

(9) <sup><1312></sup>Nehemiah 12:22,23 = *JEHOHANAN*, (3).

*David Francis Roberts*

## **JOHANNES**

*<jo-han’-es>, <jo-han’-ez>.*

*See JOANNES.*

## **JOHANNINE, THEOLOGY, THE**

*<jo-han’-in, -in>:*

The materials for the following sketch of the Johannine theology are necessarily drawn from the Fourth Gospel and the Epistles, chiefly the First Epistle, of John. The question of authorship is not here considered (see articles on the *GOSPEL* and on the *EPISTLES OF JOHN*). These writings, whether by the same or by different authors, are equally saturated with that spiritual and theological atmosphere, equally characterized by that type of thought which we call Johannine, and which presents an interpretation of

Christianity scarcely less distinctive and original than Paulinism. Where there are differences in the point of view, these will be indicated.

## I. THE ANTECEDENTS.

### *1. Personality of Writer:*

To attempt a full account of the historical sources and antecedents of the Johannine theology is beyond the scope of the present article; but they may be briefly indicated. Much must be attributed to the personality of the great anonymous writer to whom we directly owe this latest development of New Testament thought. Only a thinker of first rank among the idealists and mystics, a mind of the Platonic order, moving instinctively in the world of supersensuous realities, absorbed in the passion for the infinite, possessing in a superlative degree the gift of spiritual intuition, could under any conditions have evolved a system of thought having the special characteristics of this theology.

### *2. Earlier New Testament Writings:*

Yet with all his originality the builder has raised his structure upon the foundation already laid in the teaching represented by the earlier New Testament writings. The synoptic tradition, though freshly interpreted, is presupposed. At certain points there is a strong affinity with the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the main, however, the Johannine doctrine may be said to be a natural and inevitable development of Paulinism — the conclusion to which the earlier writer's mind is visibly moving in e.g. the Epistle to the Colossians.

### *3. Christian Experience and Teaching of History:*

Among the influences which have stimulated and guided this development, the first place belongs to the natural growth of Christian experience and the teaching of history. In the closing decades of the 1st century, Christianity was compelled by the force of events to liberate itself more completely from the husk of Jewish Messianism in which its Divine seed had first been deposited. The faith of the first Christian generation in the Messiahship of Jesus and the triumph of His cause had expressed itself (necessarily so, under the historical conditions) in vivid expectation of His Second Coming. He was only waiting behind the clouds, and would speedily return to the earth for the restitution of all things (~~cf.~~ Acts 3:21). But after the fall of Jerusalem this primitive apocalypticism became, with the passing years,



more and more discredited; and the Christian faith had either to interpret itself afresh, both to its own consciousness and to the world, or confess itself “such stuff as dreams are made of.” It would be difficult to overestimate the service which the Johannine theology must have rendered in this hazardous transition by transferring the emphasis of Christian faith from the apocalyptic to ‘the spiritual, and leading the church to a profounder realization of its essential and inalienable resources in the new spiritual life it possessed through the ever-living Christ. Eternal life was not merely a future felicity, but a present possession; the most real coming of Christ, His coming in the Spirit. The Kingdom of God is here: the eternal is now. Such was the great message of John to his age, and to all ages.

#### *4. Widening Contact with Gentile World:*

In another direction, the widening contact of Christianity with the Gentileworld had stimulated the development of doctrine. A disentanglement from Jewish nationalism, more complete than even Paul had accomplished, had become a necessity. If Christianity was to find a home and a sphere of conquest in the Greek-Roman world — to recreate European thought and civilization — the person of Christ must be interpreted as having a vastly larger significance than that of the Jewish Messiah. That this necessity hastened the process of thought which reached its goal in the Loges-doctrine of John cannot well be doubted. The way had so far been prepared by Philo and the Jewish-Alexandrian school. And while it is probably mere coincidence that Ephesus, with which the activity of John’s later years is associated by universal tradition, was also the city of Heraclitus, who, 500 years earlier, had used the term [*Logos*] to express the idea of an eternal and universal Reason, immanent in the world, there is as little room as there can be motive for questioning that in the Johannine theology Christian thought has been influenced and fertilized at certain points by contact with Hellenism.

#### *5. The Odes of Solomon:*

On the other hand it is possible that this influence has been overrated. Fresh material for the investigation of the sources and connections of the Johannine theology is furnished by the recent discovery of the Odes of Solomon (J. Rendel Harris, M.A., *Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, Cambridge, 1909; AdoIf Harnack, *Ein judisch-christliches Psalmbuch aus dem ersten Jahrhundert*, Leipzig, 1910). This collection of religious poems

is regarded by its discoverer, Rendel Harris, as the work of a writer who, while not a Jew, was a member of a community of Christians who were for the most part of Jewish extraction and beliefs. But though the Odes in their present form contain distinctly Christian elements (references, e.g. to the Son, the Incarnation, the Virgin Birth, the Passion, the Descensus ad inferos), Harnack's closer analysis tends to the conclusion that in their original form they were purely Jewish, and that they have been adapted to Christian use by a process of interpolation. For the original work Harnack gives as a possible date the beginning of the Christian era, the Christian redaction falling within the 1st century. Harnack recognizes a possibility that the redactor may have been acquainted with the Fourth Gospel. The religious feeling of the writer is throughout individual and mystical, rather than nationalistic and Messianic. The characteristic atmosphere is strongly Johannine (we may quote in illustration only the noble sentence from the 12th ode: "The dwelling-place of the Word is man; and its truth is Love"). The Odes have, in common with the Johannine writings, such leading conceptions as "grace," "believing," "knowledge," "truth," "light," "living water," "life" (for a full exhibition of the parallelisms, see article by R.H. Strachan, *The Expository Times*, October, 1910). Harnack asserts deliberately (p. 99) that in the Odes we possess "the presuppositions of the Johannine theology, apart from the historical Jesus Christ, and without any Messianic doctrine." More recent criticism of the Odes, however, has resulted in great diversity of view regarding their origin. They have been assigned to Gnosticism, and on the contrary to Montanism; and again are described (Bernard) as Christian baptismal hymns. In view of this division of critical opinion, all that can be said in the meantime is that the Odes testify to a collateral mystical development, the recognition of which necessitates a revision of the estimates which have been made regarding the extent to which the Johannine theology is indebted to Hellenistic philosophy.

#### *6. Antagonism to Gnostic Speculation:*

One other factor in this theological development remains to be mentioned — antagonism to Gnostic speculation. In the Gospel this has left not a few traces, in the way both of statement and omission; in the 1st Epistle scarcely any other danger to the faith and life of the church is apprehended than the spreading influence of Gnostic tenets (*see JOHN, EPISTLES OF*). John himself has been charged with Gnostic tendencies; but the truth rather is that to him Gnosticism must have been the more hateful and have

seemed the more dangerous because its conceptions were at some points the caricature of his own. In it he saw the real Antichrist, the “spirit of error,” giving fatally misleading solutions of those problems which the human mind can never leave alone, but regarding which the one true light is the historic Christ. Gnosticism had lost all historical sense, all touch with reality. It moved in a world of sheer mythology and speculation; history became allegory; the incarnate Christ a phantasm. John took his stand only the more firmly upon historical fact, insisted the more strenuously upon the verified physical reality of the Incarnation. In many of its adherents Gnosticism had lost almost completely the moral sense; John the more vehemently asserts the inviolable moral purity of the Divine nature and of the regenerate life which is derived from it. Gnostic dualism had set God infinitely far from men as transcendent Being; John brings God infinitely near to men as Love; and sweeps away the whole complicated mythology of Gnostic emanations, eons and archons, by his doctrine of the Logos, coeternal and coequal with the Father, incarnate in Jesus, through whom humanity is made to participate in the very life of God — the life of all love, purity and truth.

## II. THE DIVINE NATURE.

### *1. God Is Spirit:*

One of the glories of the Johannine theology is its doctrine of God, its delineation of the Divine nature. This is given in a series of intuitional affirmations which, though the manner of statement indicates no attempt at correlation, unite to form a complete organic conception. The first of these affirmations defines what is the Divine order of being: God is Spirit (~~John~~ John 4:24). The central significance of this inexhaustible saying is defined by the context. The old local worships, whether at Jerusalem or Samaria, had implied some special local mode of Divine presence; and this naturally suggested, if it did not necessitate, the idea of some kind of materiality in the Divine nature. But God is spirit; and true worship must be an intercourse of spirit with spirit, having relation to no local or material, but only to moral conditions. Thus the concept of the Divine spirituality is both moral and metaphysical. The religious relation to God, as it exists for Christian faith, rests upon the fact that the Supreme Being is essentially moral, but also omnipresent and omniscient — the Divine Spirit whose will and percipiency act immediately and simultaneously at every point of existence. Such a Being we utterly lack the power to comprehend.

But only such a Being can be God, can satisfy our religious need — a Being of whom we are assured that nothing that is in us, good or evil, true or false, and nothing that concerns us, past, present or future, is hid from His immediate vision or barred against the all-pervading operation of His will. To realize that God is such a Being is to be assured that He can be worshipped with no mechanical ritual or formal observance: they that worship Him must worship Him “in spirit and in truth.”

## 2. *God Is Life:*

God, who is spirit, is further conceived as Life, Light, Righteousness and Love. Righteousness and Love are the primary ethical qualities of the Divine nature; Life the energy by which they act; Light the self-revelation in which they are manifested throughout the spiritual universe. God is Life. He is the ultimate eternal Reality. He was “in the beginning” (~~Q00~~ John 1:1), or “from the beginning” (~~Q00~~ 1 John 1:1; 2:13). These statements are made of the *Logos*, therefore a fortiori of God. But the Divine nature is not mere abstract being, infinite and eternal; it is being filled with that inscrutable elemental energy which we call Life. In God this energy of life is self-originating and self-sustaining (“The Father hath life in himself,” ~~Q00~~ John 5:26), and is the source of all life (~~Q00~~ John 1:3,4, the Revised Version (British and American) margin). For every finite being life is union with God according to its capacity.

But the lower potencies of the creative Life do not come within the scope of the Johannine theology. The term is restricted in usage to its highest ethical significance, as denoting that life of perfect, holy love which is “the eternal life,” the possession of which in fellowship with God is the chief end for which every spiritual nature exists. The elements present in the conception of the Divine life are these:

- (1) The ethical: the life God lives is one of absolute righteousness (~~Q02~~ 1 John 2:29), and perfect love (~~Q00~~ 1 John 4:9).
- (2) The metaphysical: the Divine life is nothing else than the Divine nature itself regarded dynamically, as the ground and source of all its own activities, the animating principle or energy which makes Divine righteousness and love to be not mere abstractions but active realities.
- (3) In Johannine thought the Divine life is especially an energy of self-reproduction. It is this by inherent moral necessity. Love cannot but

seek to beget love, and righteousness to beget righteousness, in all beings capable of them. With John this generative activity of the Divine nature holds a place of unique prominence. It is this that constitutes the Fatherhood of God. Eternally the Father imparts Himself to the Son (~~GR5~~ John 5:26), the Word whose life from the beginning consisted in His relation to the Father (~~GR2~~ 1 John 1:2). To men eternal life is communicated as the result of a Divine begetting (~~GR3~~ John 1:13; 3:5; ~~GR2~~ 1 John 2:29; 3:9; 4:7, etc.) by which they become “children of God” (~~GR12~~ John 1:12; ~~GR1~~ 1 John 3:1, etc.).

(4) But God is not only the transcendent final source, He is also the immanent source of life. This is clearly implied in all those passages, too numerous to be quoted, which speak of God’s abiding in us and our abiding in Him. Life is maintained only through a continuous vitalizing union with Him, as of the branches with the vine (~~GR1~~ John 5:1-6). It must be observed, however, that John nowhere merges the idea of God in that of life. God is personal; life is impersonal. The eternal life is the element common to the personality of God, of the Loges, and of those who are the “children of God.” Any pantheistic manner of thinking is as foreign to John as to every other Biblical writer.

### 3. God Is Light:

God is not life only; He is light also (~~GR5~~ 1 John 1:5). That God is life means that He is and is self-imparting; that He is light means that the Divine nature is by inward necessity self-revealing.

(1) As the essential property of light is to shine, so God by His very nature of righteousness and love is necessitated to reveal Himself as being what He is, so as to become the Truth ([*ἡ ἀλήθεια*, *he aletheia*]), the object of spiritual perception ([*γινώσκειν*, *ginoskein*]), and the source of spiritual illumination to every being capable of receiving the revelation. “God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.” In God there is nothing that hides, nothing that is hidden. The Divine character is utterly transparent — goodness without a shadow of evil.

(2) This self-revelation of God is given in its perfect form in Jesus, the incarnate Word, who is the light of men (~~GR5~~ John 1:4), the light of the world (~~GR2~~ John 8:12; 9:5), the true light (~~GR5~~ John 1:9; ~~GR3~~ 1 John 2:8).

(3) It is in their illumination by this Divine light that there exists, even for the sinful, a medium of moral fellowship with God. We can “come to the light” (~~1889~~ John 3:19-21) and “walk in the light” (~~1907~~ 1 John 1:7). In the translucent atmosphere of the true light, we, even while morally imperfect and impure, may come to have a common view of spiritual facts with God (~~1908~~ 1 John 1:8-10; 2:9,10). This is the basis of a spiritual religion, and distinguishes Christianity from all irrational superstitions and unethical ritualisms.

#### *4. Ethical Attributes:*

In Gnostic speculation the Divine nature was conceived as the ultimate spiritual essence, in eternal separation from all that is material and mutable. But while John also, as we have seen, conceives it in this way, with him the conception is primarily and intensely ethical. The Divine nature, the communication of which is life and the revelation of which is light, has, as its two great attributes, Righteousness and Love; and with his whole soul John labors to stamp on the minds of men that only in righteousness and love can they walk in the light and have fellowship in the life of God. It is characteristic of John’s intuitional fashion of thought that there is no effort to correlate these two aspects of the ethical perfection of God; but, broadly, it may be said that they are respectively the negative and the positive. Love is the sum of all that is positively right; righteousness the antithesis of all that is wrong, in character and conduct.

#### **God Is Righteous.**

(1) That such righteousness — antagonism to all sin — belongs to, or rather is, the moral nature of God, and that this lies at the basis of Christian ethics is categorically affirmed. “If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one also that doeth righteousness is begotten of him” (~~1923~~ 1 John 2:29).

(2) This righteousness which belongs to the inward character of God extends necessarily to all His actions: “If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins” (~~1909~~ 1 John 1:9). When on the ground of Christ’s propitiation God forgives those who by confessing their sins make forgiveness possible, He acts righteously; and because He acts righteously, He acts also faithfully, that is, self-consistently. He does not “deny himself” (~~1913~~ 2 Timothy 2:13), but does what is in accordance with His own unchangeable character.

**(3)** God's righteousness is related imperatively to the whole moral activity of His creatures, rendering sin inadmissible in them — inadmissible *de jure* in all, *de facto* in all who are "begotten of him." This John maintains with unexampled vigor (compare ~~1~~ 1 John 2:29; 3:6,8-10; 5:18). It is true, however, that in its doctrine of Divine righteousness the Johannine theology makes no notable contribution to the sum of New Testament thought, but simply restates in peculiarly forceful fashion the conception of it which pervades the whole Biblical revelation.

### *5. God Is Love:*

#### **(1) The Love of God.**

It is far otherwise with the next of the great affirmations which constitute its doctrine of God: God is Love. Here Gospel and Epistle rise to the summit of all revelation, and for the first time clearly and fully enunciate that truth which is the innermost secret of existence.

#### **(a) Primarily a Disposition:**

Love is primarily a disposition, a moral quality of the will. What this quality is is indicated by the fact that the typical object of love in human relation is invariably our "brother." It is the disposition to act toward others as it is natural for those to do who have all interests in common and who realize that the full self-existence of each can be attained only in a larger corporate existence. It is the mysterious power by which egoism and altruism meet and coalesce, the power to live not only for another but in another, to realize one's own fullest life in the fulfillment of other lives. It is self-communication which is also self-assertion.

#### **(b) Embodied in Christ's Self-Sacrifice:**

In history love has its one perfect embodiment in the self-sacrifice of Christ. "Hereby know we love (i.e. perceive what love is), because he laid down his life for us" (~~1~~ 1 John 3:16). The world had never been without love; but till Jesus Christ came and laid down His life for the men that hated and mocked and slew him, it had not known what love in its greatness and purity could be.

#### **(c) Love in Redemption:**

But here history is the invisible translated into the visible. The self-sacrifice of Christ in laying down His life for us is the manifestation (~~609~~ 1 John 4:9), under the conditions of time and sense, of the love of God, eternal and invisible. In the closely related parallel passages (~~686~~ John 3:16; ~~609~~ 1 John 4:9,10) this is declared with matchless simplicity of statement. The Divine love is manifested in the magnitude of its gift — “his Son, his only begotten” (elsewhere the title is only “the Son” or “his Son” or “the Son of God”). Other gifts are only tokens of God’s love; in Christ its all is bestowed (compare ~~882~~ Romans 8:32; ~~0212~~ Genesis 22:12). The love of God is manifested further in the purpose of its gift — “that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life.” It is the self-determination of God, not only to rescue men from what is the sum and finality of all evils, but to impart the supreme and eternal good. But again, the love of God is manifested in the means by which this purpose is achieved. His son is sent as “the propitiation for our sins.” God shrinks not from the uttermost cost of redemption; but in the person of His Son humbles Himself and suffers unto blood that He may take upon Himself the load of human guilt and shame. And the last element in the full conception of Divine love is its objects: “God so loved the world”; “Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us.” Its ineffable mystery reveals itself in its absolute spontaneity, its self-origination. Its fires are self-kindled; it shines forth in its purest splendors upon the unattractive and unworthy. Such is the conception John sets before us. In this entirely spontaneous, self-determined devotion of God to sinful men; this Divine passion to rescue them from sin, the supreme evil, and to impart to them eternal life, the supreme good; in this, which is evoked not by their worthiness but by their need, and goes to the uttermost length of sacrifice in bearing the uttermost burden of their sin and its inevitable consequences; in this, which is forever revealed in the mission of Jesus Christ, God’s only begotten Son, is love.

## **(2) Love Is God’s Nature.**

And God is love (~~608~~ 1 John 4:8,16).

**(a)** God is love essentially. Love is not one of God’s moral attributes, but that from which they all proceed, and in which they all unite. The spring of all His actions is love.



**(b)** Therefore also His love is universal. In a special sense He loves those who are spiritually His children (~~GR12~~ John 14:23); but His undivided and essential love is given also to the whole world (~~GR16~~ John 3:16; ~~GR17~~ 1 John 2:2). That is John's great truth. He does not attempt to reconcile with it other apparently conflicting truths in his theological scheme; possibly he was not conscious of any need to do so. But of this he is sure — God is love. That fact must, in ways we cannot yet discern, include all other facts.

**(c)** The love of God is eternal and unchangeable; for it does not depend on any merit or reciprocation in its object, but overflows from its own infinite fullness. We may refuse to it the inlet into our life which it seeks (~~GR19~~ John 3:19; 5:40); we may so identify ourselves with evil as to turn it into an antagonistic force. But as our goodness did not call it forth, neither can our evil cause it to cease.

**(d)** If love is an essential, the essential attribute of God, it follows that we cannot ultimately conceive of God as a single simple personality. It is at this point that the fuller Johannine conception of multiple personality in the Godhead becomes most helpful, enabling us to think of the Divine life in itself not as an eternal solitude of self-contemplation and self-love, but as a life of fellowship (~~GR16~~ John 1:1; ~~GR17~~ 1 John 1:2). The Godhead is filled with love. "The Father loveth the Son" (~~GR18~~ John 3:35); and the prayer of the Son for His followers is "that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them" (~~GR26~~ John 17:26). The eternal giving and receiving of Divine love between the Father and the Son is, in the Johannine theology, an essential element of the Divine nature.

### III. THE INCARNATION.

The 2nd great contribution of the Johannine writings to the development of Christian theology is their doctrine of Christ — the latest and most deliberate effort within New Testament times to relate intellectually the church's faith in Jesus to its faith in God. In these writings the superhuman personality of Jesus is expressed by three titles which are used as practically synonymous — "the Christ," "the Son" ("Son of God," "only begotten Son of God"), the "Word" (*Logos*). The last alone is distinctively Johannine.

### *1. Historical Antecedents of the Logos-Doctrine:*

Historically, the Logos-doctrine of John has undoubted links of connection with certain speculative developments both of Greek and Hebrew thought. The Heraclitean use of the term “Logos” (see above, I) to express the idea of an eternal and all-embracing Reason immanent in the world was continued, while the conception was further elaborated, by the Stoics. On the other hand, the later developments of Hebrew thought show an increasing tendency to personify the self-revealing activity of God under such conceptions as the Angel, Glory, or Name of Yahweh, to attach a peculiar significance to the “Word” (*me’mera*) by which He created the heaven and the earth, and to describe “Wisdom” (Job, Proverbs) in something more than a figurative sense as His agent and coworker. These approximations of Greek pantheism and Hebrew monotheism were more verbal than real; and, naturally, Philo’s attempt in his doctrine of the *Logos* to combine philosophies so radically divergent was less successful than it was courageous. How far, and whether directly or indirectly, John is indebted to Philo and his school, are questions to which widely different answers have been given; but some obligation, probably indirect, cannot reasonably be denied. It is evident, indeed, that both the idea and the term “Logos” were current in the Christian circles for which his Gospel and First Epistle were immediately written; in both its familiarity is assumed. Yet the Johannine doctrine has little in common with Philo’s except the name; and it is just in its most essential features that it is most original and distinct.

As the Old Testament begins with the affirmation, “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,” so the Fourth Gospel begins with the similar affirmation, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God” (☩John 1:1). The Word was the medium of Divine action in creation (☩John 1:3).

### *2. The Logos-Doctrine in John:*

In the Word was life, not merely self-existing but self-imparting, so that it became the light of men (☩John 1:4) — the true light, which, coming into the world, lighteth every man (☩John 1:9). And finally it is declared that this Divine Word became flesh and tabernacled among us, so that “we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth” (☩John 1:14). Here faith in Jesus as Divine has been traced back to, and grounded in, a duality within the Godhead itself. In the

twofold mode of the Divine existence, it is seen that there is God who is just God (so to say), God in Himself; and there is God-with-God, God who is God's other self, God going forth from Himself in thought and action. The first without the second would be essence without manifestation, mind without utterance, light without effulgence, life without life-giving, fatherhood without sonship. It is seen that within the Divine Being there is one through whom, as there is also one from whom, all Divine energy goes forth. Above all it is seen that there is a Divine mode of existence in which it is inherently possible and natural for God to be immediately related to created being and even to become incarnate in humanity, as there is also a mode of Divine existence which cannot be immediately communicated or revealed to created life. Thus the Johannine doctrine is: first, that the *Logos* is personal and Divine, having a ground of personal being within the Divine nature (*pros ton Theon*, "in relation to God"); and, second, that the *Logos* became flesh, was and is incarnate in the historical Jesus.

### *3. The Incarnation as Delineated in the Fourth Gospel:*

In the Gospel the term "Logos" does not recur after the opening verses; yet thesis of the Prologue, so far from being irrelevant, dominates the entire biographical presentation. The creative and cosmic significance of the Logos-Christ is naturally in the background; but it may be said of the Gospel that "the Word became flesh" is its text, and all the rest — miracle, incident, discourse — is comment. On the one hand, the reality of the "becoming flesh" is emphasized (e.g. <sup><B006></sup>John 4:6; 11:35; 19:1,2,3,17,28,34,38-40; 20:20,27). On the other hand, the human vesture only reveals the Divine glory within. On earth, Jesus is still "the Son of man, who is in heaven" (<sup><B183></sup>John 3:13); the perfect revelation of the Father (<sup><B149></sup>John 14:9); the light of the world (<sup><B182></sup>John 8:12); the way, the truth and the life (<sup><B146></sup>John 14:6); the resurrection (<sup><B125></sup>John 11:26); the final judge (<sup><B172></sup>John 5:22) and Saviour (<sup><B142></sup>John 4:42; 6:40) of men; the supreme moral authority (<sup><B134></sup>John 13:34; 14:15,21); the hearer of prayer (<sup><B143></sup>John 14:13,14); the giver of the Spirit (<sup><B178></sup>John 7:38,39; 16:7; 20:22); endowed with all the prerogatives of God (<sup><B173></sup>John 5:23; 10:30,36-38).

### *4. The Incarnation in the First Epistle:*

In the 1 John the central thesis is the complete, personal, and permanent identity of the historical Jesus with the Divine Being who is the Word of Life (1:1), the Christ (4:2), the Son of God (5:5). This is maintained in a

vigorous polemic against certain heretical teachers whom the writer calls “antichrists,” who in docetic fashion denied that Jesus is the Christ (2:22), or, more definitely, the “Christ come in the flesh” (4:3), and who asserted that He “came” by water only and not by blood also (5:6; *see JOHN, EPISTLES OF*). Against this doctrine of a merely apparent or temporary association of Jesus with the Christ John bears vehement testimony. “Who is the liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ?” (1 John 2:22). ‘Every spirit that confesseth Jesus as Christ come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus is not of God’ (1 John 4:2,3). “Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not with the water only, but with the water and with the blood” (1 John 5:5,6). These passages all promulgate the same truth in substantially the same way. Without ceasing to be what He is, the Christ, the Son of God, has become Jesus; and Jesus, without ceasing to be truly human, is the Son of God. As to the manner of the incarnation — by what process of self-emptying or by what conjunction of Divine-human attributes the eternal Son became Jesus — the Johannine writings, like the New Testament everywhere, are silent. They proclaim Jesus Christ as human and Divine; but the distinguishing of what in Him was human and what Divine, or whether the one is distinct from the other, this they do not even consider. Gnosticism drew such a distinction; John does not. His one truth is that Jesus is the Son of God and the Son of God is Jesus, and that in Him the life of God was manifested (1 John 1:2) and is given (1 John 5:11) to men.

### *5. Practical Implications of the Incarnation:*

In this truth, viewed in its practical consequences, John sees the core of the church’s faith and the root and safeguard of its life.

**(a)** This alone secures and guarantees the Christian revelation of God; with its denial that revelation is canceled. “Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father” (1 John 2:23).

**(b)** Above all, it is only in the life and death of Jesus, the incarnate Son, that we possess a valid revelation of God’s self-sacrificing love. “Herein was the love of God manifested in us, that God hath sent his .... Son into the world that we might live through him” (1 John 4:9). With the denial of this the Christian ethic is drained of its very life-

blood. There was no merely external and accidental connection between Docetism and the moral indifferentism of the Gnostic. The natural result of making man's salvation easy, so to say, for God, was to make it easy for man also — salvation by creed without conduct (<sup><B11></sup>1 John 2:4,6; 3:7), knowledge without love (<sup><B12></sup>1 John 4:8), or love that paid its debts with goodly phrases and empty words (<sup><B13></sup>1 John 3:17,18). A docetic Christ meant docetic Christianity.

(c) Finally, John sees in the incarnation the only possibility of a Divine redemption. It was not for a word or a formula he was concerned, but for the raising of humanity to Divine life through the God-man. The ultimate significance of the incarnation of the Son is that in Him the eternal life of God has flowed into our humanity and become a fountain of regenerative power to as many as receive Him (<sup><B14></sup>John 1:12). “He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life” (<sup><B15></sup>1 John 5:12). This is the center of the Johannine Gospel — a Divine-human Christ, who stands in a unique, vital relation to men, reproducing in them His own character and experiences as the vine reproduces itself in the branches, doing that, the mysterious reality of which is only expressed, not explained, when it is said that He is our “life” (<sup><B16></sup>John 14:19,20; 15:5).

## IV. THE HOLY SPIRIT.

### *1. The Work of the Spirit — in the Fourth Gospel:*

In one direction the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is uniquely developed in the Johannine writings. The conception of the Spirit as the agent of Work of the Christ's presence with and activity in the church is presented with a fullness and clearness unequaled in the New Testament. The departing Christ promises to His friends a new presence, different from His own in that it was to be not a bodily but a spiritual presence, and yet really His own — a presence in which all and more than all the effects of His bodily presence would be perpetuated (<sup><B17></sup>John 14:18; 16:22). In truth, it was expedient for them that He should go away, in order that this other [*Paraclete*] should come (<sup><B18></sup>John 16:7). In the body His presence with His followers had been local and intermittent; in the Spirit He would come to take up His abode with them forever (<sup><B19></sup>John 14:16). Formerly He had been still external to them, but now was not only to dwell with them, but to be in them (<sup><B20></sup>John 14:17). Instead of the external voice of their Teacher

addressing to them the words of eternal life, they should possess the very Spirit of truth (~~647~~ John 14:17), a well-spring of illumination from within, giving them an “understanding” to know Him that is true (~~641~~ 1 John 5:20); and instead of His visible example before their eyes, an inward community of life with Him like that of the vine and the branches. The complete, vital, permanent union of Christ and His people, which had been prevented by the necessary limitations of a local, corporeal state of existence, would be attained, when for this there was substituted the direct action of spirit upon spirit.

### **Perpetuates, but also Intensifies the Consciousness of Christ.**

Thus the function of the Spirit which is chiefly emphasized in the Johannine writings is that by which He perpetuates but also intensifies, enlightens, and educates the consciousness of Christ in the church and in the Christian life. In this respect His nature is the opposite of that of the [*Logos*], the self-revealing God. The Holy Spirit never reveals Himself to human consciousness; He reveals the Son and the Father through the Son. His operations are wholly secret and inscrutable, known only by their result (~~648~~ John 3:8). He is the silent inward monitor and remembrancer of the disciples (~~640~~ John 14:20); the illuminator, the revealer of Christ (~~664~~ John 16:14); a spirit of witness who both Himself bears witness concerning Christ to His people and makes of them ready and joyful witness-bearers (~~656~~ John 15:26,27); a guide by whom a steady growth in knowledge is secured, leading gradually on to the full truth of Christ (~~662~~ John 16:12,13); a spirit of conviction working in men an immediate certainty of the truth regarding sin and righteousness, and the Divine judgment which marks their eternal antagonism (~~668~~ John 16:8-11).

### *2. In the First Epistle:*

In the Epistle we find the promise of the Gospel accomplished in actual experience. There is no reference to the manifold [*charismata*] of the first age, the prophetic afflatus excepted (~~640~~ 1 John 4:1). But whether through the prophetic “medium” or the normal Christian consciousness, the function of the Spirit is always to “teach” or to “witness” concerning Christ. This is finely brought out in the parallelism of ~~646~~ 1 John 5:6: “This (Jesus Christ) is he that came” (once for all fulfilling the Messiah’s mission); “It is the Spirit that beareth witness” (ever authenticating its Divine origin, interpreting its purpose and applying its results). The specific

testimony the Spirit bears to Christ is defined (<sup><1012></sup>1 John 4:2,3). “Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus is not of God.”

### **(1) A Divine Teacher.**

The gift of the Spirit is an “anointing from the Holy One” (<sup><1021></sup>1 John 2:20); and the result of this “anointing” is that “ye know all things” (or that “ye all have knowledge”; the reading is doubtful), and “need not that any one teach you” (<sup><1027></sup>1 John 2:27). The apostle’s comfort concerning his readers, encompassed as they are by the snares of Antichrist, is that they have a Divine Teacher, who continually enlightens their understanding, strengthens their convictions and ministers to them an invincible assurance of the truth of the Gospel. “The anointing abideth in you .... and teacheth you concerning all things.” The spirit is not a source of independent revelation, but makes the revelation of Christ effectual. The truth is placed beyond all reach of controversy and passes into absolute knowledge: “Ye know all things.” It may be added that the history of Christianity furnishes an always growing verification of this Johannine doctrine of a living power of witness and enlightenment present in the church, by which, notwithstanding the constant hindrance of human imperfection, the development of the Christian faith has been steadily advanced, its forgotten or neglected factors brought to remembrance. Old truths have been presented in new aspects and filled with fresh life, and all has been brought to pass with marvelous adaptation to the church’s needs and in proportion to its receptivity.

### **(2) Other Aspects.**

In other directions the doctrine of the Spirit is less developed. The agency of the Spirit in regeneration is repeatedly and emphatically declared in a single passage (<sup><1035></sup>John 3:5-8), but is nowhere else referred to either in the Gospel or the First Epistle. More remarkable still, neither in Gospel nor Epistle is the Holy Spirit once spoken of as the Divine agent in sanctification. There is no passage resembling that in which Paul speaks of the ethical “fruit of the Spirit” (<sup><1042></sup>Galatians 5:22,23). The Spirit is the Spirit of truth, the revealer, the inspirer of faith, but is never spoken of as the Spirit of love or holiness. If those who are begotten of God cannot sin, it is not because God’s Spirit, but because “his seed,” abideth in them (<sup><1049></sup>1

John 3:9). The explanation of this peculiarity (which has been little observed) in the Johannine theology may be that the Spirit's work of revealing Christ is regarded as all-inclusive. Thus enabling Christ's disciples to abide in Him as the branch in the vine, He secures also their bringing forth "much fruit" in all Christlikeness of character and conduct.

## *2. The Person of the Spirit:*

Passing now from the work to the Person, we observe that in the Fourth Gospel the attribution of personality to the Spirit reaches the acme of distinctness. He is "another Paraclete" (~~4146~~ John 14:16 margin), personal as Christ Himself is personal; and all the functions ascribed to Him — to remind, to teach, to testify, to guide, to convict — are such as are possible only to a personal agent. Nor is it otherwise in the First Epistle. The expressions in it which have been alleged (Pfleiderer and others) as inconsistent with personality (the "anointing," ~~4121~~ 1 John 2:20; "He hath given us of his Spirit," 4:13) require no such interpretation. The "anointing" denotes the Spirit, not in His essence or agency, but as the gift of the Holy One with which He anoints believers (compare ~~4178~~ John 7:38,39); and the expression "He hath given us of his Spirit" (as if the Spirit were a divisible entity) is no more incompatible with personality than is the saying "to Him whom he hath sent ..., God giveth not the Spirit by measure" (~~4184~~ John 3:34), or than our speaking of Christians as having more or less of the Spirit.

### **His Deity Implied.**

The essential Deity of the Spirit is nowhere explicitly asserted, but is necessarily implied in His relation both to Christ and to the church as the "other Paraclete." There is not, however, the same theological development as is achieved regarding the [*Logos*]. The Divinity of Christ is grounded in an essential duality of being within the Godhead itself; but there is no similar effort to trace back the threefoldness in the revelation of God, as Father, Son and Spirit, to an essential threefoldness in the Divine nature. The fact is that both historically and logically the doctrine of the Spirit as the third person in the Godhead depends upon that of the Divine Son as the second. It was through its living experience of the Divine in Christ that the church first developed its thought of God beyond the simple monotheism of the Old Testament; but having advanced to the conception of a twofold Godhead, in which there is Fatherhood and Sonship, it was



bound to enlarge it still further to that of a threefold Godhead — Father, Son and Spirit. The Son and the Spirit were equally manifestations of God in redemption, and must equally stand in essential relation to the Divine existence.

## V. DOCTRINE OF SIN AND PROPITIATION.

This theme is not elaborated. It is characteristic of the Johannine writings that salvation is looked at from the terminus ad quem rather than from the terminus a quo. The infinite good, eternal life, is more in view than the infinite evil, sin. It seems safe to say that the author of these writings at no time had that intense experience of bondage to the law of sin and of death which so colors Paul's presentation of the gospel. It was, moreover, no part of his plan to expound the doctrine of propitiation; nor had he any original contribution to make on this head to the sum of New Testament thought. But it is a quite unwarrantable criticism which denies that the saving work of Christ, in the Johannine conception, consists in deliverance from sin.

### *1. Sin:*

It is true that Christ not only takes away the sin of the world (~~ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲛ~~ John 1:29), but also draws it forth in its utmost intensity and guilt. All sin culminates in the rejection of Christ (~~ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲛ~~ John 15:22); the Spirit convicts men of sin because they "believe not" on Him (~~ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲛ~~ John 16:9). "Every one that committeth sin is the bondservant of sin" (~~ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲛ~~ John 8:34); but what reveals the true character of this bondage is that in the presence of the light, men "loved the darkness" (~~ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲛ~~ John 3:19). That the malign quality and power of evil are fully revealed only in the presence of perfect goodness, that the brighter is the light, the darker is the shade of guilt created by its rejection — all this John teaches; but such teaching is by no means peculiar to him, and to infer from it that "to his mind sin in itself involves no moral culpability" is nothing more than a way-ward paradox.

In the Epistle the guilt of sin as constituting an objective disability to fellowship with God is strongly emphasized. "If We say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves" (~~ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲛ~~ 1 John 1:8). The phrase "to have sin" is peculiar to John, and specifically denotes the culpability of the agent (compare ~~ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲛ~~ John 9:41; 15:22,24; 19:11). Sin is essentially that which needs God's forgiveness (~~ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲛ~~ 1 John 1:9; 2:1,2); and to this end an intercessor and a propitiation have been provided. Such culpability is

universal: “If we say that we have not sinned, we” — not only deceive ourselves — “we make him a liar” (<sup><610></sup>1 John 1:10).

A second passage (<sup><604></sup>1 John 3:4-9) emphasizes the ethical quality of sin — its antagonism to the nature of God and of the children of God. The word which defines the constitutive principle of sin is “lawlessness” (<sup><604></sup>1 John 3:4). Sin is fundamentally the denial of the absoluteness of moral obligation, the repudiation of the eternal law upon which all moral life is based. In other words, to sin is to assert one’s own will as the rule of action against the absolutely good will of God. But again, the Epistle gives the warning that “all unrighteousness is sin” (<sup><607></sup>1 John 5:17). Everything that is not right is wrong. Every morally inferior course of action, however venial it may appear, is sin and contains the elements of positive guilt. The perplexing topic of “sin unto death” demands too special treatment to be dealt with here.

## *2. Propitiation:*

### **(1) In the Gospel.**

The paucity of reference in the Fourth Gospel to the propitiating aspect of Christ’s redemptive work has been seized upon as proof that, though the writer did not consciously reject the orthodox doctrine, it was really alien to his system. But such a criticism might be directed with almost equal force against the Synoptics. It was no part of John’s plan, as has been said, to expound a doctrine of propitiation; yet his frontispiece to the ministry of Jesus is “the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world”; and, as Dr. Inge has pointed out, the same type of the Paschal Lamb underlies the whole narrative of the Passion. In the high-priestly prayer our Lord expressly represents Himself as the covenant-sacrifice which consecrates His disciples as the people of God (<sup><619></sup>John 17:19); while the Synoptic “ransom for many” is paralleled by the interpretation of Christ’s death as effectual “for the nation; and not for the nation only, but that he might also gather together into one the children of God that are scattered abroad” (<sup><615></sup>John 11:51,52; compare <sup><602></sup>1 John 2:2).

### **(2) In the Epistle.**

In the Epistle the doctrinal statement is much more explicit. The fact of propitiation is placed in the forefront. The passage which immediately follows the Prologue (<sup><606></sup>1 John 1:6 through 2:2) introduces a group of

ideas — propitiation, blood, forgiveness, cleansing — which are taken directly from the sacrificial system of the Old Testament, and are expressed, indeed, in technical Levitical terms. The mode of action by which Christ accomplished and still accomplishes His mission as the Saviour of the world is: “He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world” (☞1 John 2:2). Propitiation has its ultimate source in the moral nature of God. It is no device for inducing a reluctant Deity to forgive; it is the way by which the Father brings back His sinning children to Himself. In John’s conception it is the supreme act of God’s supreme attribute, love. “Herein is love” (☞1 John 4:10). Yet it is a real work of propitiation in which this love goes forth for man’s salvation — a work, that is, which expiates the guilt of sin, which restores sinful offenders to God by rendering their sin null and inoperative as a barrier to fellowship with Him. This propitiatory virtue is regarded as concentrated in the “blood of Jesus his Son” (☞1 John 1:7), that is to say, in the Divine-human life offered to God in the sacrifice of the cross. This, if we walk in the light as He is in the light, “cleanseth us from all sin” — removes from us the stain of our guilt, and makes us clean in God’s sight. In virtue of this, Christ is the penitent sinner’s advocate (paraclete-helper) with the Father (☞1 John 2:1). The words “with the Father” are highly significant. Even the Father’s love can urge nothing in apology for sin, nothing that avails to absolve from its guilt. But there is one who can urge on our behalf what is at once the strongest condemnation of our sin and plea for its remission — Himself, “Jesus Christ the righteous” (☞1 John 2:1). “And he (Himself) is the propitiation for our sins.” John does not speak of Christ as “making propitiation”; He, Himself, in virtue of all He is — Jesus Christ, in whom the Divine ideal of humanity is consummated, in whom the Father sees His own essential righteousness revealed, Jesus Christ the Righteous — is both propitiation and intercession. The two acts are not only united in one person, but constitute the one reconciling work by which there is abiding fellowship between God and His sinning people.

### **(3) One with New Testament Teaching.**

In this statement of the doctrine of propitiation, memorable as it is, there is nothing notably original. It tacitly presupposes, as New Testament teaching everywhere does, that God, in bestowing the sovereign grace of pardon and sonship, must deal truthfully and adequately with sin as a violation of the moral order; and with John, as with other New Testament writers, the necessity and efficacy of sacrifice as the means by which this is

accomplished are simply axiomatic. His great contribution to Christian thought is the vision of the cross in the heart of the eternal love. How suggestive are these two statements when placed side by side! “Herein is love .... that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins” (✠1 John 4:10); and “Hereby know we love (recognize what it is), because he laid down his life for us” (✠1 John 3:16). God’s sending His Son and Christ’s laying down His life are moral equivalents. The sacrifice of Christ is the sacrifice of God. John’s doctrine of propitiation follows as a moral necessity from his doctrine of God. If God is love, nothing is more inevitably true than that He suffers on account of human sin; and to deny Him the power to help and save men by bearing their burden would be to deny to Him love’s highest prerogative.

## VI. ETERNAL LIFE.

The development of the conception of eternal life must be set along with the doctrine of the moral nature of God and the doctrine of the incarnation as one of the greatest contributions of the Johannine theology to New Testament thought. With this conception the Gospel begins (✠John 1:4) and ends (✠John 20:31); and, in like manner, the Epistle (✠1 John 1:2; 5:20). The designation most frequently employed is simply “the life” (*he zoe*); 17 times in the Gospel and 6 times in the First Epistle it is described qualitatively as “eternal”; but the adjective brings out only what is implicit in the noun. In harmony with the universal Biblical conception, John regards life as the summum bonum, in which the reality of fellowship with God consists, which therefore fulfills the highest idea of being — “perfect truth in perfect action” (Westcott). Christ Himself is “the life” (✠John 14:6), its only bestower and unfailing source (✠John 14:19). He came that we might have it abundantly (✠John 10:10).

### *1. Ethical Rather than Eschatological:*

But this conception is uniquely developed in two directions. While the eschatological element is not lost, it is absorbed in the ethical. The ideas of duration and futurity, which are properly and originally expressed by the adjective “eternal” ([*aionios*] = belonging to an eon — specifically to “the coming eon”), become secondary to that of timeless moral quality. Always life is regarded as a present possession rather than as future felicity (e.g. ✠John 3:36; 20:31; ✠1 John 3:14,15; 5:12). For John the question whether it is possible to make the best of both worlds is meaningless.

Eternal life is the best, the Divine, kind of life, whether in this world or another. It is the kind of life that has its perfect manifestation in Christ (~~Q10P~~ 1 John 1:2; 5:11). To possess that nature which produces thoughts and motives and desires, words and deeds like His, is to have eternal life.

## *2. Metaphysical Aspect:*

Metaphysically the conception undergoes a development which is equally remarkable, though in the judgment of many, of more questionable value. It has already been seen (see above, II) that life is conceived as the animating principle or essence of the Divine nature, the inward energy of which all its activities are the manifold outgoing. And this conception is carried through with strict consistency. The spiritual life in men, which is “begotten of God,” is the vital essence, the mystic principle which is manifested in all the capacities and activities of Christian personality. It does not consist in, and still less is it a result following, repentance, faith, obedience or love; it is that of which they are the fruits and the evidences. Thus instead of “This do, and thou shalt live” (~~Q10S~~ Luke 10:28), John says, conversely, “Every one also, that doeth righteousness is (= has been) begotten of” God (~~Q10P~~ 1 John 2:29); instead of “The just shall live by faith” (~~Q10I7~~ Romans 1:17, the King James Version), “Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is (= has been) begotten of God” (~~Q10I1~~ 1 John 5:1). The human activity is the result and proof of Divine life already imparted, not the condition or means of its attainment. In the Johannine conception life is cause, not effect; not phenomenon, but essence; not the complex whole of the qualities, activities and experiences of the spiritual man, but that which makes them possible — the inscrutable, Divinely communicated principle (~~Q10S~~ John 3:8) in which the capacity for them is given and by which also it is realized.

## **Reply to Criticism.**

This Johannine conception of life is vigorously criticized as importing into the interpretation of Christian experience principles and modes of thought borrowed from Greek philosophy. But the tendency to infer causes from effects and to reason from phenomena to essence is not peculiar to Greek philosophy; it is native to the human intellect. The Johannine conception of spiritual life is closely analogous to the common conception of physical life. We do not conceive that a man lives because he breathes and feels and acts; we think and we say that he does these things because he lives,

because there is in him that mystic principle we call life. Only to the thinker trained in the logic of empiricism is it possible to define life solely by its phenomena, as e.g. “the continuous adjustment of internal to external relations” (Spencer). The ordinary mind instinctively passes behind the phenomena to entity of which they are the manifestation. The Johannine conception, moreover, lies in the natural line of development for New Testament thought. It is implicit in that whole strain of our Lord’s synoptic teaching which regards doing as only the outcome of being, and which is emphasized in such utterances as “Either make the tree good, and its fruit good; or make the tree corrupt, and its fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by its fruit” (<sup><0123></sup>Matthew 12:33); as also in the whole Pauline doctrine of the new creation and the mystical indwelling of Christ in the members of His body. And while it is no doubt true that the Johannine conception of life was immediately influenced by contact with Hellenism, it is one which was sure, sooner or later, to emerge in Christian theology.

### *3. Development of Doctrine:*

#### **(1) Source in God.**

In the development of the doctrine we note the following points.

**(a)** The sole and absolute source of life is God, the Father, revealed in Christ. “The Father hath life in himself” (<sup><0163></sup>John 5:26). He is the “living Father” by whom the Son lives (<sup><0165></sup>John 6:57); the “true God, and eternal life” (<sup><0151></sup>1 John 5:20). Eternal life is nothing else than the immanence of God in moral beings created after His likeness; the Divine nature reproducing itself in human nature; the energy of the Spirit of God in the spiritual nature of man. This is its ultimate definition.

#### **(2) Mediated by Christ.**

Of this life Christ is the sole mediator (<sup><0163></sup>John 6:33,17; 11:25; 14:6). The witness is that “God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son” (<sup><0151></sup>1 John 5:11). This mediation is grounded in the relation, eternally subsisting within the Godhead, of the Logos to the Father. The life manifested and seen in the historic Christ (<sup><0100></sup>1 John 1:1) is “the life, the eternal life,” which existed in relation to the Father (<sup><0100></sup>1 John 1:2). By the incarnation of the Son the eternal life in its Divine fullness has become incorporate with humanity, a permanent source of regenerative power to

“as many as received him” (ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲛ John 1:12). It is His own relation to the Father that He reproduces in men (ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲛ John 17:23).

### (3) Through the Spirit.

In the communication of this life the Spirit is the one direct agent (ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲛ John 3:5-8; see above, under IV).

### (4) The Divine “Begetting.”

The act of Divine self-communication is constantly and exclusively expressed by the word “beget” ([gennao] — ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲛ John 1:13; 3:3,5-8; ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲛ 1 John 2:29; 3:9, etc.). The word is of far-reaching significance. It implies not only that life has its ultimate origin in God, but that its communication is directly and solely His act. In how literal a sense the Divine begetting is to be understood appears very strikingly in ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲛ 1 John 3:9: “Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin; because his seed abideth in him.” The unique expression “his seed” signifies the new life-principle which is the formative element of the “children of God.” This abides in him who has received it. It stamps its own character upon his life and determines its whole development.

### (5) The “Children of God.”

Those who are “begotten of God” are ipso facto “children of God” (tekna theou, ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲛ John 1:12; 11:52; ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲛ 1 John 3:1,2,10; 5:2). The term connotes primarily the direct communication of the Father’s own nature; and secondarily the fact that the nature thus communicated has not as yet reached its full stature, but contains the promise of a future glorious development. We are now children of God, but what it fully is to be children of God is not yet made manifest (ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲛ 1 John 3:2). Participation in this life creates a family fellowship (*koinonia*) at once human and Divine. Those who are begotten of God and walk in the light have “fellowship one with another” (ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲛ 1 John 1:7). They are “brethren” and are knit together by the instincts (ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲛ 1 John 5:1) and the duties of mutual love (ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲛ John 13:34; 15:12; ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲛ 1 John 3:16; 4:11) and of mutual watchfulness and intercession (ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲛ 1 John 5:16).

On the Divine side they have fellowship “with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ” (ⲉⲃⲏⲓⲛ 1 John 1:3). In this Divine fellowship the life “begotten” is nourished and sustained; and no term is more characteristic of the Johannine vocabulary, alike in Gospel and Epistles, than the word “abide”

(*menein*), by which this is expressed. There is, however, a noticeable difference in the modes of statement. In the Epistle, the formulas almost exclusively employed are these: “God abides in us,” “We abide in God,” “God abides in us and we in him.” In the Gospel the reciprocal indwelling is that of Christ and His disciples (~~8104~~ John 15:4-10), which has its Divine counterpart in that of the Father and the Son (~~8140~~ John 14:10; 17:23; 15:10). This diversity is consistent with the different points of view occupied in the two documents. The Gospel is christocentric; the Epistle, theocentric. In the one is given the concrete presentment of the incarnate Son; in the other the immediate intuition of the Divine nature revealed in Him. While the theme common to both is the “Word of life,” the special theme of the Gospel is the Word who reveals and imparts the life; in the Epistle it is the life revealed and imparted by the Word, and the thought of the indwelling Christ is naturally carried up to the ultimate truth of the indwelling God.

### **(6) The Divine Abiding.**

The vitalizing union by which the Divine life is sustained in those who are begotten of God consists in two reciprocal activities, not separable and not identical — God’s (or Christ’s) abiding in us and our abiding in Him. As in the similitude of the vine and the branches (~~8104~~ John 15:1-10), the life imparted is dependent for its sustenance and growth upon a continuous influx from the parent source: as it is the sap of the vine that vitalizes the branches, producing leaf and blossom and fruit, so does the life of God support and foster in His children its own energies of love and truth and purity. But to this end the abiding of God in us has as its necessary counterpart our abiding in Him. We can respond to the Divine influence or reject it; open or obstruct the channels through which the Divine life flows into ours (~~8106~~ John 15:6,7,10; 8:31). Hence, abiding in God is a subject of instruction and exhortation (~~8104~~ John 15:4; ~~8127~~ 1 John 2:27 f); and here the idea of persistent and steadfast purpose which belongs to the word [*menein*] comes clearly into view. As the abiding of God in us is the persistent and purposeful action by which the Divine nature influences ours, so our abiding in God is the persistent and purposeful submission of ourselves to that influence. The means of doing this are steadfast loyalty to the truth as it is revealed in Christ and announced in the apostolic Gospel (~~8081~~ John 8:31; 15:7; ~~8127~~ 1 John 2:27), keeping God’s commandments (~~8103~~ John 14:23; 15:10; ~~8103~~ 1 John 3:24), and loving one another (~~8102~~ 1 John 4:12,16). Thus



only is the channel of communication kept clear between the source and the receptacle of life.

## VII. HUMAN NATURE AND ITS REGENERATION.

The necessity of regeneration is fundamental to the whole theological scheme (<sup><RRB></sup>John 3:3,5,7). Life which consists in union with God does not belong to man as he is naturally constituted: those who know that they have eternal life know that it is theirs because they have “passed out of death into life” (<sup><RIB></sup>1 John 3:14; <sup><RIB></sup>John 5:24).

### 1. The World:

The unregenerate state of human nature is specially connected with the Johannine conception of the “world” (*kosmos*). This term has a peculiar elasticity of application; and Westcott’s definition — “the order of finite being, regarded as apart from God” — may be taken as expressing the widest idea that underlies John’s use of the word. When the *kosmos* is material, it signifies

- (1) the existing terrestrial creation (<sup><RIO></sup>John 1:10; 13:1; 16:28), especially as contrasted with the sphere of the heavenly and eternal. When it refers to humanity, it is either
- (2) the totality of mankind as needing redemption and as the object of God’s redeeming love (<sup><RIB></sup>John 3:16; <sup><RIB></sup>1 John 2:2; 4:14), or
- (3) the mass of unbelieving men, hostile to Christ and resisting salvation (e.g. <sup><RIB></sup>John 15:18).

Of the world in this sense it is said that it has no perception of the true nature of God and the Divine glory of Christ (<sup><RIO></sup>John 1:10; 17:25; <sup><RIB></sup>1 John 3:1); that it hates the children of God (<sup><RIB></sup>John 15:18,19; 17:14; <sup><RIB></sup>1 John 3:13); that the spirit of Antichrist dwells in it (<sup><RIB></sup>1 John 4:3,4); that to it belong the false prophets and their adherents (<sup><RIB></sup>1 John 4:1,5); that it is under the dominion of the wicked one (<sup><RIB></sup>John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; <sup><RIB></sup>1 John 5:19); that the constituents of its life are “the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the vainglory of life” (<sup><RIB></sup>1 John 2:16); that it passeth away (<sup><RIB></sup>1 John 2:17); that Christ has conquered it (<sup><RIB></sup>John 16:33), and that “whatsoever is begotten of God” conquers it (<sup><RIB></sup>1 John 5:4) by the power of faith in Him (<sup><RIB></sup>1 John 5:5). Thus the “world” (in this darker significance) is composed of those who still love the darkness rather

than the light (~~<B18>~~ John 3:19), who, when Christ is presented to them, obstinately retain their blindness and enmity. Nevertheless, the “world” is not beyond the possibility of salvation. The Holy Spirit, acting in the Christian community, will convince the world with regard to sin and righteousness and judgment (~~<B18>~~ John 16:8); and the evidence of the unity of Divine fellowship among Christ’s disciples will lead it to believe in His Divine mission (~~<B17>~~ John 17:23).

## *2. Two Classes in the Human Race:*

Thus, it is true that John teaches “a distinction of two great classes in the human race — those who are from above and those who are from beneath — children of light and children of darkness.” But that he teaches this in any Gnostic or semignostic fashion is an assertion for which there is no real basis. He distinguishes between those who love the light and those who love the darkness rather than the light, between those who “receive” Christ and those who “will not” come unto Him that they may have life. This distinction, however, he traces to nothing in the natural constitution of the two classes, but solely to the regenerating act of God (~~<B13>~~ John 1:13; 6:44). His doctrine of regeneration is, in fact, his solution of the problem created by the actual existence of those two classes among men — a problem which is forced upon every thoughtful Christian mind by the diverse and opposite results of evangelism. It is this that lies behind such utterances as these: “Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice” (~~<B17>~~ John 18:37); “Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep. My sheep hear my voice .... and they follow me” (~~<B15>~~ John 10:26,27); “Every one that hath heard from the Father, cometh unto me. No man can come unto me except it be given unto him of the Father” (~~<B16>~~ John 6:45,65). In these and all similar passages, belief or unbelief in Christ, when He is presented, depends upon antecedent spiritual predisposition (John’s equivalent to the Pauline predestination). There exists in certain persons what is lacking in others, a power of spiritual vision by which Christ is recognized, a capacity and a predisposition to receive Him. But this predisposition is not (any more than Paul’s predestination) theirs by gift of nature. John refuses to find its source in human personality (~~<B13>~~ John 1:13; ~~<B11>~~ 1 John 5:1). The children of God are not a superior species of the genus homo. They are men who have passed from death into life, and who have done so because they are begotten of God. John’s doctrine is thus the antithesis of Gnosticism. The Gnostic distinction of two classes in the human race glorified men; its proper and inevitable fruit was spiritual pride. The effect of John’s doctrine

is to humble man and glorify God, to satisfy the innermost Christian consciousness that not even for their appropriation of God's gift in Christ can believers take credit to themselves; that in nothing can the human spirit do more than respond to the Divine, and that, in the last analysis, this power itself is of God. Regeneration in the Johannine sense is not to be identified with conversion. It is the communication of that vision of truth and that capacity for new moral activity which issue in conversion. The doctrine of regeneration contained in the Johannine writings is the fullest recognition in the New Testament that all the conscious experiences and activities of the Christian life are the result of God's own inscrutable work of begetting in the depths of human personality, and of renewing and replenishing there, the energies of the Divine.

## VIII. THE CHURCH AND SACRAMENTS.

### *1. The Church:*

While the word "church" is not found, the idea lies near the base of the Johannine theology. The Divine life communicated to men creates a Divine brotherhood, a "fellowship" which is with the Father and "with his Son Jesus Christ" (✠1 John 1:3) and also "one with another" (✠1 John 1:7) — a fellowship which is consecrated by the self-consecration of Jesus (✠1 John 17:19), in which men are cleansed from all sin by His blood (✠1 John 1:7), and which is maintained by His intercessory action as the [*Paraclete*] with the Father (✠1 John 2:1). This fellowship is realized in the actual Christian community and there only; but it is essentially inward and spiritual, not mechanically ecclesiastical, In the visible community spurious elements may intrude themselves, as is proved when schism unmask those who, though they have belonged to the external organization, have never been partakers of its real life (✠1 John 2:19). Only among those who walk in the light of God does true fellowship exist (✠1 John 1:7).

### *2. The Sacraments:*

From the doctrine of the Divine nature as life and light one might a priori infer the possibilities of a Johannine view of the sacraments. It is evident that there is room in the Johannine system of thought for a genuinely sacramental mode of Divine action — the employment of definite external acts, not as symbols only, but as real media of Divine communication. On the other hand, the truth that God is not life only but light also — self-

revealing as well as self-imparting — would necessarily exclude any magical *ex opere operato* theory by which spiritual efficacy is attributed either to the physical elements in themselves or to the physical act of participation. And (though there is little or no explicit statement) such is the type of doctrine we actually find. With regard to all sacramental rites the universal principle applies: ‘It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing’ (~~RB~~ John 6:63).

### (1) **Baptism.**

Yet baptism is the physical counterpart of the Spirit’s work in regeneration, and great importance is attached to it as the means of admission to the new life of the kingdom (~~RB~~ John 3:5).

### (2) **The Lord’s Supper.**

The omission of all reference to the institution of the Lord’s Supper (the incident of the feet-washing and the proclamation of the new commandment taking its place in the Gospel-narrative) is thought to indicate that John was conscious of a tendency to attach a superstitious value to the outward observance, and desired emphatically to subordinate this to what was spiritual and essential. The omission, to whatever motive it may have been due, is counter-balanced by the sacramental discourse (John 6). While the language of this discourse is not to be interpreted in a technically eucharistic sense, its purpose, or one of its purposes, undoubtedly, is to set forth the significance of the Lord’s Supper in the largest light. Christ gives to men the bread of life, which is His own flesh and of which men must eat that they may live (~~RB~~ John 6:50-55). “He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him.” This eating and drinking is essentially of the Spirit. It signifies a derivation of life analogous to that of the Son Himself from the Father. “As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father; so he that eateth me, he also shall live because of me” (~~RB~~ John 6:57). To “eat the flesh” of the Son of Man is to receive spiritual nourishment from Him, to live by His life. Yet there is nothing in John’s way of thinking to exclude a real sacramental efficiency. “The act which is nothing when it is performed ignorantly and mechanically is of sovereign value to those who have apprehended its true meaning. The material elements represent the flesh and blood of Christ — His Divine Person given for the life of the world. He is present in them, not merely by way of symbol, but actually; but there must be something in the recipient

corresponding to the spiritual reality which is conveyed through the gift. The outward act of participation must be accompanied with belief in Christ and a true insight into the nature of His work and a will to know and serve Him. The sacrament becomes operative as the bread of life through this receptive spirit on the part of those who observe it" (Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, 127-28).

## IX. ESCHATOLOGY.

### *1. Type of Thought Idealistic:*

The type of mind revealed in the Johannine writings is one that instinctively leans to the ideal and the spiritual in its contemplation of life, grasping what is of universal significance and dwelling upon events only as they are the embodiment of eternal principles. Where this fashion of thought is so strongly developed, the eschatological, like the historical, becomes secondary.

### *2. Yet History Not Ignored:*

In John there is but one life — the eternal; and there is but one world — the world of the ideal, which is also the only real. Yet he is not an idealist, pure and simple. For him events are not merely symbols; history is not allegory. The incarnation is a historical fact, the Parousia a future event. His thought does not move in a world of mere abstractions, a world in which nothing ever happens. His true distinction as a thinker lies in the success with which he unites the two strains of thought, the historical and the ideal. The word which may be said to express his conception of history is "manifestation" (compare ~~ⲁⲓⲛⲓ~~ John 2:11; 9:3; but especially ~~ⲁⲓⲛⲓ~~ 1 John 1:2; 2:19,28; 3:2,5,8; 4:9). The incarnation is only the manifestation of 'what was from the beginning' (~~ⲁⲓⲛⲓ~~ 1 John 1:1,2); the mission of Christ, the manifestation of the love eternally latent in the depths of the Divine nature (~~ⲁⲓⲛⲓ~~ 1 John 4:9). The successive events of history are the emergence into visibility of what already exists. In them the potential becomes actual.

### *3. Nor Eschatology:*

Thus John has an eschatology, as well as a history. He profoundly spiritualizes. He reaches down through the pictorial representations of the traditional apocalyptic, and inquires what essential principle each of these embodies. Then he discovers that this principle is already universally and inevitably in operation; and this, the present spiritual reality, becomes for

him the primary thought. Judgment means essentially the sifting and separation, the classification of men according to their spiritual affinities. But every day men are thus classifying themselves by their attitude toward Christ; this, the true judgment of the world, is already present fact. So also the coming and presence of Christ must always be essentially a spiritual fact, and as such it is already a present fact. There is, in the deepest significance of the word, a perpetual coming of Christ in Christian experience. This, however, does not prevent John from firmly holding the certainty of a fuller manifestation of these facts in the future, when tendencies shall have reached a final culmination, and principles which are now apprehended only by faith will be revealed in all the visible magnitude of their consequences.

#### *4. Eschatological Ideas:*

We shall now briefly survey the Johannine presentation of the chief eschatological ideas.

##### **(1) Eternal life.**

It has already been said that the most distinctive feature in the conception of eternal life is that it is not a future immortal felicity so much as a present spiritual state. The category of duration recedes before that of moral quality. Yet it has its own stupendous importance. In triumphant contrast with the poor ephemerality of the worldly life, he that doeth the will of God “abideth for ever” (<sup>1</sup>John 2:17); and the complete realization of the life eternal is still in the future (<sup>1</sup>John 4:36; 6:27; 12:25).

##### **(2) Antichrist.**

The view of Antichrist is strikingly characteristic. Tacitly setting aside the lurid figure of popular traditions, John grasps the essential fact that is expressed by the name and idea of Antichrist (= one who in the guise of Christ opposes Christ), and finds its fulfillment in the false teaching which substituted for the Christ of the gospel the fantastic product of Gnostic imagination (<sup>1</sup>John 4:3). But in this he reads the sign that the world's day has reached its last hour (<sup>1</sup>John 2:18).

##### **(3) Resurrection.**

While the Fourth Gospel so carefully records the proofs of Christ's resurrection, noticeably little (in the Epistle, nothing) is made of the

thought of a future resurrection from the dead. For the Christian, the death of the body is a mere incident. “Whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die” (~~8126~~ John 11:26; compare 8:51). Regeneration — union with Christ — is the true resurrection (~~8180~~ John 6:50,51,58). And yet, again, the eschatological idea is not lost. Side by side with the essential truth the supplementary and interpretative truth is given its right place. “Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day” (~~8164~~ John 6:54 the King James Version). If Christ says “I am the life: whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die,” He also says “I am the resurrection: he that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live” (~~8125~~ John 11:25).

#### **(4) Judgment.**

As has already been said, John regards judgment as essentially a present fact of life. Christ does not pass judgment upon men — that is not the purpose of His coming (~~8187~~ John 3:17; 12:47). Yet Christ is always of necessity judging men — compelling them to pass judgment upon themselves. For judgment He is come into the world (~~8188~~ John 9:39). By their attitude toward Him men involuntarily but inevitably classify themselves, reveal what spirit they are of, and automatically register themselves as being or as not being “of the truth” (~~8187~~ John 18:37). Judgment is not the assigning of a character from without, but the revelation of a character from within. And this is not future, but present. “He that believeth not hath been judged .... because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of of God” (~~8188~~ John 3:18). Yet the apostle indubitably looks forward to a future Day of Judgment (~~8188~~ John 12:48; ~~8147~~ 1 John 4:17). Nor is this simply an “unconscious concession to orthodoxy.” The judgment to come will be the full manifestation of the judgment that now is, that is to say, of the principles according to which men are in reality approved or condemned already. What this present judgment, the classification of men by their relation to Christ, ultimately signifies, is not at all realized by the “world,” is not fully realized even in Christian faith. There must be a day when all self-deception shall cease and all reality shall be manifested.

#### **(5) The Parousia.**

In like manner the conception of the [Parousia] is primarily spiritual. The substitution in the Fourth Gospel of the Supper Discourse (John 14

through 16) for the apocalyptic chapters in the Synoptics is of the utmost significance. It is not a Christ coming on the clouds of heaven that is presented, but a Christ who has come and is ever coming to dwell in closest fellowship with His people (see above under IV). Yet John by no means discards belief in the [Parousia] as a historical event of the future. If Christ's abiding-place is in those that love Him and keep His word, there is also a Father's House in which there are many abiding-places, whither He goes to prepare a place for them and whence He will come again to receive them unto Himself (~~GR42~~ John 14:2,3). Still more is this emphasized in the Epistle. The command "Love not the world" is sharpened by the assurance that the world is on the verge, aye, in the process of dissolution (~~GR17~~ 1 John 2:17). The exhortation to "abide in him" is enforced by the dread of being put to shame at His impending advent (~~GR28~~ 1 John 2:28). The hope of being made partakers in His manifested glory is the consummation of all that is implied in our being now children of God (~~GR19~~ 1 John 3:2,3).

**(a)** A "Manifestation": But this future crisis will be only the manifestation of the existing reality (~~GR19~~ 1 John 3:2). The Parousia will, no more than the incarnation, be the advent of a strange Presence in the world. It will be, as on the Mount of Transfiguration, the outshining of a latent glory; not the arrival of one who is absent, but the self-revealing of one who is present. As to the manner of Christ's appearing, the Epistle is silent. As to its significance, we are left in no doubt. It is a historical event; occurring once for all; the consummation of all Divine purpose that has governed human existence; the final crisis in the history of the church, of the world, and of every man.

**(b)** Relation to Believers: Especially for the children of God, it will be a coming unto salvation. "Beloved, now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is" (~~GR19~~ 1 John 3:2). Here the Johannine idea of "manifestation" is strikingly employed. "What we shall be" will be essentially what we are — children of God. No new element will be added to the regenerate nature. All is there that ever will be there. But the epoch of full development is not yet. Only when Christ — the Christ who is already in the world — shall be manifested, then also the children of God who are in the world will be manifested as being what they are. They also will have come to their Mount of Transfiguration. As eternal life here is



mediated through this first manifestation (~~and~~ 1 John 1:2), so eternal life hereafter will be mediated through this second and final manifestation. "We know that we shall be like him, because we shall see him as he is." It is true that here according to our capacity we behold Him as He is (~~and~~ John 1:14); but perception, now dim and wavering, will then be intense and vivid. The vision of the future is in some sense corporeal as well as spiritual. Sense and faith will coincide. It will then have ceased to be expedient that Christ should go away in order that the Spirit of truth may come. We shall possess in the same experience the privilege of the original eyewitnesses of the incarnate life and the inward ministry of the Spirit. And seeing Him as He is, we shall be like Him. Vision will beget likeness, and likeness again give clearness to vision. And as the vision is in some un conjecturable fashion corporeal as well as spiritual, so also is the assimilation (compare Phil 3:21). The very idea of the spiritual body is that it perfectly corresponds to the character to which it belongs. The outward man will take the mold of the inward man, and will share with it its perfected likeness to the glorified manhood of Jesus Christ. Such is the farthest view opened to our hope by the Johannine eschatology; and it is that which, of all others, has been most entrancing to the imagination and stimulating to the aspiration of the children of God.

### LITERATURE.

The following works may be mentioned as treating specially of the Theology: B. Weiss, *Der Johannische Lehrbegriff*, Berlin, 1862; O. Holtzmann, *Das Johannes-Evangelium untersucht und erklärt*, Darmstadt, 1887; Beyschlag, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*, Halle, 1896; Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristentum*, Berlin, 1902, English translation, Williams and Norgate, London; E. Haupt, *Der erste Brief des Johannes*, Colberg, 1869, English translation, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh; Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums*, Tübingen, 1902; G.B. Stevens, *The Johannine Theology*, New York, 1894; id., *The Theology of the New Testament*, 1899, also *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, 1905, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh; O. Cone, *The Gospel and Its Earliest Interpretations*, New York, 1893; Scott, *The Fourth Gospel, Its Purpose and Theology*, T. and T. Clark, 1906; Law, *The Tests of Life: A Study of the First Epistle of John (dealing specially with the Theology)*, Edinburgh

and New York, 1909; Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*, New York, 1909; Judge, *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, Macmillan, 1910.

*R. Law*

## JOHN (1)

<jon> ([ 'Ἰωάννης, *Ioannes*]): The name of several persons mentioned in the Apocrypha:

- (1) Father of Mattathias, grandfather of Judas Maccabeus and his brothers (1 Macc 2:1).
- (2) Eldest son of Mattathias, surnamed *GADDIS* (which see).
- (3) Father of Eupolemus, one of the envoys sent to Rome by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 8:17; 2 Macc 4:11).
- (4) John Hyrcanus, “a valiant man,” son of Simon, and nephew of Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 13:53; 16:1).

See *ASMONEANS; MACCABEES*.

- (5) One of the envoys sent to treat with Lysias (2 Macc 11:17).

*J. Hutchison*

## JOHN (2)

([ 'Ἰωάννης, *Ioannes*]): The name of 4 persons:

- (1) *JOHN THE BAPTIST* (which see).
- (2) The apostle, the son of Zebedee, and brother of James (*see JOHN, THE APOSTLE*).
- (3) A relative of Annas the high priest, who sat in the Sanhedrin when Peter and John were tried (~~4006~~ Acts 4:6). Lightfoot supposes him to be the Jochanan ben Zacchai of the Talmud, who, however, did not belong to the family of the high priest. Nothing is really known of him.
- (4) *JOHN MARK* (which see).
- (5) Father of Simon Peter (~~4006~~ John 1:42; 21:15,17, margin “Greek Joanes: called in ~~4007~~ Matthew 16:17, Jonah”).

*S. F. Hunter*

## JOHN, THE APOSTLE

### SOURCES OF THE LIFE OF JOHN:

The sources for the life of the apostle John are of various kinds, and of different degrees of trustworthiness. There are the references in the Synoptic Gospels, which may be used simply and easily without any preliminary critical inquiry into their worth as sources; for these Gospels contain the common tradition of the early church, and for the present purpose may be accepted as trustworthy. Further, there are the statements in Acts and in Galatians, which we may use without discussion as a source for the life of John. There is next the universal tradition of the 2nd century, which we may use, if we can show that the John of Ephesus, who bulks so largely in the Christian literature of the 2nd and 3rd centuries, is identical with the son of Zebedee. Further, on the supposition that the son of Zebedee is the author of the Johannine writings of the New Testament, there is another source of unequaled value for the estimate of the life and character of the son of Zebedee in these writings. Finally, there is the considerable volume of tradition which gathered around the name of John of Ephesus, of which, picturesque and interesting though the traditions be, only sparing use can be made.

### I. WITNESS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Addressing ourselves first to the Synoptic Gospels, to Acts and to Galatians, we ask, What, from these sources, can we know of the apostle John? A glance only need be taken at the Johannine writings, more fully discussed elsewhere in relation to their author.

#### *1. The Synoptic Gospels:*

That John was one of the two sons of Zebedee, that he became one of the disciples of Jesus, that at His call he forsook all and followed Jesus, and was thereafter continuously with Jesus to the end, are facts familiar to every reader of the Synoptic Gospels. The call was given to John and to his brother James at the Sea of Galilee, while in a boat with their father Zebedee, “mending their nets” (~~<1001>~~ Matthew 4:21,22, and parallel passages). “Come ye after me,” said Jesus, “and I will make you to become fishers of men” (~~<1001>~~ Mark 1:17; on the earlier call in Judea, ~~<1005>~~ John 1:35 ff, see below). That Zebedee was a man of considerable wealth may be inferred from the fact that he had “hired servants” with him (~~<1002>~~ Mark

1:20), and that his wife was one of those women who ministered of their substance to Jesus and His disciples (<sup><475></sup>Matthew 27:55,56). Comparison of the latter passage with <sup><454></sup>Mark 15:40,41 identifies the wife of Zebedee, John's mother, with Salome, and it seems a fair inference from <sup><605></sup>John 19:25, though all do not accept it, that Mary, the mother of Jesus, and Salome, the wife of Zebedee, were sisters. On this view, James and John were cousins of Jesus, and were also related to the family of John the Baptist. The name of John appears in all the lists of the apostles given in the Synoptic Gospels (<sup><602></sup>Matthew 10:2 and parallels). While his name appears rarely in a position by itself, he is still one of the most prominent of the disciples. With Peter and James he is present at the raising of the daughter of Jairus (<sup><465></sup>Mark 5:37; <sup><485></sup>Luke 8:51 ff). These three were also present at the transfiguration (Matthew 17; Mark 9; Luke 9). They were nearest to the Lord at the agony of Gethsemane. In all these cases nothing characteristic of John is to be noted. He is simply present as one of the three, and therefore one of the most intimate of the disciples. But there is something characteristic in an incident recorded by Luke (9:54), in which James and John are represented as wishing to call down fire on a Samarian village, which had refused them hospitality. From this can be inferred something of the earnestness, zeal, and enthusiasm of the brothers, and of their high sense of what was due to their Master. Peter, James, John, and Andrew are the four who asked Jesus about the prophecies He had uttered: "Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when these things are all about to be accomplished?" (<sup><434></sup>Mark 13:4). Then there is the request of their mother as to the place she desired for her sons in the coming kingdom (<sup><405></sup>Mark 10:35 ff). To Peter and John was entrusted the task of preparation for the keeping of the Passover (<sup><218></sup>Luke 22:8). Once John stands alone, and asks what we may consider a characteristic question: "Teacher, we saw one casting out demons in thy name; and we forbade him, because he followed not us" (<sup><408></sup>Mark 9:38; <sup><494></sup>Luke 9:49). From these notices we see that John was in the front rank of the disciples, and we see also that he was so far conscious of the position he held, and of the intimate connection he had with the Master. We note further that John was a young man of fiery zeal, and of a tendency toward intolerance and exclusiveness. The zeal and the intolerance are in evidence in the desire to call down fire upon the Samaritan village, and the tendency toward exclusiveness is manifested in the request of his mother as to the place her sons were to occupy in the kingdom. They desire to have the highest positions. These tendencies were not encouraged by Jesus. They were

rebuked by Him once and again, but the tendencies reveal the men. In harmony with these notices of character and temperament is the name given to the brothers by Jesus, “Boanerges,” “Sons of thunder” (~~MARK~~ Mark 3:17), which, whatever else may be meant by it, means strength, unexpectedness, and zeal approaching to methods of violence.

## *2. Acts and Galatians:*

John is found in company with Peter in the opening scenes in Acts. He is with Peter while the man at the gate was healed (3:1 ff). He is with Peter on the mission to Samaria (8:14 ff). He is with Peter and James, the Lord’s brother, at the interview with Paul recorded in Galatians 2, and the three are described by Paul as the pillar apostles (2:9). This interview is of importance because it proves that John had survived his brother James, whose death is recorded in Acts 12; at all events that John and James were not killed by the Jews at the same time, as some now contend that they were. This contention is considered below.

## *3. The Johannine Writings: Gospel and Revelation:*

Much is to be learned of the apostle John from the Fourth Gospel, assuming the Gospel to have been written by him. We learn from it that he was a disciple of John the Baptist (1:35), that he was one of the first six disciples called by Jesus in His early ministry in Judea (1:37-51), and that he was present at all the scenes which he describes in the Gospel. We find later that he had a home in Jerusalem, and was acquainted with many there. To that home he took Mary, the mother of Jesus, whom the dying Saviour entrusted to his care (19:26,27). Much more also we learn of him and of his history, for the Gospel is a spiritual biography, a record of the growth of faith on the part of the writer, and of the way in which his eyes were opened to see the glory of the Lord, until faith seems to have become vision. He was in the inner circle of the disciples, indeed, nearest of all to Jesus, “the disciple whom Jesus loved” (13:23; 19:26; 20:2; 21:7,20), and, because of that love, became the apostle of love (see, further, *JOHN, GOSPEL OF; JOHN, EPISTLES OF; JOHANNINE THEOLOGY*).

The Book of Revelation, likewise traditionally ascribed to John, bears important witness to the apostle’s banishment in later life to the isle of Patmos in the Aegean (1:9). There he received the visions recorded in the book. The banishment probably took place in the reign of Domitian (*see REVELATION*), with whose practice it was entirely in consonance (on the

severity of such exile, compare Sir W.M. Ramsay, Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia, chapter viii). The testimony is of high importance in its bearing on the disputed question of John's residence in Asia, a point now to be discussed.

## **II. ALLEGED EARLY MARTYRDOM OF JOHN: CRITICISM OF EVIDENCE.**

### *1. Recent Denial of John's Residence in Ephesus:*

The consentient testimony of the church of the 2nd century is that the later years of John were spent at Ephesus, where he wrote his Gospel, and gathered round him many disciples (see the evidence drawn out in detail in Godet, Commentary on Gospel of John, 43 ff; compare also Lightfoot, "The School of Ephesus," in Essays on the Work Entitled "Supernatural Religion"). Before, however, we can use the traditions connected with this residence at Ephesus, it is needful to inquire into the statement alleged to be made by Papias that John, the son of Zebedee, was killed by the Jews at an early date. It is plain, that, if this statement is correct, the apostle could not be the author of the Johannine writings in the New Testament, universally dated near the end of the 1st century.

### *2. Grounds of Denial:*

The evidence for the statement that John was early killed by the Jews is thus summed up by Dr. Moffatt: "The evidence for the early martyrdom of John the son of Zebedee is, in fact, threefold:

- (a) a prophecy of Jesus preserved in ~~4109~~ Mark 10:39 = ~~4103~~ Matthew 20:23,
- (b) the witness of Papias, and
- (c) the calendars of the church" (Intro to Lit. of New Testament, 602). Our limits do not admit of an exhaustive examination of this so-called evidence, but, happily, an exhaustive examination is not needed.

(a) The first head proceeds on an assumption which is not warranted, namely, that a prophecy of Jesus would not be allowed to stand, if it were not evidently fulfilled. In the present instance, a literal fulfillment of the prophecy ("The cup that I drink ye shall drink," etc.) is out of the question, for there is no hint that either James or John was crucified. We must

therefore fall back on the primary meaning of martyrdom, and recognize a fulfillment of the prophecy in the sufferings John endured and the testimony he bore for the Master's sake (thus Origen, etc.).

**(b)** Dr. Moffatt lays great stress on what he calls the testimony of Papias. But the alleged testimony of Papias is not found in any early authority, and then occurs in writers not of any great value from the point of view of critical investigation. It is found in a passage of Georgius Hamartolus (9th century), and is held to be corroborated by a fragment of an epitome (7th or 8th century) of the Chronicle of Philip Sidetes (5th century), a thoroughly untrustworthy writer. The passage from Georgius may be seen in convenient form in Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, 513-19. It tells that John survived to the time of Nerva, quotes a saying of Papias that he was killed by the Jews, states that this was in fulfillment of the prophecy of Jesus above referred to, and goes on to say, "So the learned Origen affirms in his interpretation of Matthew's Gospel, that John was martyred, declaring that he had learnt the last from the successors of the apostles" (Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, 531). Fortunately, the statement of Origen can be tested, and it by no means, as Moffatt admits (*op. cit.*, 604), bears out the meaning attached to it. Origen is of opinion that the prophecy of Jesus was sufficiently fulfilled by the fact of John's banishment to Patmos and his sufferings there. This, according to him, is what tradition taught and what the prophecy meant. From the whole statement of Georgius, which expressly declares that John survived till the time of Nerva, nothing can be inferred in support of the so-called quotation from Papias. It is to be remembered that the writings of Papias were known to Irenaeus and to Eusebius, and it is inconceivable that, if such a statement was to be found in these, they would have ignored it, and have given currency to a statement contradictory to it. No stress, therefore, can be laid on the alleged quotation. We do not know its context, nor is there anything in the literature of the first 3 centuries corroborative of it. In the citation in the epitome of Philip, Papias is made to speak of "John the divine" (*ho theologos*). This title is not applied to John till the close of the 4th century.

**(c)** As regards the 3rd line of evidence instanced by Dr. Moffatt — church calendars, in which James and John are commemorated together as martyrs — it is even more worthless than the other two. On the nature and origin of these martyrologies, Dr. J. Drummond may be quoted: "They were constructed in process of time out of local calendars. At some period in the 2nd half of the 5th century, a martyrology was formed by welding together

a number of provincial calendars, Roman, Italian, Spanish, and Gallic, into what was in effect a general martyrology of Western Europe. At Nicomedia, about the year 350, a similar eastern martyrology was formed out of the local calendars, and this was translated with curtailments into Syriac at Edessa about the year 400. It is a copy of this, made in 411, which is now in the British Museum” (Inquiry into Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, 232). If this is a true account of the rise and origin of martyrologies we need not be surprised that Sir W. M. Ramsay speaks as follows: “That James and John, who were not slain at the same time, should be commemorated together, is the flimsiest conceivable evidence that John was killed early in Jerusalem. The bracketing together of the memory of apostles who had some historical connection in life, but none in death, must be regarded as the worst side, historically speaking, of the martyrologies” (The First Christian Century, 49, note).

### III. THE EPHESIAN TRADITIONS.

#### *1. John the Apostle, and John the Presbyter:*

Thus the early traditions of the churches are available for the life of John the son of Zebedee. But there still remain many blank spaces in that life. After the reference to the pillar apostles in Gal, silence falls on the life of John, and we know nothing of his life and activity until we read of his banishment to Patmos, and meet with those references to the old man at Ephesus, which occur in the Christian literature of the 2nd century. One point of interest relates to the (genuine) quotation from Papias, preserved by Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 39), regarding a “Presbyter John,” a disciple of the Lord, who was one of his living authorities. Were there two Johns at Ephesus? Or was there only one? Or, if there was only one, was he John the Evangelist, or only John the Presbyter? Here there is every possible variety of opinion. Many hold that there were two, and many that there was only one. Many who hold that there was only one, hold that the one was John the son of Zebedee; others hold, with equal assurance, that he was a distinct person. Obviously, it is impossible to discuss the question adequately here. After due consideration, we lean to the conclusion that there was only one John at Ephesus, and he the son of Zebedee. For the proof of this, impossible within our limits, we refer to the learned argument of John Chapman, in his work *John the Presbyter and the Fourth Gospel* (1911).



## *2. Characteristic Traditions:*

Into the traditions which cluster round John in Ephesus it is not necessary to enter in detail (compare Godet, *op. cit.*, 57 ff). According to the tradition universally accepted in the church, John survived till the time of Trajan (98 AD). Striking and characteristic things are told of him in harmony with the touches we find in the Synoptic Gospels. The story of his rushing forth from the bath when Cerinthus, the heretic, entered it (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, iii.3, 4) recalls the characteristics of him whom Jesus called "son of thunder." The same tone of exclusiveness, modified by larger experience, is found in the 1st Epistle, which so frequently and so decisively discriminates between those who believe in Jesus and those who do not.

## **IV. THE CHARACTER OF JOHN.**

The general character of this great apostle is already sufficiently apparent. While we recall the illustrative facts found in the Synoptics, that James and John were the two who wished to call down fire from heaven on the inhospitable village, that John was one of those who desired one of the chief places in the kingdom, that he it was who forbade the man to cast out demons in the name of Jesus because he followed not with them, we do not forget that on each of these occasions he was corrected and rebuked by the Master, and he was not the kind of man who could not profit by the rebuke of Jesus. So that vehemence of disposition was held in check, and, while still in existence, was under control, and allowed to have vent only on occasions when it was permissible, and even necessary. So in his writings, and in the reflections in the Gospel, we note the vehemence displayed, but now directed only against those who refused to believe in, and to acknowledge, Jesus.

"A quiet and thoughtful temperament is by no means inconsistent with a certain vehemence, when, on occasions, the pent-up fire flashes forth; indeed, the very violence of feeling may help to foster an habitual quietude, lest word or deed should betray too deep an emotion. Then it is not without significance that, in the three narratives which are cited from the Gospels to prove the overbearing temper of John, we are expressly told that Jesus corrected him. Are we to suppose that these rebukes made no impression? Is it not more likely that they sank deep into his heart, and that the agony of beholding his Master's crucifixion made them ineffaceable?

Then, if not before, began that long development which changed the youthful son of thunder into the aged apostle of love” (Drummond, op. cit, 410, 411).

But love itself has its side of vehemence, and the intensity of love toward a person or a cause may be measured by the intensity of aversion and of hatred toward their contradictories. There are many reflections in the Gospel and in the Epistles which display this energy of hatred toward the work of the devil, and toward those dispositions which are under the influence of the father of lies. We simply notice these, for they prove that the fervent youth who was devoted to his Master carried with him to the end the same disposition which was characteristic of him from the beginning.

## LITERATURE.

In addition to books mentioned in article, see the list of works appended to article on JOHN, GOSPEL OF.

*James Iverach*

## JOHN THE BAPTIST

([ Ἰωάννης, *Ioanes*]):

## I. SOURCES.

The sources of first-hand information concerning the life and work of John the Baptist are limited to the New Testament and Josephus. Luke and Matthew give the fuller notices, and these are in substantial agreement. The Fourth Gospel deals chiefly with the witness after the baptism. In his single notice (Ant., XVIII, v, 2), Josephus makes an interesting reference to the cause of John's imprisonment. See VI, 2, below.

## II. PARENTAGE.

John was of priestly descent. His mother, Elisabeth, was of the daughters of Aaron, while his father, Zacharias, was a priest of the course of Abija, and did service in the temple at Jerusalem. It is said of them that “they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless” (ⲉⲙⲟⲩⲥ Luke 1:6). This priestly ancestry is in interesting contrast with his prophetic mission.

### III. EARLY LIFE.

We infer from Luke's account that John was born about six months before the birth of Jesus. Of the place we know only that it was a city of the hill country of Judah. Our definite information concerning his youth is summed up in the angelic prophecy, "Many shall rejoice at his birth. For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and he shall drink no wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb" (~~Q114~~ Luke 1:14-16), and in Luke's brief statement, "And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel" (~~Q180~~ Luke 1:80). The character and spiritual insight of the parents shown in the incidents recorded are ample evidence that his training was a fitting preparation for his great mission.

### IV. MINISTRY.

#### *1. The Scene:*

The scene of the Baptist's ministry was partly in the wilderness of Southern Judea and partly in the Jordan valley. Two locations are mentioned, Bethany or Bethabara (~~Q128~~ John 1:28), and Aenon near Salim (~~Q123~~ John 3:23). Neither of these places can be positively identified. We may infer from ~~Q121~~ John 3:2 that he also spent some time in Peraea beyond the Jordan.

#### *2. His First Appearance:*

The unusual array of dates with which Luke marks the beginning of John's ministry (~~Q101~~ Luke 3:1,2) reveals his sense of the importance of the event as at once the beginning of his prophetic work and of the new dispensation. His first public appearance is assigned to the 15th year of Tiberius, probably 26 or 27 AD, for the first Passover attended by Jesus can hardly have been later than 27 AD (~~Q121~~ John 2:20).

#### *3. His Dress and Manner:*

John's dress and habits were strikingly suggestive of Elijah, the old prophet of national judgment. His desert habits have led some to connect him with that strange company of Jews known as the Essenes. There is, however, little foundation for such a connection other than his ascetic habits and the fact that the chief settlement of this sect was near the home of his youth. It was natural that he should continue the manner of his youthful life in the

desert, and it is not improbable that he intentionally copied his great prophetic model. It was fitting that the one who called men to repentance and the beginning of a self-denying life should show renunciation and self-denial in his own life. But there is no evidence in his teaching that he required such asceticism of those who accepted his baptism.

#### *4. His Message:*

The fundamental note in the message of John was the announcement of the near approach of the Messianic age. But while he announced himself as the herald voice preparing the way of the Lord, and because of this the expectant multitudes crowded to hear his word, his view of the nature of the kingdom was probably quite at variance with that of his hearers. Instead of the expected day of deliverance from the foreign oppressor, it was to be a day of judgment for Israel. It meant good for the penitent, but destruction for the ungodly. "He will gather his wheat into the garner, but the chaff he will burn up with .... fire" (~~Q182~~ Matthew 3:12). "The axe also lieth at the root of the trees: every tree therefore that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire" (~~Q189~~ Luke 3:9). Yet this idea was perhaps not entirely unfamiliar. That the delay in the Messiah's coming was due to the sinfulness of the people and their lack of repentance, was a commonplace in the message of their teachers (Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, I, 169).

The call to repentance was then a natural message of preparation for such a time of judgment. But to John repentance was a very real and radical thing. It meant a complete change of heart and life. "Bring forth .... fruits worthy of repentance" (~~Q188~~ Luke 3:8). What these fruits were he made clear in his answers to the inquiring multitudes and the publicans and soldiers (~~Q180~~ Luke 3:10-14). It is noticeable that there is no reference to the usual ceremonies of the law or to a change of occupation. Do good; be honest; refrain from extortion; be content with wages.

#### *5. His Severity:*

John used such violence in addressing the Pharisees and Sadducees doubtless to startle them from their self-complacency. How hopelessly they were blinded by their sense of security as the children of Abraham, and by their confidence in the merits of the law, is attested by the fact that these parties resisted the teachings of both John and Jesus to the very end.

With what vigor and fearlessness the Baptist pressed his demand for righteousness is shown by his stern reproof of the sin of Herod and Herodias, which led to his imprisonment and finally to his death.

## V. BAPTISM.

### 1. Significance:

The symbolic rite of baptism was such an essential part of the work of John that it not only gave him his distinctive title of “the Baptist” ([ὁ βαπτιστής, *ho baptistes*]), but also caused his message to be styled “preaching the baptism of repentance.” That a special virtue was ascribed to this rite, and that it was regarded as a necessary part of the preparation for the coming of the Messiah, are shown by its important place in John’s preaching, and by the eagerness with which it was sought by the multitudes. Its significance may best be understood by giving attention to its historical antecedents, for while John gave the rite new significance, it certainly appealed to ideas already familiar to the Jews.

#### (1) Lustrations Required by the Levitical Law.

The divers washings required by the law (Leviticus 11 through 15) have, without doubt, arcligious import. This is shown by the requirement of sacrifices in connection with the cleansing, especially the sin offering ((B408) Leviticus 14:8,9,19,20; compare (A044) Mark 1:44; (A022) Luke 2:22). The designation of John’s baptism by the word [βαπτίζειν, *baptizein*], which by New Testament times was used of ceremonial purification, also indicates some historical connection (compare Sirach 34:25).

#### (2) Anticipation of Messianic Lustrations Foretold by Prophets.

John understood that his baptism was a preparation for the Messianic baptism anticipated by the prophets, who saw that for a true cleansing the nation must wait until God should open in Israel a fountain for cleansing (Zec 13:1), and should sprinkle His people with clean water and give them a new heart and a new spirit ((A625) Ezekiel 36:25,26; (A638) Jeremiah 33:8). His baptism was at once a preparation and a promise of the spiritual cleansing which the Messiah would bestow. “I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me .... shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire” ((A011) Matthew 3:11 margin).

### (3) Proselyte Baptism.

According to the teaching of later Judaism, a stranger who desired to be adopted into the family of Israel was required, along with circumcision, to receive the rite of baptism as a means of cleansing from the ceremonial uncleanness attributed to him as a Gentile. While it is not possible to prove the priority of this practice of proselyte baptism to the baptism of John, there can be no doubt of the fact, for it is inconceivable, in view of Jewish prejudice, that it would be borrowed from John or after this time.

While it seems clear that in the use of the rite of baptism John was influenced by the Jewish customs of ceremonial washings and proselyte baptism, his baptism differed very essentially from these. The Levitical washings restored an unclean person to his former condition, but baptism was a preparation for a new condition. On the other hand, proselyte baptism was administered only to Gentiles, while John required baptism of all Jews. At the same time his baptism was very different from Christian baptism, as he himself declared (~~41816~~ Luke 3:16). His was a baptism of water only; a preparation for the baptism “in the Spirit” which was to follow. It is also to be observed that it was a rite complete in itself, and that it was offered to the nation as a preparation for a specific event, the advent of the Messiah.

We may say, then, that as a “baptism of repentance” it meant a renunciation of the past life; as a cleansing it symbolized the forgiveness of sins (~~41004~~ Mark 1:4), and as preparation it implied a promise of loyalty to the kingdom of the Messiah. We have no reason to believe that Jesus experienced any sense of sin or felt any need of repentance or forgiveness; but as a Divinely appointed preparation for the Messianic kingdom His submission to it was appropriate.

### *2. Baptism of Jesus:*

While the multitudes flocked to the Jordan, Jesus came also to be baptized with the rest. “John would have hindered him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? But Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness” (~~41813~~ Matthew 3:13-15). Wherein was this act a fulfillment of righteousness? We cannot believe that Jesus felt any need of repentance or change of life. May we not regard it rather as an identification of Himself with His people in the formal consecration of His life to the work of the kingdom?

## VI. IMPRISONMENT AND DEATH.

### *1. The Time:*

Neither the exact time of John's imprisonment nor the period of time between his imprisonment and his death can be determined. On the occasion of the unnamed feast of ~~<BR>~~John 5:1, Jesus refers to John's witness as already past. At least, then, his arrest, if not his death, must have taken place prior to that incident, i.e. before the second Passover of Jesus' ministry.

### *2. The Occasion:*

According to the Gospel accounts, John was imprisoned because of his reproof of Herod's marriage with Herodias, the wife of his brother Philip (~~<BR>~~Luke 3:19,20; compare ~~<BR>~~Matthew 14:3,1; ~~<BR>~~Mark 6:17,18). Josephus says (Ant., XVIII, v, 2) that Herod was influenced to put John to death by the "fear lest his great influence over the people might put it in his power or inclination to raise a rebellion. Accordingly, he was sent a prisoner, out of Herod's suspicious temper, to Macherus, and was there put to death." This account of Josephus does not necessarily conflict with the tragic story of the Gospels. If Herod desired to punish or destroy him for the reasons assigned by the evangelists, he would doubtless wish to offer as the public reason some political charge, and the one named by Josephus would be near at hand.

## VII. JOHN AND HIS DISCIPLES.

### *1. The Inner Circle:*

Frequent reference is made in the Gospel narrative to the disciples of John. As the multitudes crowded to his baptism, it was natural that he should gather about him an inner circle of men who should receive special instruction in the meaning of his work, and should aid him in the work of baptism, which must have soon increased beyond his power to perform alone. It was in the formation of this inner circle of immediate followers that he prepared a sure foundation for the work of the Messiah; for it was from this inner group that the disciples of Jesus were mainly drawn, and that with his consent and through his witness to the superior worth of the latter, and the temporary character of his own mission (~~<BR>~~John 1:29-44).

## *2. Their Training:*

Concerning the substance of their training, we know from the disciples of Jesus (~~<210>~~Luke 11:1) that it included forms of prayer, and from his own disciples (~~<194>~~Matthew 9:14) we learn that frequent fastings were observed. We may be sure also that he taught them much concerning the Messiah and His work.

## *3. Their Fidelity:*

There is abundant evidence of the great fidelity of these disciples to their master. This may be observed in their concern at the over-shadowing popularity of Jesus (~~<33>~~John 3:26); in their loyalty to him in his imprisonment and in their reverent treatment of his body after his death (~~<429>~~Mark 6:29). That John's work was extensive and his influence lasting is shown by the fact that 20 years afterward Paul found in far-off Ephesus certain disciples, including Apollos, the learned Alexandrian Jew, who knew no other baptism than that of John (~~<491>~~Acts 19:1-7).

# VIII. JOHN AND JESUS.

## *1. John's Relation to Jesus:*

John assumed from the first the role of a herald preparing the way for the approaching Messianic age. He clearly regarded his work as Divinely appointed (~~<33>~~John 1:33), but was well aware of his subordinate relation to the Messiah (~~<407>~~Mark 1:7) and of the temporary character of his mission (~~<33>~~John 3:30). The Baptist's work was twofold. In his preaching he warned the nation of the true character of the new kingdom as a reign of righteousness, and by his call to repentance and baptism he prepared at least a few hearts for a sympathetic response to the call and teaching of Jesus. He also formally announced and bore frequent personal testimony to Jesus as the Messiah.

There is no necessary discrepancy between the synoptic account and that of the Fourth Gospel in reference to the progress of John's knowledge of the Messianic character of Jesus. According to ~~<434>~~Matthew 3:14, John is represented as declining at first to baptize Jesus because he was conscious of His superiority, while in ~~<329>~~John 1:29-34 he is represented as claiming not to have known Jesus until He was manifested by the heavenly sign. The latter may mean only that He was not known to him definitely as the Messiah until the promised sign was given.



The message which John sent to Jesus from prison seems strange to some in view of the signal testimonies which he had previously borne to His character. This need not indicate that he had lost faith in the Messiahship of Jesus, but rather a perplexity at the course of events. The inquiry may have been in the interest of the faith of his disciples or his own relief from misgivings due to Jesus' delay in assuming the expected Messianic authority. John evidently held the prophetic view of a temporal Messianic kingdom, and some readjustment of view was necessary.

## *2. Jesus' Estimate of John:*

Jesus was no less frank in His appreciation of John. If praise may be measured by the worth of the one by whose lips it is spoken, then no man ever received such praise as he who was called by Jesus a shining light (~~<RRS>~~ John 5:35), more than a prophet (~~<DRB>~~ Matthew 11:9), and of whom He said, "Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist" (~~<DRB>~~ Matthew 11:11). If, on the other hand, He rated him as less than the least in the kingdom of heaven, this was a limitation of circumstances, not of worth.

Jesus paid high tribute to the Divine character and worth of John's baptism; first, by submitting to it Himself as a step in the fulfillment of all righteousness; later, by repeated utterance, especially in associating it with the birth of the Spirit as a necessary condition of inheriting eternal life (~~<RRS>~~ John 3:5); and, finally, in adopting baptism as a symbol of Christian discipleship.

## **LITERATURE.**

The relative sections in the Gospel Commentaries, in the Lives of Christ, and the articles on John the Baptist in the several Bible dictionaries. There are a number of monographs which treat more minutely of details: W.C. Duncan, *The Life, Character and Acts of John the Baptist*, New York, 1853; Erich Haupt, *Johannes der Tauffer*, Gutersloh, 1874; H. Kohler, *Johannes der Tauffer*, Halle, 1884; R.C. Houghton, *John the Baptist: His Life and Work*, New York, 1889; H.R. Reynolds, *John the Baptist*, London, 1890; J. Feather, *John the Baptist*, Edinburgh, 1894; George Matheson in *Representative Men of the New Testament*, 24-66, Edinburgh, 1905; T. Innitzer, *Johannes der Tauffer*, Vienna, 1908; A.T. Robertson, *John the Loyal*, New York, 1911.

*Russell Benjamin Miller*

## **JOHN, THE EPISTLES OF**

Among the 7 New Testament epistles which from ancient times have been called “catholic” (universal) there is a smaller group of three in which the style alike of thought and language points to a common authorship, and which are traditionally associated with the name of the apostle John. Of these, again, the first differs widely from the other two in respect not only of intrinsic importance, but of its early reception in the church and unquestioned canonicity.

### **THE FIRST EPISTLE**

#### *I. General Character.*

##### **1. A True Letter:**

Not only is the Epistle an anonymous writing; one of its unique features among the books of the New Testament is that it does not contain a single proper name (except our Lord’s), or a single definite allusion, personal, historical, or geographical. It is a composition, however, which a person calling himself “I” sends to certain other persons whom he calls “you,” and is, in form at least, a letter. The criticism which has denied that it is more than formally so is unwarranted. It does not fall under either of Deissmann’s categories — the true letter, intended only for the perusal of the person or persons to whom it is addressed, and the epistle, written with literary art and with an eye to the public. But it does possess that character of the New Testament epistles in general which is well described by Sir William Ramsay (Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia, 24): “They spring from the heart of the writer and speak direct to the heart of the readers. They were often called forth by some special crisis in the history of the persons addressed, so that they rise out of the actual situation in which the writer conceives the readers to be placed; they express the writer’s keen and living sympathy with and participation in the fortunes of the whole class addressed, and are not affected by any thought of a wider public. .... On the other hand, the letters of this class express general principles of life and conduct, religion and ethics, applicable to a wider range of circumstances than those which called them forth; and they appeal as emphatically and intimately to all Christians in all time as they did to those addressed in the first instance.” The 1st Epistle of John could not be more

exactly characterized than by these words. Though its main features are didactic and controversial, the personal note is frequently struck, and with much tenderness and depth of feeling. Under special stress of emotion, the writer's paternal love, sympathy and solicitude break out in the affectionate appellation, "little children," or, yet more endearingly, "my little children." Elsewhere the prefatory "beloved" shows how deeply he is stirred by the sublimity of his theme and the sense of its supreme importance to his readers. He shows himself intimately acquainted with their religious environment (<sup>129</sup>1 John 2:19; 4:1), dangers (<sup>125</sup>1 John 2:26; 3:7; 5:21), attainments (<sup>122</sup>1 John 2:12-14,21), achievements (<sup>104</sup>1 John 4:4) and needs (<sup>89</sup>1 John 3:19; 5:13). Further, the Epistle is addressed primarily to the circle of those among whom the author has habitually exercised his ministry as evangelist and teacher. He has been wont to announce to them the things concerning the Word of Life (<sup>101</sup>1 John 1:1,2), that they might have fellowship with him (<sup>103</sup>1 John 1:3), and now, that his (or their) joy may be full, he writes these things unto them (<sup>106</sup>1 John 1:4). He writes as light shines. Love makes the task a necessity, but also a delight.

## 2. Subject-Matter:

There is no New Testament writing which is throughout more vigorously controversial: for the satisfactory interpretation of the Epistle as a whole, recognition of the polemical aim that pervades it is indispensable. But it is true also that there is no such writing in which the presentation of the truth more widely overflows the limits of the immediate occasion. The writer so constantly lifts up against the error he combats, the simple, sublime and satisfying facts and principles of the Christian revelation, so lifts up every question at issue into the light of eternal truth, that the Epistle pursues its course through the ages, bringing to the church of God the vision and the inspiration of the Divine. The influence of the immediate polemical purpose, however, is manifest, not only in the contents of the Epistle, but in its limitations as well. In a sense it may be said that the field of thought is a narrow one. God is seen exclusively as the Father of Spirits, the Light and Life of the universe of souls. His creatorship and government of the world, the providential aspects and agencies of salvation, the joys and sorrows, hopes and fears that spring from the terrestrial conditions and changes of human life, their disciplinary purpose and effect — to all this the Epistle contains no reference. The themes are exclusively theological and ethical. The writer's immediate interest is confined to that region in which the Divine and human vitally and directly meet — to that in God

which is communicable to man, to that in man by which he is *capax Dei*. The Divine nature as life and light, and love and righteousness; the Incarnation of this Divine nature in Jesus, with its presuppositions and consequences, metaphysical and ethical; the imparting of this Divine nature to men by regeneration; the antithesis to it — sin — and its removal by propitiation; the work of the Holy Spirit; the Christian life, the mutual indwelling of God and man, as tested by its beliefs, its antagonism to sin, its inevitable debt of love — such are the fundamental themes to which every idea in the Epistle is directly related. The topics, if few, are supremely great; and the limitations of the field of vision are more than compensated by the profundity and intensity of spiritual perception.

### 3. Characteristics of the Writer:

The Epistle is in a sense impersonal to the last degree, offering a strange contrast to that frankness of self-revelation which gives such charm to Paul's letters; yet few writings so clearly reveal the deepest characteristics of the writer. We feel in it the high serenity of a mind that lives in constant fellowship with the greatest thoughts and is nourished at the eternal fountain-head; but also the fervent indignation and vehement recoil of such a mind in contact with what is false and evil. It has been truly called "the most passionate" book in the New Testament. Popular instinct has not erred in giving to its author the title, "Apostle of Love." Of the various themes which are so wonderfully intertwined in it, that to which it most of all owes its unfading charm and imperishable value is love. It rises to its sublimest height, to the apex of all revelation, in those passages in which its author is so divinely inspired to write of the eternal life, in God and man, as love.

But it is an inveterate misconception which regards him solely as the exponent of love. Equally he reveals himself as one whose mind is dominated by the sense of truth. There are no words more characteristic of him than "true" (*[alethinós]*, denoting that which both ideally and really corresponds to the name it bears) and "the truth" (*aletheia*, the reality of things *sub specie aeternitatis*). To him Christianity is not only a principle of ethics, or even a way of salvation; it is both of them, because it is primarily the truth, the one true disclosure of the realities of the spiritual and eternal world. Thus it is that his thought so constantly develops itself by antithesis. Each conception has its fundamental opposite: light, darkness; life, death; love, hate; truth, falsehood; the Father, the world; God, the devil. There is

no shading, no gradation in the picture. No sentence is more characteristic of the writer than this: “Ye know that no lie is of the truth” (אֵלֶּכֶם 1 John 2:21 margin). But again, his sense of these radical antagonisms is essentially moral, rather than intellectual. It seems impossible that any writing could display a more impassioned sense, than this Epistle does, of the tremendous imperative of righteousness, a more rigorous intolerance of all sin (אֵלֶּכֶם 1 John 2:4; 3:4,8,9,10). The absolute antagonism and incompatibility between the Christian life and sin of whatsoever kind or degree is maintained with a vehemence of utterance that verges at times upon the paradoxical (אֵלֶּכֶם 1 John 3:9; 5:18). So long as the church lays up this Epistle in its heart, it can never lack a moral tonic of wholesome severity.

#### 4. Style and Diction:

The style is closely, though perhaps unconsciously, molded upon the Hebrew model, and especially upon the parallelistic forms of the Wisdom literature. One has only to read the Epistle with an attentive ear to perceive that, though using another language, the writer had in his own ear, all the time, the swing and cadences of Hebrew verse. The diction is inartificial and unadorned. Not a simile, not a metaphor (except the most fundamental, like “walking in the light”) occurs. The limitations in the range of ideas are matched by those of vocabulary and by the unvarying simplicity of syntactical form. Yet limited and austere as the literary medium is, the writer handles its resources often with consummate skill. The crystalline simplicity of the style perfectly expresses the simple profundity of the thought. Great spiritual intuitions shine like stars in sentences of clear-cut gnomic terseness. Historical (אֵלֶּכֶם 1 John 1:1) and theological (אֵלֶּכֶם 1 John 1:2; 4:2) statements are made with exquisite precision. The frequent reiteration of nearly the same thoughts in nearly the same language, though always with variation and enrichment, gives a cumulative effect which is singularly impressive. Such passages as אֵלֶּכֶם 1 John 2:14-17, with its calm challenge to the arrogant materialism of the world — “And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever” — or the closing verses of the Epistle, with their thrice-repeated triumphant “we know” and their last word of tender, urgent admonition, have a solemn magnificence of effect which nothing but such simplicity of language, carrying such weight of thought, could produce. If it has been true of any writer that “le style est l’homme,” it is true of the author of this Epistle.

## *II. Polemical Aim.*

The polemical intention of the Epistle has been universally recognized; but there has been diversity of opinion as to its actual object. By the older commentators, generally, this was found in the perilous state of the church or churches addressed, which had left their first love and lapsed into Laodicean lukewarmness. But the Epistle gives no sign of this, and it contains many passages that are inconsistent with it (1 John 2:13,14,20,21,27; 4:4; 5:18-20). The danger which immediately threatens the church is from without, not from within. There is a “spirit of error” (1 John 4:6) abroad in the world. From the church itself (1 John 2:18), many “false prophets” have gone forth (1 John 4:1), corrupters of the gospel, veritable antichrists (1 John 2:18). And it may be asserted as beyond question that the peril against which the Epistle was intended to arm the church was the spreading influence of some form of Gnosticism.

### **1. Gnosticism:**

The pretensions of Gnosticism to a higher esoteric knowledge of Divine things seems to be clearly referred to in several passages. In 1 John 2:4,6,9, e.g. one might suppose that they are almost verbally quoted (“He that saith”; “I know Him”; “I abide in Him”; “I am in the light”). When we observe, moreover, the prominence given throughout to the idea of knowledge and the special significance of some of these passages, the conviction grows that the writer’s purpose is not only to refute the false, but to exhibit apostolic Christianity, believed and lived, as the true Gnosis — the Divine reality of which Gnosticism was but a fantastic caricature. The confidence he has concerning his readers is that they “know him who is from the beginning,” that they “know the Father” (2:13). “Every one that loveth is begotten of God, and knoweth God” (4:7); and the final note upon which the Epistle closes is: “We know him that is true, and we are in him that is true” (5:20). The knowledge of the ultimate Reality, the Being who is the eternal life, is for Christian and Gnostic alike the goal of aspiration.

But it is against two closely related developments of Gnostic tendency, a docetic view of the incarnation, and an antinomian view of morals, that the Epistle is specifically directed. Both of these sprang naturally from the dualism which was the fundamental and formative principle of Gnosticism in all its many forms. According to the dualistic conception of existence,

the moral schism of which we are conscious in experience is original, eternal, inherent in the nature of beings. There are two independent and antagonistic principles of being from which severally come all the good and all the evil that exist. The source and the seat of evil were found in the material element, in the body with its senses and appetites, and in its sensuous earthly environment; and it was held inconceivable that the Divine nature should have immediate contact with the material side of existence, or influence upon it.

## 2. Docetism:

To such a view of the universe Christianity could be adjusted only by a docetic interpretation of the Person of Christ. A real incarnation was unthinkable. The Divine could enter into no actual union with a corporeal organism. The human nature of Christ and the incidents of His earthly career were more or less an illusion. And it is with this docetic subversion of the truth of the incarnation that the “antichrists” are specially identified (ⲁⲓⲃⲏ 1 John 2:22,23; 4:2,3), and against it that John directs with wholehearted fervor his central thesis — the complete, permanent, personal identification of the historical Jesus with the Divine Being who is the Word of Life (ⲁⲓⲃⲏ 1 John 1:1), the Christ (ⲁⲓⲃⲏ 1 John 4:2) and the Son of God (ⲁⲓⲃⲏ 1 John 5:5): “Jesus is the Christ come in the flesh.” In ⲁⲓⲃⲏ John 5:6 there is a still more definite reference to the special form which Gnostic Christology assumed in the teaching of Cerinthus and his school. According to Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., i.26, 1) this Cerinthus, who was John’s prime antagonist in Ephesus, taught that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary, and was distinguished from other men only by superiority in justice, prudence and wisdom; that at His baptism the heavenly Christ descended upon Him in the form of a dove; that on the eve of His Passion, the Christ again left Jesus, so that Jesus died and rose again, but the Christ, being spiritual, did not suffer. That is to say, that, in the language of the Epistle, the Christ “came by water,” but not, as John strenuously affirms, “by water and blood .... not with the water only, but with the water and with the blood” (ⲁⲓⲃⲏ 1 John 5:6). He who was baptized of John in Jordan, and He whose life-blood was shed on Calvary, is the same Jesus and the same Christ, the same Son of God eternally.

### 3. Antinomianism:

A further consequence of the dualistic interpretation of existence is that sin, in the Christian meaning of sin, disappears. It is no longer a moral opposition (*[anomia]*), in the human personality, to good; it is a physical principle inherent in all nonspiritual being. Not the soul, but the flesh is its organ; and redemption consists, not in the renewal of the moral nature, but in its emancipation from the flesh. Thus it is no mere general contingency, but a definite tendency that is contemplated in the repeated warning: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. .... If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us" (~~1~~ John 1:8,10).

With the nobler and more earnest spirits the practical corollary of this irreconcilable dualism in human nature was the ascetic life; but to others the same principle readily suggested an opposite method of achieving the soul's deliverance from the yoke of the material — an attitude of moral indifference toward the deeds of the body. Let the duality of nature be boldly reduced to practice. Let body and spirit be regarded as separate entities, each obeying its own laws and acting according to its own nature, without mutual interference; the spiritual nature could not be involved in, nor affected by, the deeds of the flesh. Vehement opposition to this deadly doctrine is prominent in the Epistle — in such utterances as "Sin is lawlessness" (~~1~~ John 3:4) and its converse "All unrighteousness is sin" (~~1~~ John 5:17), but especially in the stringent emphasis laid upon actual conduct, "doing" righteousness or "doing" sin. The false spiritualism which regards the contemplation of heavenly things as of far superior importance to the requirements of commonplace morality is sternly reprobated: "Little children, let no man lead you astray: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous" (~~1~~ John 3:7); and the converse application of the same doctrine, that the mere "doing" of sin is of little or no moment to the "spiritual" man, is met with the trenchant declaration, "He that doeth sin is of the devil" (~~1~~ John 3:8). The whole passage (~~1~~ John 2:29 through 3:10) presupposes, as familiar to its readers, a doctrine of moral indifferentism according to which the status of the spiritual man is not to be tested by the commonplace facts of moral conduct. It is only as a passionate contradiction of this hateful tenet that the paradoxical language of ~~1~~ John 3:6,9 and 5:18 can be understood.



To the same polemical necessity is due the uniquely reiterated emphasis which the Epistle lays upon brotherly love, and the almost fierce tone in which the new commandment is promulgated. To the Gnostic, knowledge was the sum of attainment. "They give no heed to love," says Ignatius, "caring not for the widow, the orphan or the afflicted, neither for those who are in bonds nor for those who are released from bonds, neither for the hungry nor the thirsty." That a religion which banished or neglected love should call itself Christian or claim affinity with Christianity excites John's hottest indignation; against it he lifts up his supreme truth, God is love, with its immediate consequence that to be without love is to be without capacity for knowing God (~~1~~1 John 4:7,8). The assumption of a lofty mystical piety apart from dutiful conduct in the ordinary relations of life is ruthlessly underlined as the vaunt of a self-deceiver (~~1~~1 John 4:20); and the crucial test by which we may assure our self-accusing hearts that we are "of the truth" is love "not in word, neither with the tongue; but in deed and truth" (~~1~~1 John 3:18).

The question is raised whether the polemic of the Epistle is directed against the same persons throughout or whether in its two branches, the Christological and the ethical, it has different objects of attack. The latter view is maintained on the ground that no charge of libertine teaching or conduct is brought against the "antichrists," and there is no proof that docetism in Asia Minor lay open to such a charge. But the other view has greater probability. The Epistle suggests nothing else than that the same spirit of error which is assailing the faith of the church (~~1~~1 John 4:6) is also a peril to the moral integrity of its life (~~1~~1 John 3:7). And if there is no proof that docetism in Asia Minor was also antinomian, there is no proof that it was not. The probability is that it was. Docetism and the emancipation of the flesh were both natural fruits of the dualistic theory of life.

#### 4. Cerinthus:

The name, which unvarying tradition associates with the Epistle, as John's chief antagonist in Ephesus, is that of Cerinthus. Unfortunately the accounts which have come down to us of Cerinthus and his teaching are fragmentary and confused, and those of his character, though unambiguous, come only from his opponents. But it is certain that he held a docetic view of the incarnation, and, according to the only accounts we possess, his character was that of a voluptuary. So far as they go, the

historical data harmonize with the internal evidence of the Epistle itself in giving the impression that the different tendencies it combats are such as would be naturally evolved in the thought and practice of those who held, as Cerinthus did, that the material creation, and even the moral law, had its origin, not in the Supreme God, but in an inferior power.

### *III. Structure and Summary.*

In the judgment of many critics, the Epistle possesses nothing that can be called an articulate structure of thought, its aphoristic method admitting of no logical development; and this estimate has a large measure of support in the fact that there is no New Testament writing regarding the plan of which there has been greater variety of opinion. The present writer believes, nevertheless, that it is erroneous, and that, in its own unique way, the Epistle is a finely articulated composition. The word that best describes the author's mode of thinking is "spiral." The course of thought does not move from point to point in a straight line. It is like a winding staircase — always revolving around the same center, always recurring to the same topics, but at a higher level.

Carefully following the topical order, one finds, e.g., a paragraph (~~1~~ John 2:3-6) insisting upon practical righteousness as a guaranty of the Christian life; then one finds this treated a second time in ~~1~~ John 2:29 through 3:10a; and yet again in 5:3 and 5:18. Similarly, we find a paragraph on the necessity of love in 2:7-11, and again in 3:10b-20, and yet again in 4:7-13, and also in 4:17 through 5:2. So also, a paragraph concerning the necessity of holding the true belief in the incarnate Son of God in 2:18-28, in 4:1-6, and the same subject recurring in 4:13-16 and 5:4-12. And we shall observe that everywhere these indispensable characteristics of the Christian life are applied as tests; that in effect the Epistle is an apparatus of tests, its definite object being to furnish its readers with the necessary criteria by which they may sift the false from the true, and satisfy themselves of their being "begotten of God." "These things have I written unto you, that ye may know that ye have eternal life" (5:13). These fundamental tests of the Christian life — doing righteousness, loving one another, believing that Jesus is the Christ come in the flesh — are the connecting themes that bind together the whole structure of the Epistle. Thus, if we divide the Epistle into 3 main sections, the first ending at 2:28, the second at 4:6, the result is that in the first and second of these sections we find precisely the same topics coming in

precisely the same order; while in the third section (4:7 through 5:21), though the sequence is somewhat different, the thought-material is exactly the same. The leading themes, the tests of righteousness, love, and belief, are all present; and they alone are present. There is, therefore, a natural division of the Epistle into these three main sections, or, as they might be descriptively called, “cycles,” in each of which the same fundamental themes appear. On this basis we shall now give a brief analysis of its structure and summary of its contents.

## **1. The Prologue, ~~1~~ John 1:1-4:**

The writer announces the source of the Christian revelation — the historical manifestation of the eternal Divine life in Jesus Christ — and declares himself a personal witness of the facts in which this manifestation has been given. Here, at the outset, he hoists the flag under which he fights. The incarnation is not seeming or temporary, but real. That which was from the beginning — “the eternal life, which was with the Father” — is identical with “that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled.”

## **2. First Cycle, ~~1~~ John 1:5 through 2:28:**

The Christian life, as fellowship with God (walking in the Light) tested by righteousness, love and belief. — The basis of the whole section is the announcement: “God is light, and in him is no darkness at all” (~~1~~ John 1:5). What God is at once determines the condition of fellowship with Him; and this, therefore, is set forth: first, negatively (~~1~~ John 1:6): “if we say that we have fellowship with him and walk in the darkness”; then, positively (~~1~~ John 1:7): “if we walk in the light, as he is in the light.” What, then, is it to walk in the light, and what to walk in darkness? The answer is given in what follows.

**(a)** Paragraph A, ~~1~~ John 1:8 through 2:6:(Walking in the Light tested by righteousness): First, in confession of sin (~~1~~ John 1:8 through 2:2), then in actual obedience (~~1~~ John 2:3-6). The first fact upon which the light of God impinges in human life is sin; and the first test of walking in the light is the recognition and confession of this fact. Such confession is the first step into fellowship with God, because it brings us under the cleansing power of the blood of Jesus, His Son (~~1~~ John 1:7), and makes His intercession available for us (~~1~~ John 2:1). But the light not only reveals sin; its greater function is to reveal

duty; and to walk in the light is to keep God's commandments (1 John 2:3), His word (1 John 2:5), and to walk even as Christ walked (1 John 2:6).

**(b)** Paragraph B, 1 John 2:7-17:(Walking in the Light tested by love):

**(i)** Positively:The old-new commandment (1 John 2:7-11). Love is the commandment which is "old," because familiar to the readers of the Epistle from their first acquaintance with the rudiments of Christianity (1 John 2:7); but also "new," because ever fresh and living to those who have fellowship with Christ in the true light which is now shining for them (1 John 2:8). On the contrary, "He that saith he is in the light and hateth his brother, is in the darkness" (1 John 2:9). The antithesis is then repeated with variation and enrichment of thought (1 John 2:10,11). (Then follows a parenthetical address to the readers (1 John 2:12-14). This being treated as a parenthesis, the unity of the paragraph at once becomes apparent.)

**(ii)** Negatively:If walking in the light has its guaranty in loving one's "brother," it is tested no less by not loving "the world." One cannot at the same time participate in the life of God and in a moral life which is governed by the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the vain-glory of the world.

**(c)** Paragraph C, 1 John 2:18-28:(Walking in the Light tested by belief): The light of God not only reveals sin and duty, the children of God (our "brother") and "the world" in their true character; it also reveals Jesus in His true character, as the Christ, the incarnate Son of God. And all that calls itself Christianity is to be tested by its reception or rejection of that truth. In this paragraph light and darkness are not expressly referred to; but the continuity of thought with the preceding paragraphs is unmistakable. Throughout this first division of the Epistle the point of view is that of fellowship with God, through receiving and acting according to the light which His self-revelation sheds upon all things in the spiritual realm. Unreal Christianity in every form is comprehensively a "lie." It may be the antinomian "lie" of him who says he has no sin (1 John 1:8) yet is indifferent to keeping God's commandments (1 John 2:4), the lie of lovelessness (1 John 2:9),

or the lie of Antichrist, who, claiming spiritual enlightenment, yet denies that Jesus is the Christ (~~GRB~~1 John 2:22).

### 3. Second Cycle, ~~GRB~~1 John 2:29 through 4:6:

Divine Sonship Tested by Righteousness, Love and Belief.

The first main division of the Epistle began with the assertion of what God is as self-revealing — light. He becomes to us the light in which we behold our sin, our duty, our brother, the world, Jesus the Christ; and only in acknowledging and loyally acting out the truth thus revealed can we have fellowship with God. This second division, on the other hand, begins with the assertion of what the Divine nature is in itself, and thence deduces the essential characteristics of those who are “begotten of God.”

#### (a) Paragraph A, ~~GRB~~1 John 2:29 through 3:10a:

(Divine sonship tested by righteousness): This test is inevitable. “If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one also that doeth righteousness is begotten of him” (~~GRB~~1 John 2:29). But this new idea, “Begotten of God,” arrests for a time its orderly development. The writer is carried away by wonder and thanksgiving at the thought that sinful man should be brought into such a relation as this to God. “Behold what manner of love!” he exclaims. This leads him to contemplate, further, the present concealment of the glory of God’s children, and the splendor of its future manifestation (~~GRB~~1 John 3:1,2). Then the thought that the fulfillment of this hope is necessarily conditioned by present endeavor after moral likeness to Christ (~~GRB~~1 John 3:3) leads back to the main theme, that the life of Divine sonship is by necessity of nature one of absolute antagonism to all sin. This necessity is exhibited

- (1) in the light of the moral authority of God — sin is lawlessness (~~GRB~~1 John 3:4);
- (2) in the light of Christ’s character, in which there is no sin, and of the purpose of His mission, which is to take away sin (~~GRB~~1 John 3:5-7);
- (3) in the light of the diabolic origin of sin (~~GRB~~1 John 3:8);
- (4) in the light of the God-begotten quality of the Christian life (~~GRB~~1 John 3:9). Finally, in this is declared to be the manifest distinction

between the children of God and the children of the devil (<sup>180</sup>1 John 3:10).

**(b) Paragraph B, <sup>180</sup>1 John 3:10b-24a:**

(Divine sonship tested by love): This test is inevitable (<sup>180</sup>1 John 3:10b,11). The thought is then developed pictorially instead of dialectically. Cain is the prototype of hate (<sup>182</sup>1 John 3:12). Cain's spirit is reproduced in the world (<sup>183</sup>1 John 3:13). Love is the sign of having passed from death into life (<sup>184</sup>1 John 3:14a); the absence of it, the sign of abiding in death (<sup>184</sup>1 John 3:14b,15). In glorious contrast to the sinister figure of Cain, who sacrifices his brother's life to his morbid self-love, is the figure of Christ, who sacrificed His own life in love to us His brethren (<sup>186</sup>1 John 3:16a); whence the inevitable inference that our life, if one with His, must obey the same law (<sup>186</sup>1 John 3:16b). Genuine love consists not in words, but in deeds (<sup>187</sup>1 John 3:17,18); and from the evidence of such love alone can we rightly possess confidence toward God (<sup>189</sup>1 John 3:19,20) in prayer (<sup>192</sup>1 John 3:22). Then follows recapitulation (<sup>193</sup>1 John 3:23,14b), combining, under the category of "commandment," love and also belief on His Son Jesus Christ. Thus a transition is made to Paragraph C.

**(c) Paragraph C, <sup>194</sup>1 John 3:24b through 4:6:**

(Divine sonship tested by belief): This test is inevitable (<sup>194</sup>1 John 3:24b). "We know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he gave us"; and the Spirit "which he gave us" is the Spirit that "confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh" (<sup>196</sup>1 John 4:2). On the contrary, the Spirit that confesseth not Jesus is the spirit of Antichrist (<sup>198</sup>1 John 4:3) Then follows a characterization of those who receive the true and of those who receive the false teaching (<sup>199</sup>1 John 4:4-6).

**4. Third Cycle, <sup>199</sup>1 John 4:7 through 5:21:**

Closer Correlation of Righteousness, Love and Belief.

In this closing part, the Epistle rises to its loftiest heights; but the logical analysis of it is more difficult. It may be divided into two main sections dealing respectively with love and belief.

**(a) SECTION I, <sup>199</sup>1 John 4:7 through 5:3a.**

**(i) Paragraph A, <sup>199</sup>1 John 4:7-12:**

This paragraph grounds more deeply than before the test of love. Love is indispensable, because God is love (1 John 4:7,8). The proof that God is love is the mission of Christ (1 John 4:9); which is also the absolute revelation of what love, truly so called, is (1 John 4:10). But this love of God imposes upon us an unescapable obligation to love one another (1 John 4:11); and only from the fulfillment of this can we obtain the assurance that “God abideth in us” (1 John 4:12).

**(ii) Paragraph B, 1 John 4:13-16:**

This paragraph strives to show the inner relation between Christian belief and Christian love. The true belief is indispensable as a guaranty of Christian life, because the Spirit of God is its author (1 John 4:13). The true belief is that “Jesus is the Son of God” (1 John 4:14,15). In this is found the vital ground of Christian love (1 John 4:16).

**(iii) Paragraph C, 1 John 4:17 through 5:3a:**

Here the subject is the effect, motives and manifestations of brotherly love. The effect is confidence toward God (1 John 4:17,18); the motives:

- (1)** God’s love to us (1 John 4:19);
- (2)** that the only possible response to this is to love our brother (1 John 4:20);
- (3)** that this is Christ’s commandment (1 John 4:21);
- (4)** that it is the natural instinct of spiritual kinship (1 John 5:1). But true love is inseparable from righteousness. We truly love the children of God only when we love God, and we love God only when we keep His commandments (1 John 5:2,3a).

**(b) SECTION II, 1 John 5:3b-21.**

**(i) Paragraph A, 1 John 5:3b-12:**

Righteousness is possible only through belief. It is our faith that makes the commandments “not grievous” because it overcomes the world (1 John 5:3b,4). Then follows a restatement of the contents of the true belief, specially directed against the Cerinthian heresy (1 John 5:5,6); then an exposition of the “witness” upon which this belief rests (1 John 5:7-10);

then a reiterated declaration of its being the test and guaranty of possessing eternal life (1 John 5:11,12).

**(ii) Paragraph B, 1 John 5:13-21:**

This closing paragraph sets forth the great triumphant certainties of Christian belief: its certainty of eternal life (1 John 5:13), and of prevailing in prayer (1 John 5:14,15). Then the writer guards himself by citing an instance in which such certainty is unattainable — prayer for those that sin unto death — and reminds his readers that all unrighteousness, though not sin unto death, is sin (1 John 5:16,17). He then resumes the great certainties of Christian belief: the certainty that the Christian life stands always and everywhere for righteousness, absolute antagonism to all sin (1 John 5:18); the certainty of the moral gulf between it and the life of the world (1 John 5:19); its certainty of itself, of the facts on which it rests, and the supernatural power which has given perception of these facts (1 John 5:20). With an abrupt, affectionate call to those who know the true God to beware of yielding their trust and dependence to “idols,” the Epistle ends.

*IV. Canonicity and Authorship.*

**1. Traditional View:**

As to the reception of the Epistle in the church, it is needless to cite any later witness than Eusebius (circa 325), who classes it among the books (homologoumena) whose canonical rank was undisputed. It is quoted by Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria (247-265), by the Muratorian Canon, Cyprian, Origen, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Irenaeus. Papias (who is described by Irenaeus as a “hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp”) is stated by Eusebius to have “used some testimonies from John’s former epistle”; and Polycarp’s Epistle to the Philippians (circa 115) contains an almost verbal reproduction of 1 John 4:3. Reminiscences of it are traced in Athenagoras (circa 180), the Epistle to Diognetus, the Epistle of Barnabas, more distinctly in Justin (Dial. 123) and in the Didache; but it is possible that the earliest of these indicate the currency of Johannine expressions in certain Christian circles rather than acquaintance with the Epistle itself. The evidence, however, is indisputable that this Epistle, one of the latest of the New Testament books, took immediately and permanently an unchallenged position as a writing of inspired authority. It is no material qualification of this statement to add that, in



common with the other Johannine writings, it was rejected, for dogmatic reasons, by Marcion and the so-called [*Alogi*]; and that, like all the catholic epistles, it was unknown to the Canon of the ancient Syrian church, and is stated to have been “abrogated” by Theodore (Bishop of Mopsuestia, 393-428 AD).

## 2. Critical Views:

The verdict of tradition is equally unanimous that the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle are both the legacy of the apostle John in his old age to the church. All the Fathers already mentioned as quoting the Epistle (excepting Polycarp, but including Irenaeus) quote it as the work of John; and, until the end of the 16th century, this opinion was held as unquestionable. The first of modern scholars to challenge it was Joseph Scaliger (1540-1609), who rejected the entire trio of Johannine Epistles as unapostolic; and in later times a dual authorship of the Gospel and the First Epistle has been maintained by Baur, H.J. Holtzmann, Pfleiderer, von Soden, and others; although on this particular point other adherents of the critical school like Julicher, Wrede and Wernle, accept the traditional view.

## 3. Internal Evidence:

Thus two questions are raised: first, what light does the Epistle shed upon the personality of its own author? And second, whether or not, the Gospel and the Epistle are from the same hand. Now, while the Epistle furnishes no clue by which we can identify the writer, it enables us very distinctly to class him. His relation to his readers, as we have seen, is intimate. The absence of explicit reference to either writer or readers only shows how intimate it was. For the writer to declare his identity was superfluous. Thought, language, tone — all were too familiar to be mistaken. The Epistle bore its author’s signature in every line. His position toward his readers was, moreover, authoritative. As has already been said, the natural interpretation of <sup>1</sup> John 1:2,3 is that the relation between them was that of teacher and taught. (By this fact we may account for the enigmatic brevity of such a passage as that on the “three witnesses.” The writer intended only to recall fuller oral expositions formerly given of the same topics.) The writer is at any rate a person of so distinctive eminence and recognized authority that it is not necessary to remind the readers either who he is or by what circumstances he is compelled now to address them through the medium of writing; their knowledge of both facts is taken for

granted. And all this agrees with the traditional account of John's relation to the churches of Asia Minor in the last decades of the 1st century.

Further, the writer claims to be one of the original witnesses of the facts of the incarnate life: "That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled, concerning the Word of life (and the life was manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us); that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us" (~~1~~ 1 John 1:1-3). To understand the "Word of life" here as the gospel (Westcott, Rothe, Haupt) seems to the present writer frankly impossible; and not less so theories by which the words "what we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes," etc., are regarded as utterances of the "faith-mysticism" or the "collective testimony" of the early church. It is difficult to imagine words more studiously adapted to convey the impression that the writer is one of the original, first-hand witnesses of Christ's life and resurrection ("that what we beheld, and our hands handled"; compare ~~124B~~ Luke 24:39). At furthest, the use of such language is otherwise compatible with veracity only on the supposition that the writer was recognized by the church as so closely identified with the original witnesses that he could speak of their testimony as virtually his own. But, apart from the presumption that he cannot have been one of the actual disciples of Jesus, there is really nothing to be said for this supposition. So far as the internal evidence is concerned, the ancient and unbroken tradition which assigns it to the apostle John must be regarded as holding the field, unless, indeed, the traditional authorship is disproved by arguments of the most convincing kind. Whether the arguments brought against the apostolic authorship of the Johannine writings as a whole possess this character is too large a question to be investigated here. Yet the kernel of it lies in small compass. It is whether room can be found within the 1st century for so advanced a stage of theological development as is reached in the Johannine writings, and whether this development can be conceivably attributed to one of Our Lord's original disciples. To neither of these questions, as it appears to the present writer, is a dogmatically negative answer warranted. If within a period comparatively so brief, Christian thought had already passed through the earlier and later Pauline developments, and through such a development as we find in the Epistle to the Hebrews, there is no obvious

reason why it may not have attained to the Johannine, within the lifetime of the last survivor of the apostles. Nor, when we consider the nature of the intellectual influences, within and without the church, by which the apostle John was surrounded, if, as tradition says, he lived on to a green old age in Ephesus, is there any obvious reason why he may not have been the chief instrument of that development.

## *V. Relationship to the Fourth Gospel.*

### **1. Common Characteristics:**

The further question remains as to the internal evidence the Epistle supplies regarding its relation to the Fourth Gospel. *Prima facie*, the case for identity of authorship is overwhelmingly strong. The two writings are equally saturated with that spiritual and theological atmosphere; they are equally characterized by that type of thought which we call Johannine and which presents an interpretation of Christianity not less original and distinctive than Paulinism. Both exhibit the same mental and moral habit of viewing every subject with an eye that steadfastly beholds radical antagonisms and is blind to approximations. There is in both the same strongly Hebrew style of composition; the same development of ideas by parallelism or antithesis; the same repetition of keywords like “begotten of God,” “abiding,” “keeping his commandments”; the same monotonous simplicity in the construction of sentences, with avoidance of relative clauses and singular parsimony in the use of connecting particles; the same apparently tautological habit of resuming consideration of a subject from a slightly different point of view; the same restricted range of vocabulary, which, moreover, is identical to an extent unparalleled in two independent writings.

### **2. Coincidences of Vocabulary:**

The evidence for these statements cannot be presented here in full; but the following are some of the words and phrases characteristic of both and not found elsewhere in the New Testament — the Word, joy fulfilled, to see (or behold) and bear witness, to do the truth, to have sin, [*Paraclete*], to keep the word (of God or Christ), to abide (in God or in Christ), the true light, new commandment, little children (*teknia*), children (*paidia*), to abide for ever, begotten of God, to purify one’s self, to do sin, to take away sins, works of the devil, to pass from death into life, murderer, to lay down one’s life, to be of the truth, to give commandment, to hear (= to hear

approvingly), no man hath beheld God at any time, knowing and believing, Saviour of the world, water and blood, to overcome the world, to receive witness, to give eternal life, to have eternal life (in present sense), to believe in the name. The following are some of the terms common to both, which are found very rarely elsewhere in the New Testament: Beginning (= past eternity), to be manifested (9 times in each), to bear witness (6 times in the Epistle, 33 times in the Gospel, once only in Matthew, once in Luke, not at all in Mark), light (metaphorical), walk (metaphorical), to lead astray, to know (God, Christ, or Spirit, 8 times in the Epistle, 10 times in the Gospel), true ([*alethinos*]), to confess Jesus (elsewhere only in ~~5110~~ Romans 10:9), children of God, to destroy ([*lauein*], elsewhere only in 2 Pet), the spirit of truth, to send ([*apostellein*], of mission of Christ), only begotten son, to have the witness (elsewhere only in Apocrypha), to hear (= to answer prayer).

### 3. Divergences of Vocabulary:

On the other hand, the divergences of vocabulary are not more numerous than might be expected in two writings by the same author but of different literary form. The rather notable difference in the choice and use of particles is accounted for by the fact that dialogue and narrative, of which the Gospel is largely composed, are foreign to the Epistle. The discrepancy, when closely examined, sometimes turns out to be a point of real similarity. Thus the particle *oun* occurs nearly 200 times in the Gospel, not at all in the Epistle. But in the Gospel it is used only in narrative, no occurrence of it being found, e.g. in John 14 through 16.

Of the words and phrases contained in the Epistle, but not in the Gospel, the great majority are accounted for by the fact that they are used in connection with topics which are not dealt with in the Gospel. Apart from these, the following may be noted, the most important being italicized: Word of life, fellowship, to confess sins (nowhere else in the New Testament), to cleanse from sin, propitiation ([*hilasmos*], nowhere else in the New Testament), perfected or perfect love, last hour, Antichrist, anointing, to give of the spirit, to have (Father, Son) boldness (Godward), [*Parousia*], lawlessness, seed (of God), come in the flesh, God is love, Day, of Judgment, belief ([*pistis*]), to make God a liar, understanding. As regards style and diction, therefore, it seems impossible to conceive of two independent literary productions having a more intimate affinity. The relation between them in this respect is far closer than that between the

Acts of the Apostles and the Third Gospel, or even any two of Paul's Epistles, except those to the Ephesians and the Colossians.

#### **4. Arguments against Unity of Authorship:**

Arguments for a dual authorship are based chiefly on certain theological emphasis and developments in the Epistle, which are absent from the Gospel; and invariably these arguments have been pressed with complete disregard of the fact that the one writing purports, at least, to be a Gospel, the other, an utterance of the writer in propria persona. If, for example, it is urged that the words "He is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins" have a more Pauline ring than any utterance of the Fourth Gospel, or that the conceptions in the Epistle of propitiation, intercession, and cleansing, are presented in a more explicit and technical form than in the Gospel, it is a fair reply to ask, Why not? Is it to be accepted as a canon of criticism that the writer of that Gospel must necessarily have put all his own theological expressions into the mouth of Him whose teaching he proposed to report? Much is made of the assertion that in the matter of the last things the Epistle recedes from the idealism of the Gospel, placing itself more nearly in line with the traditional apocalyptic eschatology. Whereas the Gospel speaks of Christ's bodily departure as the necessary condition of His coming again in the Spirit to make His permanent abode with His disciples (~~4:14~~ John 16:7), the writer of the Epistle thinks of a visible Parousia as nigh at hand (~~4:12~~ 1 John 2:28); and whereas the Gospel conceives of judgment as a present spiritual fact (~~4:18~~ John 3:18,19), the Epistle clings to the "popular" idea of a Judgment Day. But it ought to be noted that in the Epistle, as compared with the Gospel, the eschatological perspective is foreshortened. The author writes under the conviction that "the world is passing away" and that the "last hour" of its day has come (~~4:17~~ 1 John 2:17,18). And it is an unwarrantable assumption that he must, if he wrote the Gospel, have been guilty of the manifest anachronism of importing this conviction into it also. Apart from this the fundamental similarities between the eschatology of the Epistle and that of the Gospel are far more striking than the differences. In both, eternal life is conceived of as a present and not merely a future possession. In both, Christ's presence is an abiding reality — "Our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ" (~~4:10~~ 1 John 1:3). If the Gospel speaks of the revelation of Christ as bringing present and inevitable "judgment" into the world, the Epistle is saturated with the same thought. If, on the other hand, the Epistle speaks of a visible future Parousia, this is plainly implied in

~~<B128>~~ John 5:28,29. If the Epistle makes a single reference to the Day of Judgment (~~<B127>~~ 1 John 4:17), the Gospel has 6 passages which speak of the “last day,” and in these the “last day” is explicitly the day of resurrection (~~<B124>~~ John 11:24) and of judgment (~~<B128>~~ John 12:48). In the two writings different features of the eschatological picture may be made more or less conspicuous; but there is no such diversity as to warrant the hypothesis of a separate authorship. Again, it is urged that in the Epistle the conception of the [*Logos*] is modified in the direction of conformity to traditional doctrine. The conception of the personal, preexistent [*Logos*], who “in the beginning was,” and “was with God,” and “was God” (~~<B100>~~ John 1:1) was new, it is said, and, because of its Gnostic tinge, suspect; and was therefore avoided and becomes in the Epistle the depersonalized “Word of life” (~~<B100>~~ 1 John 1:1). But why should the “Word of life” necessarily signify anything less personal than the phraseology of the Gospel? The phraseology in both cases is exactly adapted to its purpose. In the Gospel, “in the beginning was the Word .... and the Word became flesh” is right, because it sums up the contents of the Gospel, announces its subject, the history of the Incarnate [*Logos*]. In the Epistle, the “Word of life” is right, because theme is to be the life, not as to its historical manifestation in Jesus, but as to its essential characteristics, whether in God or in man.

## 5. Conclusion:

Other arguments of a similar kind which have been put forward need not be considered. On the whole, it seems clear that, while there are between the Gospel and the Epistle differences of emphasis, perspective and point of view, these cannot be held as at all counterbalancing, on the question of authorship, the unique similarity of the two writings in style and vocabulary and in the whole matter and manner of thought, together with the testimony of a tradition which is ancient, unanimous and unbroken.

## 6. Question of Priority:

Regarding the question of priority as between the two writings, the only certainty is that the Epistle presupposes its readers’ acquaintance with the substance of the Gospel (otherwise such expressions as “Word of life,” “new commandment” would have been unintelligible); but that does not imply its subsequentness to the composition of the Gospel in literary form. By Lightfoot and others it is supposed to have been written simultaneously with the Gospel, and dispatched along with it as a covering letter to its

original readers. In view, however, of the independence and first-rate importance of the Epistle, it is difficult to think of it as having originated in this way; and by the majority of scholars it is regarded as later than the Gospel and separated from it by an appreciable interval. That it was written with a “mediating” purpose (Pfleiderer), to “popularize” the ideas of the Gospel (Weizsacker), or to correct and tone down what in it was obnoxious to the feeling of the church, and at the same time to add certain links of connection (such as propitiation, Paraclete, Parousia) with the traditional type of doctrine, or to emphasize these where they existed (Holtzmann), is a theory which rests on an extremely slender basis; theory that it was written as a protest against Gnostic appropriation of the Fourth Gospel itself (Julicher) has no tangible basis at all.

That there was an appreciable interval between the two writings is probable enough. Gnostic tendencies have meanwhile hardened into more definite form. Many, false prophets have gone out into the world. The “antichrists” have declared themselves. The time has come for the evangelist to focus the rays of his Gospel upon the malignant growth which is acutely endangering the life of the church.

## LITERATURE.

Commentaries are numerous and excellent. The most important are those by Calvin, Lucke, Ebrard, Haupt (of fine insight but grievous verbosity), Huther (specially valuable for its conspectus of all earlier exegesis), Westcott (a magazine of materials for the student of the Epistle), Alexander (in the Speaker’s Commentary), Rothe (original, beautiful, profound), B. Weiss, H.J. Holtzmann, Plummer (in Cambridge Greek New Testament — scholarly and very serviceable); Brooke (in International Critical Commentary, excellent). Among the numerous expositions of the Epistle are those by Neander, Candlish, Maurice, Alexander (Expositor’s Bible), Watson, J.M. Gibbon (Eternal Life), Findlay (Fellowship in the Life Eternal), Law (The Tests of Life — combined exposition and commentary); among books on Introduction, those by Weiss, Bleek, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Julicher, Zahn, Salmon, Gloag, Peake; and, among books of other kinds, the relevant sections in Beyschlag, New Testament Theology; Pfleiderer, Urchristenthum; Harhack, Geschichte clef altchristl. Litteratur; Farrar, Early Days of Christianity; McGiffert, History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age; Stevens, Johannine Theology and Theology of the New Testament; articles by Salmond in Hastings,



Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes); by Schmiedel in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, and by Haring in *Theologische Abhandlungen*, Carl von Weizsacker .... gewidmet. In German, the fullest investigation of the relationship of the Epistle to the Fourth Gospel will be found in a series of articles by H.J. Holtzmann in the *Jahrbucher fur protestantische Theologie* (1882-83); in English, in Brooke's commentary in *Law, Tests of Life*, 339-63. See also Drummond, *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, chapter iii.

## THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES

### *1. Canonicity and Authorship:*

It is not surprising that these brief and fugitive Epistles are among the New Testament writings which have had the hardest struggle for canonical recognition. One is probably, the other certainly, a private letter; and neither the same reason nor the same opportunity for their circulation existed, as in the case of church letters. The 2nd Epistle contains little that is distinctive; the 3rd Epistle is occupied with a vexatious episode in the internal history of a single congregation. Both are written by a person who designates himself simply as "the Presbyter"; and the names of the person (or church) to which the one is addressed and of the church with whose affairs the other is concerned are alike unknown. The fact, therefore, that, in spite of such obstacles, these letters did become widely known and eventually attained to canonical rank is proof of a general conviction of the soundness of the tradition which assigned them to the apostle John.

Like all the catholic epistles, they were unknown to the early Syrian church; when 1 John, 1 Peter and James were received into its Canon, they were still excluded, nor are they found even in printed editions of the Syriac New Testament till 1630. They were not acknowledged by the school of Antioch. Jerome distinguishes their authorship from that of the 1st Epistle. They are classed among the disputed books by Eusebius, who indicates that it was questioned whether they belonged to the evangelist or "possibly to another of the same name as he." Origen remarks that "not all affirm them to be genuine"; and, as late as the middle of the 4th century, the effort to introduce them in the Latin church met with opposition in Africa (Zahn).

On the other hand, we find recognition of their Johannine authorship at an early date, in Gaul (Irenaeus); Rome (Muratorian Canon, where, however,



the reading is corrupt, and it is doubtful whether their authorship is ascribed or denied to the apostle John); Alexandria (Clement, who is reputed by Eusebius to have commented upon them, and who in his extant works speaks of John's "larger epistle," implying the existence of one or more minor epistles); Africa (Cyprian reports that 2 John was appealed to at the Synod of Carthage, 256 AD). Dionysius, Origen's disciple and successor, speaks of John's calling himself in them "the Presbyter." Eusebius, though conscientiously placing them among the antilegomena, elsewhere writes in a way which indicates that he himself did not share the doubt of their authenticity.

The internal evidence confirms the ultimate decision of the early church regarding these letters. Quite evidently the 2nd Epistle must have been written by the author of the 1st, or was an arrant and apparently purposeless piece of plagiarism. The 3rd Epistle is inevitably associated with the 2nd by the superscription, "the Presbyter," and by other links of thought and phraseology.

## *2. The Presbyter:*

The mention of this title opens up a wide question. The famous extract from Papias (Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, III, 39) vouches for the existence, among those who were or had been his contemporaries, of a certain "Presbyter" John (*see JOHN, GOSPEL OF*, II, 5). Jerome, moreover, speaks of the two smaller Epistles as, in contrast with the 1st, ascribed to the Presbyter (*De Vir. Illustr.*, ix); Eusebius inclines to ascribe to him the Book of Revelation; and modern critics, like Weizsacker and Harnack, have improved upon the hint by finding in this shadowy personage the author of the Fourth Gospel. Into this far-reaching controversy, we cannot here enter. It may be noted, however, that whether, in the confusedly written passage referred to, Papias really intends to distinguish between John the Apostle and John the Presbyter is a point still in debate; and that Eusebius (*Evangelica Demonstratio*, III, 5) does not regard the title "Presbyter" as inapplicable to John, but observes that in his Epistles he "either makes no mention of himself or calls himself presbyter, nowhere apostle or evangelist." Dionysius, too, remarks that "in the 2nd and 3rd Epistles ascribed to him, he writes anonymously, as the Presbyter." These Fathers, both exceptionally learned men and presumably well acquainted with primitive usage, saw nothing anomalous, although they did see something characteristic, in the fact, or supposed fact, that an apostle

should designate himself by the lowlier and vaguer title. In the very sentence from Papias already referred to, the apostles are called “presbyters”; not to say that in the New Testament itself we have an instance of an apostle’s so styling himself (~~cf.~~ 1 Peter 5:1).

To sum up, it is evident that no one desiring falsely to secure apostolic prestige for his productions would have written under so indistinctive a title; also, that these brief and very occasional letters could never have won their way to general recognition and canonical rank unless through general conviction of their Johannine authorship — the very history of these Epistles proving that the early church did not arrive at a decision upon such matters without satisfying itself of the trustworthiness of the tradition upon which a claim to canonicity was rounded; finally, the internal evidence testifies to an authorship identical with that of the 1st Epistle, so that the evidence cited regarding this is available also for those. These letters, along with Paul’s to Philemon, are the only extant remains of a private apostolic correspondence which must have included many such, and for this reason, apart from their intrinsic worth, possess an interest, material and biographical, peculiar to themselves. We proceed to consider the two Epistles separately, and since an interesting question arises as to whether the 2nd is that referred to in ~~cf.~~ 3 John 1:9, it will be convenient to reverse the canonical order in dealing with them.

### **The Third Epistle.**

This brief note gives a uniquely authentic and intimate glimpse of some aspects of church life as it existed in Asia Minor (this may be taken as certain) somewhere about the end of the 1st century. It concerns a certain episode in the history of one of the churches under the writer’s supervision, and incidentally furnishes character-sketches of two of its members, the large-hearted and hospitable Gaius, to whom it is written (and whom it is merely fanciful to identify with any other Gaius mentioned in the New Testament), and the loquacious, overbearing Diotrephes; also of the faithful Demetrius, by whose hand probably the letter is sent. The story which may be gathered from the Epistle seems to be as follows. A band of itinerant teachers had been sent out, by the Presbyter’s authority, no doubt, and furnished by him with letters of commendation to the various churches, and among others to that of which Gaius and Diotrephes were members. Diotrephes, however, whether through jealousy for the rights of the local community or for some personal reason, not only declined to receive the

itinerant teachers, but exerted his authority to impose the same course of action upon the church as a whole, even to the

length of threatening with excommunication (~~6000~~3 John 1:10) those who took a different view of their duty. Gaius alone had not been intimidated, but had welcomed to his home the repulsed and disheartened teachers, who when they returned (to Ephesus, probably) had testified to the church of his courageous and large-hearted behavior (~~6006~~3 John 1:6). A 2nd time, apparently, the teachers are now sent forth (~~6006~~3 John 1:6), with Demetrius as their leader, who brings this letter to Gaius, commending his past conduct (~~6006~~3 John 1:5) and encouraging him to persevere in it (~~6006~~3 John 1:6). The Presbyter adds that he has dispatched a letter to the church also (~~6000~~3 John 1:9); but evidently he has little hope that it will be effectual in overcoming the headstrong opposition of Diotrephes; for he promises that he will speedily pay a personal visit to the church, when he will depose Diotrephes from his pride of place and bring him to account for his scornful “prating” and overbearing conduct (~~6000~~3 John 1:10). So far as appears, the cause of friction was purely personal or administrative. There is no hint of heretical tendency in Diotrephes and his party. Pride of place is his sin, an inflated sense of his own importance and a violent jealousy for what he regarded as his own prerogative, which no doubt he identified with the autonomy of the local congregation.

### **The Second Epistle.**

The letter is addressed to “the elect lady” (better, to “the lady Electa”). Its tone throughout is peculiarly affectionate; there is a warmer rush of emotion, especially in the opening verses, than is characteristic of John’s usual reserve. But in these verses the keynote of the Epistle is struck — truth. The writer testifies his love for his correspondent and her children “in truth”; this love is shared by all who “know the truth” (~~6000~~2 John 1:1), and it is “for the truth’s sake which abideth in us, and it shall be with us for ever” (~~6000~~2 John 1:2). What follows (~~6004~~2 John 1:4-9) is in effect an epitome of the 1st Epistle. After declaring his joy at finding certain of her children “walking in truth,” he proceeds to expound, quite in the style of the 1st Epistle, what “walking in truth” is. It is to love one another (~~6005~~2 John 1:5; compare ~~6000~~1 John 2:7-11); but this love is manifested in keeping God’s commandments (~~6006~~2 John 1:6a; compare ~~6000~~1 John 5:2,3); and no less in steadfast adherence to the genuine doctrine of the Gospel (compare ~~6003~~1 John 3:23). “For many deceivers are gone forth into the world, even

they that confess not that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh” (2 John 1:7; compare 1 John 4:1-3). Then follows an exhortation to steadfastness (2 John 1:8), and a warning that whoever in the name of progress departs from this teaching “hath not God,” while he who abides in it “hath both the Father and the Son” (2 John 1:9; compare 1 John 2:23,14). This leads up to the immediately practical point, a warning to extend no hospitality and show no friendliness to the false teachers (2 John 1:10,11); and the Epistle closes with the hope of a speedy and joyful meeting “face to face” of the writer and his correspondent, to whom he conveys greetings from the children of her “elect sister.”

Whether the “elect lady,” or “lady Electa” of his letter is a real person or the personification of a church is a point which has been debated from ancient times and is still unsolved. The solution has been found, it is true, if we can accept the hypothesis (put forward by Zahn and Schmiedel and adopted by Findlay) that this is the letter referred to in 3 John 1:9. It is urged on behalf of this supposition that the two Epistles are curiously identical in phraseology. In both the writer begins by describing his correspondent as one whom “I love in truth”; in both he uses a distinctive phrase (*lecharen lian*), 2 John 1:4, “I rejoice greatly,” not found elsewhere in the New Testament to declare his joy at finding “thy (my) children walking in the truth”; and in both he concludes by saying that he has “many things to write,” but that, looking forward to an early interview “face to face,” he will not commit these further thoughts to “paper and ink.” It is argued that “none but a chancery clerk could have clung so closely to his epistolary formulas” in two private letters written at different periods. But the force of this argument largely vanishes when we look at the formulas in question. If a modern writer may conclude hundreds of friendly letters by subscribing himself “yours sincerely,” or something equivalent, why may not the Presbyterian have commenced these two and many similar letters by assuring his correspondents that he sincerely loved them? And again, one in his official position must often have had occasion to say that he hoped soon to pay a personal visit, in view of which, writing at greater length was unnecessary. Even if the likeness in phraseology makes it probable that the two letters were written simultaneously, this by no means proves that the one was written to Gaius, the other to the church of which Gaius and Diotrephes were members. Zahn calculates that 2 John would occupy 32 lines, and 3 John not quite 31 lines of ancient writing, and infers that the author used two pages of papyrus of the same size for

both letters; but why we are to identify 2 John with the letter mentioned in 3 John because both happen to fill the same size of note paper is not quite clear.

On the other hand, the difficulties in the way of this attractive hypothesis are too substantial to be set aside. The two Epistles belong to entirely different situations. Both deal with the subject of hospitality; but the one forbids hospitality to the wrong kind of guests, and says nothing about the right kind, the other enjoins hospitality to the right kind and says nothing about the wrong kind. In the one the writer shows himself alarmed about the spread of heresy, in the other, about the insubordination of a self-important official. Is it conceivable that the Presbyter should send at the same time a letter to Gaius in which he promises that he will speedily come with a rod for Diotrephes (who had carried the church along with him), and another to the church in which that recalcitrant person was the leading spirit, in which he expresses the hope that when he comes and speaks face to face their “joy may be made full” — a letter, moreover, in which the real point at issue is not once touched upon? Such a procedure is scarcely imaginable.

We are still left, then, with the question What kind of entity, church or individual, is entitled “the lady Electa”? (*See* ELECT LADY, where reasons are given for preferring this translation.) The address of the letter is certainly much more suggestive of an individual than of a church. After all that has been so persuasively argued, notably by Dr. Findlay (Fellowship in the Life Eternal, chapter iii), from the symbolizing of the church as the Bride of Christ, it remains very hard for the present writer to suppose that, in the superscription of a letter and without any hint of symbolism, anyone could address a particular Christian community as “the elect lady” or the “lady elect.” On the other hand, the difficulties urged against the personal interpretation are not so grave as sometimes represented. The statement, “I have found certain of thy children walking in truth,” does not imply that others of them were not doing so, but emphasizes what had come under the writer’s personal observation. Nor can we pronounce the elevated and didactic love of the letter more suitable to a church than to an individual without taking into account the character, position and mutual relations of the correspondents. The person (if it was a person) addressed was evidently a Christian matron of high social standing — one able in a special degree to dispense hospitality, and of wide influence, one beloved of “all them that know the truth,” whose words would be listened to and whose

example would be imitated. And, in view of the ominous spreading of the leaven of Antichrist, it is not difficult to suppose that the Presbyter should write to such a person in such a strain. Nor does there seem to be anything especially odd in the fact of the children of a private family sending their respects to their aunt through the apostle John (Findlay). If he was intimate with that family, and in their immediate vicinity at the time of writing, it appears a natural thing for them to have done. Possibly Dr. Harris' "exploded" prehistoric countess of Huntington" is not so far astray as a modern equivalent of the lady Electa.

## LITERATURE.

On the 2nd and 3rd Epistles see Commentaries: Lucke, Huther, Ebrard, Holtzmann, Baumgarten, Westcott, Plummer, Bennett, Brooke; Expositions: Findlay, Fellowship in the Life Eternal; S. Cox, The Private Letters of Paul and John; J.M. Gibbon, The Eternal Life.

*R. Law*

## JOHN, GOSPEL OF

### I. INTRODUCTORY.

#### *1. Scope of Gospel:*

The Fourth Gospel has a form peculiar to itself, as well as a characteristic style and attitude, which mark it as a unique document among the books of the New Testament.

- (1) There is a prologue, consisting of ~~<BOOK>~~ John 1:1-18, of which something will be said later on.
- (2) There is a series of scenes and discourses from the life of Jesus, descriptive of Himself and His work, and marking the gradual development of faith and unbelief in His hearers and in the nation (1:19 through 12:50).
- (3) There is a more detailed account of the closing events of the Passion Week — of His farewell intercourse with His disciples (John 13 through 17), of His arrest, trials, crucifixion, death, and burial (John 18 through 19).

(4) There are the resurrection, and the manifestations of the risen Lord to His disciples on the resurrection day, and on another occasion eight days after (20:1-29). This is followed by a paragraph which describes the purpose of the Gospel, and the reason why it was written (~~«BIBL»~~ John 20:30,31).

(5) Finally, there is a supplementary chapter (21), which has all the characteristic marks of the Gospel as a whole, and which probably, therefore, proceeds from the same pen (thus Lightfoot, Meyer, Alford, etc.; some, as Zahn, prefer to take the chapter as the work of a disciple of John). The concluding verses (21:24,25) read: "This is the disciple that beareth witness of these things, and wrote these things: and we know that his witness is true. And there are also many other things which Jesus did," etc. "We know that his witness is true" seems to be a testimony on the part of those who knew as to the identity of the disciple, and the trustworthiness of his witness. Nor has this earliest testimony been discredited by the attacks made on it, and the natural meaning has been vindicated by many competent writers. The present tense, "beareth witness," indicates that the "disciple" who wrote the Gospel was still alive when the testimony was given.

## *2. State of Opinion as to Date of Appearance, etc.:*

As to the time of the appearance of the Johannine literature, apart from the question as to the authorship of these writings, there is now a growing consensus of opinion that it arose at the end of the 1st century, or at the beginning of the 2nd century. This is held by those who assign the authorship, not to any individual writer, but to a school at Ephesus, who partly worked up traditional material, and elaborated it into the form which the Johannine writings now have; by those also, as Spitta, who disintegrate the Gospel into a Grundschrift and a Bearbeitung (compare his *Das Johannes-Evangelium als Quelle der Geschichte Jesu*, 1910). Whether the Gospel is looked on as a compilation of a school of theologians, or as the outcome of an editor who utilizes traditional material, or as the final outcome of theological evolution of certain Pauline conceptions, with few exceptions the appearance of the Johannine writings is dated early in the 2nd century. One of the most distinguished of these exceptions is Schmiedel; another is the late Professor Pfleiderer. One may respect Pfleiderer in the region of philosophical inquiry, but in criticism he is a

negligible quantity. And the writings of Schmiedel on the Johannine question are rapidly passing into the same category.

Thus, the appearance of the Johannine writings at the end of the 1st century may safely be accepted as a sound historical conclusion. Slowly the critics who assigned their appearance to the middle of the 2nd century, or later, have retraced their steps, and assign the emergence of the Johannine writings to the time mentioned. This does not, of course, settle the questions of the authorship, composition and trustworthiness of the Gospel, which must be determined on their merits, on the grounds of external, and still more of internal, evidence, but it does clear the way for a proper discussion of them, and gives us a terminus which must set a limit to all further speculation on matters of this kind.

## II. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

Only an outline of the external evidence for the Fourth Gospel, which concerns both date and authorship, can be given in this article. Fuller information may be sought in the Intros to the Commentaries on the Gospel, by Godet, Westcott, Luthardt, Meyer; in Ezra Abbot's *The Fourth Gospel and Its Authorship*; in Zahn's *Introduction to the New Testament*, III; in Sanday's *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*; in Drummond's *The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*. All these and many others defend the Johannine authorship. On the other side, reference may be made to the author of *Supernatural Religion*, of which many editions have appeared. Among recent works, Moffatt's *Introduction to the New Testament*, and B.W. Bacon's *Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, may be mentioned as denying the Johannine authorship.

### *1. At End of 2nd Century:*

The external evidence is as follows. At the end of the 2nd century, the Christian church was in possession of four Gospels, which were used as sacred books, read in churches in public worship, held in honor as authoritative, and treated as part of a Canon of Scripture (*see* GOSPELS). One of these was the Fourth Gospel, universally ascribed to the apostle John as its author. We have the evidence on this point of Irenaeus, of Tertullian, of Clement of Alexandria, a little later of Origen. Clement is witness for the belief and practice of the church in Egypt and its neighborhood; Tertullian for the church in Africa; and Irenaeus, who was brought up in Asia Minor, was a teacher at Rome, and was bishop of



Lyons in Gaul, for the churches in these lands. The belief was so unquestioned, that Irenaeus could give reasons for it which would of themselves have convinced no one who had not already had the conviction which the reasons were meant to sustain. To discount the evidence of Irenaeus, Tertullian and Clement on the ground of the desire to find apostolic authorship for their sacred books, is not argument but mere assertion. There may have been such a tendency, but in the case of the four Gospels there is no proof that there was necessity for this at the end of the 2nd century. For there is evidence of the belief in the apostolic authorship of two Gospels by apostles, and of two by companions of the apostles, as an existing fact in the churches long before the end of the 2nd century.

## *2. Irenaeus — Theophilus:*

The importance of the testimony of Irenaeus is measured by the efforts which have been made to invalidate his witness. But these attempts fail in the presence of his historical position, and of the means at his command to ascertain the belief of the churches. There are many links of connection between Irenaeus and the apostolic age. There is specially his connection with Polycarp. He himself describes that relationship in his letter to Florinus, a fellow-disciple of Polycarp, who had lapsed into Gnosticism, in which he says, "I remember the events of that time more clearly than those of recent years. For what boys learn, growing with their mind, becomes joined with it; so that I am able to describe the very place in which the blessed Polycarp sat as he discoursed, and his goings out and comings in, and the manner of his life, and his physical appearance and his discourses to the people, and the accounts which he gave of his intercourse with John and the others who had seen the Lord" (Euseb., HE, V, 20: McGiffert's translation). We cannot say what was the age of Irenaeus at that time, but he was of sufficient age to receive the impressions which, after many years, he recorded. Polycarp was martyred in 155 AD, and he had been a Christian for 86 years when he was martyred. Thus there was only one link between Irenaeus and the apostolic age. Another link was constituted by his association with Pothinus, his predecessor in Lyons. Pothinus was a very old man when he was martyred, and had in his possession the traditions of the church of Gaul. Thus, Irenaeus, through these and others, had the opportunity of knowing the belief of the churches, and what he records is not only his own personal testimony, but the universal tradition of the church.

With Irenaeus should be adduced the apologist Theophilus (circa 170), the earliest writer to mention John by name as the author of the Gospel. In prefacing a quotation from the commencement of the prologue, he says, "This is what we learn from the sacred writings, and from all men animated by the Spirit, amongst whom John says" (Ad Autol., ii.22). Theophilus is further stated by Jerome to have composed a Harmony of the four Gospels (De Viris Illustr., 25).

### *3. Middle of 2nd Century:*

From Irenaeus and Theophilus we ascend nearer to the middle of the 2nd century, and here we encounter the Diatessaron of Tatian, on which much need not be said. The Diatessaron is likewise a Harmony of the four Gospels, and this Harmony dates not later than 170. It begins with the 1st verse of the Fourth Gospel, and ends with the last verse of the appendix to the Gospel. Tatian was a pupil of Justin Martyr, and that fact alone renders it probable that the "Memoirs of the Apostles," which Justin quotes so often, were those which his pupil afterward combined in the Diatessaron. That Justin knew the Fourth Gospel seems clear, though we cannot argue the question here. If he did, it follows that it was in existence about the year 130.

### *4. Ignatius, etc.:*

But there is evidence that helps us to trace the influence of the Fourth Gospel back to the year 110. "The first clear traces of the Fourth Gospel upon the thought and language of the church are found in the Epistles of Ignatius (circa 110 AD). How unmistakable these traces are is shown by the fact that not infrequently this dependence of Ignatius upon John has been used as an argument against the genuineness of the Ignatian letters" (Zahn, Introduction, III, 176). This argument may now be safely used since the Epistles have been vindicated as historical documents by Lightfoot and by Zahn. If the Ignatian Epistles are saturated with the tone and spirit of the Johannine writings, that goes to show that this mode of thought and expression was prevalent in the church of the time of Ignatius. Thus at the beginning of the 2nd century, that distinctive mode of thought and speech which we call Johannine had an existence.

A further line of evidence in favor of the Gospel, which need only be referred to, lies in the use made of it by the Gnostics. That the Gospel was

used by the Valentinians and Basilides has been shown by Dr. Drummond (op. cit., 265-343).

### *5. John the Presbyter:*

To estimate aright the force of the above evidence, it is to be remembered that, as already observed, there were many disciples of the John of Ephesus, to whom the Johannine writings were ascribed, living far on in the 2nd century — bishops like Papias and Polycarp, the presbyters” so often mentioned by Irenaeus — forming a chain connecting the time of the origin of the Gospel with the latter half of the century. Here arises the question, recently so largely canvassed, as to the identity of “the presbyter John” in the well-known fragment of Papias preserved by Euseb. (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, III, 39). Were there, as most, with Eusebius, understand, two Johns — apostle and presbyter (compare e.g. Godet) — or was there only one? If only one, was he the son of Zebedee? On these points wide difference of opinion prevails. Harnack holds that the presbyter was not the son of Zebedee; Sanday is doubtful; Moffatt believes that the presbyter was the only John at Ephesus. Zahn and Dom J. Chapman (*John the Presbyter and the Fourth Gospel*, 1911) think also that there was only one John at Ephesus, but he was the son of Zebedee. It is hardly necessary to discuss the question here, for the tradition is explicit which connected the Gospel with the apostle John during the latter part of his residence in Ephesus — a residence which there is no sufficient ground for disputing (*see JOHN, THE APOSTLE*).

### *6. Summary:*

On a fair consideration of the external evidence, therefore, we find that it is unusually strong. It is very seldom the case that conclusive proof of the existence and influence of a writing can be brought so near to the time of its publication as in the case of the Fourth Gospel. The date of its publication is at the end of the 1st century, or at the latest in the beginning of the 2nd. Traces of its influence are found in the Epistles of Ignatius. The 1st Epistle of John is quoted in the Epistle of Polycarp (chapter 7). The thought and style of the Gospel had influenced Justin Martyr. It is one of the four interwoven in the Diatessaron of Tatian. It was quoted, commented on, and interpreted by the Gnostics. In truth the external evidence for the early date and Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel is as great both in extent and variety as it is for any book of the New

Testament, and far greater than any that we possess for any work of classical antiquity.

The history of the controversy on the Johannine authorship is not here entered into. Apart from the obscure sect of the [*Alogi*] (who attributed the Gospel to Cerinthus!) in the 2nd century, no voice was heard in challenge of the authorship of John till the close of the 17th century, and serious assault did not begin till the 19th century (Bretschneider, 1820, Strauss, 1835, Weisse, 1838, Baur and his school, 1844 and after, Keim, 1865, etc.). The attacks were vigorously repelled by other scholars (Olshausen, Tholuck, Neander, Ebrard, Bleek, etc.). Some adopted, in various forms and degrees, the hypothesis of an apostolic basis for the Gospel, regarded as the work of a later hand (Weizsacker, Renan, etc.). From this point the controversy has proceeded with an increasing dogmatism on the side of the opponents of the genuineness and trustworthiness of the Gospel, but not less firmness on the part of its defenders. The present state of opinion is indicated in the text.

### **III. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GOSPEL: INTERNAL EVIDENCE.**

#### *1. General Lines of Attack and Defence:*

The external evidence for the Fourth Gospel is criticized, but it is chiefly on internal grounds that the opposition to the Johannine authorship and historical trustworthiness of the Gospel is based. Stress is laid on the broad contrast which admittedly exists in style, character and plan, between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics; on its supposed philosophical dress (the Logos-doctrine); on alleged errors and contradictions; on the absence of progress in the narrative, etc. The defense of the Gospel is usually conducted by pointing out the different aims of the Gospel, rebutting exaggerations in the above objections, and showing that in a multitude of ways the author of the Gospel reveals his identity with the apostle John. He was, e.g., a Jew, a Palestinian Jew, one familiar with the topography of Jerusalem, etc., an apostle, an eyewitness, the disciple whom Jesus loved (13:23; 20:2; 21:7,20). The attestation in 21:24 of those who knew the author in his lifetime is of the greatest weight in this connection. Instead of following these familiar lines of argument (for which see Godet, Luthardt, Westcott, Ez. Abbot, Drummond, etc., in works cited), a confirmation is here sought on the lines of a fresh comprehensive study.

## *2. Unwarrantable Critical Presuppositions:*

The study of the Johannine writings in general, and of the Fourth Gospel in particular, has been approached in many ways and from various points of view. One of the most common of these ways, in recent works, is that which assumes that here we have the product of Christian reflection on the facts disclosed in the other Gospels, and that these facts have been modified by the experience of the church, and reflect the consciousness of the church at the end of the 1st century or the beginning of the 2nd century. By this time, it is assumed that the church, now mainly a Gentile church, has been greatly influenced by Greek-Roman culture, that she has been reflecting on the wonder of her own history, and has so modified the original tradition as to assimilate it to the new environment. In the Fourth Gospel, it is said, we have the highest and most elaborate presentation of the outcome of the process. Starting with Paul and his influence, Professor B.W. Bacon traces for us the whole process until a school of theologians at Ephesus produced the Johannine writings, and the consciousness of the church was satisfied with the completeness of the new presentation of Christianity (compare his Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate). Hellenistic ideas in Hebrew form, the facts of the Gospel so transformed as to be acceptable to the Hellenistic mind — this is what scholars of this class find in the Fourth Gospel.

Others again come to the Gospel with the presupposition that it is intended to present to the reader a complete view of the life of Jesus, that it is intended to supplement and to correct the statements of the Synoptics and to present Christ in such a form as to meet the new needs of the church at the beginning of the 2nd century. Others find a polemical aim in the Gospel. Weizsacker, e.g. finds a strong polemic aim against the Jews. He says, "There are the objections raised by the Jews against the church after its secession has been consummated, and after the development of the person of its Christ has passed through its most essential stages. It is not a controversy of the lifetime, but that of the school carried back into the history of the life" (Apostolic Age, II, 222). One would have expected that a statement so forcibly put would have been supported by some evidence; that we might have some historical evidence regarding a controversy between Jew and church beyond what we have in the Fourth Gospel itself. But nothing is offered by Weizsacker except the dictum that these are controversial topics carried on in the school, and that they are anachronisms as they stand. As it happens, we know from the Dial.

between Justin Martyr and Trypho what were the topics discussed between Jew and Christian in the middle of the 2nd century, and it is sufficient to say that these topics, as reported by Justin, mainly regarded the interpretation of the Old Testament, and are not those which are discussed in the Fourth Gospel.

Perhaps the most surprising of all the presuppositions with regard to the Fourth Gospel is that which lays great stress on the supposition that the book was largely intended to vindicate a Christian doctrine of the sacraments which flourished at the beginning of the 2nd century. According to this presupposition, the Fourth Gospel set forth a doctrine of the sacraments which placed them in a unique position as a means of salvation. While scarcely contending that the doctrine of the sacraments held by the church of the 2nd century had reached that stage of development which meets us in the medieval church, it is, according to this view, far on the way toward that goal afterward reached. We do not dwell on this view, for the exegesis that finds sacramentarianism in the Fourth Gospel is hopeless. That Gospel does not put the sacraments in the place of Christ. Finally, we do not find the contention of those who affirm that the Fourth Gospel was written with a view of making the gospel of Jesus more acceptable to the Gentiles any more satisfactory. As a matter of fact, the Gospel which was most acceptable to the Gentiles was the Gospel according to Mt. It is more frequently quoted than any other. In the writings of the early church, it is quoted as often as all the other Gospels put together. The Fourth Gospel did not come into prominence in the Christian church until the rise of the Christological controversies in the 3rd century.

### *3. Real Aim of Gospel — Results:*

When, after dwelling on these ways of approaching the Fourth Gospel, and reading the demands made on the Gospel by those who approach it with these presuppositions and demands, we turn to the Gospel itself, and ask regarding its aim and purpose, we find a simple answer. The writer of it expressly says: "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name" (~~John~~ John 20:30,31). Pursuing this clue, and putting away all the presuppositions which bulk so largely in introductions,

exegeses, histories of the apostolic and sub-apostolic ages, one meets with many surprises.

### **(1) Relation to Synoptics.**

In relation to the Synoptics, the differences are great, but more surprising is the fact that the points of contact between these Gospels and the Fourth Gospel are so few. The critics to whom reference has been made are unanimous that the writer or the school who compiled the Johannine writings was indebted to the Synoptics for almost all the facts embodied in the Fourth Gospel. Apart, however, from the Passion Week, only two points of contact are found so obvious that they cannot be doubted, namely, the feeding of the 5,000, and the walking on the sea (~~John~~ John 6:4-21). The healing of the child of the royal officer (~~John~~ John 4:46-53) can scarcely be identified with the healing of the centurion's servant (Mt, Lk); but even if the identification were allowed, this is all we have in the Fourth Gospel of the events of the ministry in Galilee. There is a ministry in Galilee, but the earlier ministry in Judea and in Galilee began before John was cast into prison (3:24), and it has no parallel in the Synoptics. In fact, the Fourth Gospel assumes the existence of the other three, and does not anew convey the knowledge which can be gathered from them. It takes its own way, makes its own selections, and sets these forth from its own point of view. It has its own principle of selection: that plainly indicated in the passage already quoted. The scenes depicted, the works done, the words spoken, and the reflections made by the writer, are all directed toward the aim of enabling the readers to believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. In the writer's view this would issue in their obtaining life in His name.

### **(2) Time Occupied in the Gospel.**

Accepting this principle for our guidance, we turn to the Gospel, and the first thing that strikes the reader is the small amount of the real time filled up, or occupied, by the scenes described in the Gospel. We take the night of the betrayal, and the day of the crucifixion. The things done and the words spoken on that day, from one sunset to another, occupy no fewer than 7 chapters of the Gospel (John 13 through 19). Apart from the supplementary chapter **(21)**, there are 20 chapters in the Gospel, containing 697 vs, and these 7 chapters have 257 verses. More than one-third of the whole given to the ministry is thus occupied with the events of one day.

Again, according to ~~401B~~ Acts 1:3, there was a ministry of the risen Lord which lasted for 40 days, and of all that happened during those days John records only what happened on the day of the resurrection, and on another day 8 days after (John 20). The incidents recorded in the other Gospels fall into the background, are taken for granted, and only the signs done on these two days are recorded here. They are recorded because they are of significance for the purpose he has in hand, of inducing belief in the truth that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. If we continue to follow the clue thus afforded, we shall be surprised at the fewness of the days on which anything was transacted. As we read the story of the Fourth Gospel, there are many indications of the passing of time, and many precise statements of date. We learn from the Gospel that the ministry of Jesus probably lasted for 3 years. We gather this from the number of the feasts which He attended at Jerusalem. We have notes of time spent in journeys, but no account of anything that happened during them. The days on which anything was done or anything said are very few. We are told precisely that "six days before the passover Jesus came to Bethany, where Lazarus was" (12:1 ff), and with regard to these 6 days we are told only of the supper and the anointing of the feet of Jesus by Mary, of the entry into Jerusalem, the visit of the Greeks, and of the impression which that visit made on Jesus. We have also the reflections of the evangelist on the unbelief of the Jews, but nothing further. We know that many other things did happen on these days, but they are not recorded in this Gospel. Apart from the two days during which Jesus dwelt in the place where he was, of which days nothing is recorded, the time occupied with the raising of Lazarus is the story of one day (John 11). So it is also with the healing of the blind man. The healing is done one day, and the controversy regarding the significance of that healing is all that is recorded of another day (John 9). What is recorded in John 10 is the story of two days. The story of the 7th and 8th chapters, interrupted by the episode of the woman taken in adultery, which does not belong to the Gospel, is the story of not more than two days. The story of the feeding of the 5,000 and of the subsequent discourse (John 6) is the story of two days. It is not necessary to enter into fuller detail. Yet the writer, as remarked, is very exact in his notes of time. He notes the days, the number of days on which anything was done, or when anything was said. We make these remarks, which will be obvious to every reader who attends to them, mainly for the purpose of showing that the Gospel on the face of it does not intend to, at least does not, set forth a complete account of the life and work of Jesus. It gives at the utmost an account of



20 days out of the 1,000 days of our Lord's ministry. This is of itself sufficient to set aside the idea of those who deal with the Fourth Gospel as if it were meant to set aside, to supplement, or to correct, the accounts in the Synoptics. Plainly it was not written with that purpose.

### (3) A Personal Record.

Obviously the book professes to be reminiscences of one who had personal experience of the ministry which he describes. The personal note is in evidence all through the book. It is present even in the prologue, for in that verse in which he describes the great fact of the incarnation he uses the personal note, "We beheld his glory" (<sup><B014></sup>John 1:14). This might be taken as the keynote of the Gospel. In all the scenes set forth in the Gospel the writer believes that in them Jesus manifested forth His glory and deepened the faith of His disciples. If we were to ask him, when did he behold the glory of the incarnate Word, the answer would be, in all these scenes which are described in the Gospel. If we read the Gospel from this point of view, we find that the writer had a different conception of the glory of the incarnate Word from that which his critics ascribe to him. He sees a glory of the Word in the fact that He was wearied with His journey (<sup><B006></sup>John 4:6), that He made clay of the spittle and anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay (<sup><B006></sup>John 9:6), that He wept at the grave of Lazarus (<sup><B015></sup>John 11:35), that He groaned in the spirit and was troubled (<sup><B013></sup>John 11:38), and that He could sorrow with a sorrow unspeakable, as He did after the interview with the Greeks (<sup><B027></sup>John 12:27). For he records all these things, and evidently thinks them quite consistent with the glory of the incarnate Word. A fair exegesis does not explain these things away, but must take them as of the essence of the manifested glory of the Word.

The Gospel then is professedly reminiscences of an eyewitness, of one who was personally present at all the scenes which he describes. No doubt the reminiscences often pass into reflections on the meaning and significance of what he describes. He often pauses to remark that the disciples, and he himself among them, did not understand at the time the meaning of some saying, or the significance of some deed, of Jesus (<sup><B022></sup>John 2:22; 12:16, etc.). At other times we can hardly distinguish between the words of the Master and the reflections of the disciple. But in other writings we often meet with the same phenomenon. In the Epistle to the Galatians, e.g., Paul writes what he had said to Peter at Antioch: "If thou, being a Jew, livest as do the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, how compellest thou the Gentiles

to live as do the Jews?" (~~<R214>~~Galatians 2:14). Shortly after, he passes into reflections on the situation, and it is impossible to ascertain where the direct speech ends and the reflections begin. So it is in the Fourth Gospel. It is impossible in many instances to say where the words of Jesus end and the reflections of the writer begin. So it is, e.g., with his record of the witness of the Baptist in John 3. The record of the Baptist's words may end with the sentence, "He must increase, but I must decrease" (3:30), and the rest may be the reflections of the writer on the situation.

#### **(4) Reminiscences of an Eyewitness.**

The phenomena of the Gospel are thus, apparently at least, reminiscences of an eyewitness, with his reflections on the meaning of what he has experienced. He was present at the scenes which he describes. He was present on the night on which the Master was betrayed; he was present in the hall of the high priest; he was present at the cross, and bears testimony to the reality of the death of Jesus (~~<R1815>~~John 18:15; 19:35). As we read the Gospel we note the stress he lays on "witness." The term frequently occurs (~~<R1007>~~John 1:7,8,19; 3:11,26,33; 5:31; 12:17; 21:24, etc.), and is used to set forth the verified facts of experience. In these testimonies we have an unusual combination of elevated thought and minute observation. At one time the evangelist soars aloft into a spiritual world, and moves with ease among the richest and highest elements of spiritual experience. Using common words, he yet reads into them the deepest meanings regarding man, the world, and God which have ever entered into the mind of man. Sublime mysticism and open-eyed practical sense meet in his wonderful writings. Above all, we are impressed with his sense of the supreme value of the historical. All his spiritual meanings have a historical basis. This is as apparent in the 1st Epistle as it is in the Gospel, and in the Gospel it is conspicuous. While his main interest is to focus the minds of his readers on Jesus, His work and His word, yet unconsciously he has written his own spiritual biography. We gradually become aware, as we read ourselves sympathetically into the spirit of the Gospel, that we are following the line of a great spiritual awakening, and are tracing the growth of faith and love in the life of the writer, until they become the overmastering tone of his whole life. On the one hand, the book is a grand objective revelation of a unique life, the story of the self-revelation of the Son of God, of the revelation of the Father in Jesus Christ, moving onward to its consummation through the contrasted developments of faith and unbelief on the part of them who received Him, and on the part of them who

received Him not. On the other hand, it has a subjective unity in the heart of the writer, as it tells of how faith began, of how faith made progress, until he came to the knowledge of the Son of God. We can enter into the various crises through which he passed, through which, as they successively passed, he won the assurance which he so calmly expresses; and these supply him with the key by means of which he is able to unlock the mystery of the relations of Jesus to the world. The victory of faith which he sets forth was first won in his own soul. This also is included in the significant phrase, "We beheld his glory" (~~John~~ John 1:14).

### **(5) Reminiscence Illustrated.**

The Gospel receives powerful confirmation from reflection on the nature of reminiscence generally. A law of reminiscence is that, when we recall anything, or any occurrence, we recall it in its wholeness, with all the accessories of its accompaniments. As we tell it to others, we have to make a selection of that only which is needful to convey our meaning. Inartistic natures do not make a selection; they pour out everything that arises in the memory (compare *Dame Quickly* in Shakespeare). The finer qualities of reminiscence are abundantly illustrated in the Fourth Gospel, and furnish an independent proof that it is from the pen of an eyewitness. It is possible within reasonable limits to give only a few examples. Observe first the exact notes of time in John 1 and the special notes of character in each of the 6 disciples whom Jesus met on the first 4 days of His ministry. Mark the peculiar graphic note that Nathaniel was under the fig tree (1:50). Pass on to notice the 6 water-pots of stone set at Cana after the manner of the Jews' purifying (2:6). We might refer in this connection to the geographical remarks frequently made in the course of the narrative, indicative of an intimate knowledge of Palestine, and to the numerous allusions to Jewish laws, customs, beliefs, religious ceremonies, usually admitted now to be accurate, and illustrative of familiar knowledge on the part of the writer. Our main object, however, is to call attention to those incidental things which have no symbolical significance, but are set down because, as the main happening was recalled, these arose with it. He again sees the "lad" with the 5 barley loaves and 2 fishes (6:9); remembers that Mary sat still in the house, when the active Martha went forth to meet the Lord as He approached Bethany (11:20); recalls the appearance of Lazarus as he came forth bound hand and foot with grave-clothes (11:44). He has a vivid picture before him as he recalls the washing of the disciples' feet (13:1-15), and the various attitudes and remarks of the disciples during the whole of

that eventful night. He still sees the attitude of the soldiers who came to arrest Jesus (18:3-8), the flashing of Peter's sword (18:10), the share of Nicodemus in the burying of Jesus, and the kinds and weights of the spices brought by him for the embalming of the body (19:38-40). He tells of the careful folding of the linen cloths, and where they were placed in the empty tomb (20:4-8). These are only some of those vivid touches due to reminiscence which none but an eyewitness could safely make. Looking back on the past, the evangelist recalls the various scenes and words of the Lord in their wholeness as they happened, and he chooses those living touches which bear the mark of reality to all readers.

### **(6) Conclusions.**

These touches of vivid reality warrant the conclusion that the writer in this Gospel is depicting scenes in a real life, and is not drawing on his imagination. Looking back on his own spiritual history, he remembered with special vividness those words and works of Christ which determined his own life, and led him on to the full assurance of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God. The Gospel can be understood from this point of view: it does not seem to us that it can be understood from any other, without ignoring all the phenomena of the kind now indicated. When the Gospel is approached from this point of view, set forth by itself, one can afford to neglect many of the elaborate discussions which have arisen regarding the possible displacement of certain ehs (Spitta, etc.). Much, e.g., has been made of the sudden transference of the scene from Galilee to Judea as we pass from John 4 to John 5, and the equally sudden transference back to Galilee (6:1). Many suggestions have been made, but they all proceed on the supposition that the reminiscences were meant to be continuous, which it has been seen is not the case. While it is very likely that there is a sequence in the writer's thought, yet this need not compel us to think of displacements. Taken as they are in the Gospel, the selected proofs, whether they occur in Judea or in Galilee, in all instances indicate progress. They illustrate the manifested glory of Jesus, on the one hand, and the growth of faith and the development of unbelief on the other. This, however, opens up a separate line of objection and inquiry to which attention must now be given.

#### IV. PROGRESS AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE GOSPEL.

It is an objection often urged against the view of the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel that in it there is no progress, no development, no crisis, nothing, e.g., to correspond with the significance of the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi. (~~<orig>~~Matthew 16:13-17 parallel). This is held to be true alike of the character of Jesus, which, under the influence of the Logos-doctrine of the prologue, exhibits no development from first to last, and of the attitude of the disciples, whose faith in Jesus as the Christ is likewise represented as complete from the beginning. In reality the opposite is the case. In the course of the Gospel, as already said, the glory of the Lord is ever more completely manifested, and the disciples attain to a deeper faith, while the unbelief of those who reject Him becomes more fixed, until it is absolute. This will appear clearly on nearer examination.

##### *1. The Presentation of Jesus in the Gospel:*

The objection from the presentation of Jesus in the Gospel takes different forms, which it is desirable to consider separately.

##### **(1) Alleged Absence of Development in the Character of Jesus.**

It is affirmed, first, that there is no development in the character of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, none of those indications such as we have in the Synoptics of widening horizons, no recognition of the fact that the meaning, purpose and issue of His calling became clearer to Him as the days passed by. To this assertion there are two answers. The first is, that in a series of scenes from the activity of Jesus, selected for the definite purpose set forth in the Gospel, there is no need to demand a continuous history of His ministry. Selection is made precisely of those scenes which set forth His insight into human character and motive, His power of sympathetic healing, His command over Nature, and His supreme authority over man and the world. The other remark is, that even in the Fourth Gospel there are hints of a crisis in the ministry of our Lord, during which He came to a clearer recognition of the fuller meaning of His mission (e.g. the visit of the Greeks, John 12). It will be seen further, below, that it is not true in this Gospel, any more than in the Synoptics, that Jesus is represented as publicly proclaiming Himself as the Messiah from the first.

## (2) Alleged “Autonomy” of Jesus.

Akin to the above is the objection to the historicity of the Gospel that in it Jesus is represented as always directing His own course, maintaining an attitude of aloofness to men, refusing to be influenced by them. This, it is held, results from the dominance of the Logos-idea in the prologue. The reply is that there is really no essential difference between the attitude of Jesus in these respects in the Synoptics and in Jn. In all alike He maintains an attitude of authority. In the Synoptics He can say, “I say unto you” (~~4152~~ Matthew 5:22,28,32, etc.). In them also He claims to be the teacher of absolute truth, the Saviour, the Ruler, the Judge, of men. In this regard there is no new claim made in the Fourth Gospel: “No one cometh unto the Father, but by me” (~~6446~~ John 14:6). But He had said, “Come unto me .... and I will give you rest” (~~0118~~ Matthew 11:28). A claim to authority over men is thus common to all the Gospels. In all of them, too, in the Fourth no less than in the others, there is on the part of Jesus loyalty, submission, subordination to the Father. In fact this is more conspicuous in the Fourth Gospel than in the Synoptics: “The Father is greater than I” (~~6148~~ John 14:28). The words He speaks are the Father’s words; the works He does are the Father’s (~~4159~~ John 5:19,20; 7:16,18, etc.): “This commandment received I from my Father” (~~6108~~ John 10:18). In all the Gospels it is one consistent, gracious Figure who appears.

## (3) “Inconceivability” of Logos-Presentation.

A further objection, which aims at showing that this Gospel could not be the work of “a primitive apostle,” may be noticed, partly from the eminence of him who makes it, and partly from the interest of the objection itself. In his work on *The Apostolic Age*, Weizsacker says, “It is a puzzle that the beloved disciple of the Gospel, he who reclined at table next to Jesus, should have come to regard and represent his whole former experience as a life with the incarnate Logos of God. It is impossible to imagine any power of faith and philosophy so great as thus to obliterate the recollection of a real life and to substitute for it this marvelous picture of a Divine being. We can understand that Paul, who had not known Jesus, who had not come into contact with the man, should have been opposed to the tradition of the eyewitnesses, the idea of the heavenly man, and that he should have substituted the Christ who was spirit for His earthly manifestation, pronouncing the latter to be positively a stage above which faith must rise. For a primitive apostle it is inconceivable. The question is

decided here and finally here” (II, 211). It is easy to say, “For a primitive apostle it is inconceivable,” yet we know that a primitive apostle believed that Jesus rose from the dead, that He was exalted a Prince and Saviour, that He was seated at the right hand of God, that He was Lord of all (~~407~~ Acts 2:22-36). If we grant that the primitive church believed these things, it cannot be fairly said that the further step taken in the Fourth Gospel is inconceivable. In truth, the objection of Weizsacker is not taken against the Fourth Gospel; it is equally effective against Christianity in general. If Jesus be what He is said to be in the Synoptic Gospels, and if He be what the primitive church held Him to be, the leading conception of the Fourth Gospel is credible and conceivable. If Christianity is credible, the Fourth Gospel adds nothing to the difficulty of faith; rather it gives an additional ground for a rational faith.

## *2. The Logos-Doctrine of the Prologue:*

It is proper at this point that a little more should be said on the Logos-doctrine itself, in its bearing on the presentation of Christ in this Gospel (for the philosophical and historical aspects of the doctrine, *see LOGOS*). Obviously the great interest of the author of the reminiscences and reflections in the Fourth Gospel is in the personal life of the Master whom he had known so intimately. To him this real historical life was everything. On it he brooded, on it he meditated, and he strove to make the significance of it ever more real to himself first, and to others afterward. How shall he make the reality of that life apparent to all? What were the relationships of that person to God, to man, and to the world? What Jesus really was, and what were His relations to God, to man, and to the world, John endeavors to make known in the prologue. This real person whom he had known, revered, loved, was something more than was apparent to the eyes of an ordinary observer; more even than had been apparent to His disciples. How shall this be set forth? From the Gospel it is evident that the historical person is first, and the attempt to set forth the meaning of the person is second. The prologue is an attempt to find language to set forth fitly the glory of the person. The Logos-doctrine does not descend on the historic person as a garment from without; it is an endeavor to describe what John had grown to recognize as the essential meaning of the person of Jesus. It is not a speculative theory we have here, not an endeavor to think out a theory of the world or of God; it is an attempt to find suitable language for what the writer recognizes to be a great fact. We need not, therefore, seek an explanation of John's Logos-doctrine in the speculation

of Heraclitus, in theories of the Stoics, even in the eclecticism of Philo. The interests of these men are far removed from the atmosphere of the Fourth Gospel. They desired a theory of the universe; John sought to set forth the significance of a personal historical life. In the prologue he set forth that life, and he chose a word which he filled up with concreter meaning, a meaning which included the deepest teaching of the Old Testament, and the highest thought of his contemporaries. The teaching of Paul, especially in the epistles of the captivity, approaches very closely to that of the Fourth Gospel. Thus it is not a right method to bring the Logos-doctrine to the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, and to look at all the phenomena of the Gospel as mere illustrations of that doctrine. The right method is the reverse. The Logos-doctrine has no concreteness, no living reality, taken apart from the personal life which was manifested to the apostle. The prologue represents what John had come to see as to the meaning of the personality he had historically known. He sets it forth once for all in the prologue, and never once in the Gospel does he refer to it again. We can understand that Logos-doctrine when we look at it in the light of those manifestations recorded in the Gospel, manifestations which enabled John to behold His glory; we cannot understand the manifestations if we look at them merely as illustrations of an abstract philosophical theorem. In brief, the Fourth Gospel is concrete, not abstract; it is not the evolution or the demonstration of a theory, but the attempt to set forth a concrete personality, and to find fitting words to express the significance of that personality as John had grown to see it.

### *3. Growth of Faith and Development of Unbelief:*

As it is with the character of Jesus, so it is with the alleged absence of development in the faith of the disciples. Careful inquiry shows this objection also to be unfounded.

#### **(1) Early Confessions.**

Here again, it is said, we see the end from the beginning. In John 1 Jesus is twice greeted as the Messiah (1:41,45), and twice described as the Son of God (1:34,49). The Baptist at this early stage points to Him as “the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world” (1:29). Reference is made to the case of Nicodemus (3:1 ff), to the Samaritans (4:41 f), and other incidents of the same kind, with the view of proving that at this early stage of the ministry of our Lord such confessions are unlikely, and even



impossible. It is to be noticed, however, that the confessions in these cases are represented as the outcome of special manifestations on the part of Jesus to the persons who make them. And the manifestations are such as to justify the psychological possibility of the confession. It is so in the case of Nathaniel. Nor is the objection to the testimony of John the Baptist of a kind which admits of no answer. For the Baptist, according to the Synoptics, had found his own credentials in Isaiah 40. There he found himself and his mission, and described himself, as we find it in the Fourth Gospel, "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said Isaiah the prophet" (~~John~~ John 1:23; compare ~~John~~ Matthew 3:3; ~~John~~ Mark 1:2,3). We find also that when John "heard in the prison the works of the Christ," and "sent by his disciples and said unto him, Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?" (~~John~~ Matthew 11:2), the answer of Jesus was a reference to a passage in Isaiah 61. According to Jesus these were the true signs of the Messianic kingdom. Is there any reason why we should not say that, as John found his own credentials in Isaiah 40, he would also have found the character and signs of the Coming One in the description of the suffering servant in Isaiah 53? If he did so, what more simple than that he should describe the Coming One as the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world? In His answer to John, Jesus simply asks him to read farther on in that prophesy which had already meant so much for him.

## **(2) Growth of Faith in the Disciples.**

Apart from what may be made of these early confessions, it may fairly be said that there are many signs of a growth of faith on the part of the disciples. Carrying with us the fact that each of these confessions had its ground in a particular manifestation of the glory of Christ, we go on to passages which prove how imperfect was the faith of the disciples. It is to be remembered also that John has only one word to describe all the phases of faith, from the slightest impression up to whole-hearted conviction and thorough surrender. We may refer to the careful and exhaustive treatment of the meanings of the word "believing" by E. A. Abbott in his work, *Johannine Vocabulary*. In the Fourth Gospel the verb is always used, and never the noun. As the word is used, it denotes the impression made, whether that impression is slight and transient, or deep and abiding. Successive steps of acceptance are seen as the disciples advance to complete and absolute faith.

As we read the Gospel, we perceive that Jesus did test and try the faith of His disciples, and made His deeds and His words both tests of faith, and a means for its growth. As the result of the words on the bread of life, we find that many of His disciples said, “This is a hard saying; who can hear it?” (~~RB~~ John 6:60), and on account of the difficulty of His words, “Many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him” (~~RB~~ John 6:66). On His appeal to those who did not go away it is found that the difficulty became really an opportunity to them for a larger faith (~~RB~~ John 6:68,69). The incidents and events of the night of the betrayal, and the conversations on that night, prove how incomplete were the faith and confidence of the disciples; how far they were from a full understanding of the Master’s purpose. Nor is it until after the resurrection, and the gladness of seeing their risen Lord in the upper room, that faith obtained a complete victory, and attained to full possession of itself.

### **(3) Gradual Disclosure of Messiahship: Growth of Unbelief.**

On the other side, there is as manifestly an evolution of unbelief from the passing doubt of the moment on to the complete disbelief in Jesus, and utter rejection of Him.

It is only fair here to the Gospel to observe that the confessions to which we have already referred are on the part of individuals who came into special relationship with Jesus. Such is the case with regard to Nathaniel, Nicodemus, the woman of Samaria and the Samaritan people, and the writer places the reader in that close relationship so that he who reads may believe. But such close relationship to Jesus is only the lot of a few in this Gospel. It is not true, as already remarked, that in this Gospel Jesus is represented as definitely proclaiming Himself as the Messiah. There is something of the same reserve here as there is in the Synoptics. He did not assert His claim; He left it to be inferred. His brethren hint that He ought to put His claims really to the test (~~RB~~ John 7:3 f). An account of the doubts and speculations regarding Him is given in John 7. The people hesitate, and inquire, and speculate, Is He a good man, or a deceiver? (7:12) Had He really a mission from God? (7:14 ff) — all of which goes to prove that only certain individuals had such intimate knowledge of Him as to lead to acceptance. In John 10 we read, “And it was the feast of the dedication at Jerusalem: it was winter; and Jesus was walking in the temple in Solomon’s porch. The Jews therefore came round about him, and said unto him, How long dost thou hold us in suspense? If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly”

(10:22-24). “It is very clear,” as Dr. Sanday says, “that no sharply defined issue was set before the people. They are left to draw their own conclusions; and they draw them as well as they can by the help of such criteria as they have. But there is no entweder .... oder .... — either Messiah or not Messiah — peremptorily propounded by Jesus Himself” (The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel, 164). The sum of the matter as regards the development of unbelief is given by the evangelist in the words: “Though he had done so many signs before them, yet they believed not on him” (12:37). On the other hand, the culmination of faith is seen in the word of the Lord to Thomas: “Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed” (20:29).

## LITERATURE.

Besides Comms. and other works mentioned in the article, with valuable articles on the Gospel in Dicts. and Encs, the following may be consulted: M. Dods, common. “Fourth Gospel” in Expositor’s Greek Testament; Julicher, Eintleitung in das NT<sup>6</sup> (1906, English Translation); E. A. Abbott, Johannine Vocabulary (1905), and Johannine Grammar (1906); H. J. Holtzmann, Evangelium, Briefe und Offenbarung des Johannes, besorgt von W. Bauer (1908); Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day by Members of the University of Cambridge, edited by Dr. Swete (1909), Essay IX, “The Theology of the Fourth Gospel,” by W.H. Inge, and Essay X, “The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel,” by C.E. Brooke; Schmiedel, The Johannine Writings (English translation, 1908); J. Armitage Robinson, The Historical Character of John’s Gospel (1908); Askwith, The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel (1910); Ezra Abbot, External Evidence of the Fourth Gospel, edited by J.H. Thayer (1891); Lowrie, The Doctrine of John (1899).

*James Iverach*

## JOHN MARK

*See MARK, JOHN.*

## JOHN, THE REVELATION OF

*See REVELATION OF JOHN.*

## JOIADA

<joi'-a-da> ([<sup>1</sup><sup>2</sup><sup>3</sup><sup>4</sup><sup>5</sup><sup>6</sup><sup>7</sup><sup>8</sup><sup>9</sup><sup>10</sup><sup>11</sup><sup>12</sup><sup>13</sup><sup>14</sup><sup>15</sup><sup>16</sup><sup>17</sup><sup>18</sup><sup>19</sup><sup>20</sup><sup>21</sup><sup>22</sup><sup>23</sup><sup>24</sup><sup>25</sup><sup>26</sup><sup>27</sup><sup>28</sup><sup>29</sup><sup>30</sup><sup>31</sup><sup>32</sup><sup>33</sup><sup>34</sup><sup>35</sup><sup>36</sup><sup>37</sup><sup>38</sup><sup>39</sup><sup>40</sup><sup>41</sup><sup>42</sup><sup>43</sup><sup>44</sup><sup>45</sup><sup>46</sup><sup>47</sup><sup>48</sup><sup>49</sup><sup>50</sup><sup>51</sup><sup>52</sup><sup>53</sup><sup>54</sup><sup>55</sup><sup>56</sup><sup>57</sup><sup>58</sup><sup>59</sup><sup>60</sup><sup>61</sup><sup>62</sup><sup>63</sup><sup>64</sup><sup>65</sup><sup>66</sup><sup>67</sup><sup>68</sup><sup>69</sup><sup>70</sup><sup>71</sup><sup>72</sup><sup>73</sup><sup>74</sup><sup>75</sup><sup>76</sup><sup>77</sup><sup>78</sup><sup>79</sup><sup>80</sup><sup>81</sup><sup>82</sup><sup>83</sup><sup>84</sup><sup>85</sup><sup>86</sup><sup>87</sup><sup>88</sup><sup>89</sup><sup>90</sup><sup>91</sup><sup>92</sup><sup>93</sup><sup>94</sup><sup>95</sup><sup>96</sup><sup>97</sup><sup>98</sup><sup>99</sup><sup>100</sup><sup>101</sup><sup>102</sup><sup>103</sup><sup>104</sup><sup>105</sup><sup>106</sup><sup>107</sup><sup>108</sup><sup>109</sup><sup>110</sup><sup>111</sup><sup>112</sup><sup>113</sup><sup>114</sup><sup>115</sup><sup>116</sup><sup>117</sup><sup>118</sup><sup>119</sup><sup>120</sup><sup>121</sup><sup>122</sup><sup>123</sup><sup>124</sup><sup>125</sup><sup>126</sup><sup>127</sup><sup>128</sup><sup>129</sup><sup>130</sup><sup>131</sup><sup>132</sup><sup>133</sup><sup>134</sup><sup>135</sup><sup>136</sup><sup>137</sup><sup>138</sup><sup>139</sup><sup>140</sup><sup>141</sup><sup>142</sup><sup>143</sup><sup>144</sup><sup>145</sup><sup>146</sup><sup>147</sup><sup>148</sup><sup>149</sup><sup>150</sup><sup>151</sup><sup>152</sup><sup>153</sup><sup>154</sup><sup>155</sup><sup>156</sup><sup>157</sup><sup>158</sup><sup>159</sup><sup>160</sup><sup>161</sup><sup>162</sup><sup>163</sup><sup>164</sup><sup>165</sup><sup>166</sup><sup>167</sup><sup>168</sup><sup>169</sup><sup>170</sup><sup>171</sup><sup>172</sup><sup>173</sup><sup>174</sup><sup>175</sup><sup>176</sup><sup>177</sup><sup>178</sup><sup>179</sup><sup>180</sup><sup>181</sup><sup>182</sup><sup>183</sup><sup>184</sup><sup>185</sup><sup>186</sup><sup>187</sup><sup>188</sup><sup>189</sup><sup>190</sup><sup>191</sup><sup>192</sup><sup>193</sup><sup>194</sup><sup>195</sup><sup>196</sup><sup>197</sup><sup>198</sup><sup>199</sup><sup>200</sup><sup>201</sup><sup>202</sup><sup>203</sup><sup>204</sup><sup>205</sup><sup>206</sup><sup>207</sup><sup>208</sup><sup>209</sup><sup>210</sup><sup>211</sup><sup>212</sup><sup>213</sup><sup>214</sup><sup>215</sup><sup>216</sup><sup>217</sup><sup>218</sup><sup>219</sup><sup>220</sup><sup>221</sup><sup>222</sup><sup>223</sup><sup>224</sup><sup>225</sup><sup>226</sup><sup>227</sup><sup>228</sup><sup>229</sup><sup>230</sup><sup>231</sup><sup>232</sup><sup>233</sup><sup>234</sup><sup>235</sup><sup>236</sup><sup>237</sup><sup>238</sup><sup>239</sup><sup>240</sup><sup>241</sup><sup>242</sup><sup>243</sup><sup>244</sup><sup>245</sup><sup>246</sup><sup>247</sup><sup>248</sup><sup>249</sup><sup>250</sup><sup>251</sup><sup>252</sup><sup>253</sup><sup>254</sup><sup>255</sup><sup>256</sup><sup>257</sup><sup>258</sup><sup>259</sup><sup>260</sup><sup>261</sup><sup>262</sup><sup>263</sup><sup>264</sup><sup>265</sup><sup>266</sup><sup>267</sup><sup>268</sup><sup>269</sup><sup>270</sup><sup>271</sup><sup>272</sup><sup>273</sup><sup>274</sup><sup>275</sup><sup>276</sup><sup>277</sup><sup>278</sup><sup>279</sup><sup>280</sup><sup>281</sup><sup>282</sup><sup>283</sup><sup>284</sup><sup>285</sup><sup>286</sup><sup>287</sup><sup>288</sup><sup>289</sup><sup>290</sup><sup>291</sup><sup>292</sup><sup>293</sup><sup>294</sup><sup>295</sup><sup>296</sup><sup>297</sup><sup>298</sup><sup>299</sup><sup>300</sup><sup>301</sup><sup>302</sup><sup>303</sup><sup>304</sup><sup>305</sup><sup>306</sup><sup>307</sup><sup>308</sup><sup>309</sup><sup>310</sup><sup>311</sup><sup>312</sup><sup>313</sup><sup>314</sup><sup>315</sup><sup>316</sup><sup>317</sup><sup>318</sup><sup>319</sup><sup>320</sup><sup>321</sup><sup>322</sup><sup>323</sup><sup>324</sup><sup>325</sup><sup>326</sup><sup>327</sup><sup>328</sup><sup>329</sup><sup>330</sup><sup>331</sup><sup>332</sup><sup>333</sup><sup>334</sup><sup>335</sup><sup>336</sup><sup>337</sup><sup>338</sup><sup>339</sup><sup>340</sup><sup>341</sup><sup>342</sup><sup>343</sup><sup>344</sup><sup>345</sup><sup>346</sup><sup>347</sup><sup>348</sup><sup>349</sup><sup>350</sup><sup>351</sup><sup>352</sup><sup>353</sup><sup>354</sup><sup>355</sup><sup>356</sup><sup>357</sup><sup>358</sup><sup>359</sup><sup>360</sup><sup>361</sup><sup>362</sup><sup>363</sup><sup>364</sup><sup>365</sup><sup>366</sup><sup>367</sup><sup>368</sup><sup>369</sup><sup>370</sup><sup>371</sup><sup>372</sup><sup>373</sup><sup>374</sup><sup>375</sup><sup>376</sup><sup>377</sup><sup>378</sup><sup>379</sup><sup>380</sup><sup>381</sup><sup>382</sup><sup>383</sup><sup>384</sup><sup>385</sup><sup>386</sup><sup>387</sup><sup>388</sup><sup>389</sup><sup>390</sup><sup>391</sup><sup>392</sup><sup>393</sup><sup>394</sup><sup>395</sup><sup>396</sup><sup>397</sup><sup>398</sup><sup>399</sup><sup>400</sup><sup>401</sup><sup>402</sup><sup>403</sup><sup>404</sup><sup>405</sup><sup>406</sup><sup>407</sup><sup>408</sup><sup>409</sup><sup>410</sup><sup>411</sup><sup>412</sup><sup>413</sup><sup>414</sup><sup>415</sup><sup>416</sup><sup>417</sup><sup>418</sup><sup>419</sup><sup>420</sup><sup>421</sup><sup>422</sup><sup>423</sup><sup>424</sup><sup>425</sup><sup>426</sup><sup>427</sup><sup>428</sup><sup>429</sup><sup>430</sup><sup>431</sup><sup>432</sup><sup>433</sup><sup>434</sup><sup>435</sup><sup>436</sup><sup>437</sup><sup>438</sup><sup>439</sup><sup>440</sup><sup>441</sup><sup>442</sup><sup>443</sup><sup>444</sup><sup>445</sup><sup>446</sup><sup>447</sup><sup>448</sup><sup>449</sup><sup>450</sup><sup>451</sup><sup>452</sup><sup>453</sup><sup>454</sup><sup>455</sup><sup>456</sup><sup>457</sup><sup>458</sup><sup>459</sup><sup>460</sup><sup>461</sup><sup>462</sup><sup>463</sup><sup>464</sup><sup>465</sup><sup>466</sup><sup>467</sup><sup>468</sup><sup>469</sup><sup>470</sup><sup>471</sup><sup>472</sup><sup>473</sup><sup>474</sup><sup>475</sup><sup>476</sup><sup>477</sup><sup>478</sup><sup>479</sup><sup>480</sup><sup>481</sup><sup>482</sup><sup>483</sup><sup>484</sup><sup>485</sup><sup>486</sup><sup>487</sup><sup>488</sup><sup>489</sup><sup>490</sup><sup>491</sup><sup>492</sup><sup>493</sup><sup>494</sup><sup>495</sup><sup>496</sup><sup>497</sup><sup>498</sup><sup>499</sup><sup>500</sup><sup>501</sup><sup>502</sup><sup>503</sup><sup>504</sup><sup>505</sup><sup>506</sup><sup>507</sup><sup>508</sup><sup>509</sup><sup>510</sup><sup>511</sup><sup>512</sup><sup>513</sup><sup>514</sup><sup>515</sup><sup>516</sup><sup>517</sup><sup>518</sup><sup>519</sup><sup>520</sup><sup>521</sup><sup>522</sup><sup>523</sup><sup>524</sup><sup>525</sup><sup>526</sup><sup>527</sup><sup>528</sup><sup>529</sup><sup>530</sup><sup>531</sup><sup>532</sup><sup>533</sup><sup>534</sup><sup>535</sup><sup>536</sup><sup>537</sup><sup>538</sup><sup>539</sup><sup>540</sup><sup>541</sup><sup>542</sup><sup>543</sup><sup>544</sup><sup>545</sup><sup>546</sup><sup>547</sup><sup>548</sup><sup>549</sup><sup>550</sup><sup>551</sup><sup>552</sup><sup>553</sup><sup>554</sup><sup>555</sup><sup>556</sup><sup>557</sup><sup>558</sup><sup>559</sup><sup>560</sup><sup>561</sup><sup>562</sup><sup>563</sup><sup>564</sup><sup>565</sup><sup>566</sup><sup>567</sup><sup>568</sup><sup>569</sup><sup>570</sup><sup>571</sup><sup>572</sup><sup>573</sup><sup>574</sup><sup>575</sup><sup>576</sup><sup>577</sup><sup>578</sup><sup>579</sup><sup>580</sup><sup>581</sup><sup>582</sup><sup>583</sup><sup>584</sup><sup>585</sup><sup>586</sup><sup>587</sup><sup>588</sup><sup>589</sup><sup>590</sup><sup>591</sup><sup>592</sup><sup>593</sup><sup>594</sup><sup>595</sup><sup>596</sup><sup>597</sup><sup>598</sup><sup>599</sup><sup>600</sup><sup>601</sup><sup>602</sup><sup>603</sup><sup>604</sup><sup>605</sup><sup>606</sup><sup>607</sup><sup>608</sup><sup>609</sup><sup>610</sup><sup>611</sup><sup>612</sup><sup>613</sup><sup>614</sup><sup>615</sup><sup>616</sup><sup>617</sup><sup>618</sup><sup>619</sup><sup>620</sup><sup>621</sup><sup>622</sup><sup>623</sup><sup>624</sup><sup>625</sup><sup>626</sup><sup>627</sup><sup>628</sup><sup>629</sup><sup>630</sup><sup>631</sup><sup>632</sup><sup>633</sup><sup>634</sup><sup>635</sup><sup>636</sup><sup>637</sup><sup>638</sup><sup>639</sup><sup>640</sup><sup>641</sup><sup>642</sup><sup>643</sup><sup>644</sup><sup>645</sup><sup>646</sup><sup>647</sup><sup>648</sup><sup>649</sup><sup>650</sup><sup>651</sup><sup>652</sup><sup>653</sup><sup>654</sup><sup>655</sup><sup>656</sup><sup>657</sup><sup>658</sup><sup>659</sup><sup>660</sup><sup>661</sup><sup>662</sup><sup>663</sup><sup>664</sup><sup>665</sup><sup>666</sup><sup>667</sup><sup>668</sup><sup>669</sup><sup>670</sup><sup>671</sup><sup>672</sup><sup>673</sup><sup>674</sup><sup>675</sup><sup>676</sup><sup>677</sup><sup>678</sup><sup>679</sup><sup>680</sup><sup>681</sup><sup>682</sup><sup>683</sup><sup>684</sup><sup>685</sup><sup>686</sup><sup>687</sup><sup>688</sup><sup>689</sup><sup>690</sup><sup>691</sup><sup>692</sup><sup>693</sup><sup>694</sup><sup>695</sup><sup>696</sup><sup>697</sup><sup>698</sup><sup>699</sup><sup>700</sup><sup>701</sup><sup>702</sup><sup>703</sup><sup>704</sup><sup>705</sup><sup>706</sup><sup>707</sup><sup>708</sup><sup>709</sup><sup>710</sup><sup>711</sup><sup>712</sup><sup>713</sup><sup>714</sup><sup>715</sup><sup>716</sup><sup>717</sup><sup>718</sup><sup>719</sup><sup>720</sup><sup>721</sup><sup>722</sup><sup>723</sup><sup>724</sup><sup>725</sup><sup>726</sup><sup>727</sup><sup>728</sup><sup>729</sup><sup>730</sup><sup>731</sup><sup>732</sup><sup>733</sup><sup>734</sup><sup>735</sup><sup>736</sup><sup>737</sup><sup>738</sup><sup>739</sup><sup>740</sup><sup>741</sup><sup>742</sup><sup>743</sup><sup>744</sup><sup>745</sup><sup>746</sup><sup>747</sup><sup>748</sup><sup>749</sup><sup>750</sup><sup>751</sup><sup>752</sup><sup>753</sup><sup>754</sup><sup>755</sup><sup>756</sup><sup>757</sup><sup>758</sup><sup>759</sup><sup>760</sup><sup>761</sup><sup>762</sup><sup>763</sup><sup>764</sup><sup>765</sup><sup>766</sup><sup>767</sup><sup>768</sup><sup>769</sup><sup>770</sup><sup>771</sup><sup>772</sup><sup>773</sup><sup>774</sup><sup>775</sup><sup>776</sup><sup>777</sup><sup>778</sup><sup>779</sup><sup>780</sup><sup>781</sup><sup>782</sup><sup>783</sup><sup>784</sup><sup>785</sup><sup>786</sup><sup>787</sup><sup>788</sup><sup>789</sup><sup>790</sup><sup>791</sup><sup>792</sup><sup>793</sup><sup>794</sup><sup>795</sup><sup>796</sup><sup>797</sup><sup>798</sup><sup>799</sup><sup>800</sup><sup>801</sup><sup>802</sup><sup>803</sup><sup>804</sup><sup>805</sup><sup>806</sup><sup>807</sup><sup>808</sup><sup>809</sup><sup>810</sup><sup>811</sup><sup>812</sup><sup>813</sup><sup>814</sup><sup>815</sup><sup>816</sup><sup>817</sup><sup>818</sup><sup>819</sup><sup>820</sup><sup>821</sup><sup>822</sup><sup>823</sup><sup>824</sup><sup>825</sup><sup>826</sup><sup>827</sup><sup>828</sup><sup>829</sup><sup>830</sup><sup>831</sup><sup>832</sup><sup>833</sup><sup>834</sup><sup>835</sup><sup>836</sup><sup>837</sup><sup>838</sup><sup>839</sup><sup>840</sup><sup>841</sup><sup>842</sup><sup>843</sup><sup>844</sup><sup>845</sup><sup>846</sup><sup>847</sup><sup>848</sup><sup>849</sup><sup>850</sup><sup>851</sup><sup>852</sup><sup>853</sup><sup>854</sup><sup>855</sup><sup>856</sup><sup>857</sup><sup>858</sup><sup>859</sup><sup>860</sup><sup>861</sup><sup>862</sup><sup>863</sup><sup>864</sup><sup>865</sup><sup>866</sup><sup>867</sup><sup>868</sup><sup>869</sup><sup>870</sup><sup>871</sup><sup>872</sup><sup>873</sup><sup>874</sup><sup>875</sup><sup>876</sup><sup>877</sup><sup>878</sup><sup>879</sup><sup>880</sup><sup>881</sup><sup>882</sup><sup>883</sup><sup>884</sup><sup>885</sup><sup>886</sup><sup>887</sup><sup>888</sup><sup>889</sup><sup>890</sup><sup>891</sup><sup>892</sup><sup>893</sup><sup>894</sup><sup>895</sup><sup>896</sup><sup>897</sup><sup>898</sup><sup>899</sup><sup>900</sup><sup>901</sup><sup>902</sup><sup>903</sup><sup>904</sup><sup>905</sup><sup>906</sup><sup>907</sup><sup>908</sup><sup>909</sup><sup>910</sup><sup>911</sup><sup>912</sup><sup>913</sup><sup>914</sup><sup>915</sup><sup>916</sup><sup>917</sup><sup>918</sup><sup>919</sup><sup>920</sup><sup>921</sup><sup>922</sup><sup>923</sup><sup>924</sup><sup>925</sup><sup>926</sup><sup>927</sup><sup>928</sup><sup>929</sup><sup>930</sup><sup>931</sup><sup>932</sup><sup>933</sup><sup>934</sup><sup>935</sup><sup>936</sup><sup>937</sup><sup>938</sup><sup>939</sup><sup>940</sup><sup>941</sup><sup>942</sup><sup>943</sup><sup>944</sup><sup>945</sup><sup>946</sup><sup>947</sup><sup>948</sup><sup>949</sup><sup>950</sup><sup>951</sup><sup>952</sup><sup>953</sup><sup>954</sup><sup>955</sup><sup>956</sup><sup>957</sup><sup>958</sup><sup>959</sup><sup>960</sup><sup>961</sup><sup>962</sup><sup>963</sup><sup>964</sup><sup>965</sup><sup>966</sup><sup>967</sup><sup>968</sup><sup>969</sup><sup>970</sup><sup>971</sup><sup>972</sup><sup>973</sup><sup>974</sup><sup>975</sup><sup>976</sup><sup>977</sup><sup>978</sup><sup>979</sup><sup>980</sup><sup>981</sup><sup>982</sup><sup>983</sup><sup>984</sup><sup>985</sup><sup>986</sup><sup>987</sup><sup>988</sup><sup>989</sup><sup>990</sup><sup>991</sup><sup>992</sup><sup>993</sup><sup>994</sup><sup>995</sup><sup>996</sup><sup>997</sup><sup>998</sup><sup>999</sup><sup>1000</sup><sup>1001</sup><sup>1002</sup><sup>1003</sup><sup>1004</sup><sup>1005</sup><sup>1006</sup><sup>1007</sup><sup>1008</sup><sup>1009</sup><sup>1010</sup><sup>1011</sup><sup>1012</sup><sup>1013</sup><sup>1014</sup><sup>1015</sup><sup>1016</sup><sup>1017</sup><sup>1018</sup><sup>1019</sup><sup>1020</sup><sup>1021</sup><sup>1022</sup><sup>1023</sup><sup>1024</sup><sup>1025</sup><sup>1026</sup><sup>1027</sup><sup>1028</sup><sup>1029</sup><sup>1030</sup><sup>1031</sup><sup>1032</sup><sup>1033</sup><sup>1034</sup><sup>1035</sup><sup>1036</sup><sup>1037</sup><sup>1038</sup><sup>1039</sup><sup>1040</sup><sup>1041</sup><sup>1042</sup><sup>1043</sup><sup>1044</sup><sup>1045</sup><sup>1046</sup><sup>1047</sup><sup>1048</sup><sup>1049</sup><sup>1050</sup><sup>1051</sup><sup>1052</sup><sup>1053</sup><sup>1054</sup><sup>1055</sup><sup>1056</sup><sup>1057</sup><sup>1058</sup><sup>1059</sup><sup>1060</sup><sup>1061</sup><sup>1062</sup><sup>1063</sup><sup>1064</sup><sup>1065</sup><sup>1066</sup><sup>1067</sup><sup>1068</sup><sup>1069</sup><sup>1070</sup><sup>1071</sup><sup>1072</sup><sup>1073</sup><sup>1074</sup><sup>1075</sup><sup>1076</sup><sup>1077</sup><sup>1078</sup><sup>1079</sup><sup>1080</sup><sup>1081</sup><sup>1082</sup><sup>1083</sup><sup>1084</sup><sup>1085</sup><sup>1086</sup><sup>1087</sup><sup>1088</sup><sup>1089</sup><sup>1090</sup><sup>1091</sup><sup>1092</sup><sup>1093</sup><sup>1094</sup><sup>1095</sup><sup>1096</sup><sup>1097</sup><sup>1098</sup><sup>1099</sup><sup>1100</sup><sup>1101</sup><sup>1102</sup><sup>1103</sup><sup>1104</sup><sup>1105</sup><sup>1106</sup><sup>1107</sup><sup>1108</sup><sup>1109</sup><sup>1110</sup><sup>1111</sup><sup>1112</sup><sup>1113</sup><sup>1114</sup><sup>1115</sup><sup>1116</sup><sup>1117</sup><sup>1118</sup><sup>1119</sup><sup>1120</sup><sup>1121</sup><sup>1122</sup><sup>1123</sup><sup>1124</sup><sup>1125</sup><sup>1126</sup><sup>1127</sup><sup>1128</sup><sup>1129</sup><sup>1130</sup><sup>1131</sup><sup>1132</sup><sup>1133</sup><sup>1134</sup><sup>1135</sup><sup>1136</sup><sup>1137</sup><sup>1138</sup><sup>1139</sup><sup>1140</sup><sup>1141</sup><sup>1142</sup><sup>1143</sup><sup>1144</sup><sup>1145</sup><sup>1146</sup><sup>1147</sup><sup>1148</sup><sup>1149</sup><sup>1150</sup><sup>1151</sup><sup>1152</sup><sup>1153</sup><sup>1154</sup><sup>1155</sup><sup>1156</sup><sup>1157</sup><sup>1158</sup><sup>1159</sup><sup>1160</sup><sup>1161</sup><sup>1162</sup><sup>1163</sup><sup>1164</sup><sup>1165</sup><sup>1166</sup><sup>1167</sup><sup>1168</sup><sup>1169</sup><sup>1170</sup><sup>1171</sup><sup>1172</sup><sup>1173</sup><sup>1174</sup><sup>1175</sup><sup>1176</sup><sup>1177</sup><sup>1178</sup><sup>1179</sup><sup>1180</sup><sup>1181</sup><sup>1182</sup><sup>1183</sup><sup>1184</sup><sup>1185</sup><sup>1186</sup><sup>1187</sup><sup>1188</sup><sup>1189</sup><sup>1190</sup><sup>1191</sup><sup>1192</sup><sup>1193</sup><sup>1194</sup><sup>1195</sup><sup>1196</sup><sup>1197</sup><sup>1198</sup><sup>1199</sup><sup>1200</sup><sup>1201</sup><sup>1202</sup><sup>1203</sup><sup>1204</sup><sup>1205</sup><sup>1206</sup><sup>1207</sup><sup>1208</sup><sup>1209</sup><sup>1210</sup><sup>1211</sup><sup>1212</sup><sup>1213</sup><sup>1214</sup><sup>1215</sup><sup>1216</sup><sup>1217</sup><sup>1218</sup><sup>1219</sup><sup>1220</sup><sup>1221</sup><sup>1222</sup><sup>1223</sup><sup>1224</sup><sup>1225</sup><sup>1226</sup><sup>1227</sup><sup>1228</sup><sup>1229</sup><sup>1230</sup><sup>1231</sup><sup>1232</sup><sup>1233</sup><sup>1234</sup><sup>1235</sup><sup>1236</sup><sup>1237</sup><sup>1238</sup><sup>1239</sup><sup>1240</sup><sup>1241</sup><sup>1242</sup><sup>1243</sup><sup>1244</sup><sup>1245</sup><sup>1246</sup><sup>1247</sup><sup>1248</sup><sup>1249</sup><sup>1250</sup><sup>1251</sup><sup>1252</sup><sup>1253</sup><sup>1254</sup><sup>1255</sup><sup>1256</sup><sup>1257</sup><sup>1258</sup><sup>1259</sup><sup>1260</sup><sup>1261</sup><sup>1262</sup><sup>1263</sup><sup>1264</sup><sup>1265</sup><sup>1266</sup><sup>1267</sup><sup>1268</sup><sup>1269</sup><sup>1270</sup><sup>1271</sup><sup>1272</sup><sup>1273</sup><sup>1274</sup><sup>1275</sup><sup>1276</sup><sup>1277</sup><sup>1278</sup><sup>1279</sup><sup>1280</sup><sup>1281</sup><sup>1282</sup><sup>1283</sup><sup>1284</sup><sup>1285</sup><sup>1286</sup><sup>1287</sup><sup>1288</sup><sup>1289</sup><sup>1290</sup><sup>1291</sup><sup>1292</sup><sup>1293</sup><sup>1294</sup><sup>1295</sup><sup>1296</sup><sup>1297</sup><sup>1298</sup><sup>1299</sup><sup>1300</sup><sup>1301</sup><sup>1302</sup><sup>1303</sup><sup>1304</sup><sup>1305</sup><sup>1306</sup><sup>1307</sup><sup>1308</sup><sup>1309</sup><sup>1310</sup><sup>1311</sup><sup>1312</sup><sup>1313</sup><sup>1314</sup><sup>1315</sup><sup>1316</sup><sup>1317</sup><sup>1318</sup><sup>1319</sup><sup>1320</sup><sup>1321</sup><sup>1322</sup><sup>1323</sup><sup>1324</sup><sup>1325</sup><sup>1326</sup><sup>1327</sup><sup>1328</sup><sup>1329</sup><sup>1330</sup><sup>1331</sup><sup>1332</sup><sup>1333</sup><sup>1334</sup><sup>1335</sup><sup>1336</sup><sup>1337</sup><sup>1338</sup><sup>1339</sup><sup>1340</sup><sup>1341</sup><sup>1342</sup><sup>1343</sup><sup>1344</sup><sup>1345</sup><sup>1346</sup><sup>1347</sup><sup>1348</sup><sup>1349</sup><sup>1350</sup><sup>1351</sup><sup>1352</sup><sup>1353</sup><sup>1354</sup><sup>1355</sup><sup>1356</sup><sup>1357</sup><sup>1358</sup><sup>1359</sup><sup>1360</sup><sup>1361</sup><sup>1362</sup><sup>1363</sup><sup>1364</sup><sup>1365</sup><sup>1366</sup><sup>1367</sup><sup>1368</sup><sup>1369</sup><sup>1370</sup><sup>1371</sup><sup>1372</sup><sup>1373</sup><sup>1374</sup><sup>1375</sup><sup>1376</sup><sup>1377</sup><sup>1378</sup><sup>1379</sup><sup>1380</sup><sup>1381</sup><sup>1382</sup><sup>1383</sup><sup>1384</sup><sup>1385</sup><sup>1386</sup><sup>1387</sup><sup>1388</sup><sup>1389</sup><sup>1390</sup><sup>1391</sup><sup>1392</sup><sup>1393</sup><sup>1394</sup><sup>1395</sup><sup>1396</sup><sup>1397</sup><sup>1398</sup><sup>1399</sup><sup>1400</sup><sup>1401</sup><sup>1402</sup><sup>1403</sup><sup>1404</sup><sup>1405</sup><sup>1406</sup><sup>1407</sup><sup>1408</sup><sup>1409</sup><sup>1410</sup><sup>1411</sup><sup>1412</sup><sup>1413</sup><sup>1414</sup><sup>1415</sup><sup>1416</sup><sup>1417</sup><sup>1418</sup><sup>1419</sup><sup>1420</sup><sup>1421</sup><sup>1422</sup><sup>1423</sup><sup>1424</sup><sup>1425</sup><sup>1426</sup><sup>1427</sup><sup>1428</sup><sup>1429</sup><sup>1430</sup><sup>1431</sup><sup>1432</sup><sup>1433</sup><sup>1434</sup><sup>1435</sup><sup>1436</sup><sup>1437</sup><sup>1438</sup><sup>1439</sup><sup>1440</sup><sup>1441</sup><sup>1442</sup><sup>1443</sup><sup>1444</sup><sup>1445</sup><sup>1446</sup><sup>1447</sup><sup>1448</sup><sup>1449</sup><sup>1450</sup><sup>1451</sup><sup>1452</sup><sup>1453</sup><sup>1454</sup><sup>1455</sup><sup>1456</sup><sup>1457</sup><sup>1458</sup><sup>1459</sup><sup>1460</sup><sup>1461</sup><sup>1462</sup><sup>1463</sup><sup>1464</sup><sup>1465</sup><sup>1466</sup><sup>1467</sup><sup>1468</sup><sup>1469</sup><sup>1470</sup><sup>1471</sup><sup>1472</sup><sup>1473</sup><sup>1474</sup><sup>1475</sup><sup>1476</sup><sup>1477</sup><sup>1478</sup><sup>1479</sup><sup>1480</sup><sup>1481</sup><sup>1482</sup><sup>1483</sup><sup>1484</sup><sup>1485</sup><sup>1486</sup><sup>148</sup>

## JOKIM

<jo'-kim> ([~~μ~~ϣϣϣ~~ω~~ yoqim], “Yahweh raises up”; compare *JEHOIAKIM*; *JOIAKIM*): A Judahite, descendant of Shelah (~~1302~~ 1 Chronicles 4:22).

## JOKMEAM

<jok'-me-am> ([~~μ~~ ϣϣ~~ω~~; yoqme`am]): A town in Mt. Ephraim assigned to the Kohathite Levites (~~1368~~ 1 Chronicles 6:68), named along with Gezer and Beth-horon. Its place is taken by Kibzaim in ~~1622~~ Joshua 21:22 (in Septuagint here the name is omitted). It is mentioned again in ~~1042~~ 1 Kings 4:12 (the King James Version wrongly “Jokneam”), where it seems to indicate some position to the East of Ephraim. So far no identification is possible.

## JOKNEAM

<jok'-ne-am> ([~~μ~~ ϣϣ~~ω~~; yoqne`am]): A royal city of the Canaanites taken by Joshua and described as “in Carmel” (~~1622~~ Joshua 12:22), in the territory of Zebulun, and allotted to the Merarite Levites (21:34). The border of Zebulun “reached to the brook that is before Jokneam” (19:11). In ~~1042~~ 1 Kings 4:12 the name appears in the King James Version where, with the Revised Version (British and American), we should read “Jokmeam.” Eusebius, Onomasticon places it 6 Roman miles from Lejio (*Lejjun*) on the way to Ptolemais (Acre). This points to Tell Kaimun, a striking mound on the eastern slope of Mt. Carmel. To the East of it runs the “torrent bed” of the Kishon. It stands about 300 ft. above the valley to the North of it, and the sides are steep. It is crowned by the ruins of an 18th-century fortress. A little lower down are the remains of a small chapel. There are fine springs at the foot (PEFM, II, 69 f). In Judith 7:3 it appears as “Cyamon” ([~~Κ~~υαμ~~ω~~ν, *Kuamon*]). It is the “Mons Cain” of the Middle Ages. “In the Samaritan Book of Judges it is noticed as the scene of a conflict between the Hebrews and the Giants; and Joshua is said to have been shut up here in magic walls of brass, till on sending a dove to the Hebrew king of Gilead, he was rescued” (Conder, HDB, under the word).

*W. Ewing*

## JOKSHAN

<jok'-shan> ([<sup>ˈ</sup>vqj; yoqshan], meaning unknown): Son of Abraham and Keturah (<sup><1028></sup>Genesis 25:2,3 parallel <sup><1013></sup>1 Chronicles 1:32). Tuch suggested that yoqshan = yoqTan (<sup><1005></sup>Genesis 10:25-29); see HDB, under the word; Skinner, Gen, 350.

## JOKTAN

<jok'-tan> ([<sup>ˈ</sup>fqj; yoqTan], meaning unknown): “Son” of Eber, and “father” of 13 tribes (<sup><1005></sup>Genesis 10:25,26,29; <sup><1019></sup>1 Chronicles 1:19,20,23).

## JOKTHEEL

<jok'-the-el>, <jok'-thel> ([<sup>ˈ</sup>aθj; yoqethe'el]) :

(1) A city in the Shephelah of Judah named between Mizpeh and Lachish (<sup><1058></sup>Joshua 15:38); unidentified.

(2) A city in Edom formerly called Sela, taken by Amaziah after the battle in the Valley of Salt, and by him called Joktheel (<sup><1247></sup>2 Kings 14:7).

*See SELA.*

## JONA

<jo'-na>.

*See JONAH; JONAS.*

## JONADAB

<jon'-a-dab>.

*See JEHONADAB.*

## JONAH

<jo'-na> ([<sup>ˈ</sup>hnwQ yonah], “dove”; [<sup>ˈ</sup>Ionváz, Ionas]):

(1) According to <sup><1245></sup>2 Kings 14:25, Jonah, the son of Amittai, of Gath-hepher, a prophet and servant of Yahweh, predicted the restoration of the

land of Israel to its ancient boundaries through the efforts of Jeroboam II. The prophet lived and labored either in the early part of the reign of Jeroboam (790-750 BC), or during the preceding generation. He may with great probability be placed at 800-780 BC. His early ministry must have made him popular in Israel; for he prophesied of victory and expansion of territory. His native village of Gath-hepher was located in the territory of Zebulun (~~<6913>~~Joshua 19:13).

**(2)** According to the book bearing his name, Jonah the son of Amittai received a command to preach to Nineveh; but he fled in the opposite direction to escape from the task of proclaiming Yahweh's message to the great heathen city; was arrested by a storm, and at his own request was hurled into the sea, where he was swallowed by a great fish, remaining alive in the belly of the fish for three days. When on his release from the body of the fish the command to go to Nineveh was renewed, Jonah obeyed and announced the overthrow of the wicked city. When the men of Nineveh repented at the preaching of the prophet, God repented of the evil He had threatened to bring upon them. Jonah was grieved that the oppressing city should be spared, and waited in the vicinity to see what would be the final outcome. An intense patriot, Jonah wished for the destruction of the people that threatened to swallow up Israel. He thought that Yahweh was too merciful to the heathen oppressors. By the lesson of the gourd he was taught the value of the heathen in the sight of Yahweh.

It is the fashion now in scholarly circles to treat the Book of Jonah as fiction. The story is said to be an allegory or a parable or a symbolic narrative. Why then did the author fasten upon a true and worthy prophet of Yahweh the stigma of rebellion and narrowness? On theory that the narrative is an allegory, J. Kennedy well says that "the man who wrote it was guilty of a gratuitous insult to the memory of a prophet, and could not have been inspired by the prophet's Master thus to dishonor a faithful servant."

**(3)** our Lord referred on two different occasions to the sign of Jonah the prophet (~~<1028>~~Matthew 12:38-41; ~~<1123>~~Luke 11:29-32; ~~<1064>~~Matthew 16:4). He speaks of Jonah's experience in the belly of the fish as parallel with His own approaching entombment for three days, and cites the repentance of the Ninevites as a rebuke to the unbelieving men of his own generation. Our Lord thus speaks both of the physical miracle of the preservation of Jonah in the body of the fish and of the moral miracle of the repentance of

the Ninevites, and without the slightest hint that He regarded the story as an allegory.

*John Richard Sampey*

## **JONAH, THE BOOK OF**

This little roll of four short chapters has given rise to almost as much discussion and difference of opinion as the first four chapters of Genesis. It would be presumptuous to think that one could, in a brief article, speak the final word on the questions in debate.

### **I. CONTENTS OF THE BOOK.**

The story is too well known to need retelling. Moreover, it would be difficult to give the events in fewer words than the author employs in his classic narrative. One event grows out of another, so that the interest of the reader never flags.

#### *1. Jonah Disobedient, <3300>Jonah 1:1-3:*

When the call came to Jonah to preach in Nineveh, he fled in the opposite direction, hoping thus to escape from his unpleasant task. He was afraid that the merciful God would forgive the oppressing heathen city, if it should repent at his preaching. Jonah was a narrow-minded patriot, who feared that Assyria would one day swallow up his own little nation; and so he wished to do nothing that might lead to the preservation of wicked Nineveh. Jonah was willing to prophesy to Israel; he at first flatly refused to become a foreign missionary.

#### *2. Jonah Punished, <3300>Jonah 1:4-16:*

The vessel in which the prophet had taken passage was arrested by a great storm. The heathen sailors inferred that some god must be angry with some person on board, and cast lots to discover the culprit. When the lot fell upon Jonah, he made a complete confession, and bravely suggested that they cast him overboard. The heathen mariners rowed desperately to get back to land, but made no progress against the storm. They then prayed Yahweh not to bring innocent blood upon them, and cast Jonah into the sea. As the storm promptly subsided, the heathen sailors offered a sacrifice to Yahweh and made vows. In this part of the story the mariners give an example of the capacity of the Gentiles to perform noble deeds and to offer acceptable worship to Yahweh.



### *3. Jonah Miraculously Preserved, <3017>Jonah 1:17 through 2:10:*

Yahweh prepared a great fish to swallow Jonah and to bear him in his body for three days and nights. Surprised to find himself alive and conscious in the body of the fish, the prophet prayed to his God. Already by faith he speaks of his danger as a past experience. The God who had saved him from drowning in the depths of the sea will yet permit him once more to worship with loud thanksgiving. At the command of Yahweh the fish vomits out Jonah upon the dry land. The almost inevitable grotesqueness of this part of the story is one of the strongest arguments against the view that the Book of Jonah is literal history and not a work of the imagination.

### *4. Jonah's Ministry in Nineveh, <3018>Jonah 3:1-4:*

Upon the renewal of the command to go to Nineveh, Jonah obeyed, and marching through the streets of the great city, he cried, "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown!" His message was so brief that he may well have spoken it in good Assyrian. If the story of his deliverance from the sea preceded him, or was made known through the prophet himself, the effect of the prophetic message was thereby greatly heightened.

### *5. The Ninevites Repent, <3019>Jonah 3:5-10:*

The men of Nineveh repented at the preaching of Jonah, the entire city uniting in fasting and prayer. So great was the anxiety of the people that even the lower animals were clothed in sackcloth. The men of Nineveh turned from deeds of violence ("their evil way") to seek the forgiveness of an angry God. Yahweh decided to spare the city.

### *6. A Narrow Prophet versus the Merciful God, <3020>Jonah 4:1-11:*

Jonah breaks out into loud and bitter complaint when he learns that Nineveh is to be spared. He decides to encamp near the city to see what will become of it. He hopes it may yet be overthrown. Through a gourd vine Yahweh teaches the prophet a great lesson. If such a mean and perishable plant could come to have real value in the eyes of the sullen prophet, what estimate ought to be put on the lives of the thousands of innocent children and helpless cattle in the great city of Nineveh? These were dearer to the God of heaven than Jonah's protecting vine could possibly be to him.

## II. THE AIM OF THE BOOK.

The main purpose of the writer was to enlarge the sympathies of Israel and lead the chosen people to undertake the great missionary task of proclaiming the truth to the heathen world. Other lessons may be learned from the subordinate parts of the narrative, but this is the central truth of the Book of Jonah. Kent well expresses the author's main message: "In his wonderful picture of God's love for all mankind, and of the Divine readiness to pardon and to save even the ignorant heathen, if they but repent according to their light, he has anticipated the teaching of the parable of the Prodigal Son, and laid the foundation for some of the broadest faith and the noblest missionary activity of the present generation" (Sermon, Epistles, etc., 420).

## III. IS THE BOOK HISTORY?

### *1. What Did our Lord Teach?:*

Most of the early interpreters so understood it, and some excellent scholars still hold this view. If Jesus thought of the story as history and so taught, that fact alone would settle the question for the devout believer. On two, possibly three, different occasions He referred to Jonah (<sup>4128</sup>Matthew 12:38-41; 16:4; <sup>4129</sup>Luke 11:29-32). It is significant that Jesus brought the two great miracles of the Book of Jonah into relation with Himself and His preaching. As Jonah was three days and three nights in the body of the fish, so should the Son of Man be three days in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh repented at the preaching of Jonah, while the contemporaries of Jesus for the most part rejected His message. It is the fashion now among advanced critics to treat <sup>4124</sup>Matthew 12:40 as an addition to the words of Jesus, though there is no manuscript evidence in favor of regarding the verse as an interpolation. G.A. Smith, among recent scholars, holds the view that Jesus did not mean to teach the historicity of Jonah's experience in the fish.

"Christ is using an illustration: it matters not whether that illustration be drawn from the realms of fact or of poetry" (BTP, II, 508). In a footnote Dr. Smith says: "Suppose we tell slothful people that theirs will be the fate of the man who buried his talent, is this to commit us to the belief that the personages of Christ's parables actually existed? Or take the homiletic use of Shakespeare's dramas — 'as Macbeth did,' or 'as Hamlet said.' Does it commit us to the historical reality of Macbeth or Hamlet? Any preacher

among us would resent being bound by such an inference. And if we resent this for ourselves, how chary we should be about seeking to bind our Lord by it.”

Notwithstanding Principal Smith’s skillful presentation of his case, we still think that our Lord regarded the miracles of the fish and the repentance of the Ninevites as actual events. Orelli puts the matter judiciously: “It is not, indeed, proved with conclusive necessity that, if the resurrection of Jesus was a physical fact, Jonah’s abode in the fish’s belly must also be just as historical. On this point also the saying, ‘A greater than Jonah is here,’ holds good. But, on the other hand, how arbitrary it is to assert, with Reuss, that Jesus regarded Jonah’s history as a parable! On the contrary, Jesus saw in it a sign, a powerful evidence of the same Divine power which showed itself also in His dying in order to live again and triumph in the world. Whoever, therefore, feels the religious greatness of the book, and accepts as authoritative the attitude taken to its historical import by the Son of God Himself, will be led to accept a great act of the God who brings down to Hades and brings up again, as an actual experience of Jonah in his flight from his Lord” (The Twelve Minor Prophets, 172, 3).

## *2. Modern Critical Views:*

Most modern critical scholars since Kleinert (1868) and Bloch (1875) have regarded the Book of Jonah as a work of the imagination. Some prefer to call it an allegory, others a parable, others a prose poem, others a didactic story, others a midrash, others a symbolical book. Keil, Pusey, Delitzsch, Orelli, J. Kennedy and others have contended for the historical character of the narrative. A few treat it as a legend containing a kernel of fact. Cheyne and a few other scholars assert that in the symbolic narrative are imbedded mythical elements. The trend of critical opinion, even in evangelical circles, has of late been toward the symbolical interpretation. Radical critics boldly set aside the teaching of Jesus as erroneous, while the more evangelical take refuge either in the doctrine of the Kenosis (Phil 2:5-8), or in the principle of accommodation. The last explanation might commend itself to the devout student, namely, that Jesus did not think it worth while to correct the views of his contemporaries, had our Lord not spoken more than once of the sign of Jonah, and in such detail as to indicate His acceptance of the entire narrative with its two great miracles.

#### IV. AUTHORSHIP AND DATE.

The old view that Jonah was the author is still held by some scholars, though most moderns place the book in the late exilic or post-exilic times. A few Aramaic words occur in the Hebrew text. The question in debate is whether the language of Israel in the days of Jeroboam II had taken over words from the Aramaic. There had certainly been a century of close political and commercial contact between Israel and the Arameans of Damascus, so that it would not be surprising to meet with Aramaic words in a prophet of Samaria. Hosea, in the generation following Jonah, betrays little evidence of Aramaic influence in his style and vocabulary. Of course, the personal equation is a factor that ought not to be overlooked. If the author was a Judean, we should probably have to think of the post-exilic period, when Aramaic began to displace Hebrew as the vernacular of the Jews. The Book of Jonah is anonymous, and we really do not know who the author was or when he lived. The view that Jonah wrote the story of his own disobedience and his debate with the merciful God has not been made wholly untenable.

#### V. THE UNITY OF THE BOOK

Nachtigal (1799) contended that there were three different authors of widely different periods. Kleinert (1868) held that two parallel narratives had been woven together in Jonah 3 and 4. Kaufmann Kohler (1879) contended that there were a considerable number of glosses and interpolations besides some transpositions of material. W. Bohme, in 1887, advanced the most radical theory of the composition of the roll. He partitioned the story among two authors, and two redactors or supplementers. A few additional glosses were charged to later hands. Even radical critics treat Bohme's theory as one of the curiosities of criticism. Winckler (AOF, II, 260 ff) tried to improve the story by a few transpositions. Hans Schmidt (1905) subjects the roll of Jonah to a searching criticism, and concludes that a good many changes have been made from religious motives. Budde follows Winckler and Schmidt both in transposing and in omitting some material. Sievers (1905) and Erbt (1907) tried to make of the Book of Jonah a poem; but they do not agree as to the meter. Sievers regards the roll as a unit, while Erbt contends for two main sources besides the prayer in Jonah 2. Bewer, in ICC (1912), is far more conservative in both textual and literary criticism, recognizing but few glosses in our present text and arguing for the unity of the story apart from

the insertion of the psalm in Jonah 2. Nearly all recent critics assign Jonah's prayer to a writer other than the author of the narrative about Jonah, but opinions vary widely as to the manner in which the psalm found its way into the Book of Jon. Bewer holds that it was probably put on the margin by a reader and afterward crept into the text, the copyist inserting it after 2:2, though it would more naturally follow 2:11. Bewer remarks: "The literary connections with various post-exilic psalms argue for a post-exilic date of the psalm. But how early or how late in the post-exilic period it belongs we cannot tell. The Hebrew is pure and no Aramaic influence is apparent." It is evident, then, that the presence or absence of Aramaic influence does not alone settle the question of the date of the document. Geography and the personal equation may be more important than the question of date. Bewer recognizes the fact that the psalm in Jonah is not a mere cento of quotations from the Psalms. "The phrases it has in common with other psalms," writes Professor Bewer, "were the common property of the religious language of the author's day" (p. 24). Those who still believe that David wrote many of the psalms find no difficulty in believing that a prophet of 780 BC could have drawn upon his knowledge of the Psalter in a prayer of thanksgiving to Yahweh.

### LITERATURE.

Among commentaries covering the twelve Minor Prophets, see especially Pusey (1861), Keil (English translation, 1880), von Orelli (English translation, 1893), Wellhausen (1898), G.A. Smith (1898). Among special commentaries on Jonah, consult Kleinert, in Lange (English translation, 1875); Perowne, in Cambridge Bible (1897); Bewer in ICC (1912). See also C. H. H. Wright, *Biblical Essays* (1886); H. C. Trumbull, "Jonah in Nineveh," *JBL*, XI (1892); J. Kennedy, *Book of Jonah* (1895); König in *HDB*; Cheyne in *EB*. For more elaborate bibliography see Bewer in *ICC*, 25-27.

*John Richard Sampey*

### JONAM

<jo'-nam> ([<sup>ϛ</sup> Ἰωνάμ, *Ionam*], Westcott and Hort, *The New Testament in Greek*; [<sup>ϛ</sup> Ἰωνάν, *Ionan*], *Textus Receptus of the New Testament*; the King James Version *Jonan*): An ancestor of Jesus in Luke's genealogy (~~αδελφου~~ Luke 3:30).

## JONAN

<jo'-nan>.

*See JONAM.*

## JONAS (1)

<jo'-nas> ([<sup>ʾ</sup>Ιωνάς, *Ionas*]; the King James Version, Jonan):

- (1) Son of Eliasib (1 Esdras 9:1).
- (2) Corresponds in 1 Esdras 9:23 to “Eliezer” in Ezr 10:23.
- (3) The prophet Jonah (2 Esdras 1:39; Tobit 14:4,8).

## JONAS (2)

<jo'-nas> ([<sup>h</sup>νωϞ yonah], or [<sup>ˆ</sup>nj ϞϞ yochanan]; [<sup>ʾ</sup>Ιωνά, *Iona*]):

- (1) The name given in <sup><R123></sup>Matthew 12:39-41; 16:4; <sup><R123></sup>Luke 11:29-32 the King James Version to the Old Testament prophet Jonah (the Revised Version (British and American) renders “Jonah”).

*See JONAH.*

- (2) ([<sup>ʾ</sup>Ιωάνης, *Ioanes*]): The name given in <sup><R215></sup>John 21:15,16 the King James Version to the father of the apostle Simon Peter. Nothing further is known of him, except the different forms of his name. In <sup><R142></sup>John 1:42 the King James Version he is called Jona (compare also <sup><R167></sup>Matthew 16:17 the King James Version). In <sup><R142></sup>John 1:42; 21:15,16 the Revised Version (British and American) he is called John, with the marginal note “Gr Joanes.” In <sup><R167></sup>Matthew 16:17 the Revised Version (British and American) Simon Peter is called Simon Bar-Jonah.

Jonas may be a contraction for Joanes (Keim). It has also been suggested that the father of Simon may have had a double name, Jona-Johannes (compare F. H. Chase in HDB, article “John, father of Simon Peter”).

*C. M. Kerr*

## JONATH ELEM REHOKIM

<jo'-nath> <e'-lem> <re-ho'-kim> ([<sup>pyqj</sup> σ]μl ætn" w<sup>Q</sup> yonath 'elem rechoqim]) (Psalm 56, title): "The silent dove of the far ones" (i.e. either of far-off lands, or among aliens), or "The dove of the distant terebinths," in either case indicating the tune to the melody of which the psalm was to be sung.

*See PSALMS; SONG.*

## JONATHAN (1)

<jon'-a-than> ([<sup>t nw</sup>θy] yehonathan], [<sup>t nw</sup>Q yonathan], "Yahweh has given"; [<sup>l w</sup>αθάv, *Jonathan*]; compare **JEHONATHAN**):

**(1)** (Hebrew *yehonathan*): The young "Levite" of Judges 17; 18 referred to by name in 18:30, where he is called "the son of Gershom, the son of Moses," and where the King James Version has "Manasseh" for Moses, following the Massoretic Text in which the letter nun of Manasseh is "suspended."

Rashi states the reason thus: "Because of the honor of Moses was the nun written so as to alter the name." The original word was Moses, but it was thought undesirable that a descendant of his should have anything to do with images; and so Jonathan was made to have affinity (metaphorically) with Manasseh. See GB, Intro, 335-38.

Jonathan was a Levitical Judahite of Beth-lehem-judah, who came to the house of Micah, in the hill country of Ephraim, and hired himself as a priest in Micah's sanctuary (<sup>OTOL</sup>Judges 17:1-13). The Danites sent 5 men north to spy for new territory, and on their way the spies came to the house of Micah, where they found Jonathan and consulted the oracle through him (<sup>OTOL</sup>Judges 18:1-5). Having received a favorable answer, they set out and came to Laish, and on their return south they advised that an expedition be sent thither (<sup>OTOL</sup>Judges 18:6-10). Their clansmen accordingly sent out a band of warriors who on their way passed by Micah's house. The spies informed their comrades of the ephod and teraphim and images there, and they seized them, inducing Jonathan at the same time to accompany them as their priest (<sup>OTOL</sup>Judges 18:11-20). At Laish he founded a priesthood which was thus descended from Moses (<sup>OTOL</sup>Judges 18:30).

It has been held that there are two sources in the narrative in Judges 17; 18 (see Moore, Judges, 365-72). The section is important because of the light it throws on life and religion in early Israel. The “Levites” were not all of one tribe (see Moore, op. cit., 383-84); there were priests who claimed descent from Moses as well as Aaronite priests; and images were common in early Hebrew worship (compare <sup><1310></sup>Genesis 31:30 ff; <sup><1087></sup>Judges 8:27; <sup><1093></sup>1 Samuel 19:13).

(2) Son of King Saul. See separate article.

(3) (Hebrew *yehonathan*, *yonathan*, <sup><1057></sup>2 Samuel 15:27,36; 17:17,20; <sup><1042></sup>1 Kings 1:42,43): Son of Abiathar the priest. He acted with Ahimaaz as courier to inform David of events at Jerusalem during Absalom’s revolt. It was he who also brought to Adonijah the news of Solomon’s accession.

(4) (Hebrew *yehonathan*, <sup><1221></sup>2 Samuel 21:21 parallel <sup><1310></sup>1 Chronicles 20:7): Son of Shimei or Shimea, David’s brother; he is said to be the slayer of Goliath.

*See JEHONADAB (1).*

(5) (<sup><1232></sup>2 Samuel 23:32, Hebrew *yehonathan* = <sup><13134></sup>1 Chronicles 11:34, Hebrew *yonathan*): One of David’s mighty men.

*See JASHEN.*

(6) (Hebrew *yonathan*, <sup><1232></sup>1 Chronicles 2:32,33): A Jerahmeelite.

(7) (Hebrew *yehonathan*, and so <sup><1375></sup>1 Chronicles 27:25 the King James Version): Son of Uzziah, and one of David’s treasurers.

(8) (Hebrew *yehonathan*, <sup><1375></sup>1 Chronicles 27:32): A *dodh* of David, the Revised Version (British and American) “uncle,” the Revised Version margin “brother’s son”; if he was David’s nephew, he will be the same as

(4) above. He “was a counselor” to David, and “a man of understanding, and a scribe.”

(9) (Hebrew *yonathan*, Ezr 8:6; 1 Esdras 8:32): Father of Ebed, a returned exile.

(10) (Hebrew *yonathan*, Ezr 10:15; 1 Esdras 9:14): One who either supported (Revised Version (British and American)) or opposed (Revised



Version margin, the King James Version) Ezra in the matter of foreign marriages; *see JAHZEIAH*.

(11) (Hebrew *yonathan*, <sup><4621></sup>Nehemiah 12:11): A priest, descendant of Jeshua (Joshua) = “Johanan” (<sup><4622></sup>Nehemiah 12:22,23); *see JEHOHANAN*, (3).

(12) (Hebrew *yonathan*, <sup><4624></sup>Nehemiah 12:14): A priest.

(13) (Hebrew *yonathan*, <sup><4625></sup>Nehemiah 12:35): A priest, father of Zechariah.

(14) (Hebrew *yehonathan*, <sup><2475></sup>Jeremiah 37:15,20; 38:26): A scribe in whose house Jeremiah was imprisoned.

(15) (Hebrew *yonathan*, <sup><2408></sup>Jeremiah 40:8): Son of Kareah; a Judahite captain who joined Gedaliah after the fall of Jerusalem.

(16) ([<sup>ˈ</sup>Ιωνάθης, *Ionathes*], 1 Macc 2:5; 9 through 13; and [<sup>ˈ</sup>Ιναθάβ, *Inathan*] 2 Macc 8:22; Swete reads *Ionathes*): The Maccabee surnamed Apphus in 1 Macc 2:5, son of Mattathias.

(17) Son of Absalom (1 Macc 13:11). He was sent by Simon the Maccabee to capture Joppa (compare 1 Macc 11:70, where there is mentioned a Mattathias, son of Absalom).

(18) A priest who led in prayer at the first sacrifice after the return from exile (2 Macc 1:23).

*David Francis Roberts*

## JONATHAN (2)

([<sup>˘</sup>תנחניך] *yehonathan*]; also [<sup>˘</sup>תנחנך] *yonathan*], “Yahweh has given”; [<sup>ˈ</sup>Ιωνάθβ, *Ionathan*]): The eldest son of Saul, the first king of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin.

### 1. THREE PERIODS:

The life of Jonathan, as far as we are told about him, falls naturally into 3 periods.

*(1) First Period.*

He comes on the scene as the right hand and lieutenant of his father in his early struggles to beat off the hostile tribes, especially the Ammonites (1 Samuel 11), who beset the territory of Israel on all sides. As soon as Saul had gained his first decisive victory, the people rallied to him in great numbers, so that he was able to count upon 3,000 men whenever they took the field. These were divided into two small armies, Saul retaining 2,000 and making Michmash his headquarters, the rest being stationed at Gibeah under Jonathan, some 5 miles distant as the crow flies. Jonathan thus commanded the base, while his father led the fighting force. This position of comparative inactivity does not appear to have been much to the taste of Jonathan. Midway between the two camps was a Philistine outpost at Geba, facing Michmash across the pass of that name, a valley with steep sides, now the Wady Suweinit. Saul does not seem to have felt himself strong enough to commence hostilities against the Philistines, and took means to increase the forces at his disposal. The Philistines no sooner heard that the Israelites had cast off their yoke (<sup>Q13B</sup>1 Samuel 13:3b: for "Let the Hebrews hear," read "The Hebrews have revolted," after the Septuagint), than they came out in great numbers (<sup>Q13E</sup>1 Samuel 13:5). They seem to have compelled Saul to evacuate Michmash, which they occupied, Saul falling back on Gibeah (<sup>Q13F</sup>1 Samuel 13:16) and Gilgal with a greatly reduced following (<sup>Q13D</sup>1 Samuel 13:3,4a seems to be a summary anticipation, in Hebrew style, of the events detailed in 1 Samuel 14). In spite of this, Jonathan, accompanied only by his armor-bearer, surprised the Philistine outpost at Geba (<sup>Q14E</sup>1 Samuel 14:5, "Gibeah" should be "Geba"), which was killed to a man. This feat precipitated a general engagement, in which the Israelites, whose only weapons appear to have been their farming implements (<sup>Q13D</sup>1 Samuel 13:20), Saul and Jonathan alone being armed with iron swords and spears, routed their enemies. The completeness of the victory was impaired by the superstitious action of Saul in refusing to allow the people to eat until the day was over (<sup>Q14E</sup>1 Samuel 14:24). As this order was unwittingly broken by Jonathan, Saul wished to have him executed; but this the people refused to allow, as they clearly recognized that the credit of the victory was due to the energetic action of Jonathan in striking before the enemy had time to concentrate. (In the Hebrew text there is some confusion between Gibeah and Geba; compare <sup>Q14E</sup>1 Samuel 10:5 margin and 13:3.)

## *(2) Second Period.*

The 2nd period of the life of Jonathan is that of his friendship for David. The narrative is too well known to need recapitulating, and the simple tale would only be spoiled by telling it in other words. Jonathan's devotion to David was such that he not only took his part against his father, Saul (1 Samuel 18; 19), but was willing to surrender to him his undoubted claim to become Saul's successor (1 Samuel 20). Their last meeting took place in the "desert" of Ziph, to the South of Hebron, some time after David had been driven into outlawry (~~<0236>~~ 1 Samuel 23:16-18).

## *(3) Third Period.*

The 3rd phase of Jonathan's life is that of the exile of David, when Saul was directing his energies to combat what he no doubt considered the rebellion of the son of Jesse. During this civil war, if that can be called war in which one of the two sides refuses to take the offensive against the other, Jonathan remained entirely passive. He could not take part in proceedings which were directed against his friend whom he believed to be destined to occupy the place which he himself should in the ordinary course of events have filled. We therefore hear no more of Jonathan until the encroachments of the Philistines once more compelled Saul to leave the pursuit of the lesser enemy in order to defend himself against the greater. Saul's last campaign against the Philistines was short and decisive: it ended in the defeat of Gilboa and the death of himself and his sons. The men of Jabesh-gilead, out of gratitude for Saul's rescue of their town at the beginning of his reign, crossed over to Beth-shan, on the walls of which town the Philistines had hung in chains the bodies of Saul and Jonathan, and took them down under cover of darkness and carried them to Jabesh. There they burned the bodies after the manner of the primitive inhabitants of the land, and buried the bones.

## **2. HIS CHARACTER:**

If we may judge from the little which has been handed down to us concerning him, Jonathan must have been one of the finest spirits that ever lived. His character is, as far as our knowledge goes, nearly perfect. He was athletic and brave (~~<0413>~~ 1 Samuel 14:13; ~~<1012>~~ 2 Samuel 1:22,23).

### 3. MILITARY QUALITIES:

He could keep his plans secret when secrecy was necessary in order to carry them to a successful issue (<sup><0941></sup>1 Samuel 14:1), and could decide on what course of action to follow and act upon it on the instant. His attack upon the Philistine garrison at Geba (or Gibeah, if we adopt the reading of the Septuagint and Targum of <sup><0938></sup>1 Samuel 13:3; compare 10:5) was delivered at the right moment, and was as wise as it was daring. If he had a fault, from a military point of view, it may have been an inability to follow up an advantage. The pursuit of the Philistines on the occasion referred to ended with nightfall. In this respect, however, he perhaps cannot be censured with justice, as he never had an entirely free hand.

### 4. FILIAL PIETY:

Jonathan's independence and capacity for acting on his own responsibility were combined with devotion to his father. While holding his own opinion and taking his own course, he conformed as far as possible to his father's views and wishes. While convinced of the high deserts of David, he sought by all means to mitigate Saul's hatred toward him, and up to a certain point he succeeded (<sup><0906></sup>1 Samuel 19:6). Filial duty could not have been more severely tested than was that of Jonathan, but his conduct toward both his father and his friend is above criticism. Only on one occasion did his anger get the better of him (<sup><0934></sup>1 Samuel 20:34) under gross provocation, Saul having impugned the honor of Jonathan's mother (<sup><0928></sup>1 Samuel 20:30, Septuagint) Ahinoam (<sup><0945></sup>1 Samuel 14:50), and attempted his life. The estrangement was momentary; Saul and Jonathan were undivided in life and in death (<sup><1023></sup>2 Samuel 1:23 to be so read).

### 5. FRIENDSHIP FOR DAVID:

But it is as the befriender of David that Jonathan will always be remembered. He is the type of the very perfect friend, as well as of the chivalrous knight, for all time. His devotion to David was altogether human; had it been dictated by a superstitious belief in David's destiny as the future ruler of his people (<sup><0927></sup>1 Samuel 23:17), that belief would have been shared by Saul, which was not the case (<sup><0931></sup>1 Samuel 20:31). In disinterestedness and willingness to efface his own claims and give up his own titles the conduct of Jonathan is unsurpassed, and presents a pleasing contrast to some of the characters with whom we meet in the Bible. In this

respect he resembles `Ali, the cousin and son-in-law of Muhammad, who was the bravest of the brave, save when fighting in his own cause, and who had no ambition to fill the highest posts. So Jonathan preferred to serve rather than to command (<sup><0237></sup>1 Samuel 23:17). Jonathan and David stand for the highest ideal of Hebrew friendship, as do Damon and Pythias in Greek literature.

## 6. INSPIRED AFFECTION:

We may be sure that Jonathan won the affection of the people. His squire was ready to follow him anywhere (<sup><0407></sup>1 Samuel 14:7). David's devotion to him seems to have been sincere, although it unfortunately coincided with his own self-interest. Jonathan appears to have inspired as great an affection as he himself felt (<sup><0241></sup>1 Samuel 20:41; <sup><0126></sup>2 Samuel 1:26). His quarrel with his father was largely due to the solicitude of the latter for his son's interests (<sup><0829></sup>1 Samuel 18:29; 20:31).

## 7. HIS DESCENDANTS:

Jonathan's sons were, in common with his brother's, killed in the wars. One alone — Meribbaal (Mephibosheth) — survived. Jonathan's posterity through him lasted several generations. A table of them is given in <sup><1883></sup>1 Chronicles 8:33 ff parallel 9:40 ff (compare <sup><0912></sup>2 Samuel 9:12). They were famous soldiers and were, like their ancestors, distinguished in the use of the bow (<sup><1380></sup>1 Chronicles 8:40).

*Thomas Hunter Weir*

## JONATHAS

<jon'-a-thas> (Swete reads [<sup>Ἰαθαῶν</sup>, *Iathan*], in Codex Vaticanus; [<sup>Ναθαῶν</sup>, *Nathan*], in Codex Sinaiticus): The Latin form of the common name "Jonathan" (Tobit 5:13). *See JATHAN*. It is sometimes represented as Nathan.

## JOPPA

<jop'-a> ([<sup>Ἰωππῆ</sup>, *yapho*], [<sup>Ἰωππῆ</sup>, *yapho'*]; [<sup>Ἰόππη</sup>, *Ioppe*]): In <sup><0346></sup>Joshua 19:46 the King James Version called "Japho," a city in the territory allotted to Dan; but there is nothing to show that in pre-exilic times it ever passed into Israelite hands.

## 1. ANCIENT NOTICES:

“The gate of Joppa” is mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna Letters (214, 32 f; compare 178, 20), as guarded by an Egyptian officer for Amenhotep IV. It was conquered by Thothmes III, and old Egyptian records speak of the excellence of its gardens and fruit trees. Sennacherib claims to have taken Jonathas after a siege (Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, 2, 93). To Jonathas, the Chronicler tells us, the cedars of Lebanon were brought in floats for transportation to Jerusalem by the workmen of the king of Tyre (~~4016~~2 Chronicles 2:16).

## 2. BIBLICAL REFERENCES:

The city does not appear in the history as Philistine, so we may, perhaps, infer that it was held by the Phoenicians, the great seamen of those days. It was doubtless a Phoenician ship that Jonah found here, bound for Tarshish, when he fled from the presence of the Lord (~~3008~~Jonah 1:3). In Ezra’s time, again, cedars were brought here for the buildings in Jerusalem (Ezr 3:7). Having been brought by messengers from Lydda to Jonathas, Peter here raised the dead Dorcas to life (~~4086~~Acts 9:36 f). On the roof of Simon’s house by the sea, the famous vision was vouchsafed to this apostle, from which he learned that the gospel was designed for Jew and Gentile alike (~~4001~~Acts 10:1 ff; 11:5 ff).

## 3. HISTORY FROM MACCABEAN TIMES:

The men of Joppa, having treacherously drowned some 200 Jews, Judas Maccabeus fell upon the town “and set the haven on fire by night, and burned the boats, and put to the sword those that had fled thither” (2 Macc 12:3 ff). Jonathan took the city, in which Apollonius had placed a garrison (1 Macc 11:47 ff). It was not easy to hold, and some years later it was captured again by Simon, who garrisoned the place, completed the harbor and raised the fortifications (1 Macc 12:36 f; 13:11; 14:5-34). It is recorded as part of Simon’s glory that he took it “for a haven, and made it an entrance for the isles of the sea,” the Jews thus possessing for the first time a seaport through which commerce might be fully developed. It was taken by Pompey and joined to the province of Syria (Ant., XIV, iv, 4; BJ, I, vii, 7). Caesar restored it to the Jews under Hyrcanus (Ant., XIV, x, 6). It was among the cities given by Antony to Cleopatra (XV, iv, 1). Caesar added it to the kingdom of Herod (vii. 3; BJ, I, xx, 3), and at his death it

passed to Archelaus (Ant., XVII, xi, 4; BJ, II, vi, 3). At his deposition it was attached to the Roman province. The inhabitants were now zealous Jews, and in the Roman wars it suffered heavily. After a massacre by Cestius Gallus, in which 8,400 of the people perished, it was left desolate. Thus it became a resort of the enemies of Rome, who turned pirates, and preyed upon the shipping in the neighboring waters. The place was promptly captured and destroyed by Vespasian. The people took to their boats, but a terrific storm burst upon them, dashing their frail craft to pieces on the rocks, so that vast numbers perished (BJ, III, ix, 2-4). At a later time it was the seat of a bishopric. During the Crusades it had a checkered history, being taken, now by the Christians, now by the Moslems. It was captured by the French under Kleber in 1799. It was fortified by the English, and afterward extended by the Turks (Baedeker, Palestine, 130).

#### 4. DESCRIPTION:

The modern Yafa is built on a rocky mound 116 ft. high, at the edge of the sea. A reef of rocks runs parallel to the shore a short distance out. It may be rounded in calm weather by lighter vessels, and it affords a certain amount of protection. There is a gap in the reef through which the boats pass that meet the steamers calling here. In time of storm the passage is dangerous. On one of these rocks Perseus is said to have rescued the chained Andromeda from the dragon. Yafa is a prosperous town, profiting much by the annual streams of pilgrims who pass through it on their way to visit the holy places in Palestine. A good trade is done with Egypt, Syria and Constantinople. Soap, sesame, wheat and oranges are the chief exports. The famous gardens and orange groves of Jaffa form one of the main sights of interest. The Christians and the Moslems have rival traditions as to the site of the house of Simon the tanner. The remains of the house of Tabitha are also pointed out. From Jaffa to Jerusalem the first railway in Palestine was built.

*W. Ewing*

### JORAH

<jo'-ra> ([~~hrw~~Q yorah] meaning uncertain, perhaps "harvest-born"): A family which returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:18) = "Chariph" of Nehemiah 7:24 = "Arsiphurith" (the King James Version ~~<Arzaphan>~~ "Arzephurith") of 1 Esdras 5:16.

## JORAI

<jo'-ra-i> ([yr" wQ yoray], “whom Yahweh teaches”): A Gadite chief, but possibly the name of a clan (~~1353~~ 1 Chronicles 5:13).

## JORAM

<jo'-ram> ([μrwQ yoram], “Yahweh is exalted”; compare JEHORAM):

(1) Son of Toi (or Tou, according to Septuagint, Codex Vaticanus, and ~~1389~~ 1 Chronicles 18:9,10), sent by his father to greet David (~~1080~~ 2 Samuel 8:10) = “Hadoram” (~~1389~~ 1 Chronicles 18:9,10) a form preferred by commentators in 2 Samuel also.

(2) Same as Jehoram, king of Judah (~~1182~~ 2 Kings 8:21-24; 11:2; ~~1381~~ 1 Chronicles 3:11; ~~1008~~ Matthew 1:8 [ 'Ιωρόμ, Ioram]).

(3) Same as Jehoram, king of Northern Israel (~~1189~~ 2 Kings 8:29; compare ~~1095~~ 2 Kings 9:15 the Revised Version margin).

(4) (In form [μywQ yoram]): A Levite (~~1325~~ 1 Chronicles 26:25).

(5) ([ 'Ιωρόμ, Ioram], 1 Esdras 1:9) = “Jozabad” (~~1489~~ 2 Chronicles 35:9); see JOZABAD (4).

## JORDAN

<jor'-dan> ([^Deÿ" , yarden], “flowing downward”; [ 'Ιορδάνης, Iordanes]):

### 1. SOURCE:

The Jordan river proper begins at the junction of four streams (the Bareighit, the Hasbany, the Leddan, and the Banias), in the upper part of the plain of Lake Huleh. The Bareighit receives its supply of water from the hills on the West, which separate the valley from the river Litany, and is the least important of the four. The Hasbany is the longest of the four (40 miles), issuing from a great fountain at the western foot of Mt. Hermon near Hasbeiya, 1,700 ft. above the sea, and descends 1,500 ft. in its course to the plain. The Leddan is the largest of the four streams, issuing in several fountains at the foot of the mound Tell el-kady (Dan, or Laish) at an elevation of 505 ft. above the sea. The Banias issues from a celebrated



fountain near the town of Banias, which is identified as the Caesarea Philippi associated with the transfiguration. The ancient name was Paneas, originating from a grotto consecrated to the god Pan. At this place Herod erected a temple of white marble dedicated to Augustus Caesar. This is probably the Baal-gad of ~~16117~~ Joshua 11:17 and 12:7. Its altitude is 1,100 ft. above tide, and the stream falls about 600 ft. in the 5 miles of its course to the head of the Jordan.

## 2. LAKE HULEH:

The valley of Lake Huleh, through which the Jordan wends its way, is about 20 miles long and 5 miles wide, bordered on either side by hills and mountains attaining elevations of 3,000 ft. After flowing 4 or 5 miles through a fertile plain, the Jordan enters a morass of marshy land which nearly fills the valley, with the exception of 1 or 2 miles between it and the base of the mountains upon the western side. This morass is almost impenetrable by reason of bushes and papyrus reeds, which in places also render navigation of the channel difficult even with a canoe. Lake Huleh, into which the river here expands, is but 7 ft. above tide, and is slowly contracting its size by reason of the accumulation of the decaying vegetation of the surrounding morass, and of the sediment brought in by the river and three tributary mountain torrents. Its continued existence is evidence of the limited period through which present conditions have been maintained. It will not be many thousand years before it will be entirely filled and the morass be changed into a fertile plain. When the spies visited the region, the lake must have been much larger than it is now.

At the southern end of Lake Huleh, the valley narrows up to a width of a few hundred yards, and the river begins its descent into levels below the Mediterranean. The river is here only about 60 ft. broad, and in less than 9 miles descends 689 ft. through a narrow rocky gorge, where it meets the delta which it has deposited at the head of the Sea of Galilee, and slowly winds its way to meet its waters. Throughout this delta the river is easily fordable during a great part of the year.

## 3. SEA OF GALILEE:

The Sea of Galilee occupies an expansion of the Jordan valley 12 miles long and from 3 to 6 miles wide. The hills, reaching, in general, 1,200 or 1,500 ft. above the lake, come down close to its margin on every side. On

the East and South they are mainly of volcanic origin, and to some extent of the same character on the Northwest side above Tiberias. In the time of Christ the mouth of the river may have been a half-mile or more farther up the delta than now.

#### 4. THE YARMUK:

As all the sediment of the upper Jordan settles in the vicinity of the delta near Capernaum, a stream of pellucid water issues from the southern end of the lake, at the modern town of Kerak. Before it reaches the Dead Sea, however, it becomes overloaded with sediment. From Kerak the opening of the valley is grand in the extreme. A great plain on the East stretches to the hills of Decapolis, and to the South, as far as the eye can reach, through the Ghor which descends to the Dead Sea, bordered by mountain walls on either side. Four or five miles below, it is joined on the East by the Yarmuk, the ancient Hieromax the largest of all its tributaries. The debris brought down by this stream has formed a fertile delta terrace 3 or 4 miles in diameter, which now, as in ancient times, is an attractive place for herdsmen and agriculturists. The valley of the Yarmuk now furnishes a natural grade for the Acre and Damascus Railroad, as it did for the caravan routes of early times. The town of Gadara lies upon an elevation just South of the Yarmuk and 4 or 5 miles East of the Jordan.

Ten miles below the lake, the river is joined on the West by Wddy el-Bireh, which descends from the vicinity of Nazareth, between Mt. Tabor and Endor, and furnishes a natural entrance from the Jordan to Central Galilee. An aqueduct here still furnishes water for the upper terrace of the Ghor. Wddy el-Arab, with a small perennial stream, comes in here also from the East.

#### 5. EL-GHOR:

Twenty miles below Lake Galilee the river is joined by the important Wady el-Jalud, which descends through the valley of Jezreel between Mt. Gilboa and the range of the Little Hermon (the hill Moreh of ~~xxx~~ Judges 7:1). This valley leads up from the Jordan to the valley of Esdrelon and thence to Nazareth, and furnished the usual route for Jews going from Jerusalem to Nazareth when they wished to avoid the Samaritans. This route naturally takes one past Beisan (Bethshean), where the bodies of Saul and Jonathan were exposed by the Philistines, and past Shunem and Nain. There is a

marked expansion of the Ghor opposite Beisan, constituting an important agricultural district. The town of Pella, to which the Christians fled at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, lies upon the East side of the Ghor; while Jabesh-gilead, where the bodies of Saul and Jonathan were finally taken by their friends and cremated, is a little farther up the slope of Gilead. Twenty miles farther down, the Ghor, on the East, is joined by Wady Zerka (the brook Jabbok), the second largest tributary, separating Ammon from Gilead, its upper tributaries flowing past Ammon, Mizpeh, and Ramoth-gilead. It was down this valley that Jacob descended to Succoth.

A few miles below, the Wady Farah, whose head is at Sychar between Mts. Ebal and Gerizim, descends from the West, furnishing the natural route for Jacob's entrance to the promised land.

At Damieh (probably the Adam of ~~Gen~~ Joshua 3:16), the Ghor is narrowed up by the projection, from the West, of the mountain ridge terminating in Kurn Surtubeh, which rises abruptly to a height of 2,000 ft. above the river.

The section of the Ghor between Damieh and the Dead Sea is of a pretty uniform width of 10 to 12 miles and is of a much more uniform level than the upper portions, but its fertility is interfered with by the lack of water and the difficulty of irrigation. From the vicinity of Jericho, an old Roman road follows up the Wady Nawaimeh, which furnished Joshua a natural line of approach to Ai, while through the Wady el-Kelt is opened the natural road to Jerusalem. Both Ai and the Mount of Olives are visible from this point of the Ghor.

## 6. THE ZOR:

In a direct line it is only 70 miles from Lake Galilee to the Dead Sea, and this is the total length of the lower plain (the Zor); but so numerous are the windings of the river across the flood plain from one bluff to the other that the length of the river is fully 200 miles. Col. Lynch reported the occurrence of 27 rapids, which wholly interrupted navigation, and many others which rendered it difficult. The major part of the descent below Lake Galilee takes place before reaching Damieh, 1,140 ft. below the Mediterranean. While the bluffs of the Ghor upon either side of the Zor, are nearly continuous and uniform below Damieh, above this point they are much dissected by the erosion of tributary streams. Still, nearly

everywhere, an extended view brings to light the original uniform level of the sedimentary deposits formed when the valley was filled with water to a height of 650 ft. (*see ARABAH; DEAD SEA*).

The river itself averages about 100 ft. in width when confined strictly within its channel, but in the early spring months the flood plain of the Zor is completely overflowed, bringing into its thickets a great amount of driftwood which increases the difficulty of penetrating it, and temporarily drives out ferocious animals to infest the neighboring country.

## 7. THE FORDS OF JORDAN:

According to Conder, there are no less than 60 fording-places between Lake Galilee and the Dead Sea. For the most part it will be seen that these occur at rapids, or over bars deposited by the streams which descend from one side or the other, as, for example, below the mouths of the Yarmuk, Jabbok, Jalud and Kelt. These fords are, however, impassable during the high water of the winter and spring months. Until the occupation by the Romans, no bridges were built; but they and their successors erected them at various places, notably below the mouth of the Yarmuk, and the Jabbok, and nearly opposite Jericho.

Notwithstanding the great number of fords where it is possible to cross at low water, those which were so related to the lines of travel as to be of much avail were few. Beginning near the mouth of the Jordan and proceeding northward, there was a ford at el-Henu leading directly from Jericho to the highlands Northeast of the Dead Sea. Two or three miles farther to the North is the ford of the pilgrims, best known of all, at the mouth of Wady Kelt. A few miles farther up the river on the road leading from Jericho to es-Salt, near the mouth of the Wady Nimrin, there is now a bridge where the dependence was formerly upon the ford. Just below the mouth of the Wady Zerka (Jabbok) is the ford of Damieh, where the road from Shechem comes down to the river. A bridge was at one time built over the river at this point; but owing to a change in the course of the stream this is now over a dry water-course. The next important crossing-place is at the opening of the valley of Jezreel coming in from the West, where probably the Bethabara of the New Testament should be located. Upon this ford a number of caravan routes from East to West converge. The next important crossing-place is at el-Mujamia, 2 or 3 miles below the mouth of the Yarmuk. Here, also, there was a Roman bridge. There are

also some traces of an ancient bridge remaining just below the exit of the river from Lake Galilee, where there was a ford of special importance to the people residing on the shores of this lake who could not afford to cross in boats. Between Lake Galilee and Lake Huleh, an easy ford leads across the delta of the stream a little above its junction with the lake; while 2 or 3 miles below Lake Huleh is found “the bridge of Jacob’s daughters” on the line of one of the principal routes between Damascus and Galilee. Above Lake Huleh the various tributaries are easily crossed at several places, though a bridge is required to cross the Bareighit near its mouth, and another on the Hasbany on the main road from Caesarea Philippi to Sidon, at el-Ghagar.

*George Frederick Wright*

## **JORDAN VALLEY**

### **1. PHYSICAL PECULIARITIES:**

As more fully detailed elsewhere (*see ARABAH; DEAD SEA; GEOLOGY OF PALESTINE*), the Jordan valley in its lower portion occupies a remarkable depression in the earth’s surface, reaching its greatest depth in the Dead Sea, the surface of which is 1,300 ft., the bottom 2,600 ft. below tide level, the portion of the basin below the level of the sea being about 100 miles in length and from 10 to 15 miles in breadth at base, and from two to three times that distance between the bordering summits of the mountains and plateaus on either side. In the early prehistoric period, corresponding with the Glacial epoch, this depression was filled with water to a height of 1,400 ft. (see references above) which gradually disappeared by evaporation as present climatic conditions came on. At an elevation of approximately 650 ft. above the Dead Sea, very extensive sedimentary deposits were made, which, while appearing only in fragments along the shores of the Dead Sea, are continuous over the bottom of the valley (the so-called Ghor), farther North. These deposits are from 100 to 200 ft. thick, consisting of material which was brought down into the valley by the tributary mountain streams descending from each side, while the water stood at this higher level. Naturally these deposits slope gradually from the sides of the valley toward the center, the coarser material of the deposits being nearer the sides, and the amount of sediment being much increased opposite the mouths of the larger streams. The deposit was at first continuous over the entire Ghor, or valley, but has since been much

dissected by the Jordan river and its tributaries. The Jordan itself has eroded a channel through the soft sediment, 100 ft. more or less deep, from Lake Galilee to the Dead Sea, a distance in a straight line of about 70 miles. At first this channel was narrow, but it has been constantly enlarged by the stream as it has meandered from side to side, undercutting the banks so that they cave into the river and are washed down to fill up the Dead Sea, a process which is especially familiar to residents upon the banks of the Mississippi and Missouri rivers. This narrow gorge is called the Zor, and will hereafter be referred to under this name. The Zor at present averages about 1/2 mile wide, the most of which is occupied by a flood plain extending from the banks of the river to the foot of the sedimentary bluffs on either side. This flood plain is so overgrown with brush and reeds that it is practically impenetrable, except by wild beasts, which, according to Scriptural references, have infested it from earliest times, among which may be mentioned the lion, the tiger, the wild boar. During the spring months, when the snows are melting from Mt. Hermon and cloudbursts are sending sudden torrents of water down the river courses from the plateau of Gilead and the mountains of Samaria, the Jordan "overflows all its banks," i.e. covers this flood plain and drives out the beasts to infest the neighborhood for a short time.

The surface of this old lake bed has also been much dissected by the tributary streams which come in from either side, they having cut channels across the Ghor down to a depth corresponding to that of the Zor. As a consequence the roads leading up the valley find it necessary to hug the base of the mountains on either side to avoid the abrupt descent into the channels of the tributary streams, which are deepest near their mouths. Another natural consequence of these physical peculiarities is that agriculture cannot be carried on except as water to irrigate the level surfaces of the Ghor is carried out from the higher levels of the perennial streams. There are many remains of such aqueducts for irrigation constructed in early times. These are now almost all in ruins and unused. Merrill, however, estimates that 200 square miles of the Jordan valley, over which the surface is as level as a prairie, and as free from stones, could be irrigated at the present time and made as fruitful as the valley of the Nile. But from time immemorial settled agriculture in the Ghor has been rendered precarious by the incursions of the nomadic tribes, who periodically come down from the desert regions on the East.

## 2. DESCRIPTIONS:

Two descriptions (the first from my own journal) of the general views obtained of the Jordan valley from adjoining elevated points will give vividness to our conceptions of this remarkable depression.

“It was the middle of December when, after wading all day across the southern flanks of Mt. Hermon, through snow knee-deep for our horses, we descended below the clouds and the snow to the brink of the eastern mountain wall overlooking the upper valley of the Jordan. It was a sight ever to be remembered, with the glistening peak of Mt. Hermon to our right, and the jagged walls of the borders of Naphtali stretching across the horizon on the West, only a few miles away, while between and at our feet were the green fields of the upper Jordan valley, through which ran the silver thread of the river, broadening out into the expanded waters of Lake Merom. Over the plain could dimly be seen the black tents of the Arabs, and the husbandmen plowing the fields for an early harvest. No wonder the spies were impressed with the attractiveness and fertility of the region.”  
This of the upper Jordan valley.

Dr. Merrill gives the following description of the view of the lower Jordan valley from the summit of Kurn Surtabeh, March 23: “Jebel esh Sheikh (Mt. Hermon) was covered with snow, and so was the Lebanon range farther to the West and North. Lake Merom and the volcanic peaks on the plain to the East of it and South of Hermon were distinctly seen, likewise the Sea of Galilee, the hills about Safed, the hills West of Tiberias and the slope from their summit, which inclines toward Mt. Tabor; also Gamala and Gadara, all the range of Jebel `Ajlun or hills of Gilead, Kulat er Rubad, Jebel Meisera and Jebel Osha, the mountains of Moab, and the Dead Sea. But the mere naming of different points that can be seen gives no adequate idea of the extent and magnificence of the prospect which one enjoys from the top of this strange landmark. Hills to the West obstruct the view in that direction, and to the East nothing can be seen beyond the highest part of the Moab and Gilead ranges, but it is the north-and-south sweep which makes the prospect a glorious one. No language can picture correctly the Jordan valley, the winding stream, the jungles on its banks, the strange Ghor with its white, ragged sides, the vast plain of the valley, through and in the middle of which the lower Ghor (the Zor) is sunk, the dense green oases formed here and there by some mountain stream, and the still, lifeless sea, as bright and motionless as molten lead, lying far to the South, ending

the great valley and touching the mountains on either side! This is an outline merely, but I cannot summon to my aid words which will describe it more accurately. The Jordan valley or Ghor, in front of Surtabeh, is about 8 miles wide, and looks like a vast plain. The lower Ghor (Zor) is the ragged channel cut down along the middle of the large one. This distinction of the upper and lower Ghor is by no means so strikingly defined above the mouth of the Zerka as it is below that point, and all the way thence to the Dead Sea."

### 3. DIVISION INTO EIGHT SECTIONS:

Considered in detail the valley may be divided, as Conder suggests, into 8 sections. "First the portion between Banias and the Huleh, where it is some 5 miles broad, with steep cliffs some 2,000 ft. high on either side and a broad marsh between. Secondly, from the Huleh to the Sea of Galilee, where the stream runs close to the eastern hills, and about 4 miles from the base of those on the West, which rise toward the high Safed mountains, more than 3,500 ft. above the lake. Thirdly, for 13 miles from the South end of the Sea of Galilee to the neighborhood of Beisan. Here the valley is only 1 1/2 miles broad West of the river, and about 3 on the East, the steep cliffs of the plateau of Kaukab el Hawa on the West reaching an altitude of 1,800 ft. above the stream.

"South of Beisan is the 4th district, with a plain West of Jordan, 12 miles long and 6 miles broad, the line of hills on the East being straight, and the foot of the mountains on this side about 2 miles from the river. In the neighborhood of Beisan, the cross-section of the plain shows 3 levels: that of the shelf on which Beisan stands, about 300 ft. below sea-level; that of the Ghor itself, some 400 ft. lower, reached by an almost precipitous descent; and that of the Zor, or narrow trench, from a half to a quarter of a mile wide, and about 150 ft. lower still. The higher shelf extends westward to the foot of Gilboa; it dies away on the South, but on the North it gradually rises into the plateau of Kaukab and to the western table-land above the sea of Galilee, 1,800 ft. above Jordan.

"After leaving the Beisan plain, the river passes through a narrow valley 12 miles long and 2 or 3 miles wide, with a raised table-land to the West, having a level averaging about 500 ft. above the sea. The Beisan plain is full of springs of fresh water, some of which are thermal, but a large



current of salt warm water flows down Wady Maleh, at the northern extremity of this 5th district.

“In the 6th district, the Damieh region, the valley again opens to a width of about 3 miles on the West, and 5 on the East of J. The great block of the Kurn Surtubeh here stands out like a bastion, on the West, 2,400 ft. above the river. Passing this mountain, the 7th district is entered — a broad valley extending from near Fusail to `Osh el Ghurab, North of Jericho. In this region the Ghor itself is 5 miles broad, West of the river, and rather more on the East. The lower trench or Zor is also wider here and more distinctly separated from the Ghor. A curious geographical feature of this region was also discovered by the Survey party. The great affluents of the Far’ah and `Aujeh do not flow straight to Jordan, but turn South about a mile West of it, and each runs, for about 6 miles, nearly parallel with the river; thus the mouth of the Far’ah is actually to be found just where that of the next valley is shown on most maps.

“The 8th and last district is that of the plain of Jericho, which, with the corresponding basin (Ghor-es-Seiseban) East of Jordan, measures over 8 miles North and South, and more than 14 across, with Jordan about in the middle. The Zor is here about a mile wide, and some 200 ft. below the broad plain of the Ghor.”

#### **4. CLIMATE FAUNA AND FLORA:**

Owing to its depression below sea-level the climate of the lower Jordan valley is even more than tropical. In the summer months thermometer scarcely falls below 100 degrees F., even in the night; but during the winter months, though the days are hot, thermometer frequently goes down to 40 degrees in the night time.

The fauna of this part of the Jordan valley and about the Dead Sea is said by Tristram (SWP, “Fauna and Flora”) to be identical with that now existing in Ethiopia. Of the mammalia characteristic of this general region, 34 are Ethiopian and 16 Indian, though there is now no possible connection with either Ethiopia or India. The fish of the Jordan show close affinity to many species of the Nile and of the lakes and rivers of tropical Africa. Many species of birds, also, now confined to the lower basin and the Dead Sea, are related to Ethiopian and Indian species.

The flora is equally interesting. Out of 162 species of plants found at the Southwest corner of the Dead Sea, 135 species are African in their affinity. In the marshes of Lake Huleh, many acres are covered with the papyrus plant, which became extinct in Egypt long ago, and is now found in Africa only in the Upper Nile beyond the 7th degree of North latitude. The most common trees and plants of the Jordan valley are the castor-oil plant and the oleander, flourishing especially about Jericho, several varieties of the acacia tree, the caper plant, the Dead Sea apple (*Solanum Sodomaeum*) the oser tree of the Arabs, tamarisks, *Agnus casti* (a flowering bamboo), *Balanites Aegyptiaca* (supposed to be the balm of Gilead), *Populus Euphratica* (a plant found all over Central Asia but not West of the Jordan), and many tropical plants, among which may be mentioned *Zygophyllum coccineum*, *Boerhavia*, *Indigofera*, several *Astragali*, *Cassias*, *Gymnocarpum*, and *Nitraria*.

*George Frederick Wright*

## JORIBUS

< *jo*’-*i-bus* > ([ ’ *Ιώριβος*, *Ioribos*]; the King James Version, Joribas):

(1) In 1 Esdras 8:44, called “Jarib” in Ezr 8:16.

(2) In 1 Esdras 9:19, called “Jarib” in Ezr 10:18.

## JORIM

< *jo*’-*rim* > ([ ’ *Ιωρείμ*, *Ioreim*] from [*μῆρμ*<sup>by</sup>] *yehoram*], [*μῆρμ*<sup>Q</sup> *yoram*]):

An ancestor of Jesus in Luke’s genealogy ( <sup>RB4</sup> Luke 3:29).

## JORKEAM

< *jo*’-*ke-am* > ([*μῆρμ*<sup>Q</sup>] *yorke`am*]; the King James Version Jorkoam):

This is probably to be taken as the name of a town, the “father” or “founder” of which was Raham ( <sup>RB4</sup> 1 Chronicles 2:44). It may be identical with “Jokdeam” of <sup>RB56</sup> Joshua 15:56.

## JOSABAD

< *jos*’-*a-bad* >.

See *JOZABAD*.

## JOSABDUS

<*jo-sab'-dus*> ([<sup>ʾ</sup>Ἰωσαβδός, *Iosabdos*], 1 Esdras 8:63; probably identical with [<sup>ʾ</sup>Ἰωζαβάδος, *Iozabados*], in 9:23): The same as Jozabad of Ezr 8:33; 10:23 (which see).

## JOSAPHAT

<*jos'-a-fat*> ([<sup>ʾ</sup>Ἰωσαφάτ, *Iosaphat*], the King James Version in ~~4008~~ Matthew 1:8 for JEHOSEPHAT (which see)): A king of Judah, mentioned in Matthew's genealogy of Christ.

## JOSAPHIAS

<*jos-a-fi'-as*> ([<sup>ʾ</sup>Ἰωσαφίας, *Iosaphias*], 1 Esdras 8:36): Called "Josephiah" in Ezr 8:10.

## JOSE

<*jo'-se*> ([<sup>ʾ</sup>Ἰωσή, *Iose*]): the King James Version form for "Jesus" ([<sup>ʾ</sup>Ἰησοῦς, *Iesus*]) in Luke's genealogy (~~4189~~ Luke 3:29), the Revised Version (British and American) Greek

## JOSECH

<*jo'-sek*> ([<sup>ʾ</sup>Ἰωσήχ, *Iosech*], Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek; [<sup>ʾ</sup>Ἰωσήφ, *Ioseph*], Textus Receptus of the New Testament; the King James Version, Joseph): An ancestor of Jesus in Luke's genealogy (~~4185~~ Luke 3:26).

## JOSEDECH; JOSEDEK

<*jos'-e-dek*>, <*jos'e-dek*> ([<sup>ʾ</sup>Ἰωσεδέκ, *Iosedek*]): Father of Jeshua (1 Esdras 5:5). In ~~5000~~ Hagai 1:1 the Revised Version (British and American), the relationship is described as "Joshua the son of JEHOZADAK (which see), the high priest."

## JOSEPH (1)

<*jo'-zef*> ([<sup>ʾ</sup>Ἰωσήφ, *Ioseph*]):

### 1. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

- (1) The 11th son of Jacob and 1st of Rachel (see separate article).
- (2) The father of Igal of Issachar, one of the 12 spies (~~<4137>~~ Numbers 13:7).
- (3) A son of Asaph (~~<1351>~~ 1 Chronicles 25:2,9).
- (4) A man of the sons of Bani, who had married a foreign wife (Ezr 10:42).
- (5) A priest of the family of Shebaniah in the days of Joiakim (~~<1624>~~ Nehemiah 12:14).

### 2. IN THE APOCRYPHA:

- (1) Son of Zacharias, defeated by Gorgias circa 164 BC (1 Macc 5:18,56,60).
- (2) Called a brother of Judas Maccabeus in 2 Macc 8:22, probably by mistake for John.
- (3) Great-grandfather of Judith (Judith 8:1).

### 3. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

- (1) The husband of Mary, the mother of Jesus (see special article).
- (2, 3) The name of 3 ancestors of Jesus according to the King James Version (~~<4134>~~ Luke 3:24,26,30); the name of two according to the Revised Version (British and American), which reads “Josech” in ~~<4136>~~ Luke 3:26.
- (4) A Jew of Arimathea in whose sepulcher Jesus was buried (~~<4175>~~ Matthew 27:57, etc.; see article).
- (5) One of the brethren of Jesus, according to the Revised Version (British and American) (~~<4135>~~ Matthew 13:55, the King James Version “Josés”). the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) both have “Josés” in ~~<4176>~~ Matthew 27:56; ~~<4183>~~ Mark 6:3; 15:40,47.
- (6) Joseph Barsabbas (~~<4123>~~ Acts 1:23; see article).
- (7) Joseph, surnamed Barnabas (~~<4186>~~ Acts 4:36, the King James Version “Josés”; *see BARNABAS*).

*S. F. Hunter*

## JOSEPH (2)

<jo'-zef> ([~~ts~~~~o~~yoceph], "He will add"; Septuagint [ Ἰωσήφ, *Ioseph*]). The narrative (<sup>43B</sup>Genesis 30:23,14) indicates not so much a double etymology as the course of Rachel's thoughts. The use of [~~ts~~" a; 'acaph], "He takes away," suggested to her mind by its form in the future, [~~ts~~~~o~~yoceph], "He will add," "And she called his name Joseph, saying, Yahweh add to me another son"):

The eleventh son of Jacob. The Biblical narrative concerning Joseph presents two subjects for consideration, the Joseph story, a literary question, and the story of Joseph, a biography. It is of the first importance to consider these questions in this order.

Cheyne in *Encyclopedia Biblica* reaches such conclusions concerning the Joseph story that the story of Joseph is mutilated almost beyond recognition as a biography at all. Driver in *HDB* holds that the Joseph story was "in all probability only committed to writing 700-800 years" later than the time to which Joseph is attributed, points out that Joseph's name was also the name of a tribe, and concludes that "the first of these facts at once destroys all guarantee that we possess in the Joseph narrative a literal record of the facts," and that "the second fact raises the further question whether the figure of Joseph, in part or even as a whole, is a reflection of the history and characteristics of the tribe projected upon the past in the individual form." But he draws back from this view and thinks it "more probable that there was an actual person Joseph, afterward .... rightly or wrongly regarded as the ancestor of the tribe .... who underwent substantially the experience recounted of him in Genesis." In the presence of such critical notions concerning the literature in which the narrative of Joseph is embodied, it is clear that until we have reached some conclusions concerning the Joseph story, we cannot be sure that there is any real story of Joseph to relate.

### I. THE JOSEPH STORY, A LITERARY QUESTION.

#### *1. An Independent Original or an Adaptation?:*

This literary problem will be solved, if satisfactory answers may be found to two questions: Is it an independent original or an adaptation? Suitable material for such an adaptation as would produce a Joseph story has been

sought at either end of the line of history: Joseph the progenitor and Joseph the tribe. The only contestant for the claim of being an early original of which the Joseph story might be an adaptation is the nasty “Tale of Two Brothers” (RP, series I, volume II, 137-46). This story in its essential elements much resembles the Joseph story. But such events as it records are common: why not such stories?

What evidence does this “Tale of Two Brothers” afford that the Joseph story is not an independent original? Are we to suppose that because many French romances involve the demi-monde, there was therefore no Madame de Pompadour? Are court scandals so unheard of that ancient Egypt cannot afford two? And why impugn the genuineness of the Joseph story because the “Tale of Two Brothers” resembles it? Is anyone so ethereal in his passions as not to know by instinct that the essential elements of such scandal are always the same? The difference in the narrative is chiefly in the telling. At this latter point the Joseph story and the “Tale of Two Brothers” bear no resemblance whatever.

If the chaste beauty of the Biblical story be observed, and then one turn to the “Tale of Two Brothers” with sufficient knowledge of the Egyptian tongue to perceive the coarseness and the stench of it, there can be no question that the Joseph story is independent of such a literary source. To those who thus sense both stories, the claim of the “Tale of Two Brothers” to be the original of the Joseph story cannot stand for a moment. If we turn from Joseph the progenitor to Joseph the tribe, still less will the claim that the story is an adaptation bear careful examination. The perfect naturalness of the story, the utter absence from its multitudinous details of any hint of figurative language, such as personification always furnishes, and the absolutely accurate reflection in the story of the Egypt of Joseph’s day, as revealed by the many discoveries of which people of 700-800 years later could not know, mark this theory of the reflection of tribal history and characteristics as pure speculation. And besides, where in all the history of literature has it been proven that a tribe has been thus successfully thrown back upon the screen of antiquity in the “individual form”? Similar mistakes concerning Menes and Minos and the heroes of Troy are a warning to us. Speculation is legitimate, so long as it does not cut loose from known facts, but gives no one the right to suppose the existence in unknown history of something never certainly found in known history. So much for the first question.

## *2. A Monograph or a Compilation?:*

Is it a monograph or a compilation? The author of a monograph may make large use of literary materials, and the editor of a compilation may introduce much editorial comment. Thus, superficially, these different kinds of composition may much resemble each other, yet they are, in essential character, very different the one from the other. A compilation is an artificial body, an automaton; a monograph is a natural body with a living soul in it. This story has oriental peculiarities of repetition and pleonastic expression, and these things have been made much of in order to break up the story; to the reader not seeking grounds of partition, it is one of the most unbroken, simply natural and unaffected pieces of narrative literature in the world. If it stood alone or belonged to some later portion of Scripture, it may well be doubted that it would ever have been touched by the scalpel of the literary dissector. But it belongs to the Pentateuch. There are manifest evidences all over the Pentateuch of the use by the author of material, either documentary or of that paradoxical unwritten literature which the ancients handed down almost without the change of a word for centuries.

### **(1) An Analytical Theory Resolving It into a Mere Compilation.**

An analytical theory has been applied to the Pentateuch as a whole, to resolve it into a mere compilation. Once the principles of this theory are acknowledged, and allowed sway there, the Joseph story cannot be left untouched, but becomes a necessary sacrifice to the system. A sight of the lifeless, ghastly fragments of the living, moving Joseph story which the analysis leaves behind (compare EB, article "Joseph") proclaims that analysis to have been murder. There was a life in the story which has been ruthlessly taken, and that living soul marked the narrative as a monograph.

### **(2) A Narrative Full of Gems.**

Where else is to be found such a compilation? Here is one of the most brilliant pieces of literature in the world, a narrative full of gems:

**(a)** the account of the presentation of the brothers in the presence of Joseph when he was obliged to go out to weep (~~Gen~~ Genesis 43:26-34), and

(b) the scene between the terrified brothers of Joseph and the steward of his house (<sup><0406></sup>Genesis 44:6-13),

(c) Judah's speech (<sup><0448></sup>Genesis 44:18-34),

(d) the touching close of the revelation of Joseph to his brothers at last (<sup><0451></sup>Genesis 45:1-15). The soul of the whole story breathes through all of these. Where in all literature, ancient or modern, is to be found a mere compilation that is a great piece of literature? So far removed is this story from the characteristics of a compilation, that we may challenge the world of literature to produce another monograph in narrative literature that surpasses it.

### **(3) The Argument from Chronology Supporting It as a Monograph**

Then the dates of Egyptian names and events in this narrative strongly favor its origin so early as to be out of the reach of the compilers. That attempts at identification in Egyptian of names written in Hebrew, presenting as they do the peculiar difficulties of two alphabets of imperfectly known phonetic values and uncertain equivalency of one in terms of the other, should give rise to differences of opinion, is to be expected. The Egyptian equivalents of Zaphenath-paneah and Asenath have been diligently sought, and several identifications have been, suggested (Brugsch, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, 122; Budge, *History of Egypt*, V, 126-27). That which is most exact phonetically and yields the most suitable and natural meaning for Zaphenath-paneah is by Lieblein (PSBA, 1898, 204-8). It is formed like four of the names of Hyksos kings before the time of Joseph, and means "the one who furnishes the nourishment of life," i.e. the steward of the realm. The name Asenath is found from the XIth Dynasty on to the XVIIIth. Potiphar is mentioned as an Egyptian. Why not of course an Egyptian? The narrative also points distinctly to conditions obtaining under the Hyksos kings. When the people were like to perish for want of food they promised Joseph in return for help that they would be "servants of Pharaoh" (<sup><0478></sup>Genesis 47:18-25). This suggests a previous antagonism to the government, such as the Hyksos kings had long to contend with in Egypt. But the revolution which drove out the Hyksos labored so effectually to eradicate every trace of the hated foreigners that it is with the utmost difficulty that modern Egyptological research has wrested from the past some small items of information



concerning them. Is it credible that the editor of scraps, which were themselves not written down until some 700-800 years later, should have been able to produce such a life-story fitting into the peculiar conditions of the times of the Hyksos? Considered as an independent literary problem on its own merits, aside from any entangling necessities of the analytical theory of the Pentateuch, the Joseph story must certainly stand as a monograph from some time within distinct memory of the events it records. If the Joseph story be an independent original and a monograph, then there is in reality to be considered the story of Joseph.

## II. THE STORY OF JOSEPH, A BIOGRAPHY.

It is unnecessary to recount here all the events of the life of Joseph, a story so incomparably told in the Biblical narrative. It will be sufficient to touch only the salient points where controversy has raged, or at which archaeology has furnished special illumination. The story of Joseph begins the tenth and last natural division of Genesis in these words: "The generations of Jacob" (<sup>Q137D</sup>Genesis 37:2). Up to this point the unvarying method of Genesis is to place at the head of each division the announcement "the generations of" one of the patriarchs, followed immediately by a brief outline of the discarded line of descent, and then to give in detail the account of the chosen line.

There is to be now no longer any discarded line of descent. All the sons of Jacob are of the chosen people, the depository of the revelation of redemption. So this division of Genesis begins at once with the chosen line, and sets in the very foreground that narrative which in that generation is most vital in the story of redemption, this story of Joseph beginning with the words, "Joseph, being seventeen years old, was feeding the flock with his brethren" (<sup>Q137D</sup>Genesis 37:2). Joseph had been born in Haran, the firstborn of the beloved Rachel, who died at the birth of her second son Benjamin. A motherless lad among the sons of other mothers felt the jealousies of the situation, and the experience became a temptation. The "evil report" of his brethren was thus naturally carried to his father, and quite as naturally stirred up those family jealousies which set his feet in the path of his great career (<sup>Q137D</sup>Genesis 37:2-4). In that career he appears as a Bedouin prince in Canaan.

### *1. A Bedouin Prince in Canaan:*

The patriarchs of those times were all sheiks or princes of those semi-nomadic rovers who by the peculiar social and civil customs of that land were tolerated then as they are to this day under the Turkish government in the midst of farms and settled land tenure. Jacob favored Rachel and her children. He put them hindmost at the dangerous meeting with Esau, and now he puts on Joseph a coat of many colors (<sup><Q373></sup>Genesis 37:3). The appearance of such a coat a little earlier in the decoration of the tombs of Benichassan among Palestinian ambassadors to Egypt probably indicates that this garment was in some sense ceremonial, a token of rank. In any case Joseph, the son of Jacob, was a Bedouin prince. Did the father by this coat indicate his intention to give him the precedence and the succession as chieftain of the tribe? It is difficult otherwise to account for the insane jealousy of the older brethren (<sup><Q374></sup>Genesis 37:4). According to the critical partition of the story, Joseph's dreams may be explained away as mere reflections or adaptations of the later history of Joseph (compare *PENTATEUCH*). In a real biography the striking providential significance of the dreams appears at once. They cannot be real without in some sense being prophetic. On the other hand they cannot be other than real without vitiating the whole story as a truthful narrative, for they led immediately to the great tragedy; a Bedouin prince of Canaan becomes a Bedouin slave in Egypt.

### *2. A Bedouin Slave in Egypt:*

The plot to put Joseph out of the way, the substitution of slavery for death, and the ghastly device for deceiving Jacob (<sup><Q375></sup>Genesis 37:18-36) are perfectly natural steps in the course of crime when once the brothers had set out upon it. The counterplot of Reuben to deliver Joseph reflects equally his own goodness and the dangerous character of the other brothers to whom he did not dare make a direct protest.

Critical discussion of "Ishmaelites" and "Midianites" and "Medanites" presents some interesting things and many clever speculations which may well be considered on their own merits by those interested in ethnology and etymologies. Many opinions advanced may prove to be correct. But let it be noted that they are for the most part pure speculation. Almost nothing is known of the interrelation of the trans-Jordanic tribes in that age other than the few hints in the Bible. And who can say what manner of persons might

be found in a caravan which had wandered about no one knows where, or how long, to pick up trade before it turned into the northern caravan route? Until archaeology supplies more facts it is folly to attach much importance to such speculations (Kyle, *The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism*, 221).

In the slave market in Egypt, Joseph was bought by Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, “an Egyptian.” The significant mention of this fact fits exactly into a place among the recovered hints of the history of those times, which make the court then to be not Egyptian at all, but composed of foreigners, the dynasty of Hyksos kings among whom an “Egyptian” was so unexpected as to have his nationality mentioned.

Joseph’s native nobility of character, the pious training he had received in his father’s house, and the favor of God with him gave him such prosperity that his master entrusted all the affairs of his household to him, and when the greatest of temptations assails him he comes off victorious (Genesis 39). There is strong ground for the suspicion that Potiphar did not fully believe the accusation of his wife against Joseph. The fact that Joseph was not immediately put to death is very significant. Potiphar could hardly do less than shut him up for the sake of appearances, and perhaps to take temptation away from his wife without seeming to suspect her. It is noticeable also that Joseph’s character soon triumphed in prison. Then the same Providence that superintended his dreams is leading so as to bring him before the king (Genesis 40; 41).

### *3. The Bedouin Slave Becomes Again the Bedouin Prince:*

The events of the immediately preceding history prepared Joseph’s day: the Hyksos kings on the throne, those Bedouin princes, “shepherd kings” (Petrie, *Hyksos and Israelite Cities*), the enmity of the Egyptians against this foreign dynasty so that they accounted every shepherd an “abomination” (<sup>0463</sup>Genesis 46:34), the friendly relation thus created between Palestinian tribes and Egypt, the princely character of Joseph, for among princes a prince is a prince however small his principality, and last of all the manifest favor of God toward Joseph, and the evident understanding by the Pharaohs of Semitic religion, perhaps even sympathy with it (<sup>0443</sup>Genesis 41:39). All these constitute one of the most majestic, Godlike movements of Providence revealed to us in the word of God, or evident anywhere in history. The same Providence that presided over the

boy prince in his father's house came again to the slave prince in the Egyptian prison. The interpretation of the dreams of the chief butler and the chief baker of Pharaoh (Genesis 40 through 41:1-24) brought him at last through much delay and selfish forgetfulness to the notice of the king, and another dream in which the same cunning hand of Providence is plainly seen (Genesis 41) is the means of bringing Joseph to stand in the royal presence. The stuff that dreams are made of interests scarcely less than the Providence that was superintending over them. As the harvest fields of the semi-nomadic Bedouin in Palestine, and the household routine of Egypt in the dreams of the chief butler and the chief baker, so now the industrial interests and the religious forms of the nation appear in the dreams of Pharaoh. The "seven kine" of the goddess Hathor supplies the number of the cows, and the doubling of the symbolism in the cattle and the grain points to the two great sources of Egypt's welfare. The Providence that had shaped and guided the whole course of Joseph from the Palestinian home was consummated when, with the words, "Inasmuch as thou art a man in whom is the spirit of God," Pharaoh lifted up the Bedouin slave to be again the Bedouin prince and made him the prime minister.

#### *4. The Prime Minister:*

The history of "kings' favorites" is too well known for the elevation of Joseph to be in itself incredible. Such things are especially likely to take place among the unlimited monarchies of the Orient. The late empress of China had been a Chinese slave girl. The investiture of Joseph was thoroughly Egyptian — the "collar," the signet "ring," the "chariot" and the outrunners who cried before him "Abrech." The exact meaning of this word has never been certainly ascertained, but its general import may be seen illustrated to this day wherever in the East royalty rides out. The policy adopted by the prime minister was far-reaching, wise, even adroit (<sup>04125</sup>Genesis 41:25-36). It is impossible to say whether or not it was wholly just, for we cannot know whether the corn of the years of plenty which the government laid up was bought or taken as a taxlevy. The policy involved some despotic power, but Joseph proved a magnanimous despot. The deep and subtle statesmanship in Joseph's plan does not fully appear until the outcome. It was probably through the policy of Joseph, the prime minister, that the Hyksos finally gained the power over the people and the mastery of the land.

Great famines have not been common in Egypt, but are not unknown. The only one which corresponds well to the Bible account is that one recorded in the inscription of Baba at el Kab, translated by Brugsch. Some scarcely justifiable attempts have been made to discredit Brugsch in his account of that inscription. The monument still remains and is easily visited, but the inscription is so mutilated that it presents many difficulties. The severity of the famine, the length of its duration, the preparation by the government, the distribution to the people, the success of the efforts for relief and even the time of the famine, as far as it can be determined, correspond well to the Bible account (Brugsch, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, chapter vi). The way in which such famines in Egypt come about has been explained by a movement of the sudd, a sedgelike growth in the Nile, so as to clog the upper river (Wright, *Scientific Confirmations*, 70-79).

Joseph's brethren came "with those that came," i.e. with the food caravans. The account does not imply that the prime minister presided in person at the selling of grain, but only that he knew of the coming of his brethren and met them at the market place. The watchfulness of the government against "spies," by the careful guarding of the entrances to the land, may well have furnished him with such information. Once possessed with it, all the rest of the story of the interviews follows naturally (compare traditions of Joseph, *Jewish Encyclopedia*).

The long testing of the brethren with the attendant delay in the relief of the father Jacob and the family (Genesis 42 through 45) has been the subject of much discussion, and most ingenious arguments for the justification of Joseph. All this seems unnecessary. Joseph was not perfect, and there is no claim of perfection made for him in the Bible. Two things are sufficient to be noted here: one that Joseph was ruler as well as brother, with the habits of a ruler of almost unrestrained power and authority and burdened with the necessity for protection and the obligation to mete out justice; the other that the deliberateness, the vexatious delays, the subtle diplomacy and playing with great issues are thoroughly oriental. It may be also that the perplexities of great minds make them liable to such vagaries. The career of Lincoln furnishes some curious parallels in the parleying with cases long after the great president's mind was fully made up and action taken.

The time of these events and the identification of Joseph in Egypt are most vexed questions not conclusively settled. Toffteen quite confidently presents in a most recent identification of Joseph much evidence to which

one would like to give full credence (Toffteen, *The Historical Exodus*). But aside from the fact that he claims two exodi, two Josephs, two Aarons, two lawgivers called Moses, and two givings of the law, a case of critical doublets more astounding than any heretofore claimed in the Pentateuch, the evidence itself which he adduces is very far from conclusive. It is doubtful if the texts will bear the translation he gives them, especially the proper names. The claims of Rameses II, that he built Pithom, compared with the stele of 400 years, which he says he erected in the 400th year of King Nubti, seems to put Joseph about the time of the Hyksos king. This is the most that can be said now. The burial of Jacob is in exact accord with Egyptian customs. The wealth of the Israelites who retained their possessions and were fed by the crown, in contrast with the poverty of the Egyptians who sold everything, prepares the way for the wonderful growth and influence of Israel, and the fear which the Egyptians at last had of them. "And Joseph died, being 110 years old," an ideal old age in the Egyptian mind. The reputed burial place of Joseph at Shechem still awaits examination.

### *5. The Patriarch:*

Joseph stands out among the patriarchs in some respects with preeminence. His nobility of character, his purity of heart and life, his magnanimity as a ruler and brother Patriarch make him, more than any other of the Old Testament characters, an illustration of that type of man which Christ was to give to the world in perfection. Joseph is not in the list of persons distinctly referred to in Scripture as types of Christ — the only perfectly safe criterion — but none more fully illustrates the life and work of the Saviour. He wrought salvation for those who betrayed and rejected him, he went down into humiliation as the way to his exaltation, he forgave those who, at least in spirit, put him to death, and to him as to the Saviour, all must come for relief, or perish.

### **LITERATURE.**

Commentaries on Genesis; for rabbinical literature, compare Seligsohn in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, some very interesting and curious traditions; Ebers, *Ägypten und die Bucher Moses*; "The Tale of Two Brothers," RP, series I, volume II, 13746; Wilkinson-Birch, *The Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*; Erman, *Life in Ancient Egypt*.

*M. G. Kyle*

## JOSEPH BARNABAS

See *BARNABAS*.

## JOSEPH BARSABBAS

<bar-sab'-as> [βαρσαββᾱς, *Barsabbas*], or [βαρσαβᾱς, *Barsabas*]; the King James Version Barsabas, [bar'-sa-bas]; for etymology, etc., of Joseph, see general article on JOSEPH: Joseph Barsabbas was surnamed Justus (Acts 1:23). Barsabbas was probably a patronymic, i.e. son of Sabba or Seba. Other interpretations given are “son of an oath,” “son of an old man,” “son of conversion,” “son of quiet.” It is likely that the “Judas called Barsabbas” of Acts 15:22 was his brother. Ewald considers that both names refer to the same person, but this is improbable.

Joseph was one of those who accompanied the apostles “all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto the day that he was received up from us” (Acts 1:21,22). At the meeting of the brethren under the presidency of Peter in Jerusalem shortly after the crucifixion, he was, therefore, proposed along with Matthias as a suitable candidate for the place in the apostleship left vacant by the treachery and death of Judas Iscariot; but was unsuccessful (Acts 1:15-26).

According to Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, I, 12), Joseph was one of the 70 (Luke 10:1), and Papias records the oral tradition that he drank a cup of poison without harm (compare Mark 16:18). The Acts of Paul, a work belonging to the 2nd century and first mentioned by Origen, relates that Barsabbas, Justus the Flatfoot and others were imprisoned by Nero for protesting their faith in Christ, but that upon a vision of the newly martyred Paul appearing to the emperor, he ordered their immediate release.

*C. M. Kerr*

## JOSEPH, HUSBAND OF MARY

### 1. REFERENCES IN NEW TESTAMENT:

(For etymology, etc., of Joseph, see *JOSEPH*): Joseph, the carpenter (Matthew 13:55), was a “just man” (Matthew 1:19 the King James Version), who belonged to Nazareth (Luke 2:4). He was of Davidic descent (Matthew 1:20; Luke 2:4), the son of Heli (Luke 3:23)

or Jacob (~~4016~~ Matthew 1:16), the husband of Mary (~~4016~~ Matthew 1:16), and the supposed father of Jesus (~~4035~~ Matthew 13:55; ~~4033~~ Luke 3:23; 4:22; ~~4045~~ John 1:45; 6:42).

(1) Before the Nativity. The Gospels of Matthew and Mark alone give any detailed reference to Joseph and the birth of Jesus, and their accounts vary in part. Luke begins with the Annunciation to Mary at Nazareth (~~4026~~ Luke 1:26-38). Overwhelmed with the tidings, Mary departed “with haste” “into the hill country, .... into a city of Judah,” to seek communion with Elisabeth, with whom she had been coupled in the Annunciation by the angel Gabriel (~~4039~~ Luke 1:39-55). After abiding with her about three months she returned “unto her own house” (~~4046~~ Luke 1:56 the King James Version). The events recorded in ~~4008~~ Matthew 1:18-24 probably took place in the interval between this return and the birth of Jesus. During Mary’s visit to Elisabeth, Joseph had likely remained in Nazareth. The abrupt and probably unexplained departure of his espoused wife for Judah (compare the phrase “with haste”), and her condition on her return, had caused him great mental distress (~~4008~~ Matthew 1:18-20). Though his indignation was tempered with mercy, he was minded to put her away “privily,” but the visitation of the angel in his sleep relieved him from his dilemma, and he was reconciled to his wife (~~4024~~ Matthew 1:24). The narrative is then continued by Luke. While Joseph and Mary still abode in Nazareth, “there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be enrolled” (~~4006~~ Luke 2:1). “And all went to enroll themselves, every one to his own city” (~~4008~~ Luke 2:3). Being of the house and lineage of David, Joseph went up with Mary, who was “great with child,” from Galilee, “out of the city of Nazareth, into Judea, to the city of David, which is called Bethlehem” (~~4004~~ Luke 2:4,5), and there Jesus was born (~~4007~~ Luke 2:7; compare ~~4008~~ Matthew 2:1).

(2) After the Nativity.

(a) Luke’s Account: The two accounts now diverge considerably. According to Lk, the Holy Family remained for a time at Bethlehem and were there visited by the shepherds (~~4008~~ Luke 2:8-20). After a sojourn of 40 days for the purification (compare ~~4021~~ Luke 2:21,22; Leviticus 12), Joseph departed with his wife for Jerusalem “to present” the infant Jesus “to the Lord” and to offer up sacrifice according to the ancient law (~~4024~~ Luke 2:24). There he was present at the prophesying of



Simeon and Anna concerning Jesus, and received the blessing of the former (<sup>403</sup>Luke 2:34). After “they had accomplished all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth” (<sup>404</sup>Luke 2:39). Every year, at the Passover, they made this journey to Jerusalem (<sup>405</sup>Luke 2:41). The care and solicitude of Joseph and Mary for the boy Jesus and their grief at His temporary loss are also recorded (<sup>406</sup>Luke 2:45,48,51). There is evidence that, though Mary “kept all these things in her heart,” Joseph at least had no understanding then of the Divine nature of the charge committed to his care (<sup>407</sup>Luke 2:50).

**(b) Matthew’s Account:** But according to Matthew it was from the Wise Men of the East that Jesus received homage at Bethlehem (<sup>408</sup>Matthew 2:1-11). There is no further mention of the dedicatory journey to Jerusalem, or of the return to Nazareth. Instead, it is stated that on the departure of the Wise Men from Bethlehem, Joseph was warned in a dream of the impending wrath of Herod, and escaped with his wife and the infant Jesus into Egypt (<sup>409</sup>Matthew 2:13,14). Upon the death of Herod, an angel appeared to Joseph, and he returned to the land of Israel (<sup>410</sup>Matthew 2:19-21). His original intention was to settle once more in Judea, but on learning that Archelaus, the son of Herod, was ruler there, “he withdrew into the parts of Galilee, and came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth” (<sup>411</sup>Matthew 2:22,23).

**(c) The Proper Sequence of the Two Narratives:** The narrative of Matthew would thus imply that the Holy Family had no connection with Nazareth previous to their return from Egypt. It has, however, been suggested by Ramsay that Matthew merely reports what was common knowledge, and that Lk, while quite cognizant of this, supplemented it in his own Gospel with details known only to the Holy Family, and in part to the mother alone (compare Sir W. Ramsay, *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?* 78-79). A comparison of the two Gospel narratives makes it clear that the visitation of the Wise Men fell on a later date than that of the shepherds. The latter took place immediately after the Nativity (compare <sup>412</sup>Luke 2:11,15,16, “is born .... this day,” “let us now go,” “and they came with haste”). On the other hand, when the Wise Men came to Jerusalem, Christ was already born (compare <sup>413</sup>Matthew 2:1). Time was required for this journey to Jerusalem and the consultation of Herod with the chief priests (<sup>414</sup>Matthew 2:4); and

during this interval the events recorded in <sup><118></sup>Luke 2:8-39 had taken place. That there was sufficient time for this is attested also by the fact that Herod's decree was directed against children up to two years of age (<sup><126></sup>Matthew 2:16). Thus it was after the return of the Holy Family to Nazareth, and on a further visit to Bethlehem, implied by Matthew but not recorded by Lk, that the infant Jesus received the adoration of the Wise Men. Jesus being born in 6 BC, this took place in 5 BC, and as Herod died in 4 BC, Joseph may have missed only one of the Passovers (compare <sup><124></sup>Luke 2:41) by his flight into Egypt. (For a full discussion, compare Ramsay, op. cit.) As no mention is made of Joseph in the later parts of the Gospels where the Holy Family is referred to (compare <sup><126></sup>Matthew 12:46; <sup><189></sup>Luke 8:19), it is commonly supposed that he died before the commencement of the public ministry of Christ.

## 2. CHARACTER:

If a type is to be sought in the character of Joseph, it is that of a simple, honest, hard-working, God-fearing man, who was possessed of large sympathies and a warm heart. Strict in the observance of Jewish law and custom, he was yet ready when occasion arose to make these subservient to the greater law of the Spirit. Too practical to possess any deep insight into the Divine mysteries or eternal significance of events which came within his knowledge (compare <sup><120></sup>Luke 2:50), he was quick to make answer to what he perceived to be the direct call of God (compare <sup><124></sup>Matthew 1:24). Originally a "just man" (the King James Version), the natural clemency within his heart prevailed over mere justice, and by the promptings of the Holy Spirit that clemency was transferred into a strong and enduring love (compare <sup><124></sup>Matthew 1:24). Joseph is known to us only as a dim figure in the background of the Gospel narratives, yet his whole-hearted reconciliation to Mary, even in the face of possible slanderings by his neighbors, his complete self-sacrifice, when he left all and fled into Egypt to save the infant Jesus, are indicative that he was not unworthy to fulfill the great trust which was imposed upon him by the Eternal Father.

## 3. REFERENCES IN APOCRYPHAL LITERATURE:

The Gospel of the Infancy according to James, a work composed originally in the 2nd century, but with later additions (compare Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, 47-63), gives a detailed account of the marriage of the aged Joseph with Mary, of their journey to Bethlehem, and

of the birth of Jesus. A similar gospel, reputed to be by Thomas the philosopher, of later origin and Gnostic tendency (compare Hennecke, 63-73), narrates several fantastic, miraculous happenings in the domestic life of the Holy Family, and the dealings of Joseph with the teachers of the youthful Jesus. Other legends, from Syriac or Egyptian sources, also dealing with the Infancy, in which Joseph figures, are extant. The chief is The History of Joseph the Carpenter (compare Hennecke, Handbuch der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen, 95-105). This contains an account of the death and burial of Joseph at the age of 110, and of the entreaties of Mary to Christ to save him. Its aim was to show forth Christ as the Saviour, even at the last hour, and the rightful manner of Christian death. Joseph has received a high place in the Calendar of the Roman Catholic Saints, his feast being celebrated on March 19.

*C. M. Kerr*

## JOSEPH OF ARIMATHAEA

([ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας, *apo Arimathaias*]; for etymology, etc., of Joseph, see general article on *JOSEPH*): Joseph of Arimathea — a place the locality of which is doubtful, but lying probably to the Northwest of Jerusalem — was a “rich man” (<sup>4175</sup>Matthew 27:57), “a councilor of honorable estate,” or member of the Sanhedrin (<sup>4153</sup>Mark 15:43; <sup>4281</sup>Luke 23:50), “a good and righteous man .... who was looking for the kingdom of God” (<sup>4281</sup>Luke 23:50; <sup>4153</sup>Mark 15:43), and “himself was Jesus’ disciple” (<sup>4175</sup>Matthew 27:57; <sup>4198</sup>John 19:38). Although he kept his discipleship secret “for fear of the Jews” (<sup>4198</sup>John 19:38), he was yet faithful to his allegiance in that he absented himself from the meeting which found Jesus guilty of death (compare <sup>4281</sup>Luke 23:51; <sup>4144</sup>Mark 14:64). But the condemnation of his Lord awakened the courage and revealed the true faith of Joseph. On the evening after the crucifixion he went “boldly” to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus. There is a fine touch in that he himself took down the body from the cross. With the assistance of Nicodemus he wound it in fine linen with spices (compare <sup>4175</sup>Matthew 27:57, Joseph was a “rich man”) and brought it to the new sepulcher in the garden near the place of His crucifixion. There they “laid him in a tomb that was hewn in stone, where never man had yet lain” and “rolled a stone against the door of the tomb” (compare <sup>4175</sup>Matthew 27:57-60; <sup>4150</sup>Mark 15:42-46; <sup>4281</sup>Luke 23:50-53; <sup>4198</sup>John 19:38-42). In this was held to be the fulfillment of the prophecy of <sup>2510</sup>Isaiah 53:9.

The Gospel of Peter, written probably in Syria about the middle of the 2nd century, gives a slightly different account. According to this Joseph, “the friend of Pilate and the Lord,” was present at the trial of Jesus, and immediately upon its conclusion besought of Pilate that he might have the body for burial. This was granted, and after the crucifixion the Jews handed the body over to Joseph (compare Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, 27-30). Legends of a later origin record that Joseph was sent by Philip from Gaul to Britain along with 11 other disciples in 63 AD, and built an oratory at Glastonbury (compare PHILIP THE APOSTLE), that he brought the Holy Grail to England, and that he freed Ireland from snakes.

*C. M. Kerr*

## **JOSEPH, PRAYER OF**

An Old Testament pseudepigraph, number 3 in the *Stichometry of Nicephorus* (Westcott, *Canon of the New Testament*(7), 571), with the length given as 1,100 lines, and number 5 in the *List of Sixty Books* (Westcott, 568). The work is lost, and the only quotations are in Origen (In Joan., ii.25, English in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, IX, 341; In Gen., iii.9, 12). Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are said to have been created before every work, but Jacob-Israel is the greatest, “the firstborn of every living creature,” the “first minister in God’s presence,” greater than the angel with whom he wrestled. The purport may be anti-Christian, the patriarchs exalted in place of Christ; compare, perhaps, Enoch 71 (but not so in Charles’ 1912 text), but Origen’s favorable opinion of the book proves that the polemic could not have been very direct.

## **LITERATURE.**

GJV, 4th edition, III, 359-60; Dillmann in PRE, 2nd edition, XII, 362; compare Beer in 3rd edition, XVI, 256; Fabricius, *Codex pseudep. Vet. Test.*, I, 761-71.

*Burton Scott Easton*

## **JOSEPH’S DREAM**

*See ASTRONOMY, II, 6; JOSEPH.*

## JOSEPH, THE CARPENTER, GOSPEL OF

*See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.*

### JOSEPHUS

<jo-se'-fus> ([<sup>Ἰ</sup>ῶσηφος, *Iosephos*]; Codex Vaticanus reads [Φόσηπος, *Phosepos*]): In 1 Esdras 9:34, corresponding to “Joseph” in Ezr 10:42.

### JOSEPHUS; FLAVIUS

<jo-se'-fus>, <fla'-vi-us>:

#### 1. EARLY LIFE AND BELIEFS:

Was born at Jerusalem 37-38 AD, and died at Rome early in the 2nd century, when is not known precisely. His father and mother belonged to families of the priestly aristocracy; consequently he received an excellent education, becoming familiar, not only with Jewish, but with Hellenistic, culture. When 16 years old he resorted to one Banus, an ESSENE, (which see), in the desert of Engedi, with whom he remained for 3 years, absorbing occult lore, and practicing the ascetic life. It might have been expected from his social position that, on his return to Jerusalem, he would join the *SADDUCEES* (which see); but, his Essene experience having indoctrinated him with ceremonialism, he preferred to become a *PHARISEE* (which see). He evidently believed, too, that the Pharisees were akin to the Stoics, who were then influential in the Hellenistic world. During his absence in the desert, the misgovernment of the Roman procurators at Jerusalem had grown apace. And the ineptitudes and injustices of Felix, Albanus and Florus were succeeded by anarchy under Annas, the high priest (62). Accordingly, the *ZEALOTS* (which see) plotted against Roman rule. Rebellion simmered, and many of the disaffected were transported to Rome to be dealt with there. Among these were several priests, whom Josephus knew. About the year 64, he went to Rome to plead for them, met shipwreck on the voyage, was rescued with a few survivors and was brought to port at Puteoli. Here he met Alityrus, a Jewish actor, who happened to be in the good graces of Poppea, Nero's consort. The empress, a Jewish proselyte, espoused his cause at Rome, and showed him many favors. At the capital, he also discerned the power of the Romans and, in all probability, grew convinced of the hopelessness of

armed revolt. On his return to Jerusalem, he found his people set upon insurrection, and was forced, possibly against his better judgment, to make common cause with them. The first part of his public career is concerned with the great struggle that now began.

## 2. PUBLIC CAREER:

When war broke out, Josephus was appointed governor of Galilee, the province where the Roman attack would first fall. He had no military fitness for command, but the influence of his friends and the exigencies of politics thrust the office upon him. The Zealots soon found that he did not carry out the necessary preparations with thoroughness, and they tried to compass his removal. But he was too influential, too good a politician also, to be undermined. Surrounded by enemies among his own folk, who even attempted to assassinate him, he encountered several dangerous experiences, and, at length, flying from the Romans, was beleaguered with his army in Jotopata, near the Lake of Gennesaret, in May, 67 AD. The Jews withstood the siege for 47 days with splendid courage, till Titus, assaulting under cover of a mist, stormed the stronghold and massacred the weary defenders. Josephus escaped to a cave where, with his usual adroitness, he saved himself from death at the hands of his companions. The Romans soon discovered his hiding-place, and haled him before Vespasian, the commander-in-chief. Josephus worked upon the superstitions of the general, and so ingratiated himself that Vespasian took him to Alexandria in his train. Having been liberated by his captor, he adopted the family name of the Flavians, according to Roman custom. Returning to Palestine with Titus, he proceeded to mediate between the Romans and the Jews, earning the suspicion of the former, the hatred of the latter. His wonted diplomacy preserved him from anything more serious than a wound, and he was an eyewitness of the terrible events that marked the last days of Jerusalem. Then he accompanied Titus to Rome for the **TRIUMPH** (which see). Here he lived the remainder of his days, in high favor with the ruling house, and relieved from all anxiety about worldly goods by lavish imperial patronage. He was thus enabled to devote himself to literary pursuits.

## 3. WORKS:

The works of Josephus render him one of the most valuable authorities for the student of New Testament times. They are as follows:

**(1)** Concerning the Jewish War, written before 79; we have the Greek translation of this history by the author; there are 7 books: I, the period from Antiochus Epiphanes (175 BC) to Herod the Great (4 BC); II, from 4 BC to 66 AD, covering the early events of the War; III, occurrences in Galilee in 67 AD; IV, the course of the War till the siege of Jerusalem; V and VI, the investment and fall of Jerusalem; VII, the aftermath of the rebellion. While this work is not written with the objective accuracy of scientific history, it is credible on the whole, except where it concerns the role played by the author.

**(2)** The Antiquities of the Jews, written not later than 94 AD. In this Josephus purports to relate the entire history of his race, from the beginning till the War of 66 AD. The 20 books fall naturally into 5 divisions, thus:

**(a)** I-X, from prehistoric times till the Captivity, in other words, the period related in the Old Testament substantially;

**(b)** XI, the age of Cyrus;

**(c)** XII-XIV, the beginnings of the Hellenistic period, from Alexander the Great, including the Maccabean revolt, till the accession of Herod the Great;

**(d)** XV-XVII, the reign of Herod;

**(e)** XVIII-XX, from Herod's death till the War of 66. While it cannot be called an apology for the Jews, this work betrays the author's consciousness of the disfavor with which his people were viewed throughout the Roman Empire. Josephus does what he can to disabuse the Greek-Roman educated classes, although he shows curious obliquity to the grandeur of Hebrew religion. All in all, the work is disappointing; but it contains many details and sidelights of first importance to investigators.

**(3)** The treatise called, since Jerome, *Against Apion*, is Josephus' most inspiring performance. The older title, *Concerning the High Antiquity of the Jews*, tells us what it contains — a defense of Hebrew religion against the libels of heathendom. It is in two books. The vituperation with which Josephus visits Apion is unimportant in comparison with the defense of Mosaic religion and the criticism of paganism. Here the

author's character is seen at its best; the air of Worldly Wiseman has been dropped, and he approaches enthusiasm.

(4) His last work is the *Vita* or *Autobiography*, a misleading title. It is an echo of old days in Galilee, directed against the traductions of an associate, Justus of Tiberias. We have Josephus at his worst here. He so colors the narrative as to convey a totally wrong impression of the part he played during the great crisis. In extenuation, it may be said that his relations with the imperial court rendered it difficult, perhaps impossible, for him to pursue another course.

## LITERATURE.

W.D. Morrison, *The Jews under Roman Rule* (London, 1890); E. Schurer, *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, Div. I, Vol. I (Edinburgh, 1890); A. Hausrath, *History of New Testament Times*, IV, div VII, chapter ii (London, 1895); H. Graetz, *History of the Jews from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, II, chapter x (London, 1891); article "Josephus" in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Translations by Whiston (many editions), and of *The War of the Jews*, by Traill and Taylor (London, 1862).

*R. M. Wenley*

## JOSES

<jo'-sez>, <jo'-zez> ([<sup>1</sup> Ἰωσῆς, *Ioses*]):

(1) One of the brethren of Jesus (<sup><4068></sup>Mark 6:3; in <sup><4035></sup>Matthew 13:55 the Greek is "Joseph," and the Revised Version (British and American) so renders).

(2) A son of Mary, perhaps identical with

(1) (<sup><4275></sup>Matthew 27:56; <sup><4150></sup>Mark 15:40,47).

*See BRETHREN OF THE LORD.*

(3) A name of Barnabas (<sup><4086></sup>Acts 4:36 the King James Version, where again Greek and the Revised Version (British and American) have "Joseph").

*See BARNABAS.*



## JOSHAH

<jo'-sha> ([hvwQ yoshah], “Yahweh’s gift”): A descendant of Simeon, chief in his family (<sup><1314></sup>1 Chronicles 4:34,38).

## JOSHAPHAT

<josh'-a-fat> ([fpvwQ yoshaphaT], “Yahweh has judged”; compare *JEHOSHAPHAT*):

- (1) One of David’s mighty men (<sup><1314></sup>1 Chronicles 11:43), a “Mithnite,” but not included in the list of 2 Samuel 23.
- (2) A priest and trumpeter of David’s time (<sup><1314></sup>1 Chronicles 15:24), the King James Version “Jehoshaphat.”

## JOSHAVIAH

<josh-a-vi'-a> ([hywY" wQ yoshawyah], allied form to JOSHAH (which see)): Son of Elnaam, one of the band of braves who served David (<sup><1314></sup>1 Chronicles 11:46), omitted from the list of 2 Samuel 23, which is less complete and differs in detail.

## JOSHBKASHAH

<josh-be-ka'-sha>, <josh-be-kash'-a> ([hvaqBYy; yoshbeqashah], “son” of Heman; <sup><1314></sup>1 Chronicles 25:4,24): The last 8 or 9 names in per 4 are taken by commentators to be not names but the words of a prayer. See OTJ C2, 143, note; Curtis, Chron, 278, 280; SBOT.

## JOSHEB-BASSHEBETH

<jo-sheb-ba-she'-beth> ([tbvYB" bvyg; yoshebh ba-shebheth]): This proper name in the Revised Version (British and American) takes the place of the translation “that sat in the seat” in the King James Version (<sup><1318></sup>2 Samuel 23:8). The phrase so rendered is meaningless. The text has evidently suffered corruption. There can be no doubt that a proper name is intended. This, according to the parallel passage in <sup><13111></sup>1 Chronicles 11:11, should be Jashobeam. Some scholars think that this also is a corruption, and by a process of emendation arrive at “Eshbaal” as the correct name (Driver, Hebrew Text of S; SBOT, at the place).

## JOSHIBIAH

<josh-i-bi'-a> ([hyb]yiw yoshibhyah], “Yahweh sets,” or “causes to dwell”; the King James Version Josibiah): A Simeonite (<sup><1345></sup>1 Chronicles 4:35).

## JOSHUA (1)

<josh'-u-a> ((a) [[Wviw] yehoshua`],

(b) [[vwy] yehoshua`], “Yahweh is deliverance” or “opulence”; compare *JESHUA*; [᾽Ιησοῦς, *Iesous*]):

(1) Joshua the son of Nun; the name has the Hebrew form

(a) above in <sup><692></sup>Deuteronomy 3:21; <sup><693></sup>Judges 2:7; elsewhere the form (b), except in <sup><687></sup>Nehemiah 8:17, where it is of the form [yeshua`] (*See* *JESHUA*); compare also <sup><698></sup>Numbers 13:8,16; <sup><694></sup>Deuteronomy 32:44. See following article.

(2) In <sup><694></sup>1 Samuel 6:14,18 (form (b)), the Bethshemite in whose field stood the kine that brought the ark from the Philistines.

(3) In <sup><698></sup>2 Kings 23:8 (form (b)), governor of Jerusalem in the time of Josiah.

(4) The high priest at Jerusalem after the return. See separate article.

*S. F. Hunter*

## JOSHUA (2)

### I. FORM AND SIGNIFICANCE OF NAME.

The name Joshua, a contracted form of Jehoshua ([Wvwy] [vwy] yehoshua`)], which also appears in the form Jeshua ([vwy] yeshua`], <sup><687></sup>Nehemiah 8:17), signifies “Yahweh is deliverance” or “salvation,” and is formed on the analogy of many Israelite names, as Jehoiakim ([pyqjwy] yehoyaqim]), “Yahweh exalteth,” Jehochanan ([nj wy] yehochanan]), “Yahweh is gracious,” Elishua or Elisha ([Wvy] ə] ‘elishua`], [vy] ə] elisha`]), “God is deliverance,” Elizur ([rWxy] ə] ‘elitsur]), “God is a rock,” etc. In the narrative of the mission of the spies in Numbers 13, the

name is given as Hoshea ([<sup><1506></sup>ῥῶσῃ, *hoshea`*], 13:8,16; compare <sup><1504></sup>Deuteronomy 32:44), which is changed by Moses to Joshua (<sup><0436></sup>Numbers 13:16). In the passage in Deuteronomy, however, the earlier form of the name is regarded by Dr. Driver (Commentary in the place cited.) as an erroneous reading.

The Greek form of the name is Jesus ([<sup>'</sup>Ἰησοῦς, *Iesous*], <sup><4075></sup>Acts 7:45; <sup><3048></sup>Hebrews 4:8, the Revised Version (British and American) “Joshua,” but the King James Version “Jesus” in both passages), and this form appears even in the passages cited above from Nehemiah and Deuteronomy. In <sup><0438></sup>Numbers 13:8,16, however, Septuagint has [<sup><0064></sup>Ἀύση, *Hause*]. The name occurs in later Jewish history, e.g. as that of the owner of the field in which the ark rested after its return from the land of the Philistines (<sup><0064></sup>1 Samuel 6:14,18), and appears to have become especially frequent after the exile (Ezr 2:40; Zec 3:1ab, etc.). It is also found (Jeshua) with a local signification as the name of one of the “villages” in Southern Judea, where the repatriated Jews dwelt after their return from Babylon (<sup><6125></sup>Nehemiah 11:26).

## II. HISTORY OF THE LIFE OF JOSHUA.

The narrative of the life of Joshua, the son of Nun, is naturally divided into two parts, in which he held entirely different positions with regard to the people of Israel, and discharged different duties. In the earlier period he is the servant and minister of Moses, loyal to his leader, and one of his most trusted and valiant captains. After the death of Moses he himself succeeds to the leadership of the Israelite host, and conducts them to a settlement in the Promised Land. The service of the earlier years of his life is a preparation and equipment for the office and responsibility that devolved upon him in the later period.

### 1. *First Appearance:*

The first appearance of Joshua in the history is at Rephidim, on the way from the wilderness of Sin to Horeb. Neither the exact site of Rephidim nor the meaning of the name can be determined; the Israelites, however, apparently came to Rephidim before they approached the rich oasis of Feiran, for at the former place “there was no water for the people to drink” (Exodus 17:1). The fact that the host encamped there seems to assume the existence of wells; either, therefore, these were found to be dry, or they

failed before the wants of the great host were satisfied. The Amalekites, wandering desert tribes, claimed the ownership of the wells, and, resenting the Israelite intrusion, swooped down upon them to drive them away and to enrich themselves with the spoil of their possessions. Under the command of Joshua, the Israelites won a complete victory in a battle that seems to have been prolonged until sunset; the fortunes of the battle varying with the uplifting or falling of Moses' hands, which were accordingly supported by Aaron and Hur throughout the day (Exodus 17:11 ff). A curse and sentence of extermination pronounced against Amalek were formally written down and communicated to Joshua, apparently that, as the future leader of Israel, he might have it in charge to provide for their fulfillment.

It is evident also that at this period Joshua was no young and untried warrior. Although no indication of his previous history is given, his name is introduced into the narrative as of a man well known, who is sufficiently in the confidence of Moses to be given the chief command in the first conflict in which the Israelites had been engaged since leaving Egypt. The result justified the choice. And if, during the march, he had held the position of military commander and organizer under Moses, as the narrative seems to imply, to him was due in the first instance the remarkable change, by which within the brief space of a month the undisciplined crowd of serfs who had fled from Egypt became a force sufficiently resolute and compact to repel the onset of the Amalekite hordes.

## *2. The Minister of Moses:*

In all the arrangements for the erection and service of the tabernacle, Joshua the warrior naturally has no place. He is briefly named (Exodus 24:13) as the minister of Moses, accompanying him apparently to the foot of the mount of God, but remaining behind with the elders and Aaron and Hur, when Moses commenced the ascent. A similar brief mention is in Exodus 32:17, where he has rejoined Moses on the return of the latter from the mount with the two tables of the testimony, and is unaware of the outbreak of the people and their idolatrous worship of the molten calf in the camp; compare 33:11, where again he is found in the closest attendance upon his leader and chief. No further reference is made to Joshua during the stay of the Israelites at Sinai, or their subsequent journeyings, until they found themselves at Kadesh-barnea on the southern border of the Promised Land (Numbers 13). His name is once mentioned, however, in an earlier

chapter of the same book (<sup><04128></sup>Numbers 11:28), when the tidings are brought to Moses that two men in the camp of Israel, Eldad and Medad, had been inspired to prophesy. There he is described in harmony with the previous statements of his position, as Moses' minister from his youth. Jealous of his leader's prerogative and honor, he would have the irregular prophesying stopped, but is himself checked by Moses, who rejoices that the, spirit of God should rest thus upon any of the Lord's people.

### *3. One of the Spies:*

Of the 12 men, one from each tribe, sent forward by Moses from Kadesh to ascertain the character of the people and land before him, two only, Hoshea the Ephraimite, whose name is significantly changed to Joshua (<sup><04138></sup>Numbers 13:8,16), and Caleb the Judahite, bring back a report encouraging the Israelites to proceed. The account of the mission of the spies is repeated substantially in <sup><04122></sup>Deuteronomy 1:22-46. There, however, the suggestion that spies should be commissioned to examine and report upon the land comes in the first instance from the people themselves. In the record of Numbers they are chosen and sent by Moses under Divine direction (13:1 f). The two representations are not incompatible, still less contradictory. The former describes in an altogether natural manner the human initiative, probable enough in the circumstances in which the Israelites found themselves; the latter is the Divine control and direction, behind and above the affairs of men. The instructions given to the spies (13:17 ff) evidently contemplated a hasty survey of the entire region of the Negeb or southern borderland of Palestine up to and including the hill country of Judea; the time allowed, 40 days (13:25), was too brief to accomplish more, hardly long enough for this purpose alone. They were, moreover, not only to ascertain the character of the towns and their inhabitants, the quality and products of the soil, but to bring back with them specimens of the fruits (13:20). An indication of the season of the year is given in the added clause that "the time was the time of first-ripe grapes." The usual months of the vintage are September and October (compare <sup><04239></sup>Leviticus 23:39); in the warm and sheltered valleys, however, in the neighborhood of Hebron, grapes may sometimes be gathered in August or even as early as July. The valley from which the fruits, grapes, figs and pomegranates were brought was known as the valley of Eshcol, or the "cluster" (<sup><04123></sup>Numbers 13:23 f; 32:9; <sup><04124></sup>Deuteronomy 1:24).

No hesitating or doubtful account is given by all the spies of the fertility and attractiveness of the country; but in view of the strength of its cities and inhabitants only Joshua and Caleb are confident of the ability of the Israelites to take possession of it. Their reports and exhortations, however, are overborne by the timidity and dissuasion of the others, who so entirely alarm the people that they refuse to essay the conquest of the land, desiring to return into Egypt (<sup><0443></sup>Numbers 14:3 f), and attempt to stone Joshua and Caleb (<sup><0440></sup>Numbers 14:10). These two alone, therefore, were exempted from the sentence of exclusion from the Promised Land (<sup><0444></sup>Numbers 14:24,30,38; 26:65; 32:12; <sup><0125></sup>Deuteronomy 1:25 ff). The remainder of the spies perished at once by a special visitation (<sup><0446></sup>Numbers 14:36); and the people were condemned to a 40-year exile in the wilderness, a year for each day that the spies had been in Palestine, until all the men of that generation “from twenty years old and upward” were dead (<sup><0449></sup>Numbers 14:29; 26:64 f; 32:11 ff). An abortive attempt was made to invade the land in defiance of the prohibition of Yahweh, and ended in failure and disastrous defeat (<sup><0430></sup>Numbers 32:40 ff; <sup><0141></sup>Deuteronomy 1:41 ff; compare 21:1-3).

Upon the events of the next 38 or 40 years in the life of Israel an almost unbroken silence falls. The wanderers in the wilderness have no history. Some few events, however, that are recorded without note of time, the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, and the breaking out of the plague because of the people’s murmuring, and probably others (<sup><0452></sup>Numbers 15:32-36; 16 f), appear to belong to this period. In none of them does Joshua take an active part, nor is his name mentioned in connection with the campaigns against Sihon and Og on the East of the Jordan. When the census of the people is taken in the plains of Moab opposite Jericho, Joshua and Caleb with Moses himself are found to be the only survivors of the host that 40 years previously came out of Egypt (<sup><0463></sup>Numbers 26:63 ff). As the time of the death of the great leader and lawgiver drew near, he was commissioned formally to appoint Joshua as his successor and to hand over to him and to Eleazar the priest the duty of finally apportioning the conquered territory among the several tribes (<sup><0478></sup>Numbers 27:18 ff; 32:28; 34:17; compare <sup><0138></sup>Deuteronomy 1:38; 3:28; 31:3,7,23; 34:9). Some of these passages anticipate the direct Divine commission and encouragement recorded in Joshua (1:1,5 ff) and given to him after the death of Moses.

#### *4. The Head of the People:*

The history of Joshua in his new capacity as supreme head and leader of the people in several instances recapitulates as it were the history of his greater forerunner. It was not Head unnatural that it should be so; and the similarity of recorded events affords no real ground for doubt with regard to the reliability of the tradition concerned. The position in which Israel now found itself on the East of the Jordan was in some respects not unlike that which confronted Moses at Kadesh-barnea or before the crossing of the Red Sea. Joshua, however, was faced with a problem much less difficult, and in the war-tried and disciplined host at his command he possessed an instrument immensely more suitable and powerful for carrying out his purpose.

##### **(1) His First Act — Sending of the Spies.**

His first act was to send spies from Shittim to ascertain the character of the country immediately opposite on the West of the Jordan, and especially the position and strength of Jericho, the frontier and fortified city which first stands in the way of an invader from the East who proposes to cross the river by the fords near its mouth (<sup><HEB></sup>Joshua 2:2). In Jericho the spies owed their lives to the quick inventiveness of Rahab (compare <sup><HEB></sup>Hebrews 11:31), who concealed them on the roof of her house from the emissaries of the king; and returning to Joshua, they reported the prospects of an easy victory and conquest (<sup><HEB></sup>Joshua 2:23 f).

There were doubtless special reasons which induced Joshua to essay the crossing of the Jordan at the lower fords opposite Jericho. Higher up the river a probably easier crossing-place led directly into Central Palestine, a district in which apparently his advance would not have been obstructed by fortified cities such as confronted him farther south; which therefore would seem to offer the advantages of an open and ready entrance into the heart of the country. His decision was probably influenced by a desire to possess himself of a fortified base at Jericho and in the neighboring cities. The favorable report of the spies also proved that there would be no great difficulty in carrying out this plan.

##### **(2) Crossing of the Jordan.**

The actual crossing of the river is narrated in Joshua 3; 4. The city of Jericho was built in a plain from 12 to 14 miles wide formed by the

recession of the hills that border the valley of the Jordan from the Sea of Galilee to the Dead Sea, and stood at the mouth of the valley of Achor (7:24,26; 15:7). The modern village of Eriha is built at a short distance Southeast of the ancient site, and Gilgal lay half-way to the river. At the latter place the fixed camp was established after the taking of Jericho, and Gilgal formed for some considerable time the base of operations, where the women and children remained in safety while the men were absent on their warlike expeditions. There also the tabernacle was erected, as the symbol and center of national life, and there apparently it remained until the time came for the removal to Shiloh (18:1).

Within the plain the stream has excavated a tortuous bed to a depth of 200 ft. below the surface, varying from an eighth of a mile to a mile in breadth. In ordinary seasons the waters are confined to a small portion of the channel, which is then crossed opposite Jericho by two fords where the depth does not exceed 2 or 3 ft. When the river is low it may be crossed elsewhere. In times of flood, however, the water rises and fills the entire channel from bank to bank, so that the fords become impracticable. It is expressly stated that it was at such a time of flood that the Israelites approached the river, at the "time of harvest," or in the early spring (<sup>HB5</sup>Joshua 3:15). The priests were directed to carry the ark to the brink of the river, the waters of which, as soon as their feet touched them, would be cut off, and a dry passage afforded. The narrative therefore is not to be understood as though it indicated that a wall of water stood on the right and left of the people as they crossed; the entire breadth of the river bed was exposed by the failure of the waters from above.

*See JORDAN.*

An interesting parallel to the drying up of the Jordan before Joshua is recorded by an Arabic historian of the Middle Ages, who writes to explain a natural but extraordinary occurrence, without any thought of the miraculous or any apparent knowledge of the passage of the Israelites. During the years 1266-67 AD, a Mohammedan sultan named Beybars was engaged in building a bridge over the Jordan near Damieh, a place which some have identified with the city Adam (<sup>HB6</sup>Joshua 3:16); but the force of the waters repeatedly carried away and destroyed his work. On one night, however, in December of the latter year, the river ceased entirely to flow. The opportunity was seized, and an army of workmen so strengthened the bridge that it resisted the flood which came down upon it the next day, and



stood firm. It was found that at some distance up the river, where the valley was narrow, the banks had been undermined by the running water and had fallen in, thus completely damming back the stream. It seems not improbable that it was by agency of this character that a passage was secured for the Israelites; even as 40 years earlier a “strong east wind” had been employed to drive back the waters of the Red Sea before Moses.

At the command of Joshua, under Divine direction, the safe crossing of the Jordan was commemorated by the erection at Gilgal of 12 stones (4:3-9,20 ff), one for each of the tribes of Israel, taken from the bed of the river. In ~~<104>~~Joshua 4:9 it is stated that 12 stones were set up in the midst of the river. The statement is probably a misunderstanding, and a mere confusion of the tradition. It is not likely that there would be a double commemoration, or an erection of stones in a place where they would never be seen. At Gilgal also the supply of manna ceased, when the natural resources of the country became available (5:12). The date of the passage is given as the 10th day of the 1st month (4:19); and on the 14th day the Passover was kept at Gilgal in the plains of Jericho (5:10). For the 2nd time, also, at the crisis of the first entrance into the land, Joshua was encouraged for his work by a vision and Divine promise of assistance and direction (5:13-15).

### **(3) Capture of Jericho.**

The narrative that follows, of the taking of Jericho, illustrates, as would naturally be expected in the case of a city so situated the effeminate and unwarlike character of its inhabitants. There was apparently little or no fighting, while for a whole week Joshua with priests and people paraded before the walls. A brief reference (6:1) seems to indicate that the citizens were quickly driven to take refuge behind their fortifications. Twice seven times the city was compassed, with the ark of the covenant borne in solemn procession, and at the 7th circuit on the 7th day, while the people shouted, the wall of the city fell “in its place” (6:20 margin), and Jericho was taken by assault. Only Rahab and her household were spared. All the treasure was devoted to the service of the Lord, but the city itself was burnt, and a solemn curse pronounced upon the site and upon the man who should venture to rebuild its walls (6:26). The curse was braved, whether deliberately or not, by a citizen of Bethel in the time of King Ahab; and the disasters foretold fell upon him in the loss of his children (~~<116>~~1 Kings 16:34). Thenceforward Jericho appears to have been continuously

inhabited. There was a settlement of the sons of the prophets there in Elisha's day (<sup><1115></sup>2 Kings 2:5,15). The natural fertility of the site won for it the name of the city of palm trees (<sup><1545></sup>Deuteronomy 34:3; <sup><1116></sup>Judges 1:16; 3:13).

From the plains of Jericho two valleys lead up into the central hill country in directions Northwest and Southwest respectively. These form the two entrances or passes, by which the higher land is approached from the East. Along these lines, therefore, the invasion of the land was planned and carried out. The main advance under Joshua himself took place by the northernmost of the valleys, while the immediate southern invasion was entrusted to Caleb and the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin, the supreme control remaining always in the hands of Joshua (compare Joshua 14; 15; Judges 1). This seems on the whole to be the better way of explaining the narratives in general, which in detail present many difficulties.

#### **(4) Conquest of Ai and Bethel.**

At the head of the northern pass stood the city of Luz or Bethel (<sup><1239></sup>Genesis 28:19; <sup><1513></sup>Joshua 18:13; <sup><1123></sup>Judges 1:23). Ai lay close at hand, and was encountered by the invaders before reaching Bethel; its exact site, however, is undetermined. The two towns were in close alliance (compare <sup><1517></sup>Joshua 8:17), and the defeat and destruction of the one was quickly followed by the similar fate that overtook the other. Before Ai, the advance guard of the Israelites, a small party detached on the advice of the spies sent forward by Joshua from Jericho, suffered defeat and were driven back in confusion (7:2 ff). The disaster was due to the failure to obey the command to "devote" the whole spoil of Jericho, and to theft by one of the people of treasure which belonged rightfully to Yahweh (7:11). When the culprit Achan had been discovered and punished, a renewed attempt upon Ai, made with larger forces and more skillful dispositions, was crowned with success. The city was taken by a stratagem and destroyed by fire, its king being hanged outside the city gate (8:28 f). Unlike Jericho, it seems never to have been restored. Bethel also was captured, through the treachery apparently of one of its own citizens, and its inhabitants were put to the sword (<sup><1124></sup>Judges 1:24 f).

#### **(5) Reading of the Law on Mt. Ebal.**

Of further campaigns undertaken by Joshua for the subjugation of Central Palestine no account has been preserved. It is possible, therefore, that the

conquest of this part of the country was accomplished without further fighting (*see JOSHUA, BOOK OF*). In the list of the cities (<sup><617></sup>Joshua 12:7-24) whose kings were vanquished by Joshua, there are no names of towns that can be certainly identified as situated here; the greater part evidently belong to the north or south. The only record remaining is that of the formal erection of an altar on Mt. Ebal in the presence of all the people and the solemn reading of the law in their hearing (8:30-35). It is expressly noted that all this was done in accordance with the directions of Moses (compare <sup><612></sup>Deuteronomy 11:29; 27:2-8,11 ff). It would further appear probable that this ceremony really took place at the close of the conquest, when all the land was subdued, and is narrated here by anticipation.

### (6) **The Gibeonites.**

The immediate effect of the Israelite victories under Joshua was very great. Especially were the Hivite inhabitants of Gibeon struck with fear (9:3 ff) lest the same fate should overtake them that had come upon the peoples of Jericho and Ai. With Gibeon, 3 other cities were confederate, namely, Chephirah, Beeroth and Kiriath-jearim, or the "city of groves" (9:17). Gibeon, however, was the chief, and acted in the name of the others. It is usually identified with the modern village or township of el-Jib, 7 or 8 miles North by West of Jerusalem; and all four lay clustered around the head of the pass or valley of Aijalon, which led down from the plateau westward to the foothills of the Shephelah, toward the plain and the sea. Gibeon held therefore a position of natural strength and importance, the key to one of the few practicable routes from the west into the highlands of Judea, equally essential to be occupied as a defensive position against the incursions of the dwellers in the plains, and as affording to an army from the east a safe and protected road down from the mountains.

By a stratagem which threw Joshua and the leaders of Israel off their guard, representing themselves as jaded and wayworn travelers from a distance, the Gibeonites succeeded in making a compact with Israel, which assured their own lives and safety. They affirmed that they had heard of the Israelite victories beyond Jordan, and also of the gift to them by Yahweh of the whole land (<sup><600></sup>Joshua 9:9 f,24). Joshua and the princes were deceived and entered too readily into covenant with them, a covenant and promise that was scrupulously observed when on the 3rd day of traveling the Israelites reached their cities and found them to be close at hand (9:16 ff). While, however, their lives were preserved, the men of Gibeon were

reduced to the position of menial servants, “hewers of wood and drawers of water”; and the writer adds, it is thus “unto this day” (9:21,27).

*See GIBEON.*

The treaty of peace with the Gibeonites and the indignation thereby aroused among the neighboring kings, who naturally regarded the independent action of the men of Gibeon as treachery toward themselves, gave rise to one of the most formidable coalitions and one of the most dramatic incidents of the whole war. The king of Jerusalem, Adoni-zedek (“the Lord of righteousness” or “the Lord is righteousness,” <sup><600></sup>Joshua 10:1; compare Melchizedek, “the king of righteousness,” <sup><0148></sup>Genesis 14:18; in <sup><0006></sup>Judges 1:5 ff the name appears as Adoni-bezek, and so Septuagint reads here), with the 4 kings of Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish and Eglon (<sup><600></sup>Joshua 10:3), formed a plan to destroy Gibeon in revenge, and the Gibeonites sent hastily for assistance to Joshua, who had returned with his army to Gilgal. The Israelites made a forced march from Gilgal, came upon the allied kings near Gibeon, and attacked and defeated them with great slaughter. The routed army fled westward “by the way of the ascent to Beth-horon” (<sup><600></sup>Joshua 10:10), and in the pass was overtaken by a violent hailstorm, by which more perished than had fallen beneath the swords of the Israelites (<sup><600></sup>Joshua 10:11). The 5 kings were shut up in a cave at Makkedah, in which they had taken refuge, whence they were subsequently brought forth and put to death. The actual pursuit, however, was not stayed until the remnant had found temporary security behind the walls of their fortified cities (<sup><600></sup>Joshua 10:16 ff). The victory of Israel was commemorated by Joshua in a song of which some words are preserved (<sup><600></sup>Joshua 10:12 f).

*See BETH-HORON, BATTLE OF.*

### **(7) Conquest of the South.**

With almost severe simplicity it is further recorded how the confederate cities in turn were captured by Joshua and utterly destroyed (10:28-39). And the account is closed by a summary statement of the conquest of the entire country from Kadesh-barnea in the extreme south as far as Gibeon, after which the people returned to their camp at Gilgal (10:40-43).

## **(8) Northern Conquests.**

A hostile coalition of northern rulers had finally to be met and defeated before the occupation and pacification of the land could be said to be complete. Jabin, king of Hazor, the “fort,” was at the head of an alliance of northern kings who gathered together to oppose Israel in the neighborhood of the waters of Merom (<sup><610></sup>Joshua 11:1 ff). Hazor has been doubtfully identified with the modern Jebel Hadireh, some 5 miles West of the lake. No details of the fighting that ensued are given. The victory, however, of the Israelites was decisive, although chariots and horses were employed against them apparently for the first time on Canaanite soil. The pursuit was maintained as far as Sidon, and Misrephoth-maim, perhaps the “boilings” or “tumults of the waters,” the later Zarephath on the coast South of the former city (<sup><610></sup>Joshua 11:8; compare 13:6); and the valley of Mizpeh must have been one of the many wadies leading down to the Phoenician coast land. The cities were taken, and their inhabitants put to the sword; but Hazor alone appears to have been burnt to the ground (<sup><611></sup>Joshua 11:11 ff). That the royal city recovered itself later is clear from the fact that a king of Hazor was among the oppressors of Israel in the days of the Judges (Judges 4). For the time being, however, the fruit of these victories was a widespread and much-needed peace. “The land had rest from war” (<sup><612></sup>Joshua 11:23).

## **(9) Allotment of Territory.**

Thus the work of conquest, as far as it was effected under Joshua’s command, was now ended; but much yet remained to be done that was left over for future generations. The ideal limits of Israel’s possession, as set forth by Yahweh in promise to Moses, from the Shihor or Brook of Egypt (compare <sup><615></sup>1 Chronicles 13:5) to Lebanon and the entering in of Hamath (Numbers 34), had not been and indeed never were reached. In view, however, of Joshua’s age (<sup><616></sup>Joshua 13:1), it was necessary that an allotment of their inheritance West of the Jordan should at once be made to the remaining tribes. Reuben, Gad and half the tribe of Manasseh had been already provided for by Moses in Eastern Palestine (<sup><615></sup>Joshua 13:15-32). Joshua 14 through 21 accordingly contain a detailed account of the arrangements made by the Israelite leader for the settlement of the land and trace the boundaries of the several tribal possessions. The actual division appears to have been made on two separate occasions, and possibly from two distinct centers. Provision was first made for Judah and the children of

Joseph; and between the northern border of the former tribe, recorded in detail in 15:5-11, and the inheritance of the sons of Joseph, a tract of land for the present left unassigned was later given to the tribes of Benjamin and Dan. An extra portion also was promised by Joshua to the descendants of Joseph on the ground of their numbers and strength (17:14 ff).

For the 7 tribes that were yet without defined inheritance a rough survey of the land appears to have been made, and the unallotted districts were divided into 7 portions, for which lots were then cast at Shiloh in the presence of the assembled tribes (Joshua 18; 19). The express mention of Shiloh here (<sup><6801></sup>Joshua 18:1,10) suggests that the previous division was carried out at some other place, and if so, probably at Gilgal, the earlier resting-place of the ark and the tabernacle. No definite statement, however, to that effect is made. Benjamin's portion was assigned between the territories of Judah and the children of Joseph (<sup><6811></sup>Joshua 18:11). Simeon received his inheritance out of the land given to Judah, a part on the south being taken away on the ground that the whole was too great for a single tribe (<sup><6901></sup>Joshua 19:1-9). Zebulun, Issachar, Asher, and Naphtali were established in the north (<sup><6910></sup>Joshua 19:10-39). And Dan was settled on the seacoast by Joppa, with additional territory in the extreme north, of which they apparently took independent and forcible possession, beyond the inheritance of the other tribes (<sup><6940></sup>Joshua 19:40-48; compare <sup><71827></sup>Judges 18:27-29).

### **(10) Cities of Refuge.**

Finally the 6 cities of refuge were appointed, 3 on each side of the Jordan, and the 48 cities of the Levites taken out of the territories of the several tribes (Joshua 20; 21; compare Numbers 35; <sup><6944></sup>Deuteronomy 4:41-43). The two and a half tribes whose inheritance lay in Eastern Palestine were then dismissed, their promise of assistance to their brethren having been fulfilled (Joshua 22); and an altar was erected by them on the right bank of the Jordan whose purpose is explained to be to serve as a standing witness to the common origin of all the tribes, and to frustrate any future attempt to cut off those on the East from the brotherhood of Israel.

### **(11) Final Address and Death.**

In a closing assembly of the Israelites at Shechem, Joshua delivered to the people his final charge, as Moses had done before his death, reminding them of their own wonderful history, and of the promises and claims of

God, and exhorting them to faithful and loyal obedience in His service (23; 24). A stone also was set up under the oak in the sacred precinct of Yahweh, to be a memorial of the renewed covenant between God and His people (24:26 f). Then at the age of 110 the second great leader of Israel died, and was laid to his rest within his own inheritance in Timnath-serah (24:29,30; in ~~24:29~~Judges 2:9, Timnath-heres), in the hill country of Ephraim. The site of his grave is unknown. Tradition has placed it at Kefr Haris, 9 miles South of Nablus or Shechem. But the localizing by tradition of the burying-place of hero or saint is often little more than accidental, nor can any reliance be placed upon it in this instance.

### III. SOURCES OF HISTORY.

That the narratives concerning the life and work of Joshua rest in the main upon basis of tradition can hardly be doubted. How far the details have been modified, or a different coloring imparted in the course of a long transmission, it is impossible to determine. There is a remarkable similarity or parallelism between many of the leading events of Joshua's life as ruler and captain of Israel and the experiences of his predecessor Moses, which, apart from any literary criticism, suggests that the narratives have been drawn from the same general source, and subjected to the same conditions of environment and transmission. Thus both are called to and strengthened for their work by a special Divine revelation, Moses at Horeb in the burning bush, Joshua at Jericho. Both lead the people across the bed of waters miraculously driven back to afford them passage. And both at no long interval after the passage win a notable victory over their adversaries — a victory ascribed in each case to direct Divine intervention on their behalf, although in different ways. At the close of their life-work, moreover, both Moses and Joshua deliver stirring addresses of appeal and warning to the assembled Israelites; and both are laid in nameless graves. These all, however, are occurrences perfectly natural and indeed inevitable in the position in which each found himself. Nor do they afford adequate ground for the supposition that the achievements of the greater leader have been duplicated, or by mistake attributed to the less. To cross the Jordan and to defeat the Canaanite confederacy were as essential to the progress of Israel as the passage of the Red Sea and the breaking up of the gathering of Amalekite clans; and no true or sufficient history could have evaded the narration of these events. The position of Israel also on the East of the Jordan about to undertake the invasion and conquest of the Promised Land

as imperatively demanded a specially qualified captain and guide, a mastermind to control the work, as did the oppressed people in Egypt or the wanderers in the desert. That Joshua was not so great a man as his predecessor the entire narrative testifies. Moses, however, must of necessity have had a successor to take up his unfinished work and to carry it to completion.

#### **IV. CHARACTER AND WORK OF JOSHUA.**

As to the personal character of Joshua, there is little to be inferred from the narrative of his campaigns. In this respect indeed they are singularly colorless. In early life his loyalty to Moses was conspicuous and unswerving. As his successor, he seems to have faithfully acted upon his principles, and in the direction of the Israelite campaigns to have proved himself a brave and competent general, as wise in counsel as he was strong in fight. The putting to death of captives and the handing over to the sword of the inhabitants of hostile cities, which the historian so often records as the consequence of his victories, must evidently be judged by the customs of the times, and have perhaps lost nothing in the narration. They do not in any case justify the attribution to Joshua of an especially inhumane disposition, or a delight in slaughter for its own sake. After the death of Moses he would appear to have been reluctant to undertake the onerous position and duty assigned to him through mistrust of his own ability and lack of self-confidence, and needed more than once to be encouraged in his work and assured of Divine support. In the language of his closing discourse there is apparent a foresight and appreciation of the character and tendencies of the people who had followed him, which is hardly inferior to that of Moses himself. In a real sense also his work was left unfinished at his death. The settlement of Canaan by the tribes of Israel within the appointed and promised limits was never more than partial. The new colonists failed to enjoy that absolute and undisturbed possession of the land to which they had looked forward; witness the unrest of the period of the Judges, prolonged and perpetuated through monarchical times. For all this, however, the blame cannot justly be laid to the account of Joshua. Many causes undoubtedly concurred to an issue which was fatal to the future unity and happiness and prosperity of Israel. The chief cause, as Joshua warned them would be the case, was the persistent idolatry of the people themselves, their neglect of duty, and disregard of the commands and claims of their God.



**JOSHUA (3)**

Son of Jehozadak (<sup><5000></sup>Haggai 1:1,12,14; 2:2,4; Zec 3:1,3,6,8,9; 6:11 form (b)) and high priest in Jerusalem, called “Jeshua” in Ezra-Nehemiah. His father was among the captives at the fall of Jerusalem in 586 BC, and also his grandfather Seraiah, who was put to death at Riblah (<sup><12518></sup>2 Kings 25:18 ff; <sup><13165></sup>1 Chronicles 6:15). Joshua appears in Ezr 3:2 with Zerubbabel at the head of the returned exiles and as leader in the work of building an altar and reestablishing sacrificial worship (538 or 537 BC). Ezr 3:8 tells of their laying the foundation of the temple, and in 4:1 ff the two heads of the community refuse to allow the Samaritans to cooperate in the building operations, with the result that the would-be helpers became active opponents of the work. Building then ceased until Haggai and Zechariah in 520 (Ezr 5; <sup><5000></sup>Haggai 1:1-11) exhort the community to restart work, and the two leaders take the lead (<sup><5012></sup>Haggai 1:12-15). The following are, in chronological order, the prophetic utterances in which Joshua is spoken of:

- (1) <sup><5000></sup>Haggai 1:1-11;
- (2) <sup><5000></sup>Haggai 2:1-9;
- (3) Zec 1:1-6;
- (4) <sup><5020></sup>Haggai 2:10-19;
- (5) <sup><5020></sup>Haggai 2:20-23;
- (6) the visions of Zec 1:7-6:8 together with
- (7) the undated utterance of Zec 6:9-15.1.

The Vision of <sup><3810></sup>Zechariah 3:1-10: Two of these call for special attention. First, the vision of a trial in which Joshua is prosecuted before the angel of Yahweh by Satan ([ha-saTan], “the adversary”), who is, according to one view, “not the spirit of evil who appears in later Jewish writings; he is only the officer of justice whose business is to see that the case against criminals is properly presented” in the heavenly court of justice (H.P. Smith, *Old Testament History*, 356); while others regard him as the enemy of God’s people (compare Orelli, *Minor Prophets*, English translation, 327). We are not told what the charge against Joshua is: some hold him to be tried as in some way a representative of the people or the priesthood, and his filthy

garments as symbolical of sin; while others explain the garments as put on to excite the court's pity. The adversary is rebuked by "the angel of Yahweh" (read at beginning of Zec 3:2, "and the angel of Yahweh said," etc.), and Joshua is acquitted. He is then ordered to be stripped of his old clothes and to be arrayed in "rich apparel" (Zec 3:4), while a "clean turban" (American Standard Revised Version margin) is to be put on his head. Conditional upon his walking in God's ways, he is promised the government of the temple and "free access" to God, being placed among the servants of the "angel of Yahweh." Joshua and his companions "are men that are a sign" (Zec 3:8), i.e. a guaranty of the coming of the Messiah; there is set before Joshua a stone which is to be inscribed upon, and the iniquity of the land will be removed, an event to be followed by peace and plenty (Zec 3:9 f). In Zec 3:4 ff Nowack and Wellhausen (with the Septuagint mostly) read, "And he answered and spake unto those that stood before him (i.e. his servants) thus: Take the filthy garments from off him, and clothe him with rich apparel, (5) and set a clean turban upon his head. So they set a clean turban upon his head and clothed him with clean garments. And the angel of Yahweh stood up, (6) and solemnly exhorted Joshua," etc. They also omit the first "for" in Zec 3:8 as a dittography. Different interpretations are given of the vision:

(1) Some claim to see here a contest between the civil and religious powers as represented by Zerubbabel and Joshua respectively (Zec 6:13), and that Zechariah decides for the supremacy of the latter. The Messiah-King is indeed in Jerusalem in the person of Zerubbabel, though as yet uncrowned; but Joshua is to be supreme (see G.A. Smith, *Jerusalem*, II, 303; H.P. Smith, *Old Testament History*, 356 f). This explanation is dependent to a large extent upon Zec 6:9-15, and is not supported by 3:8. It is difficult to explain 3:2 on this view, for Zerubbabel could also be described as a "brand plucked out of the fire." What the vision says is that the vindication of Joshua is a sign for the coming of Yahweh's "servant, the Branch," a title that is not given to Joshua (compare Zec 3:7).

(2) Others maintain that the garments are symbolical of the sins of the predecessors of Joshua, who is tried for their offenses and himself regarded as being unworthy of the office because he had been brought up in a foreign and heathen land (so Keil, Orelli).

(3) Hitzig, followed by Nowack (Kleine Propheten, 325), holds that the idea which lies at the basis of the vision is that Satan is responsible for the ills which the community had suffered (compare Job 1; 2).

The people had begun to think that their offerings were not acceptable to God and that He would not have pity upon them. There was a feeling among the most pious ones that God's righteousness would not allow of their restoration to their former glory. This conflict between righteousness and mercy is decided by silencing the accuser and vindicating Joshua. It is difficult to decide which view, if any, is correct. "The brand plucked out of the fire" seems to point to God's recognizing that the community, or perhaps the priestly succession, had almost been exterminated by the exile. It reminds us of the oak of which, after its felling, the stump remaineth (<sup>2363</sup>Isaiah 6:13), and may perhaps point to God's pity being excited for the community. The people, attacked by their enemies and represented by Joshua, are to be restored to their old glory: that act being symbolized by the clothing of Joshua in clean raiment; and that symbolical act (compare <sup>2388</sup>Isaiah 8:18) is a sign, a guaranty, of the coming of the Messiah-King. The ritualistic tone of Malachi will then follow naturally after the high place given here to the high priest. It is noteworthy that the promise of Zec 3:7 is conditional. One more point remains, namely, the meaning of the stone in Zec 3:9. It has been differently explained as a jewel in the new king's crown (Nowack); a foundation stone of the temple, which, however, was already laid (Hitzig); the chief stone of 4:7 (Ewald, Steiner); the Messiah Himself (Keil); the stone in the high priest's breastplate (Bredenkamp), and the stone which served as an altar (Orelli). Commentators tend to regard the words "upon one stone are seven eyes" as a parenthetical addition characteristic of the author of Zec 9 ff.2. Joshua's Crown, <sup>3019</sup>Zechariah 6:9-15: The utterance of Zec 6:9-15 presents to us some more exiles coming from Babylon with silver and gold apparently for the temple. According to the present text, Zechariah is commanded to see that this is used to make a crown for Joshua who is to be a priest-king. This is taken to mean that he is to be given the crown that had been meant for Zerubbabel. But commentators hold that the text has been altered: that the context demands the crowning of Zerubbabel — the Branch of Davidic descent. This view is supported by Zec 6:13, "And the counsel of peace shall be between them both"; and therefore the last clause of 6:11 is omitted. Wellhausen keeps 6:9 and 10, and then reads: "(11) Yea, take of them silver and gold and make a crown, (12) and say to them:

Thus saith Yahweh of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is the Branch, from whose root there will be a sprout, (13) and he will build the Temple of Yahweh, and he will obtain glory and sit and rule upon his throne. And Joshua will be a priest on his right hand, and there will be friendly peace between them both. (14) The crown shall be,” etc.; Zec 6:15 is incomplete. It will be objected that this does away with the idea of a priest-king, an idea found also in Psalm 110. But it seems fairly certain that Psalm 110 (see Kirkpatrick, *The Book of Psalms*) does not refer to Joshua, the point there being that the king referred to was a priest, although not descended from Aaron, being a priest after the order of Melchizedek, while here the point is, if the present text be correct, that a priest is crowned king. What became of Zerubbabel after this is not known. See Ed. Meyer, *Der Papyrusfund von Elephantine*<sup>2</sup>, 70 ff, 86 ff. Joshua is called Jesus in Sirach 49:12.

See ZERUBBABEL; HAGGAI; ZECHARIAH.

*David Francis Roberts*

## JOSHUA, BOOK OF

### I. TITLE AND AUTHORSHIP.

The name Joshua signifies “Yahweh is deliverance” or “salvation” (see *JOSHUA*). The Greek form of the name is Jesus ([<sup>’</sup> Ἰησοῦς, *Iesous*], <sup><4075></sup>Acts 7:45; <sup><8008></sup>Hebrews 4:8). In later Jewish history the name appears to have become popular, and is even found with a local significance, as the designation of a small town in Southern Palestine ([<sup>W</sup>vyeyeshua<sup>`</sup>]), <sup><6126></sup>Nehemiah 11:26). The use of the title by the Jews to denote the Book of Joshua did not imply a belief that the book was actually written or dictated by him; or even that the narratives themselves were in substance derived from him, and owed their authenticity and reliability to his sanction and control. In the earliest Jewish literature the association of a name with a book was not intended in any case to indicate authorship. And the Book of Joshua is no exception to the rule that such early writings, especially when their contents are of a historical nature, are usually anonymous. The title is intended to describe, not authorship, but theme; and to represent that the life and deeds of Joshua form the main subject with which the book is concerned.

## II. CONTENTS.

With regard to the contents of Joshua, it will be found to consist of two well-marked divisions, in the first of which (Joshua 1-2) are narrated the invasion and gradual conquest under the command of Joshua of the land on the West of the Jordan; while the 2nd part describes in detail the allotment of the country to the several tribes with the boundaries of their territories, and concludes with a brief notice of the death and burial of Joshua himself.

1. Invasion and Conquest of Western Palestine: Joshua 1: Renewal of the Divine promise to Joshua and exhortation to fearlessness and courage (1:1-9); directions to the people to prepare for the passage of the river, and a reminder to the eastern tribes (Reuben, Gad, and half and Manasseh) of the condition under which they held their possession beyond Jordan; the renewal by these tribes of their pledge of loyalty to Moses' successor (1:10-18). Joshua 2: The sending of the two spies from Shittim and their escape from Jericho through the stratagem of Rahab. Joshua 3: The passage of Jordan by the people over against Jericho, the priests bearing the ark, and standing in the dry bed of the river until all the people had crossed over. Joshua 4: Erection of 12 memorial stones on the other side of Jordan, where the people encamped after the passage of the river (4:1-14); the priests with the Ark of the Covenant ascend in their turn from out of the river-bed, and the waters return into their wonted course (4:15-24). Joshua 5: Alarm excited among the kings on the West of Jordan by the news of the successful crossing of the river (5:1); circumcision of the people at Gilgal (5:2-9); celebration of the Passover at Gilgal in the plains of Jericho (5:10,11); cessation of the supply of the manna (5:12); appearance to Joshua of the captain of the Lord's host (5:13-15). Joshua 6: Directions given to Joshua for the siege and taking of Jericho (6:1-5); capture of the city, which is destroyed by fire, Rahab and her household alone being saved (6:6-25); a curse is pronounced on the man who rebuilds Jericho (6:26).

Joshua 7: The crime and punishment of Achan, who stole for himself part of the spoil of the captured city (7:1,16-26); incidentally his sin is the cause of a disastrous defeat before Ai (7:2-12).

Joshua 8: The taking of Ai by a stratagem, destruction of the city, and death of its king (8:1-29); erection of an altar on Mt. Ebal, and reading of the Law before the assembled people (8:30-35).

Joshua 9: Gathering of the peoples of Palestine to oppose Joshua (9:1-2); a covenant of peace made with the Gibeonites, who represent themselves as strangers from a far country (9:3-26); they are, however, reduced to a condition of servitude (9:27).

Joshua 10: Combination of 5 kings of the Amorites to punish the inhabitants of Gibeon for their defection, and defeat and rout of the kings by Joshua at Beth-horon (10:1-14); return of the Israelites to Gilgal (10:15); capture and death by hanging of the 5 kings at Makkedah (10:16-27); taking and destruction of Makkedah (10:28), Libnah (10:29,30), Lachish (10:31,32), Gezer (10:33), Eglon (10:34,35), Hebron (10:36,37), Debir (10:38,39), and summarily all the land, defined as from Kadesh-barnea unto Gaza, and as far North as Gibeon (10:40-42); return to Gilgal (10:43).

Joshua 11: Defeat of Jabin, king of Hazor, and allied kings at the waters of Merom (11:1-9); destruction of Hazor (11:10-15); reiterated summary of Joshua's conquests (11:16-23).

Joshua 12: Final summary of the Israelite conquests in Canaan, of Sihon and Og on the East of the Jordan under the leadership of Moses (12:1-6); of 31 kings and their cities on the West of the river under Joshua (12:7-24).

## *2. Allotment of the Country to the Tribes of Israel:*

Joshua 13: Command to Joshua to allot the land on the West of the Jordan, even that which was still unsubdued, to the nine and a half tribes (13:1-7); recapitulation of the inheritance given by Moses on the East of the river (13:8-13,32); the border of Reuben (13:15-23), of Gad (13:24-28), of the half-tribe of Manasseh (13:29-31); the tribe of Levi alone received no the landed inheritance (13:14,33).

Joshua 14: Renewed statement of the principle on which the division of the land had been made (14:1-5); Hebron given to Caleb for his inheritance (14:6-15).

Joshua 15. The inheritance of Judah, and the boundaries of his territory (15:1-20), including that of Caleb (15:13-19); enumeration of the cities of Judah (15:21-63).

Joshua 16: Inheritance of the sons of Joseph (16:1-4); the border of Ephraim (16:5-10).

Joshua 17: Inheritance of Manasseh and the border of the half-tribe on the West of the Jordan (17:1-13); complaint of the sons of Joseph of the insufficiency of their inheritance, and grant to them by Joshua of an extension of territory (17:14-18).

Joshua 18: The land yet unsubdued divided by lot into 7 portions for the remaining 7 tribes (18:1-10); inheritance of the sons of Benjamin and the border of their territory (18:11-20); enumeration of their cities (18:21-28).

Joshua 19: Inheritance of Simeon and his border (19:1-9); of Zebulun and his border (19:10-16); of Issachar and his border (19:17-23); of Asher and his border (19:24-31); of Naphtali and his border (19:32-39); and of Dan and his border (19:40-48); inheritance of Joshua (19:49,50); concluding statement (19:51).

Joshua 20: Cities of Refuge appointed, three on each side of the Jordan.

Joshua 21: 48 cities with their suburbs given to the Levites out of the territories of the several tribes (21:1-41); the people had rest in the land, their enemies being subdued, according to the Divine promise (21:43-45).

Joshua 22: Dismissal of the eastern tribes to their inheritance, their duty to their brethren having been fulfilled (22:1-9); the erection by them of a great altar by the side of the Jordan aroused the suspicion of the western tribes, who feared that they intended to separate themselves from the common cause (22:10-20); their reply that the altar is to serve the purpose of a witness between themselves and their brethren (22:21-34).

Joshua 23: Joshua's address of encouragement and warning to the people.

Joshua 24: Second address of Joshua, recalling to the people their history, and the Divine interventions on their behalf (24:1-23); the people's pledge of loyalty to the Lord, and formal covenant in Shechem (24:24,25); the book of the law of God is committed to writing, and a stone is erected as a permanent memorial (24:26-28); death and burial of Joshua (24:29-31); burial in Shechem of the bones of Joseph, brought from Egypt (24:32); death and burial of Eleazar, son of Aaron (24:33).

### III. HISTORICAL CHARACTER AND CHRONOLOGY.

#### *1. The Book of Joshua as History:*

As a historical narrative, therefore, detailing the steps taken to secure the conquest and possession of Canaan, Joshua is incomplete and is marked by many omissions, and in some instances at least includes phrases or expressions which seem to imply the existence of parallel or even divergent accounts of the same event, e.g. in the passage of the Jordan and the erection of memorial stones (Joshua 3; 4), the summary of the conquests of Joshua (10:40-43; 11:16-23), or the references to Moses' victories over the Amorite kings on the East of the Jordan.

This last fact suggests, what is in itself sufficiently probable, that the writer or compiler of the book made use of previously existing records or narratives, not necessarily in every instance written, but probably also oral and traditional, upon which he relied and out of which by means of excerpts with modifications and omissions, the resultant history was composed. The incomplete and defective character of the book therefore, considered merely as a history of the conquest of Western Palestine and its allotment among the new settlers, would seem to indicate that the "sources" available for the writer's use were fragmentary also in their nature, and did not present a complete view either of the life of Joshua or of the experiences of Israel while under his direction.

#### *2. Chronology:*

Within the limits of the book itself, moreover, notifications of chronological sequence, or of the length of time occupied in the various campaigns, are almost entirely wanting. Almost the only references to date or period are the statements that Joshua himself was 110 years old at the time of his death (24:29), and that his wars lasted "a long time" (11:18; compare 23:1). Caleb also, the son of Jephunneh, companion of Joshua in the mission of the spies from Kadesh-barnea, describes himself as 85 years old, when he receives Hebron as his inheritance (14:10; compare 15:13 ff); the inference would be, assuming 40 years for the wanderings in the desert, that 5 years had then elapsed since the passage of the Jordan "on the tenth day of the first month" (4:19). No indication, however, is given of the chronological relation of this event to the rest of the history; and 5 years would be too short a period for the conquest of Palestine, if it is to be understood that the whole was carried out in consecutive campaigns under



the immediate command of Joshua himself. On the other hand, “very much land” remained still unsubdued at his death (13:1). Christian tradition seems to have assumed that Joshua was about the same age as Caleb, although no definite statement to that effect is made in the book itself; and that, therefore, a quarter of a century, more or less, elapsed between the settlement of the latter at Hebron and Joshua’s death (14:10; 24:29). The entire period from the crossing of the Jordan would then be reckoned at from 28 to 30 years.

#### **IV. SOURCES OF THE WRITTEN NARRATIVE.**

The attempt to define the “sources” of Joshua as it now exists, and to disentangle them one from another, presents considerably more difficulty than is to be encountered for the most part in the Pentateuch. The distinguishing criteria upon which scholars rely and which have led serious students of the book to conclude that there may be traced here also the use of the same “documents” or “documentary sources” as are to be found in the Pentateuch, are essentially the same. Existing and traditional accounts, however, have been used apparently with greater freedom, and the writer has allowed himself a fuller liberty of adaptation and combination, while the personal element has been permitted wider scope in molding the resultant form which the composition should take. For the most part, therefore, the broad line of distinction between the various “sources” which have been utilized may easily be discerned on the ground of their characteristic traits, in style, vocabulary or general conception; in regard to detail, however, the precise point at which one “source” has been abandoned for another, or the writer himself has supplied deficiencies and bridged over gaps, there is frequent uncertainty, and the evidence available is insufficient to justify an absolute conclusion. The fusion of material has been more complete than in the 5 books of the law, perhaps because the latter were hedged about with a more reverential regard for the letter, and at an earlier period attained the standing of canonicity.

A detailed analysis of the sources as they have been distinguished and related to one another by scholars is here unnecessary. A complete discussion of the subject will be found in Dr. Driver’s LOT6, 105 ff, in other Introductions, or in the Commentaries on Joshua. Not seldom in the ultimate detail the distinctions are precarious, and there are differences of opinion among scholars themselves as to the precise limit or limits of the use made of any given source, or at what point the dividing line should be

drawn. It is only in a broad and general sense that in Joshua especially the literary theory of the use of “documents,” as generally understood and as interpreted in the case of the Pentateuch, can be shown to be well founded. In itself, however, such a theory is eminently reasonable, and is both in harmony with the general usage and methods of ancient composition, and affords ground for additional confidence in the good faith and reliability of the narrative as a whole.

## V. RELATION TO THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

### *1. Parallel Narratives:*

A comparison moreover of the history recorded in Joshua with the brief parallel account in Judges furnishes ground for believing that a detailed or chronological narrative was not contemplated by the writer or writers themselves. The introductory verses of Judges (1:1 through 2:5) are in part a summary of incidents recorded in Joshua, and in part supply new details or present a different view of the whole. The original notices that are added relate almost entirely to the invasion and conquest of Southern Palestine by the united or allied tribes of Judah and Simeon and the destruction of Bethel by the “house of Joseph.” The action of the remaining tribes is narrated in a few words, the brief record closing in each case with reference to the condition of servitude to which the original inhabitants of the land were reduced. And the general scheme of the invasion as there represented is apparently that of a series of disconnected raids or campaigns undertaken by the several tribes independently, each having for its object the subjection of the territory assigned to the individual tribe. A general and comprehensive plan of conquest under the supreme leadership of Joshua appears to be entirely wanting. In detail, however, the only real inconsistency between the two narratives would appear to be that in Judges (1:21) the failure to expel the Jebusites from Jerusalem is laid to the account of the Benjamites, while in ~~Joshua~~ Joshua 15:63 it is charged against the children of Judah. The difficulties in the way of the formation of a clear conception of the incidents attending the capture of Jerusalem are perhaps insuperable upon any hypothesis; and the variation of the tribal name in the two texts may be no more than a copyist’s error.

### *2. Omissions in the History:*

A perhaps more striking omission in both narratives is the absence of any reference to the conquest of Central Palestine. The narrative of the

overthrow of Bethel and Ai (~~<HB>~~ Joshua 6:1 through 8:29) is followed immediately by the record of the building of an altar on Mt. Ebal and the recitation of the Law before the people of Israel assembled in front of Mts. Ebal and Gerizim (~~<HB>~~ Joshua 8:30 ff). Joshua then turns aside to defeat at Beth-horon the combination of the Amorite kings, and completes the conquest of the southern country as far south as Kadesh-barnea (10:41). Immediately thereafter he is engaged in overthrowing a confederacy in the far north (11:1-15), a work which clearly could not have been undertaken or successfully accomplished, unless the central region had been already subdued; but of its reduction no account is given. It has been supposed that the silence of the narrator is an indication that at the period of the invasion this district was in the occupation of tribes friendly or even related to the Israelite clans; and in support of the conjecture reference has been made to the mention of Israel on the stele of Merenptah, the Egyptian ruler in whose reign, according to the most probable view, the exodus took place. In this record the nation or a part thereof is regarded as already settled in Palestine at a date earlier by half a century than their appearance under Moses and Joshua on the borders of the Promised Land. The explanation is possible, but perhaps hardly probable. The defects of the historical record are irremediable at this distance of time, and it must be acknowledged that with the available material no complete and consistent narrative of the events of the Israelite conquest of Palestine can be constructed.

## **VI. PLACE OF JOSHUA IN THE HEBREW CANON.**

In the Hebrew Canon Joshua is the first in order of the prophetic books, and the first of the group of 4, namely, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, which form the “Earlier Prophets” ([nebhi’im ri’ shonim]). These books, the contents of which are history, not prophecy in the ordinary sense of the term, were assigned by the Jews to the 2nd division of their sacred Canon, and found a place by the side of the great writings of the “Later Prophets” ([nebhi’im ‘acharonim]). This position was given to them in part perhaps because they were believed to have been written or composed by prophets, but mainly because Jewish history was regarded as in purpose and intent “prophetic,” being directed and presided over by Yahweh Himself, and conveying direct spiritual instruction and example. The Canon of the Law, moreover, was already closed; and however patent and striking might be the resemblance of Joshua in style and method of composition to the books of the Pentateuch, it was impossible to admit it therein, or to give a place

within the Torah, a group of writings which were regarded as of Mosaic authorship, to a narrative of events which occurred after Moses' death. Later criticism reviewed and reversed the verdict as to the true character of the book. In every Canon except the Hebrew, its historical nature was recognized, and the work was classified accordingly. Modern criticism has gone further, and, with increasing consciousness of its close literary relationship to the books of the Law, has united it with them in a Hexateuch, or even under the more comprehensive title of Octateuch combines together the books of Judges and Ruth with the preceding six on the ground of similarity of origin and style.

## VII. GREEK AND OTHER ANCIENT VERSIONS.

### *1. The Greek:*

In the ancient versions of Joshua there is not much that is of interest. The Greek translation bears witness to a Hebrew original differing little from the Massoretic Text. In their renderings, however, and general treatment of the Hebrew text, the translators seem to have felt themselves at liberty to take up a position of greater independence and freedom than in dealing with the 5 books of the Law. Probably also the rendering of Joshua into Greek is not to be ascribed to the same authors as the translation of the Pentateuch. While faithful to the Hebrew, it is less constantly and exactly literal, and contains many slight variations, the most important of which are found in the last 6 chapters.

Joshua 19: The Septuagint transposes 19:47,48, and, omitting the first clause of 19:47, refers the whole to the sons of Judah, without mention of Dan; it further adds 19:47a,48a on the relation between the Amorites and Ephraim, and the Amorites and the Danites respectively. With 19:47a compare 16:10 and <sup><002></sup>Judges 1:29, and with 19:48a compare 19:47 (Hebrew) and <sup><003></sup>Judges 1:34.

<sup><604></sup>Joshua 20:4-6 inclusive are omitted in B, except a clause from 20:6; A, however, inserts them in full. Compare Driver, LOT6, 112, who, on the ground of their Deuteronomic tone, regards it as probable that the verses are an addition to the Priestly Code (P), and therefore did not form part of the original text as used by the Greek translators.

<sup><626></sup>Joshua 21:36,37, which give the names of the Levitical cities in Judah, are omitted in the Hebrew printed text although found in many Hebrew

manuscripts. Four verses also are added after 21:42, the first three of which repeat 19:50 f, and the last is a reminiscence of 5:3.

~~(124)~~ Joshua 24:29 f which narrate the death and burial of Joshua are placed in the Greek text after 24:31; and a verse is inserted after 24:30 recording that the stone knives used for the purposes of the circumcision (5:2 ff) were buried with Joshua in his tomb (compare 21:42). After 24:33 also two new verses appear, apparently a miscellany from ~~(125)~~ Judges 2:6, 11-15; 3:7, 12, 14, with a statement of the death and burial of Phinehas, son and successor of Eleazar, of the idolatrous worship by the children of Israel of Astarte and Ashtaroth, and the oppression under Eglon, king of Moab.

## *2. Other Ancient Versions:*

The other VSS, with the exception of Jerome's translation from the Hebrew, are secondary, derived mediately through the Greek. The Old Latin is contained in a manuscript at Lyons, Cod. Lugdunensis, which is referred to the 6th century. Of the Coptic version only small portions are extant; they have been published by G. Maspero, *Memoires de la mission archeologique frantsaise*, tom. VI, fasc. 1, le Caire, 1892, and elsewhere. A Samuel translation also is known, for parts of which at least an early origin and an independent derivation from the Hebrew have been claimed. The ancient character of the version, however, is contested, and it has been shown that the arguments on which reliance was placed are insufficient to justify the conclusions drawn. The translation appears to be in reality of quite recent date, and to have been made originally from the Arabic, perhaps in part compared with and corrected by the Massoretic Text. The subject was fully and conclusively discussed by Dr. Yehuda of Berlin, at the Oriental Congress in the summer of 1908, and in a separate pamphlet subsequently published. It was even stated that the author of the version was still living, and his name was given. Dr. Gaster, the original discoverer of the Samuel MS, in various articles and letters maintains his contention that the translation is really antique, and therefore of great value, but he has failed to convince scholars. (See M. Gaster in *JRAS* (1908), 795 ff, 1148 ff; E. N. Adler, *ib*, 1143 ff. The text of the manuscript was published by Dr. Caster in *ZDMG* (1908), 209 ff, and a specimen chapter with English rendering and notes in *PSBA*, XXXI (1909), 115 ff, 149 ff.)

## VIII. RELIGIOUS PURPOSE AND TEACHING.

As a whole, then, Joshua is dominated by the same religious and hortatory purpose as the earlier writings of the Pentateuch; and in this respect as well as in authorship and structure the classification which assigns to it a place by the side of the 5 books of Moses and gives to the whole the title of Hexateuch is not unjustified. The author or authors had in view not merely the narration of incident, nor the record of events in the past history of their people of which they judged it desirable that a correct account should be preserved, but they endeavored in all to subserve a practical and religious aim. The history is not for its own sake, or for the sake of the literal facts which it enshrines, but for the sake of the moral and spiritual lessons which may be elucidated therein, and enforced from its teaching. The Divine leading in history is the first thought with the writer. And the record of Israel's past presents itself as of interest to him, not because it is a record of events that actually happened, but because he sees in it the ever-present guidance and overruling determination of God, and would draw from it instruction and warning for the men of his own time and for those that come after him. Not the history itself, but the meaning and interpretation of the history are of value. Its importance lies in the illustrations it affords of the controlling working of a Divine Ruler who is faithful to His promises, loving righteousness and hating iniquity, and swaying the destinies of men in truth. Thus the selection of materials, and the form and arrangement of the book are determined by a definite aim: to set forth and enforce moral lessons, and to exhibit Israel's past as the working out of a Divine purpose which has chosen the nation to be the recipient of the Divine favor, and the instrument for the carrying forward of His purposes upon earth.

## LITERATURE.

A Complete bibliography of the literature up to date will be found in the dictionaries, under the word "Joshua," DB2, 1893, HDB, II, 1899, EB, II, 1901; compare W. H. Bennett, "The Book of Josh.," in SBOT, Leipzig, 1895; W.G. Blaikie, "Joshua," in Expositor's Bible, 1893; A. Dillmann, Nu, Deuteronomy u. Josua2, Leipzig, 1886; H. Holzinger, "Das Buch Josua," in Kurzer Hand-Comm. zum A T, Tübingen, 1901; C. Steuernagel, "Josua," in Nowack's Handcommentar zum Altes Testament, 1899; S. Oettli, "Deuteronomy, Josua u. Richter," in Kurzgef. Komm, München,

1893; W.J. Deane, Joshua, His Life and Times, in “Men of the Bible Series,” London.

*A. S. Geden*

## JOSIAH

<jo-si'-a> ([𐤒𐤏𐤕𐤓𐤕 yo'shiyahu], “Yahweh supports him”; [Ἰωσείας, *Ioseias*]; the King James Version Josias (which see)):

The name given 6 years before the death of his grandfather Manasseh resumes the Judaic custom, suspended in the case of that king and Amon, of compounding royal names with that of Yahweh; perhaps a hint of the time, when, according to the Chronicler, Manasseh realized Yahweh's claim on his realm (<sup><44312></sup>2 Chronicles 33:12,13). One of the most eminent of the kings of Judah; came to the throne at 8 years of age and reigned circa 637-608 BC.

### I. SOURCES FOR HIS LIFE AND TIMES.

#### *1. Annalistic:*

The earliest history (<sup><12218></sup>2 Kings 22:1-23; 30) is dispassionate in tone, betraying its prophetic feeling, however, in its acknowledgment of Yahweh's wrath, still menacing in spite of Josiah's unique piety (<sup><12236></sup>2 Kings 23:26,27). For “the rest of his acts” (to which the rather bald account of his death is relegated as a kind of appendix), it refers to “the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah.” In the later history (2 Chronicles 34; 35), written from the developed ecclesiastical point of view, he is considerably idealized: the festal and ceremonial aspects of his reform are more fully detailed, and the story of his campaign and death is more sympathetically told in the sense of it as a great national calamity.

#### *2. Prophetic:*

For the spiritual atmosphere of his time and the prophetic consciousness of a day of wrath impending, the prophet Zephaniah is illuminating, especially for the first half of the reign. Jeremiah, born at about the same time as Josiah, began prophesying in the 13th year of the reign (<sup><24012></sup>Jeremiah 1:2). His intimate connection with state affairs, however, belongs to succeeding reigns; but some prophecies of his, notably those revealing his attitude toward the temple misuse (7:1-15) and toward the Deuteronomic reform

(11:1-13), throw much light on the prevailing conditions. Nahum, writing near the end of the reign, and from an outlying village, is less concerned with home affairs than with the approaching end of Nineveh (fell 606 BC).

### *3. Memorial:*

In Jesus Sirach's Praise of Famous Men there is a passage (Sirach 49:1-4), wholly eulogistic of Josiah, on the score that "in the days of wicked men he made godliness to prevail"; and along with David and Hezekiah he is one of the three who alone did not "commit trespass." Jeremiah's lamentation for Josiah, mentioned in <sup><4825></sup>2 Chronicles 35:25, is not preserved to us; instead there is only an allusion (<sup><3220></sup>Jeremiah 22:10), naming his successor Shallum (Jehoahaz) as a fitter subject. The lamentations which became "an ordinance in Israel" (<sup><4825></sup>2 Chronicles 35:25) are not to be referred to the Scripture book of that name; which has no hint of Josiah, unless <sup><2900></sup>Lamentations 4:20 be so construed.

## **II. TRAITS OF HIS REIGN.**

### *1. Situation at the Beginning:*

Until his 18th year 2 Kings gives no events of Josiah's reign; 2 Chronicles, however, relates that in his 8th year (at 16 years of age) he "began to seek after the God of David his father," and that in the 12th year he began the purgation of Judah and Jerusalem. The Chronicler may be mistaken in putting the completion of this work before the finding of the law (<sup><4818></sup>2 Chronicles 34:8), but of his disposition and of his beginning without documentary warrant on a work which Hezekiah had attempted before him, there is no reason to doubt. And indeed various influences were working together to make his procedure natural. The staunch loyalty to the Davidic house, as emphasized by the popular movement which seated him (see under AMON), would in itself be an influence to turn his mind to the God of David his father. Manasseh's all-embracing idolatry had indeed reduced his aristocracy to a people "settled on their lees, that say in their heart, Yahweh will not do good, neither will he do evil" (<sup><3012></sup>Zephaniah 1:12); but these represented merely the inertia, not the intelligence, of the people. Over against them is to be reckoned the spiritually-minded "remnant" with which since Isaiah the prophets had been working; a remnant now seasoned by persecution, and already committed to the virtue of meekness (<sup><3013></sup>Zephaniah 2:3) and the willing acceptance of affliction as their appointed lot, as against the arrogance of the "proudly exulting ones"



(~~3811~~ Zephaniah 3:11-13). To such courage and hope the redeeming element of Israel had grown in the midst of a blatant infidelity and worldliness. Nor were they so unconnected with the established order as formerly. The ministers of the temple-service, if not subjected to persecution, had been ranked on a level with devotees of other cults, and so had a common cause which would work to unite the sympathies of priests and prophets in one loyalty to Yahweh. All this is adduced as indicating how the better elements of the nation were ripening for a forward step in enlightened religious progress.

## *2. Finding of the Law:*

The providential moment arrived when in the 18th year of his reign Josiah sent Shaphan the scribe to the temple to arrange with Hilkiah the high priest for the prescribed temple repairs. On giving his account of the funds for that purpose, Hilkiah also delivered to Shaphan a book which he had found in the "house of Yahweh," that is, in the temple proper; which book, when Shaphan read therefrom to the king, caused the latter to rend his robe in dismay and consternation. It was a book in which were commands of Yahweh that had long been unknown or disregarded, and along with these, fearful curses to follow the infraction of them. Such a discovery could not be treated lightly, as one might spurn a prophet or priest; nay, it immediately called the authority of the prophet into requisition. The king sent a deputation to Huldah the prophetess for her verdict on the book; and she, whether aware of its contents or not, assured him that the curses were valid, and that for impieties against which the prophets continually warned, all the woes written in the book were impending. One of the most voluminous discussions of Biblical scholarship has centered round the question what this book was, what its origin, and how it came there in the temple. The Chronicler says roundly it was "the book of the law of Yahweh by the hand of Moses." That it was from the nation's great first prophet and lawgiver was the implicit belief of the king and all his contemporaries. There can be little doubt, judging from the nature of the reforms it elicited and the fact that the curses it contained are still extant, that this "book of the law" was virtually identical with our Book of Deuteronomy. But is this the work of Moses, or the product of a later literary activity? In answer, it is fair to say that it is so true to the soundest interpretation of the spirit and power of Moses that there need be no hesitation in calling it genuinely Mosaic, whatever adaptations and supplementations its laws received after his time. Its highly developed

style, however, and its imperfect conformity to the nomadic conditions of Moses' time, make so remote an origin of its present form very doubtful. It comes to us written with the matured skill of Israel's literary prime, in a time too when, as we know (see under *HEZEKIAH*), men of letters were keenly interested in rescuing and putting to present use the literary treasures of their past. As to how it came to be left in the temple at a time so much before its discovery that none questioned its being what it purported to be, each scholar must answer for himself. Some have conjectured that it may have been a product of Solomon's time, and deposited, according to immemorial custom in temple-building, in the foundation of Solomon's temple, where it was found when certain ruins made repairs necessary. To the present writer it seems likelier that it was one of the literary products of Hezekiah's time, compiled from scattered statutes, precedents, and customs long in the keeping — or neglect — of priests and judges, put into the attractive form of oratory, and left for its providential moment.

*See further, DEUTERONOMY; WRITING.*

### *3. The Great Reform:*

Josiah's immediate procedure was to call to the temple a representative assemblage — elders, prophets, priests, populace — and to read to them this "book of the covenant" (~~2~~<sup>22</sup> 2 Kings 23:2). Then he made a solemn covenant before Yahweh to obey it, and all the people stood to the covenant. So, perhaps for the first time, the people of Judah and Jerusalem had for their guidance not only the case decisions of judges and priests, nor only the emergency warnings and predictions of prophets, but a written and accessible document, covering in a large and liberal way the duties of their civic, social and religious life. One of the most momentous productions of all history, the book became the constitution of the Jewish race; nor were its noble provisions superseded when, centuries later, the tethers of race were broken and a Christian civilization came into its heritage. But the book that was destined to have so large a significance in all coming history had its immediate significance too, and never had this been so pressing. Josiah's consternation arose from the sense of how much of the nation's obvious duty had been left undone and unregarded. First of all, they had through heedless years and ages drifted into a medley of religious ideas and customs which had accumulated until all this lumber of Manasseh's idolatry was upon them. Hezekiah had tried to clear away some of its most crude

and superstitious elements (see under *HEZEKIAH*), but he was handicapped by the lack of its clear issue and objective, which now this book supplied. Zephaniah too was showing what Yahweh's will was (~~<3000>~~ Zephaniah 1:2-6); there must be a clean sweep of the debasing and obscuring cults, and the purgation must be done to stay. So Josiah's first reforming step was to break up the high places, the numerous centers of the evil, to destroy the symbols and utensils of the idolatrous shrines and rites, and to defile them past resuscitation. His zeal did not stop with Jerusalem and Judah; he went on to Bethel, which had been the chief sanctuary of the now defunct Northern Kingdom, and in his work here was recognized the fulfillment of an old prophecy dating from the time of its first king (~~<1237>~~ 2 Kings 23:17; compare ~~<1130>~~ 1 Kings 13:1,2). This necessitated the concentration of public worship in the temple at Jerusalem, and in Deuteronomy was found the warrant for this, in the prescript, natural to Moses' point of view, that the worship of Israel must have a single center as it had in the wilderness. From this negative procedure he went on to the positive measure of reviving the festival services inseparable from a religion requiring pilgrimage, instituting a grand Passover on a scale unheard of since the time of the Judges (~~<1231>~~ 2 Kings 23:21,22), a feature of his reform on which the Chronicler dwells with peculiar zest (~~<1481>~~ 2 Chronicles 35:1-15). Thus both in the idolatries they must abolish and in the organized worship that they must maintain, the people were committed to a definite and documented issue; this it was which made Josiah's reform so momentous. That the reform seemed after Josiah's untimely death to have been merely outward, is what might reasonably be expected from the inveteracy of the unspirituality that it must encounter. Jeremiah had small faith in its saving power against the stubborn perversity of the people (~~<3100>~~ Jeremiah 11:1-14); and the historian of 2 Kings intimates that more than the piety of a zealous king was needed to turn away the stern decree of Yahweh's anger (~~<1236>~~ 2 Kings 23:26,27). In spite of all hardness and apostasy, however, the nation that had once "stood to the covenant" of Deuteronomy could never again be at heart the nation it was before.

#### *4. Disaster at Megiddo:*

Ardent and pious as he was, there seems to have been a lack of balance in Josiah's character. His extreme dismay and dread of the curse pronounced on the realm's neglect of the law seems to have been followed, after his great reform had seemed to set things right, by an excess of confidence in Yahweh's restored favor which went beyond sound wisdom, and amounted

to presumption. The power of Assyria was weakening, and Pharaoh-necho of Egypt, ambitious to secure control of Mesopotamia, started on the campaign in which he was eventually to suffer defeat at Carchemish. Josiah, whose reforming zeal had already achieved success in Northern Israel, apparently cherished inordinate dreams of invincibility in Yahweh's name, and went forth with a little army to withstand the Egyptian monarch on his march through the northern provinces. At the first onset he was killed, and his expedition came to nothing. In his untimely death the fervid hopes of the pious received a set-back which was long lamented as one of the cardinal disasters of Israel. It was a sore calamity, but also a stern education. Israel must learn not only the enthusiasm but also the prudence and wisdom of its new-found faith.

(2) A contemporary of Zechariah (Zec 6:10), at whose house in Jerusalem the prophet met some returned Jews from Babylon.

*John Franklin Genung*

## JOSIAS

<jo-si'-as> (Textus Receptus, [ Ἰωσίας, *Iosias*]; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek [ Ἰωσείας, *Ioseias*]) :

(1) Greek form in the King James Version of Josiah (~~am~~ Matthew 1:10,11; compare 1 Esdras 1; Baruch 1:8), king of Judah.

(2) In 1 Esdras 8:33 the King James Version for JESIAS (which see).

## JOSIBIAH

<jos-i-bi'-a>.

*See JOSHIBIAH.*

## JOSIPHIAH

<jos-i-fi'-a> ([~~hyp~~~~fi~~~~q~~ yociphyah], “Yah adds”): Found in Ezr 8:10, where Massoretic Text is “and of the sons of .... Shelomith the son of Josiphiah.” With the help of Septuagint A and 1 Esdras 8:36, the name “Bani” (which is the same in the unpointed text as “the sons of” and was omitted through haplography) can be supplied above before “Shelomith.”

Josophia is thus the father of Shelomith, one of Ezra's companions. 1 Esdras 8:36 has "Josaphias."

## JOT

<jot>: "Jot" (Revised Version, later editions of the King James Version) is a corruption of [ἰῶτα, *iote*] (early editions of the King James Version, Geneva, Rheims, Bishops' — pronounced i-o'te), an English transliteration of [ἰῶτα, *iota*], the 9th letter of the Greek alphabet (~~4158~~ Matthew 5:18 parallel). "Iota," in turn, is the nearest Greek equivalent for the Hebrew *yodh* (y), the smallest letter of the Hebrew alphabet, in New Testament times being little larger than an English accent ('). The tittle (which see) is the smallest part of a letter (not part of a y, however). Consequently, thinking of the law as written out, the sense of ~~4157~~ Matthew 5:17, is: "From this code, so written, not the smallest letter nor part of a letter — not an `i' nor the crossing of a `t' — shall be erased until all things come to pass." (For the meaning, *see* LAW.) The reference is to the synagogue rolls, which were written in Hebrew, so that the passage has no bearing on the language used by Christ. For the form of the "jot," compare the tables in HDB, article "Alphabet," more fully in Chwolson,. Corp. Inscr. Hebrew. (1882).

*See* **TITTLE**.

*Burton Scott Easton*

## JOTAPATA

<jo-tap'-a-ta> (BJ, III, iii, 7).

*See* **JOTBATHAH**.

## JOTBAH

<jot'-ba> ([hBfy; yoTbah], "pleasantness"): The home of Meshullemeth, the mother of King Amon, daughter of Haruz (~~2219~~ 2 Kings 21:19). It may be the same as **JOTBATHAH** (which see).

## JOTBATHAH

<jot'-ba-tha> ([<sup>htBfj</sup>; yoTbathah]): A desert camp of the Israelites between Hor-hagidgad and Abironah (<sup><0833></sup>Numbers 33:33,34; <sup><5007></sup>Deuteronomy 10:7). It was “a land of brooks of water” (<sup><5007></sup>Deuteronomy 10:7). Site is unknown.

See *WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL*.

## JOTHAM

<jo'-tham> ([<sup>μtω</sup> yotham], “Yahweh is perfect”; [<sup>Ἰωαθάμ</sup>, Ioatham]):

(1) The youngest son of Gideon-Jerubbaal, the sole survivor of the massacre of his seventy brothers by Abimelech (<sup><005></sup>Judges 9:5), and (by <sup><002></sup>Judges 8:22) the legitimate ruler of Shechem after their death. Recognizing, however, that he is powerless to assert his claim, Jotham delivers from the summit of Gerizim his famous fable (<sup><007></sup>Judges 9:7-15), applies it to the situation in hand, and then flees for his life to Beer (<sup><002></sup>Judges 9:21). Nothing more is told of him, but the downfall of Abimelech is referred in part to his “curse” (<sup><005></sup>Judges 9:57). The fable tells of the kingship of the trees which, after having been declined by all useful plants, was finally offered to the bramble. The latter, inflated by its unexpected dignity, pompously offers its “shade” to its faithful subjects, while threatening all traitors with punishment (brambles carry forest fires), quite in the manner of an oriental monarch on assuming the throne. Having thus parodied the relationship of the worthless Abimelech to the Shechemites, Jotham ironically wishes both parties joy of their bargain, which will end in destruction for all concerned. Otherwise the connection between the fable and its application is loose, for, while the fable depicts the kingship as refused by all properly qualified persons, in the application the Shechemites are upbraided for their treachery and their murder of the rightful heirs. In fact, the fable taken by itself would seem rather to be a protest against kings as a class (compare <sup><080></sup>1 Samuel 8:10-18; 12:19, etc.); so it is possible that either the fable or its application has become expanded in transmission. Or an older fable may have been used for the sake of a single salient point, for nothing is more common than such an imperfect reapplication of fables, allegories and parables.

*Burton Scott Easton*

(2) Twelfth king of Judah, son of Uzziah and Jerusha, daughter of Zadok (~~<1215>~~ 2 Kings 15:32-38; ~~<1420>~~ 2 Chronicles 27:1-9).

### 1. ACCESSION AND REGENCY:

Jotham was 25 years of age at the time of his father's attack of leprosy, and was at once called upon to take the administration of the kingdom (~~<1215>~~ 2 Kings 15:5; ~~<1420>~~ 2 Chronicles 26:21). In doing this he not only judged the people of the land by presiding at the administration of justice, but also was over the household of the king, showing how complete was the isolation of his father. He was thus king in all but name, and is invariably spoken of as reigning in Jerusalem. His reign lasted for 16 years (~~<1215>~~ 2 Kings 15:33; ~~<1420>~~ 2 Chronicles 27:1), 759-744 (others put later). While the father loved husbandry and had much cattle (~~<1430>~~ 2 Chronicles 26:10) — external affairs with which he could occupy himself in his retirement — to the son fell the sterner duties and heavier responsibilities of the state.

### 2. THE WAR WITH AMMON:

The relation between father and son is well brought out in the Chronicler's account of the Ammonite war. In ~~<1438>~~ 2 Chronicles 26:8 we are told that "the Ammonites gave tribute (the King James Version "gifts") to Uzziah," such gifts being compulsory, and of the nature of tribute. In ~~<1420>~~ 2 Chronicles 27:5 we are told that the actual conquest of Ammon was made by Jotham, and that for 3 successive years he compelled them to pay an annual subsidy of 100 talents of silver and 10,000 "cors" each of wheat and barley (the cor (Hebrew [kor]) was about 10 bushels). The campaign on the East of the Jordan was the only one in which Jotham took part, but as the state suffered no loss of territory during his regency, the external provinces must have been strongly held and well governed.

### 3. JOTHAM'S BUILDING OPERATIONS:

It is probable that before attempting to win any extension of territory, Jotham had spent some years in completing the unfinished building schemes in which his father was engaged at the time of his affliction. Like him, he became an enthusiastic builder (~~<1420>~~ 2 Chronicles 27:3,4). He is recorded to have built towers, castles and cities, and specifically to have completed the Ophel wall in Jerusalem, which is still standing to the South of the Haram area. But the crowning architectural glory of his reign was

the completion of the temple court by erecting, or setting up, “the upper gate of the house of Yahweh” (~~1478~~2 Chronicles 27:3; ~~1258~~2 Kings 15:35). This particular gate was the entrance to, and exit from, the upper or new court of the temple, which had been begun so long ago as the time of Asa (compare the writer’s Solomon’s Temple, Part II, chapter viii). Its situation is perfectly known, as it bore the same name and place in the Herodian temple as in each of its predecessors. It stood facing the South, and was on higher ground than any other of the temple gates. Hence, its name. It gave entrance to that upper court of the temple, mentioned in ~~2860~~Jeremiah 36:10, where it is spoken of as “the new gate of Yahweh’s house.” As Jeremiah began his ministry about a century after Jotham’s death, Jeremiah’s use of the name commemorates the fact that the gate was not built till long after the other parts of the structure.

#### 4. THE SYRIAN LEAGUE:

During Jotham’s regency, a formidable combination of the Northern Kingdom and the Syrian state, with Damascus as capital, began to show signs of hostility to Judah. For 4 years before Jotham’s death, Pekah occupied the throne of Samaria. The Assyrian king, Tiglath-pileser III, was then pushing his arms westward, and a Syrian league was formed to oppose them. Jotham may have refused to join this league. The political situation at his death is thus described: “In those days Yahweh began to send against Judah Rezin the king of Syria, and Pekah the son of Remaliah” (~~1257~~2 Kings 15:37).

#### 5. CONDITION OF JUDAH:

Jotham’s character is represented in a moderately favorable light, it being put to his credit that he did not enter the temple (~~1472~~2 Chronicles 27:2). The wisdom and vigor of his administration, and of his policy for the defense of the country, are recognized. It was owing to his completion of his father’s plans for the protection of Jerusalem, and of the building of country fortresses, that Hezekiah, a few years afterward, was able to show so stout a resistance to Sennacherib. But within the state itself corruption and oppression were rife. The great prophets, Isaiah, Hosea and Micah, exercised their ministries in Jotham’s days, and in their pages we have graphic picture of the moral condition of the time. Isaiah does not name Jotham, except in the title (~~2900~~Isaiah 1:1; compare 7:1), but Isaiah 1 through 5 of his book were probably written in this reign. Hosea’s writings



go back to the last years of Jeroboam II, who died the year Jotham came to the throne. Micah's evidence is valuable, telling us that Omri had formulated and published rules for the cult of the Zidonian Baal, and that these "statutes" were kept by some of the citizens of Samaria, and, possibly, of Jerusalem (<sup><3766></sup>Micah 6:16).

Jotham's name appears in the royal genealogical list of <sup><1382></sup>1 Chronicles 3:12, and in the genealogy of Jesus (<sup><1009></sup>Matthew 1:9).

(3) A Calebite (<sup><1387></sup>1 Chronicles 2:47 the King James Version).

*W. Shaw Caldecott*

## JOURNEY

<jur'-ni>.

See *DAY'S JOURNEY; SABBATH DAY'S JOURNEY*.

## JOY

<joi> ([<sup>h</sup><sup>j</sup> <sup>m</sup><sup>ç</sup>i *simchah*]; [<sup>χ</sup><sup>α</sup><sup>ρ</sup><sup>ά</sup>, *chara*]):

### 1. TERMS:

The idea of joy is expressed in the Old Testament by a wealth of synonymous terms that cannot easily be differentiated. The commonest is *simchah* (<sup><9816></sup>1 Samuel 18:6, etc.), variously translated in English Versions of the Bible "joy," "gladness," "mirth"; from *sameah*, properly "to be bright," "to shine" (<sup><1139></sup>Proverbs 13:9, "The light of the righteous rejoiceth," literally, "is bright"), but generally used figuratively "to rejoice," "be glad" (<sup><9230></sup>Leviticus 23:40 and very frequent).

Other nouns are *masos* and *sason*, both from *sus*, properly "to spring," "leap," hence, "exult," "rejoice"; *rinnah*, "shouting," "joy"; *gil*, from verb *gil* or *gul*, "to go in a circle," hence, "be excited" (dancing round for joy), "rejoice." In the New Testament, far the commonest are *chara*, "joy," *chairō*, "to rejoice" (compare [<sup>χ</sup><sup>ά</sup><sup>ρι</sup><sup>ς</sup>, *charis*], "grace"). But we have also *agalliasis*, which expresses "exuberant joy," "exultation" (not used in classical Greek, but often in the Septuagint; in the New Testament, <sup><9114></sup>Luke 1:14,44; <sup><4126></sup>Acts 2:46; <sup><6124></sup>Jude 1:24; <sup><3009></sup>Hebrews 1:9), and the corresponding verb *agalliaoo* (*-aomai*), "to exult," "rejoice exceedingly" (<sup><4152></sup>Matthew 5:12, etc.). In English Versions of the Bible we have

sometimes “to joy” (now obsolete as a verb), used in an intransitive sense = “to rejoice” (<sup><3188></sup>Habakkuk 3:18; <sup><4073></sup>2 Corinthians 7:13, etc.).

## 2. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

Besides joy in a general sense, as the response of the mind to any pleasurable event or state (<sup><1044></sup>1 Kings 1:40; <sup><1087></sup>Esther 8:17, etc.), joy as a religious emotion is very frequently referred to in the Old Testament. Religion is conceived of as touching the deepest springs of emotion, including the feeling of exultant gladness which often finds outward expression in such actions as leaping, shouting, and singing. Joy is repeatedly shown to be the natural outcome of fellowship with God. “In thy presence is fullness of joy; in thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore” (<sup><1961></sup>Psalms 16:11; compare 16:8,9). God is at once the source (<sup><1907></sup>Psalms 4:7; 51:12) and the object (<sup><1989></sup>Psalms 35:9; <sup><2909></sup>Isaiah 29:19) of religious joy. The phrase “rejoice (be glad) in Yahweh” and similar expressions are of frequent occurrence (e.g. <sup><1972></sup>Psalms 97:12; 149:2; <sup><2610></sup>Isaiah 61:10; Zec 10:7). Many aspects of the Divine character call forth this emotion, such as His lovingkindness (<sup><1926></sup>Psalms 21:6,7; 31:7), His salvation (<sup><1920></sup>Psalms 21:1; <sup><2389></sup>Isaiah 25:9; <sup><3188></sup>Habakkuk 3:18), His laws and statutes (Psalms 12; 119 passim), His judgments (<sup><1981></sup>Psalms 48:11), His words of comfort in dark days (<sup><2455></sup>Jeremiah 15:15,16). The fundamental fact of the sovereignty of God, of the equity of the Divine government of the world, gives to the pious a joyous sense of security in life (<sup><1991></sup>Psalms 93:1 f; 96:10; 97:1) which breaks forth into songs of praises in which even inanimate Nature is poetically called upon to join (<sup><1961></sup>Psalms 96:11-13; 98:4-9). In the case of those who held such views of God, it was natural that the service of God should elicit a joyous spirit (“I will offer in his tabernacle sacrifices of joy,” <sup><1926></sup>Psalms 27:6; compare <sup><1309></sup>1 Chronicles 29:9), a spirit which is abundantly manifest in the jubilant shouting with which religious festivities were celebrated, and the trumpet-sound which accompanied certain sacrifices (<sup><1065></sup>2 Samuel 6:15; <sup><1981></sup>Psalms 33:1-3; <sup><4000></sup>Numbers 10:10; <sup><1027></sup>2 Chronicles 29:27), and especially in psalms of praise, thanksgiving and adoration (Psalms 47; 81; 100, etc.). “Rejoice before Yahweh your God” is an oft-repeated phrase in Deuteronomy with reference to the sacrificial feast (e.g. 12:12). But joy is a Divine, as well as a human, emotion; for God Himself is represented in the Old Testament, not as a rigid, impassible Being, but as susceptible to pleasure and pain. God may be conceived of as “rejoicing in his works” (<sup><1946></sup>Psalms 104:31;

compare <sup><003></sup>Genesis 1:31), and over His people “for good” (<sup><009></sup>Deuteronomy 30:9). “He will rejoice over thee (Zion) with joy; he will rest in his love; he will joy over thee with singing” (<sup><017></sup>Zephaniah 3:17). Such noble and vivid anthropomorphisms are a nearer approach to the truth than the abstract doctrine of the impassibility of God which, owing to Platonic influences, dominated theology of the early Christian centuries.

### 3. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT:

The element of joy in religion is still more prominent in the New Testament. It is the appropriate response of the believer to the “good tidings of great joy” which constitute the gospel (<sup><020></sup>Luke 2:10). In the four Gospels, especially Luke, this element is conspicuous. It is seen in the canticles of Luke 1 and 2. It is both exemplified in the life and character, and set forth in the teaching of Jesus. There are many intimations that, in spite of the profound elements of grief and tragedy in His life, His habitual demeanor was gladsome and joyous, certainly not gloomy or ascetic: such as, His description of Himself as bridegroom, in defense of His disciples for not fasting (<sup><028></sup>Mark 2:18-20); the fact that He came “eating and drinking,” giving occasion to the charge that He was “a gluttonous man and a winebibber” (<sup><019></sup>Matthew 11:19); His “rejoicing in the Holy Spirit” (<sup><021></sup>Luke 10:21); the fact that His presence was found to be congenial at social festivities (<sup><043></sup>Mark 14:3; <sup><040></sup>Luke 14:1; <sup><030></sup>John 12:1), and at the wedding in Cana (<sup><030></sup>John 2:1 ff); His mention of “my joy” (<sup><051></sup>John 15:11; 17:13). His teaching with reference to His followers harmonizes with this. The Christian virtues confer on those who attain them not only beatitude, a calm and composed state of felicity (<sup><028></sup>Matthew 5:3-11), but also a more exuberant state of joy, which is in sharp contrast to the “sad countenance” of the hypocrites (<sup><066></sup>Matthew 6:16) (“Rejoice, and be exceeding glad”, <sup><052></sup>Matthew 5:12). This spirit is reflected in many of the parables. The discovery of the true treasure of life brings joy (<sup><034></sup>Matthew 13:44). The three parables in Luke 15 reveal the joy of the Divine heart itself at the repentance of sinners (see especially 15:5-7,9,10,22-24,32). The parable of the Talents lays stress on the “joy of the Lord” which is the reward of faithfulness (<sup><051></sup>Matthew 25:21,23). Jesus confers on His followers not only peace (<sup><047></sup>John 14:27; 16:33), but participation in His own fullness of joy (<sup><051></sup>John 15:11; 16:24; 17:13), a joy which is permanent, in contrast to the sorrow which is transient (<sup><062></sup>John 16:22). In the dark days of disappointment that succeeded the crucifixion, the joy of the disciples

passed under a cloud, but at the resurrection (<sup><244></sup>Luke 24:41) and still more on the day of Pentecost it emerged into light, and afterward remained a marked characteristic of the early church (<sup><404></sup>Acts 2:46 f; 8:39; 13:52; 15:3). Paul speaks of joy as one of the fruits of the spirit (<sup><452></sup>Galatians 5:22) and of “joy in the Holy Spirit” as an essential mark of the kingdom of God (<sup><547></sup>Romans 14:17). This joy is associated with faith (Phil 1:25), hope (<sup><482></sup>Romans 5:2; 12:12), brotherly fellowship and sympathy (<sup><525></sup>Romans 12:15; <sup><473></sup>2 Corinthians 7:13; Phil 2:1 f). To rejoice in the Lord is enjoined as a Christian duty (Phil 3:1; 4:4; compare 2:17 f; <sup><516></sup>1 Thessalonians 5:16). In Christ, the Christian “rejoices with joy unspeakable and full of glory” (<sup><408></sup>1 Peter 1:8), in spite of his temporary afflictions (<sup><406></sup>1 Peter 1:6). Christian joy is no mere gaiety that knows no gloom, but is the result of the triumph of faith over adverse and trying circumstances, which, instead of hindering, actually enhance it (<sup><454></sup>Acts 5:41; <sup><483></sup>Romans 5:3 f; <sup><502></sup>James 1:2,12; 5:11; <sup><4043></sup>1 Peter 4:13; compare <sup><4051></sup>Matthew 5:11,12). Even our Lord Himself “for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising shame” (<sup><517></sup>Hebrews 12:2).

*D. Miall Edwards*

## JOZABAD

<sup><joz'-a-bad></sup> ([<sup><dbzwQ></sup> yozabhadh], “Yahweh has bestowed”):

**(1)** A Gederathite, and one of David’s recruits at Ziklag (<sup><324></sup>1 Chronicles 12:4 (Hebrew 5)). He is named with the Benjamites, but possibly he was a native of the town Gedara in Southern Judah. See Curtis, Chronicles, 196.

**(2), (3)** Two Manassite captains who joined David at Ziklag (<sup><322></sup>1 Chronicles 12:20 (Hebrew 21)).

**(4)** A Levite overseer in Hezekiah’s time (<sup><4813></sup>2 Chronicles 31:13); may be the ancestor of the chief of the priests in <sup><489></sup>2 Chronicles 35:9 = “Joram” of 1 Esdras 1:9.

**(5)** A Levite (Ezr 8:33), mentioned again probably in Ezr 10:23; <sup><488></sup>Nehemiah 8:7; 11:16. The name in 1 Esdras 8:63 (= Ezr 8:33) is “Josabds” (the King James Version “Josabad”).

**(6)** A priest who had married a foreign wife Ezr 10:22) = “Ocidelus” of 1 Esdras 9:22.

## JOZABDUS

<jo-zab'-dus> ([<sup>1</sup> Ἰωζαβδός, *Iozabdos*]):

- (1) Son of Jeshua the Levite (1 Esdras 8:63), called “Jozabad” in Ezr 8:33.
- (2) Son of Bebai (1 Esdras 9:29), called “Zabbai” in Ezr 10:28.

## JOZACAR

<joz'-a-kar>, <jo-za'-kar> ([<sup>1</sup>rkzwq yozakhar], “Yahweh has remembered”; the King James Version Jozachar): Servant and murderer (with Jehozabad) of Joash, king of Judah (<sup><2K21></sup>2 Kings 12:21 (Hebrew 22)); called “Zabad” in <sup><2Ch26></sup>2 Chronicles 24:26. Many manuscripts have “Jozabad” in 2 Kings.

## JOZADAK

<joz'-a-dak>.

See *JEHOZADAK*.

## JUBAL

<joo'-bal> ([<sup>1</sup> bwy, yubhal]; for meaning see JASAL): Son of Lamech by Adah, and inventor of musical instruments (<sup><Gen4></sup>Genesis 4:21).

## JUBILEE, CYCLE OF THE

<joo'-bi-le>, <ju'-bi-le>.

See *Luni-solar cycle, under ASTRONOMY, I, 5*.

## JUBILEE YEAR

([<sup>1</sup> bwh" tn" v] shenath ha-yobhel]; [<sup>1</sup>έτος της ἀφέσεως, *etos tes apheseos*]; [*annus jubilaeus*], “year of jubilee” (<sup><Lev13></sup>Leviticus 25:13), or simply [<sup>1</sup> bwh" , ha-yobhel], “the jubilee” (<sup><Lev28></sup>Leviticus 25:28; compare <sup><Num4></sup>Numbers 36:4), the King James Version and the English Revised Version Jubile): The Hebrew word *yobhel* stands for *qeren ha-yobhel*, meaning the horn of a ram. Now, such a horn can be made into a trumpet, and thus the word *yobhel* came to be used as a synonym of trumpet.

According to <sup>(RS19)</sup>Leviticus 25:9 a loud trumpet should proclaim liberty throughout the country on the 10th day of the 7th month (the Day of Atonement), after the lapse of 7 sabbaths of years = 49 years. In this manner, every 50th year was to be announced as a jubilee year. All real property should automatically revert to its original owner (<sup>(RS10)</sup>Leviticus 25:10; compare 25:13), and those who, compelled by poverty, had sold themselves as slaves to their brothers, should regain their liberty (<sup>(RS10)</sup>Leviticus 25:10; compare 25:39).

In addition to this, the Jubilee Year was to be observed after the manner of the sabbatic year, i.e. there should be neither sowing nor reaping nor pruning of vines, and everybody was expected to live on what the fields and the vineyards produced “of themselves,” and no attempt should be made at storing up the products of the land (<sup>(RS11)</sup>Leviticus 25:11 f). Thus there are three distinct factors constituting the essential features of the Jubilee Year: personal liberty, restitution of property, and what we might call the simple life.

### 1. PERSONAL LIBERTY:

The 50th year was to be a time in which liberty should be proclaimed to all the inhabitants of the country. We should, indeed, diminish the import of this institution if we should apply it only to those who were to be freed from the bonds of physical servitude. Undoubtedly, they must have been the foremost in realizing its beneficial effects. But the law was intended to benefit all, the masters as well as the servants. They should never lose sight of their being brothers and citizens of theocratic kingdom. They owed their life to God and were subject to His sovereign will. Only through loyalty to Him were they free and could ever hope to be free and independent of all other masters.

### 2. RESTITUTION OF PROPERTY:

The institution of the Jubilee Year should become the means of fixing the price of real property (<sup>(RS15)</sup>Leviticus 25:15 f; compare 25:25-28); moreover, it should exclude the possibility of selling any piece of land permanently (<sup>(RS23)</sup>Leviticus 25:23), the next verse furnishing the motive: “The land is mine: for ye are strangers and sojourners with me.” The same rule was to be applied to dwelling-houses outside of the walled cities (<sup>(RS31)</sup>Leviticus

25:31), and also to the houses owned by Levites, although they were built within walled cities (<sup><BR25></sup>Leviticus 25:32).

In the same manner the price of Hebrew slaves was to vary according to the proximity of the Jubilee Year (<sup><BR24></sup>Leviticus 25:47-54). This passage deals with the enslaving of a Hebrew by a foreigner living among the Jews; it goes without saying that the same rule would hold good in the case of a Hebrew selling himself to one of his own people.

In <sup><BR27></sup>Leviticus 27:17-25 we find a similar arrangement respecting such lands that were “sanctified unto Yahweh.” In all these cases the original owner was at liberty to redeem his property at any time, or have it redeemed by some of his nearest relatives (25:25-27, 29, 48 ff; 27:19).

The crowning feature, though, was the full restitution of all real property in the Jubilee Year. The primary object of this regulation was, of course, the reversion of all hereditary property to the family which originally possessed it, and the reestablishment of the original arrangement regarding the division of the land. But that was not all; for this legal disposition and regulation of external matters was closely connected with the high calling of the Jewish people. It was a part of the Divine plan looking forward to the salvation of mankind. “The deepest meaning of it (the Jubilee Year) is to be found in the [<sup><BR28></sup>*ἀποκατάστασις τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ*, *apokatastasis tes basileias tou theou*], i.e. in the restoring of all that which in the course of time was perverted by man’s sin, in the removing of all slavery of sin, in the establishing of the true liberty of the children of God, and in the delivering of the creation from the bondage of corruption to which it was subjected on account of man’s depravity” (<sup><BR29></sup>Romans 8:19 ff) (compare Keil, Manual of Biblical Archaeology). In the Year of Jubilee a great future era of Yahweh’s favor is foreshadowed, that period which, according to <sup><BR30></sup>Isaiah 61:1-3, shall be ushered in to all those that labor and are heavy laden, by Him who was anointed by the spirit of the Lord Yahweh.

### 3. THE SIMPLE LIFE:

The Jubilee Year, being the crowning point of all sabbatical institutions, gave the finishing touch as it were to the whole cycle of sabbatic days, months and years. It is, therefore, quite appropriate that it should be a year of rest for the land like the preceding sabbatic year (<sup><BR31></sup>Leviticus 25:11 f). It follows, of course, that in this instance there were two years, one after

the other, in which there should be no sowing or systematic ingathering. This seems to be clear from <sup><182518></sup>Leviticus 25:18-22: “And ye shall sow the eighth year, and eat of the fruits, the old store; until the ninth year, until its fruits come in, ye shall eat the old store.” Thus in the 7th and 8th years the people were to live on what the fields had produced in the 6th year and whatever grew spontaneously. This shows the reason why we may say that one of the factors constituting the Jubilee Year was the “simple life.” They could not help but live simply for two consecutive years. Nobody can deny that this afforded ample opportunity to develop the habit of living within very limited means. And again we see that this external part of the matter did not fully come up to the intention of the Lawgiver. It was not the simple life as such that He had in view, but rather the laying down of its moral and religious foundations. In this connection we must again refer to <sup><182518></sup>Leviticus 25:18-22, “What shall we eat the seventh year?” The answer is very simple and yet of surpassing grandeur: “Then I will command my blessing upon you,” etc. Nothing was expected of the people but faith in Yahweh and confidence in His power, which was not to be shaken by any doubtful reflection. And right here we have found the root of the simple life: no life without the true God, and no simplicity of life without true faith in Him. “Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God” (<sup><180018></sup>Matthew 4:4; compare <sup><181818></sup>Deuteronomy 8:3).

We may well ask: Did the Jewish people ever observe the Jubilee Year? There is no reason why they should not have observed it in pre-exilic times (compare Lotz in *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, X, under the word “Sabbatical Year” and “Year of Jubilee”). Perhaps they signally failed in it, and if so, we should not be surprised at all. Not that the institution in itself was cumbered with any obstacles that could not have been overcome; but what is more common than unbelief and unwillingness to trust absolutely in Yahweh? Or, was it observed in post-exilic times? Here, too, we are in the dark. There is, indeed, a tradition according to which the Jubilee Year has never been observed — neither in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah nor at any later period. The truth of this seems to be corroborated by the silence of Josephus, who, while referring quite frequently to the sabbatic year, never once mentions the Year of Jubilee.

***William Baur***



## JUBILEES, BOOK OF

*See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.*

## JUCAL

<joo'-kal>.

*See JEHUCAL.*

## JUDA

<joo'-da>: <sup><419></sup>Luke 1:39 the King James Version, *see JUTTAH*; <sup><436></sup>Luke 3:26, *see JODA*; 3:30, *see JUDAS*.

## JUDAEA

<joo-de'-a>, <ju-de'-a> ([<sup>᾿</sup>Ιουδαία, *Ioudaia*]): The “land of the Jews,” the Greco-Roman equivalent of Judah. As most of the Israelites returning from the captivity belonged to the tribe of Judah, they came to be called Jews and their land Judea. In Tobit 1:18 the name is applied to the old kingdom of Judah. For a general description of the physical geography and early history of this region *see* JUDAH. The limits of this district varied greatly, extending as the Jewish population increased, but in many periods with very indefinite boundaries.

Under the Persian empire, Judea (or Judah) was a district administered by a governor who, like Zerubbabel (<sup><3014></sup>Haggai 1:14; 2:2), was probably usually a Jew. Even as late as Judas Maccabeus, Hebron and its surroundings — the very heart of old Judah was under the domination of the Edomites, whom, however, Judas conquered (1 Macc 5:65); in the time of his brother Jonathan (145 BC), three tetrarchies of Samaria, Aphaerema, Lydda and Ramathaim, were added to Judea (1 Macc 10:30,38; 11:34); in some passages it is referred to at this time as the “land of Judah” ([<sup>᾿</sup>Ιούδα, *Iouda*]) (1 Macc 10:30,33,37). The land was then roughly limited by what may be called the “natural boundaries of Judah” (*see* JUDAH).

Strabo (xvi.11, 21) extends the name Judea to include practically all Palestine; as does Luke (4:44 m; 23:5; <sup><409></sup>Acts 2:9; 10:37, etc.). In several New Testament references (<sup><4025></sup>Matthew 4:25; <sup><4005></sup>Mark 1:5; 3:7; <sup><4157></sup>Luke 5:17; <sup><4192></sup>John 3:22; <sup><4008></sup>Acts 1:8), Judea is contrasted with its capital

Jerusalem. The country bordering on the shores of the Dead Sea for some miles inland was known as the Wilderness of Judea (*see JUDAH; JESHIMON*) (~~ABR~~Matthew 3:1), or “the wilderness” (~~ABR~~Mark 1:4; ~~ABR~~Luke 3:2); here John the Baptist appeared as a preacher. According to ~~ABR~~Matthew 19:1 (but compare ~~ABR~~Mark 10:1, where the Revised Version (British and American) has “Judaea and beyond Jordan”), some cities beyond Jordan belonged to Judea. That this was an actual fact we know from Ptolemy (v.16,9) and Josephus (Ant., XII, iv, 11).

According to Josephus (BJ, III, iii, 5), Judea extended from Anuath-Borkaeos (i.e. Khan Berkit near Khan es Saweh, close to the most northerly frontier of Judah as described in *JUDAH* (which see)) to the village Jordan, possibly *Tell `Arad*, near Arabia in the South. Its breadth was from Joppa in the West to Jordan in the East. The seacoast also as far north as Ptolemais (*`Akka*), except Jamnia, Joppa and (according to the Talm) Caesarea, belonged to this province.

After the death of Herod the Great, Archelaus received Judea, Samaria and Idumea as his ethnarchy, but on his deposition Judea was absorbed into the Roman province of Syria, the procurator of which lived at Caesarea.

Of later history it is only necessary to notice that in the 5th century Judea became part of the land known as Palaestina Prima; that at the time of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem (12th century) all the hill country of Judah from Sinjil to Tekoa was the royal domain, while the southern section to Beersheba belonged to the Seigneur de Abraham (i.e. of Hebron); and lastly that a district, the rough equivalent of the kingdom of Judah, though larger, and of the Judea described by Josephus (BJ, III, iii, 5), though slightly smaller, forms today the Mutaserraflic of el Kuds, an administrative area where more than in any spot in the world the problem of the “land of the Jews” is today increasingly acute.

*E. W. G. Masterman*

## **JUDAEA, WILDERNESS OF**

(~~ABR~~Matthew 3:1).

*See JUDAEA.*

## JUDAH (1)

<joo'-da> ([**hdWhy**] *yehudhah*], “praised”):

- (1) 4th son of Jacob by Leah (see separate article).
- (2) An ancestor of Kadmiel, one of those who had the oversight of the rebuilding of the temple (Ezr 3:9). He is the same as Hodaviah (Ezr 2:40), and Hodevah (<sup><167B></sup>Nehemiah 7:43).
- (3) A Levite who had taken a strange wife (Ezr, 10:23).
- (4) A Levite who came up with Zerubbabel (<sup><167B></sup>Nehemiah 12:8).
- (5) A priest and musician who took part in the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem (<sup><162B></sup>Nehemiah 12:36); (3), (4) and (5) may be the same person.
- (6) A Benjamite, the son of Hassenuah, who was second over the city of Jerusalem in the days of Nehemiah (<sup><161B></sup>Nehemiah 11:9).
- (7) One of the princes of Judah who took part in the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem (<sup><162B></sup>Nehemiah 12:34).

*S. F. Hunter*

## JUDAH (2)

([**hdWhy**] *yehudah*]; in <sup><02B></sup>Genesis 29:35 Codex Vaticanus, [ ' **Ιούδα**ν, *Ioudan*]; Codex Alexandrinus, [ ' **Ιούδα**, *Iouda*]; elsewhere Codices Vaticanus and Alexandrinus, [ ' **Ιούδας**, *Ioudas*]):

### 1. JACOB'S SON:

The 4th son born to Jacob by Leah in Paddan-aram (<sup><02B></sup>Genesis 29:35, etc.). Of this patriarch's life only scanty details remain to us. He turned his brethren from their purpose to slay Joseph, persuading them to sell him to the Midianites at Dothan (<sup><032B></sup>Genesis 37:26 ff). A dark stain is left upon his memory by the disgraceful story told in Genesis 38. Reuben forfeited the rights of primogeniture by an act of infamy; Simeon and Levi, who came next in order, were passed over because of their cruel and treacherous conduct at Shechem; to Judah, therefore, were assigned the honors and responsibilities of the firstborn (34; 35:22; 49:5 ff). On the occasion of their first visit to Egypt, Reuben acted as spokesman for his brethren (42:22,37). Then the leadership passed to Judah (43:3, etc.). The

sons of Joseph evidently looked askance upon Judah's promotion, and their own claims to hegemony were backed by considerable resources (49:22 ff). The rivalry between the two tribes, thus early visible, culminated in the disruption of the kingdom. To Judah, the "lion's whelp," a prolonged dominion was assured (49:9 ff).

## 2. TRIBE OF JUDAH:

The tribe of Judah, of which the patriarch was the name-father, at the first census in the wilderness numbered 74,600 fighting men; at Sinai the number "from 20 years old and upward" was 76,500 (<sup><0027></sup>Numbers 1:27; 26:22; *see* NUMBERS). The standard of the camp of Judah, with which were also the tribes of Zebulun and Issachar, was to the East of the tabernacle "toward the sunrising," the prince of Judah being Nahshon, the son of Amminadab (<sup><0018></sup>Numbers 2:3). Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, represented Judah among the spies (<sup><0035></sup>Numbers 13:6); he also was told off to assist at the future allocation of the tribal portions (<sup><0019></sup>Numbers 34:19).

## 3. TERRITORY:

The land assigned to Judah lay in the South of Palestine (*see* **JUDAH, TERRITORY OF**), comprising part of the mountain, the Shephelah, and the maritime plain. The information given of its conquest is meager and cannot be arranged in a self-consistent story. In <sup><0121></sup>Joshua 11:21 ff, the conquest is ascribed to Joshua. Caleb is described as conquering at least a portion in <sup><0142></sup>Joshua 14:12; 15:13 ff; while in Judges 1 the tribes of Judah and Simeon play a conspicuous part; and the latter found a settlement in the South within the territory of Judah. The tribal organization seems to have been maintained after the occupation of the land, and Judah was so loosely related to the northern tribes that it was not expected to help them against Sisera. Deborah has no reproaches for absent Judah. It is remarkable that no judge over Israel (except Othniel, <sup><0019></sup>Judges 3:9-11) arose from the tribe of Judah. The first king of all Israel was chosen from the tribe of Benjamin. This made acquiescence on the part of Judah easier than it would have been had Saul sprung from the ancient rival, Ephraim. But the dignity of Judah was fully vindicated by the splendid reigns of David and Solomon, in lineal descent from whom the Saviour of the world should come. The further history of the tribe is merged in that of Israel.

## JUDAH, KINGDOM OF

### I. CANAAN BEFORE THE MONARCHY.

#### *1. The Coming of the Semites:*

Some 4,000 years BC the land on either side of the valley of the Jordan was peopled by a race who, to whatever stock they belonged, were not Semites. It was not until about the year 2500 BC that the tide of Sere immigration began to flow from North Arabia into the countries watered by the Jordan and the Euphrates. One of the first waves in this human tide consisted of the Phoenicians who settled in the Northwest, on the seashore; they were closely followed by other Canaan tribes who occupied the country which long bore their name.

#### *2. The Canaanites:*

The Canaanites are known to us chiefly from the famous letters found at Tell Amarna in Egypt which describe the political state of the country during the years 1415-1360 BC — the years of the reigns of Amenophis III and IV. Canaan was at this time slipping out of the hands of Egypt. The native princes were in revolt: tribute was withheld; and but few Egyptian garrisons remained. Meantime a fresh tide of invasion was hurling its waves against the eastern frontiers of the land. The newcomers were, like their predecessors, Semitic Bedouin from the Syrian desert. Among them the Tell el-Amarna Lettersname the Chabiri, who are, no doubt, the people known to us as the Hebrews.

#### *3. The Israelite Confederacy:*

The Hebrews are so named by those of other nationality after one of their remoter ancestors (<sup>עֵבֶר</sup>Genesis 10:24), or because they had come from beyond (*ebher*) the Jordan or the Euphrates. Of themselves they spoke collectively as Israel. Israel was a name assumed by the eponymous hero of the nation whose real name was Jacob. Similarly the Arabian prophet belonged to the tribe called from its ancestor Koraish, whose name was Fihr. The people of Israel were a complex of some 12 or 13 tribes. These 12 tribes were divided into two main sections, one section tracing its descent from Leah, one of Jacob's wives, and the other section tracing its descent from Rachel, his other wife. The names of the tribes which claimed

to be descended from Leah were Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Zebulun, and, indirectly, Gad and Asher; those which claimed to be descended from Rachel were Joseph, which was divided into two clans; Ephraim and Manasseh, Benjamin, and, indirectly, Dan and Naphtali. The rivalry between these two great divisions runs all through the national history of the Hebrews, and was only brought to an end by the annihilation of one of the opposing factions (<sup><2113></sup>Isaiah 11:13). But not only was the Israelite nation a combination of many clans; it was united also to other tribes which could not claim descent, from Israel or Jacob. Such tribes were the Kenites and the Calebites. Toward such the pure Israelite tribes formed a sort of aristocracy, very much as, to change the parallel, the tribe of Koraish did among the Arabs. It was rarely that a commander was appointed from the allied tribes, at least in the earlier years of the national life.

#### *4. Migration into Canaan:*

We find exactly the same state of things obtaining in the history of the Arabian conquests. All through that history there runs the rivalry between the South Arabian tribes descended from Kahtan (the Hebrew [Joktan], <sup><0105></sup>Genesis 10:25, etc.) and the northern or Ishmaelite tribes of Modar. It is often stated that the Old Testament contains two separate and irreconcilable accounts of the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites. According to the Book of Joshua, it is said the invasion was a movement of the whole people of Israel under the leadership of Joshua; according to the Book of Judges, it consisted of a series of expeditions made by individual tribes each on its own account (<sup><0002></sup>Judges 1:2,10, etc.). But again, in the history of the Arabs we find precisely the same apparent discrepancy. For Persia, Syria and Egypt were conquered by the Arabs as a whole; but at the same time no tribe lost its individuality; each tribe made expeditions on its own account, and turned its arms against rival tribes even in the enemy's country. On the confines of China in the East and in Spain on the West, the arms of the Yemen's tribes were employed in the destruction of those of Modar as fiercely as ever they had been within Arabia itself.

#### *5. The Bond of Union:*

The bond which united the Israelite tribes, as well as those of Kayin (the eponym of the Kenites) and Caleb, was that of the common worship of

Yahweh. As Mohammed united all the tribes of Arabia into one whole by the doctrine of monotheism, so did Moses the Israelite tribes by giving them a common object of worship. And the sherifs or descendants of `Ali today occupy a position very like what the Levites and the descendants of Aaron must have maintained in Israel. In order to keep the Israelite nation pure, intermarriage with the inhabitants of the invaded country was forbidden, though the prohibition was not observed (~~QRT5~~Judges 3:5 f). So too, the Arab women were not permitted to marry non-Arabs during the first years of conquest.

### 6. *Early Rulers:*

It is customary to date the beginning of monarchy in Israel from Saul the son of Kish, but in point of fact many early leaders were kings in fact if not in name. Moses and Joshua may be compared with Mohammed and his caliph (properly khalifa) or “successor,” Abu Bekr. Their word was law; they reigned supreme over a united nation. Moreover, the word “king” (melekh) often means, both in Hebrew and Arabic, nothing more than governor of a town, or local resident. There was more than one “king” of Midinn (~~QRT2~~Judges 8:12). Balak seems to have been only a king of Moab (~~QRT4~~Numbers 22:4).

### 7. *The Judges:*

Before the monarchy proper, the people of Israel formed, in theory, a theocracy, as did also the Arabs under the caliphs. In reality they were ruled by temporary kings called judges (*shopheT*, the Carthaginian sufes). Their office was not hereditary, though there were exceptions (compare Judges 9). On the other hand, the government of the Northern Kingdom of Israel was practically an elective monarchy, so rarely were there more than two of the same dynasty. The judge again was usually appointed in order to meet some special crises, and theoretically ideal state of things was one in which there was no visible head of the state — a republic without a president. These intervals, however, always ended in disaster, and the appointment of another judge. The first king also was elected to cope with a specially serious crisis. The main distinction between judge and king was that the former, less than the latter, obscured the fact of the true King, upon the recognition of whom alone the continued existence of the nation depended. The rulers then became the “elders” or sheikhs of the tribes, and

as these did not act in unison, the nation lost its solidarity and became an easy prey to any invader.

### *8. Hereditary Kings:*

During the period of the Judges a new factor entered into the disturbed politics of Canaan. This was an invader who came not from the eastern and southern deserts, but from the western sea. Driven out of Crete by invaders from the mainland, the last remnants of the race of Minos found refuge on the shores of the country which ever after took from them the name it still bears — Philistin or Palestine. At the same time the Ammonites and Midianites were pressing into the country from the East (1 Samuel 11). Caught between these two opposing forces, the tribes of Israel were threatened with destruction. It was felt that the temporary sovereignty of the judge was no longer equal to the situation. The supreme authority must be permanent. It was thus the monarchy was founded. Three motives are given by tradition as leading up to this step. The pretext alleged by the elders or sheikhs is the worthlessness and incapacity of Samuel's sons, who he intended should succeed him (1 Samuel 8). The immediate cause was the double pressure from the Philistines (<sup>10916</sup>1 Samuel 9:16) and the Ammonite king (<sup>10912</sup>1 Samuel 12:12). The real reason was that the system of government by elective kings or judges had proved a failure and had completely broken down. The times called for a hereditary monarchy.

## **II. THE FIRST THREE KINGS.**

### *1. The Benjamite King:*

The most warlike of the clans of Israel shortly before this had been that of Benjamin — one of the Rachel tribes. The national sanctuary, with the ark and the grandson of Aaron as priest, was at Bethel in their territory. Moreover, they had defeated the combined forces of the other tribes in two pitched battles. They had at last been defeated and almost exterminated, but they had recovered much of their strength and prestige (Judges 20; <sup>10912</sup>1 Samuel 4:12). From this tribe the first king was chosen (*see SAUL*). He, however, proved unequal to his task. After some years spent in war with the Philistines and in repressing supposed disloyalty at home, he was defeated and killed.

Meantime, one of the less-known clans was coming to the front. The territory of the tribe of Judah lay in the South. After its occupation



(compare <sup><0002></sup>Judges 1:2,3), the tribe of Judah appears to have settled down to the care of its flocks and herds. It is not mentioned in the Song of Deborah. None of the judges belonged to it, unless Ibzan, who seems to have been of little account (<sup><0728></sup>Judges 12:8 f). Under the leadership of DAVID (which see), this tribe now came to the front, and proved in the end to be endowed with by far the greatest vitality of all the tribes. It outlived them all, and survives to this day.

## *2. Rachel and Leah Tribes:*

The Rachel tribes, led by Benjamin and Ephraim (2 Samuel 2; 3), resisted for some time the hegemony of Judah, but were obliged in the end to submit. Under David Israel became again a united whole. By making Jerusalem his capital on the borders of Judah and Benjamin, he did much to insure the continuance of this union (compare <sup><1008></sup>1 Chronicles 9:3). The union, however, was only on the surface. By playing off the Rachel tribes, Benjamin and Ephraim, against the rest, Absalom was able to bring the whole structure to the ground (2 Samuel 15 ff), the tribe to which Saul belonged being especially disloyal (<sup><1046></sup>2 Samuel 16:5 ff). Nor was this the only occasion on which the smoldering enmity between the two houses burst out into flame (2 Samuel 20). As soon as the strong hand of David was removed, disaffection showed itself in several quarters (<sup><1114></sup>1 Kings 11:14 ff), and especially the aspiration of the tribe of Ephraim, after independence was fomented by the prophets (<sup><1116></sup>1 Kings 11:26 ff). Egypt afforded a convenient asylum for the disaffected until opportunity should ripen. They had not long to wait.

## *3. The Disruption:*

Solomon was succeeded by Rehoboam, who found it politic to hold a coronation ceremony at Shechem as well, presumably, as at Jerusalem. The malcontents found themselves strong enough to dictate terms. These Rehoboam rejected, and the northern tribes at once threw off their allegiance to the dynasty of David. The disruption thus created in the Israelite nation was never again healed. The secession was like that of the Moors in Spain from the `Abbhsid caliphs. Henceforth "Israel," except in the Chronicler, denotes the Northern Kingdom only. In that writer, who does not recognize the kingdom of the ten tribes, it means Judah. It is usual at the present day to recognize in the Northern Kingdom the true Israelite kingdom. Certainly in point of extent of territory and in resources it was far

the greater of the two. But as regards intellectual power and influence, even down to the present day, not to mention continuity of dynasty, the smaller kingdom is by far the more important. It is, therefore, treated here as the true representative of the nation. Lying, as it did, in the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem, the tribe of Benjamin could hardly do otherwise than throw in its lot with that of Judah Bethel, which became one of the religious capitals of the Northern Kingdom, although nominally within their territory, in fact belonged to Ephraim (~~<1012>~~Judges 1:22 ff). With this union of opposing interests may be compared that of the `Alids and `Abbids, both belonging to the house of Mohammed and both aspirants to the caliphate, against the house of Umeiya.

### III. THE DUAL MONARCHY.

#### *1. War between Two Kingdoms:*

Rehoboam made no decisive attempt to bring back the recalcitrant tribes to their allegiance (~~<1121>~~1 Kings 12:21 ff), though the two countries made raids, one upon the other (~~<1143>~~1 Kings 14:30). For his own security he built numerous fortresses, the remains of some of which have, it is probable, been recovered within recent years (~~<1410>~~2 Chronicles 11:5 ff). These excited the suspicion of Shishak of Egypt, who invaded the country and reduced it to vassalage (~~<1145>~~1 Kings 14:25 ff). Under Rehoboam's son Abijah, actual war broke out between the two kingdoms (~~<1156>~~1 Kings 15:6 as corrected in 15:7; 2 Chronicles 13). The war was continued during the long reign of his son Asa, whose opponent, Baasha, built a fort some 6 miles North of Jerusalem in order to cut off that city from communication with the North. Asa confessed his weakness by appealing for help to Ben-hadad of Damascus. The end justified the means. The fort was demolished.

#### *2. First Reform of Religion:*

The reign of Asa is also remarkable for the first of those reformations of worship which recur at intervals throughout the history of the Southern Kingdom. The high places Reform of were not yet, however, considered illegitimate (~~<1154>~~1 Kings 15:14; but compare ~~<1445>~~2 Chronicles 14:5). He also, like his grandfather, was a builder of castles, and with a similar, though more fortunate, result (~~<1446>~~2 Chronicles 14:6,9 ff). Asa's old age and illness helped to bring to the rival kingdoms a peace which lasted beyond his own reign (~~<1153>~~1 Kings 15:23).

### *3. Two Kingdoms at Peace:*

An effect of this peace is seen in the expanding foreign trade of the country under his successor Jehoshaphat. He rebuilt the navy as in the days of Solomon, but a storm ruined the enterprise (<sup><1228></sup>1 Kings 22:48 f). During this reign the two kingdoms came nearer being united than they had done since the disruption. This was no doubt largely due to the Northern Kingdom having been greatly weakened by the wars with Syria and Assyria, and having given up the idea of annexing the smaller country. Moreover, Jehoshaphat had married his son Joram (Jehoram) to Ahab's daughter Athaliah. From a religious point of view, the two states reacted upon one another. Jehoram of Israel inaugurated a reformation of worship in the Northern Kingdom, and at the same time that of Judah was brought into line with the practice of the sister kingdom (<sup><17818></sup>2 Kings 8:18). The peace, from a political point of view, did much to strengthen both countries, and enabled them to render mutual assistance against the common foe.

### *4. Two Kingdoms Contrasted:*

Up to the death of Jehoram of Israel, which synchronized with that of Joram and Ahaziah of Judah, 6 kings had reigned in Judah. Of these the first 4 died in their beds and were buried in their own mausoleum. During the same period of about 90 years there were in Israel 9 kings divided into 4 dynasties. The second king of the 1st Dynasty was immediately assassinated and the entire family annihilated. Precisely the same fate overtook the 2nd Dynasty. Then followed a civil war in which two pretenders were killed, one perishing by his own hand. The 3rd Dynasty lasted longer than the first two and counted 4 kings. Of these one was defeated and killed in battle and another assassinated. The fate of the kings of Israel is very like that of the middle and later `Abbasid caliphs. The murder of his brothers by the Judean Jehoram, a proceeding once regular with the sultans of Turkey, must also be put down to the influence of his Israelite wife.

### *5. Revolution in the Northern Kingdom:*

It was obvious that a crisis was impending. Edom and Libnah had thrown off their allegiance, and the Philistines had attacked and plundered Jerusalem, even the king's sons being taken prisoners, with the exception of the youngest (<sup><4216></sup>2 Chronicles 21:16). Moreover, the two kingdoms had become so closely united, not only by intermarriage, but also in religion

and politics, that they must stand and fall together. The hurricane which swept away the northern dynasty also carried off the members of the southern royal house more nearly connected with Ahab, and the fury of the queen-mother Athaliah made the destruction complete (~~<210>~~ 2 Kings 11:1).

### *6. Effect on the Southern Kingdom:*

For 6 years the daughter of Ahab held sway in Jerusalem. The only woman who sat on the throne of David was a daughter of the hated Ahab. In her uniqueness, she thus holds a place similar to that of Shejered-Durr among the Memluk sultans of Egypt. The character of her reign is not described, but it can easily be imagined. She came to her inevitable end 6 years later.

### *7. Davidic House at Lowest Ebb:*

Successive massacres had reduced the descendants of David until only one representative was left. Jehoram, the last king but one, had murdered all his brothers (~~<4204>~~ 2 Chronicles 21:4); the Arab marauders had killed his sons except the youngest (~~<4211>~~ 2 Chronicles 22:1; compare 21:17). The youngest, Ahaziah, after the death of his father, was, with 42 of his "brethren," executed by Jehu (~~<2104>~~ 2 Kings 10:14). Finally, Athaliah "destroyed all the seed royal." The entente with the Northern Kingdom had brought the Davidic dynasty to the brink of extinction.

### *8. Begins to Recover:*

But just as `Abd er-Rahman escaped from the slaughter of the Umeiyads to found a new dynasty in Spain, so the Davidic dynasty made a fresh start under Joash. The church had saved the state, and naturally the years that followed were years in which the religious factor bulked large. The temple of Baal which Athaliah had built and supported was wrecked, the idols broken, and the priest killed. A fund was inaugurated for the repair of the national temple. The religious enthusiasm, however, quickly cooled. The priests were found to be diverting the fund for the restoration of the temple to their own uses. A precisely similar diversion of public funds occurred in connection with the Qarawiyn mosque in Fez under the Almoravids in the 12th century. The reign which had begun with so much promise ended in clouds and darkness (~~<1217>~~ 2 Kings 12:17 ff; ~~<4247>~~ 2 Chronicles 24:17 ff; ~~<4235>~~ Matthew 23:35), and Joash was the first of the Judean kings to be assassinated by his own people (~~<1220>~~ 2 Kings 12:20 f).

### *9. Reviving Fortunes:*

By a curious coincidence, a new king ascended the throne of Syria, of Israel and of Judah about the same time. The death of Hazael, and accession of Ben-hadad III led to a revival in the fortunes of both of the Israelite kingdoms. The act of clemency with which Amaziah commenced his reign (<sup><1245></sup>2 Kings 14:5,6; <sup><1246></sup>Deuteronomy 24:16) presents a pleasing contrast to the moral code which had come to prevail in the sister kingdom; and the story of his hiring mercenaries from the Ephraimite kingdom (<sup><1245></sup>2 Chronicles 25:5-10) sheds a curious light on the relations subsisting between the two countries, and even on those times generally. It is still more curious to find him, some time after, sending, without provocation, a challenge to Jehoash; and the capture and release of Amaziah evinces some rudimentary ideas of chivalry (<sup><1248></sup>2 Kings 14:8 ff). The chief event of the reign was the reconquest of Edom and taking of Petra (<sup><1247></sup>2 Kings 14:7).

### *10. Monarchy Still Elective:*

The principle of the election of kings by the people was in force in Judah, although it seemed to be in abeyance since the people were content to limit their choice to the Davidic line. But it was exercised when occasion required. Joash had been chosen by the populace, and it was they who, when the public discontent culminated in the assassination of Amaziah, chose his 16-year-old son Uzziah (or Azariah) to succeed him.

### *11. Government by Regents:*

The minority of the king involved something equivalent to a regency. As Jehoiada at first carried on the government for Joash, so Uzziah was at first under the tutelage of Zechariah (<sup><1245></sup>2 Chronicles 26:5), and the latter part of his reign was covered by the regency of his son Jotham. It is obvious that with the unstable dynasties of the north, such government by deputy would have been impracticable.

### *12. Period of Great Prosperity:*

The reign of Uzziah (2 Chronicles 26) was one of the most glorious in the annals of the Judean kingdom. The Philistines and southern Arabs, who had been so powerful in the reign of Jehoram, were subdued, and other Bedouin were held in check. The frontiers were strengthened with numerous castles. Now that Edom was again annexed, the Red Sea trade

was resumed. Irrigation was attended to, and the agricultural resources of the country were developed. Uzziah also established a standing army, properly equipped and trained. Artillery, in the shape of catapults and other siege engines, was manufactured. It is obvious that in this reign we have advanced far beyond the earlier and ruder times.

### *13. Rise of Priestly Caste:*

In this and the preceding reigns, we notice also how the priests are becoming a distinct and powerful caste. Zadok and Abiathar were no more than the domestic chaplains of David. The kings might at pleasure discharge the functions of the priest. But the all-powerful position of Jehoiada seems to have given the order new life; and in the latter part of the reign of Uzziah, king and priest come into conflict, and the king comes off second-best (~~4436~~ 2 Chronicles 26:16 ff).

### *14. Advent of Assyria:*

Uzziah is the first king of Judah to be mentioned in the Assyrian annals. He was fighting against “Pul” in the years 742-740. The advent of the great eastern power upon the scene of Judean politics could end but in one way — as it was soon to do with Israel also. The reign of Jotham may be passed over as it coincided almost entirely with that of his father. But in the following reign we find Judah already paying tribute to Assyria in the year of the fall of Damascus and the conquest of the East-Jordan land, the year 734.

### *15. Judah a Protectorate:*

During the regency of Jotham, the effeminacy and luxury of the Northern Kingdom had already begun to infect the Southern (~~3001~~ Micah 1:9; 6:16), and under the irresolute Ahaz the declension went on rapidly. This rapprochement in morals and customs did not prevent Israel under Pekah joining with Rezin of Syria against Judah, with no less an object than to subvert the dynasty by placing an Aramean on the throne (~~2006~~ Isaiah 7:6). What the result might have been, had not Isaiah taken the reins out of Ahaz’ hands, it is impossible to say. As it was, Judah felt the strain of the conflict for many a year. The country was invaded from other points, and many towns were lost, some of which were never recovered (~~4487~~ 2 Chronicles 28:17 ff). In despair Ahaz placed himself and his country under the protection of Assyria (~~12417~~ 2 Kings 16:7 ff).

## *16. Cosmopolitan Tendencies:*

It was a part of the cosmopolitan tendencies of the time that the worship became tarnished with foreign innovations (~~<1260>~~ 2 Kings 16:10). The temple for the first time in its history was closed (~~<1483>~~ 2 Chronicles 28:24). Altars of Baal were set up in all the open spaces of Jerusalem, each representing some urban god (~~<24113>~~ Jeremiah 11:13). About the closing of the temple Isaiah would not be greatly concerned. Perhaps it was his suggestion (compare Isaiah 1). The priests who were supreme in the preceding reigns had lost their influence: their place had been taken by the prophets. The introduction of Baalism, however, was no doubt due to Ahaz alone.

## **IV. PERIOD OF DECLINE.**

### *1. Judah Independent:*

The following reign — that of Hezekiah — was, perhaps as a result of the disappearance of the Northern Kingdom, a period of reformation. Isaiah is now supreme, and the history of the times will be found in his biography. It must have been with a sigh of relief that Hezekiah saw the Northern Kingdom disappear forever from the scene. The relations of the two countries had been too uniformly hostile to make that event anything but an omen for good. It was no doubt due to Isaiah that Hezekiah sought to recover the old independence of his country. Their patriotism went near to be their own undoing. Sennacherib invaded Palestine, and Hezekiah found himself shorn of everything that was outside the walls of Jerusalem. Isaiah's patriotism rose to the occasion; the invading armies melted away as by a miracle; Judah was once more free (~~<1283>~~ 2 Kings 18:13 ff).

### *2. Reform of Religion:*

A curious result of Sennacherib's invasion was the disappearance of the high places — local shrines where Levitical priests officiated in opposition to those of the temple. When the Judean territories were limited to the city, these of necessity vanished, and, when the siege was over, they were not restored. They were henceforward regarded as illegal. It is generally held by scholars that this reform occurred later under Josiah, on the discovery of the "Book of the Law" by Hilkiah in the temple (~~<12218>~~ 2 Kings 22:8), and that this book was Deuteronomy. The high places, however, are not mentioned in the law book of Deuteronomy. The reform was probably the work of Isaiah, and due to considerations of morals.

### *3. Egypt and Judah:*

The Judeans had always had a friendly feeling toward Egypt. When the great eastern power became threatening, it was to Egypt they turned for safety. Recent excavation has shown that the influence of Egypt upon the life and manners of Palestine was very great, and that that of Assyria and Babylonia was comparatively slight, and generally confined to the North. In the reign of Hezekiah a powerful party proposed an alliance with Egypt with the view of check-mating the designs of Assyria (~~1274~~2 Kings 17:4; ~~2312~~Isaiah 30:2,3; 31:1). Hezekiah followed Isaiah's advice in rejecting all alliances.

### *4. Traffic in Horses:*

The commercial and other ties which bound Palestine to Egypt were much stronger than those between Palestine and the East. One of the most considerable of these was the trade in horses. This traffic had been begun by Solomon (~~1103~~1 Kings 10:28 f). The chief seat of the trade in Palestine was Lachish (~~3300~~Micah 1:13). In their nomadic state the Israelites had used camels and donkeys, and the use of the horse was looked upon with suspicion by the prophets (~~45716~~Deuteronomy 17:16; Zec 9:10). When the horse is spoken of in the Old Testament, it is as the chief weapon of the enemies of the nation (Exodus 15:1; ~~0762~~Judges 5:22, etc.).

### *5. Reaction under Manasseh:*

On the death of Hezekiah, the nation reverted to the culture and manners of the time of Ahaz and even went farther than he in corrupt practices. Especially at this time human sacrifice became common in Israel (~~3067~~Micah 6:7). The influence for good of the prophets had gone (2 Kings 21). There is a curious story in ~~44311~~2 Chronicles 33:11 f that Manasseh was taken captive by the Assyrians, and, after spending some time in captivity in Babylon, reformed and was restored to his throne. His son, however, undid these reforms, and public discontent grew to such an extent that he was assassinated (~~12219~~2 Kings 21:19 ff).

### *6. Triumph of Reform Party:*

Once more the tide turned in the direction of reform, and on this occasion it rose higher than ever before. The reformation under Josiah was never again wholly undone. The enthusiasm of the iconoclasts carried them far beyond the frontiers of Judah (~~44316~~2 Chronicles 34:6), for on this occasion



they were backed up by the newly found “Book of the Law.” All boded well for a prosperous reign, but unforeseen disasters came from without. The Scythian invasion swept over Southwestern Asia (<sup><2014></sup>Jeremiah 1:14-16; 6:1, etc.). The storm passed, and hope rose higher than before, for the power of Assyria had been shattered forever.

### *7. Babylonia and Judah:*

Already in 722, when Sargon seized the throne on the death of Shalmaneser, Babylonia had revolted, and crowned Marduk-baladan king (<sup><2301></sup>Isaiah 39:1). Hezekiah received a deputation from Babylonia (<sup><1202></sup>2 Kings 20:12 ff), no doubt in the hope of freeing himself from the Assyrian danger by such an alliance. The revolt of Merodach-baladan was maintained for 12 years; then it was suppressed. There was, however, a second revolt of Babylonia on the accession of Sennacherib, Sargon’s son, in 705, which went on till 691, and the events referred to in 2 Kings 20 may have happened at this time, for Hezekiah’s reign seems to have ended prosperously.

### *8. End of Assyrian Empire:*

Sennacherib was assassinated in 681 (<sup><2378></sup>Isaiah 37:38) and was succeeded by his son Esar-haddon, who rebuilt Babylon, razed to the ground by his father, and under whom the province remained quiet. In 674 hostilities with Egypt broke out, and that country was overrun, and **TIRHAKAH** (which see) was expelled in 670. Two years later, however, occurred the revolt of Egypt and the death of Esar-haddon. Assur-bani-pal succeeded, and Egypt regained her independence in 660. The revolt of Babylonia, the incursion of the Scythians (<sup><2014></sup>Jeremiah 1:14 ff) and the death of Assur-bani-pal followed. Two more kings sat on the throne of Assyria, and then Nineveh was taken by the combined Scythians (Mandor) and Babylonians (Herod. i.74; Nah; <sup><3023></sup>Zephaniah 2:13-15; <sup><3005></sup>Habakkuk 1:5 f).

### *9. After Scythian Invasion:*

The Scythian tempest passed quickly, and when it was over the Assyrian peril was no more. Pharaoh-necho seized the opportunity to avenge the injuries of his country by the invasion of the erstwhile Assyrian territories. Josiah, pursuing the policy of alliance with Babylonia inaugurated by Hezekiah, endeavored to arrest his progress. He was defeated and mortally wounded at Megiddo (Zec 12:11).

### *10. Judah Again Dependent:*

By the foolhardy action of Josiah, Judah lost its independence. The people, indeed, elected Jehoahaz (Shallum) king, but he was immediately deposed and carried to Egypt by the Pharaoh (<sup><2210></sup>Jeremiah 22:10 ff; <sup><2618></sup>Ezekiel 19:3 f), who appointed Jehoiakim (Eliakim) as vassal-king. After the defeat of the Pharaoh at Carchemish, the old Hittite stronghold, by Nebuchadrezzar, Jehoiakim submitted, and Judah became a dependency of Babylon. There must have been some return of prosperity, for Jehoiakim is denounced for his luxury and extravagance and oppressive taxation (<sup><2213></sup>Jeremiah 22:13 ff), but the country was raided by the neighboring Bedouin (<sup><1241></sup>2 Kings 24:2), and Jehoiakim came to an untimely end (<sup><2219></sup>Jeremiah 22:19).

### *11. Prophets Lose Influence:*

The prophets were no longer, as under Hezekiah, all-powerful in the state. The influence of Jeremiah was no doubt great, but the majority was against him. His program was both unpopular in itself and it had the fatal defect of being diametrically opposed to that of Isaiah, the patriot-politician (if such there be), who had saved the state from shipwreck. Isaiah had preached reliance upon the national God and through it the political independence of the nation. It was the sad duty of Jeremiah to advise the surrender of the national independence to the newly risen power of Babylon. (<sup><2104></sup>Jeremiah 21:4,9; 38:2, etc.). Isaiah had held that the Holy City was impregnable (<sup><1932></sup>2 Kings 19:32); Jeremiah was sure that it would be taken by the Chaldeans (<sup><2324></sup>Jeremiah 32:24,43). Events proved that each prophet was right for the time in which he lived.

### *12. The Deportations:*

Jehoiakim was the only Judean king who was a vassal first to one overlord and then to another. Judah took a step downward in his reign. It was under him also that the first deportation of the Judeans occurred (<sup><2001></sup>Daniel 1:1-17). He was succeeded by his son Jehoiachin who, on account of a rebellion which closed the reign of his father, was ere long deported, along with the best of the nation (<sup><2224></sup>Jeremiah 22:24 ff; <sup><2615></sup>Ezekiel 19:5 ff). A 3rd son of Josiah, Mattaniah, was set on the throne under the title of Zedekiah. Against the advice of Jeremiah, this, the last king of Judah, declared himself independent of Babylon, and threw in his lot with Egypt under Pharaoh Hophra (Apries), thus breaking his oath of fealty

(<sup>3715</sup>Ezekiel 17:15 ff). On the advance of the Chaldeans, Judah was deserted by her allies, the Edomites and Philistines (*see BOOK OF JOB*), and soon only Lachish (Tell el-Hesi), Azekah (probably Tell Zakarua) and Jerusalem remained in the hands of Zedekiah. The siege of the city lasted two years. It was taken on the fatal 9th of Ab in the year 586. Zedekiah's family was put to the sword, and he himself was taken to Babylon. Egypt shared the fate of Judah, with whom she had been often so closely connected, and Hophra was the last of the Pharaohs.

### *13. Summary:*

The kingdom of Judah had lasted 480 years, counting from its commencement, exactly twice as long as the kingdom of Israel, counting from the disruption. No doubt this longer many existence was due in the first place to the religious faith of the people. This is clear from the fact that the national religion not only survived the extinction of the nation, but spread far beyond its original territories and has endured down to the present day. But there were also circumstances which conspired to foster the growth of the nation in its earliest and most critical period. One of these was the comparative isolation and remoteness of the country. Neither the kingdom of Israel nor that of Judah is for a moment to be compared to those of Egypt and Assyria. Even the combined kingdom under David and Solomon hardly deserves that comparison; and separate, the Northern Kingdom would be about the size of New Hampshire and the Southern Kingdom about that of Connecticut. The smaller kingdom survived the larger because it happened to be slightly farther removed from the danger zone. Even had the two kingdoms held together, it is impossible that they could have withstood the expansion of Assyria and Babylonia on the one side and of Egypt on the other. The Egyptian party in Judean politics in the times of Isaiah and Jeremiah were so far in the right, that, if Judah could have maintained her independence in alliance with Egypt, these two countries combined might have withstood the power of Assyria or Babylon. But it is because this ancient race, tracing its descent from remote antiquity, preserved its religious, at the expense of its national independence, that its literature continues to mold much of the thought of Europe and America today.

*See ISHAEL, KINGDOM OF.*

*Thomas Hunter Weir*

## JUDAH, TERRITORY OF

([hdWhy] yehudhah]):

### I. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA.

Although the physical conformation of Western Palestine divides this land into very definite areas running longitudinally North and South, yet all through history there has been a recognition of a further — and politically more important — division into 3 areas running transversely, known in New Testament times as Galilee, Samaria and Judea. These districts are differentiated to some extent by distinctive physical features which have in no small degree influenced the history of their inhabitants.

#### *1. The Natural Boundaries:*

The southernmost of these regions possesses on 3 sides very definite natural boundaries: to the West the Mediterranean, to the East the Dead Sea, and the Jordan, and to the South 60 miles, North to South, of practically trackless desert, a frontier as secure as sea or mountain range. On the North no such marked “scientific frontier” exists, and on this the one really accessible side, history bears witness that the frontier has been pushed backward and forward. The most ideal natural northern frontier, which only became the actual one comparatively late in Hebrew times (*see JUDAEA*), is that which passes from the river `Aujeh in the West, up the Wady Deir Baldt, by the wide and deep Wady Ishar to `Akrabbeh and thence East to the Jordan. A second natural frontier commences at the same line on the West, but after following the Wady Deir Baldt, branches off southward along the Wady Nimr (now traversed by the modern carriage road from Jerusalem to Nablus), crosses the water-parting close to the lofty Tell Ashur and runs successively down the Wady Sanieh and the Wady `Aujeh and by the eastern river `Aujeh to the Jordan. This division-line is one conformable to the physical features, because north of it the table-lands of “Judea” give place to the more broken mountain groups of “Samaria.” Another less natural, though much more historic, frontier is that which traverses the Vale of Ajalon, follows the Beth-horon pass, and, after crossing the central plateau near el Jib (Gibeon) and er Ram (Ramah of Benjamin), runs down the deep and rugged Wady SuweiniT, between Jeba` (Geba) and Mukhmas (Michmash), to Jericho and the Jordan. It was along this line that the great frontier fortresses, Bethel, Gibeon, Ramah, Adasa,

Geba and Michmash, were erected. Such, on the North, South, East, and West, were the natural boundaries of the southern third of Palestine; yet in all history the land thus enclosed scarcely ever formed a homogeneous whole.

## *2. The Natural Divisions of Judah:*

Within these boundaries lay four very different types of land — the maritime plain, the “lowland” or Shephelah, the “hill country” and, included usually with the last, the desert or Jeshimon.

### **(1) The Maritime Plain:**

The maritime plain, the “land Judah of the Philis” (<sup><900></sup>1 Samuel 6:1; 27:1; <sup><182></sup>2 Kings 8:2; <sup><305></sup>Zephaniah 2:5), was ideally though never actually, the territory of Judah (compare <sup><655></sup>Joshua 15:45-47); it may have been included, as it is by some modern writers, as part of the Shephelah, but this is not the usual use of the word. It is a great stretch of level plain or rolling downs of very fertile soil, capable of supporting a thriving population and cities of considerable size, especially near the seacoast.

### **(2) The Shephelah:**

The Shephelah (shephelah), or “lowland” of Judah (<sup><800></sup>Deuteronomy 1:7; <sup><690></sup>Joshua 9:1; 11:2,16; 15:33-44; <sup><1107></sup>1 Kings 10:27; <sup><1378></sup>1 Chronicles 27:28; <sup><2475></sup>Jeremiah 17:26). — In these references the word is variously rendered in the King James Version, usually as “vale” or “valley,” sometimes, as in the last two, as “plain.” In the Revised Version (British and American) the usual rendering is “lowland.” In 1 Macc 12:38, the King James Version has “Shephela” and the Revised Version (British and American) “plain country.” The word “Shephelah” appears to survive in the Arabic Sifla about Beit Jebrin.

This is a very important region in the history of Judah. It is a district consisting mainly of rounded hills, 500-800 ft. high, with fertile open valleys full of corn fields; caves abound, and there are abundant evidences of a once crowded population. Situated as it is between the “hill country” and the maritime plain, it was the scene of frequent skirmishes between the Hebrews and the Philistines; Judah failed to hold it against the Philistines who kept it during most of their history. The Shephelah is somewhat sharply divided off from the central mountain mass by a remarkable series of valleys running North and South. Commencing at the Vale of Ajalon and

passing South, we have in succession the Wady el Ghurab and, after crossing the Wady es Siwan, the Wady en Najil, the Wady es Sunt (Elah) and the Wady es Cur. It is noticeable that the western extremity of the most historic northern frontier of ancient Judah — that limited by the Vale of Ajalon in the West — appears to have been determined by the presence of this natural feature. North of this the hills of Samaria flatten out to the plain without any such intervening valleys.

### (3) **The Hill Country of Judah:**

The hill country of Judah is by far the most characteristic part of that tribe's possessions; it was on account of the shelter of these mountain fastnesses that this people managed to hold their own against their neighbors and hide away from the conquering armies of Assyria and Egypt. No other section of the country was so secluded and protected by her natural borders. It was the environment of these bare hills and rugged valleys which did much to form the character and influence the literature of the Jews. The hill country is an area well defined, about 35 miles long and some 15 broad, and is protected on three sides by natural frontiers of great strength; on the North alone it has no "scientific frontier." On the South lay the Negeb, and beyond that the almost waterless wilderness, a barrier consisting of a series of stony hills running East and West, difficult for a caravan and almost impracticable for an army. On the West the hills rise sharply from those valleys which delimit them from the Shephelah, but they are pierced by a series of steep and rugged defiles which wind upward to the central table-land. At the northwestern corner the Bethhoron pass — part of the northern frontier line — runs upward from the wide Vale of Ajalon; this route, the most historic of all, has been associated with a succession of defeats inflicted by those holding the higher ground (*see* BETH-HORON). South of this is the Wady `Ali, up which runs the modern carriage road to Jerusalem, and still farther South lies the winding rocky defile, up part of which the railway from Jaffa is laid, the Wady es Surar. A more important valley, because of its width and easier gradient, is the great Vale of Elah (Wady es Cunt), to guard the highest parts of which (now the Wady es Cur) was built the powerful fortress of Beth-zur (~~400~~ 2 Chronicles 11:7, etc.), which Josephus (Ant., XIII, v, 6) describes as "the strongest place in all Judea (*see* **BETH-ZUR**). Up this pass the Syrians successfully with the aid of elephants (Ant., XII, ix, 4) invaded Judea. The eastern frontier of the hill country is one of extraordinary natural strength. Firstly, there were the Jordan and the Dead Sea; then along all but the

northernmost part of the eastern frontier lay a long line of semi-precipitous cliffs, in places over 1,000 ft. high, absolutely unscalable and pierced at long intervals by passes all steep and dangerous. Within this again came a wide area of waterless and barren desert, the Wilderness of Judah (or Judea) known in English Versions of the Bible as JESHIMON (which see). To the northeasterly part of the frontier, where the ascent from the Jericho plain to the mountains presents no special difficulty in gradation, the waterless condition of the Jeshimon greatly restricted the possible routes for an enemy. The natural position for the first line of defense was the fortified city of Jericho, but as a frontier fortress she failed from the days of Joshua onward (*see JERICHO*). From Jericho four roads pass upward to the plateau of Judah; unlike the corresponding passes on the western frontier, they do not traverse any definite line of valley, but in many places run actually along the ridges.

These roads are:

- (a) The earliest historically, though now the least frequented, is the most northerly, which passes westward at the back of ancient Jericho (near `Ain es Sultan) and ascends by Michmash and Ai to Bethel;
- (b) the route traversed by the modern Jerus-Jericho road;
- (c) the more natural route which enters the hills by Wady Joreif Ghusal and runs by Nebi Musa joining the line of the modern carriage road a mile or so after passing the deserted ruin of the Saracenic Khan el Ahmar. Here runs the road for the thousands of pilgrims who visit the shrine of Nebi Musa in the spring.
- (d) The most natural pass of all is by way of Wady el Kuneiterah, across the open plateau of el Bukeia' and over the shoulder of Jebel el Muntar to Bethlehem. From `Ain Feshkhah a very steep road, probably ancient, ascends to join this last route in el Bukeia'. From Engedi (`Ain Jidy) a steep ascent — almost a stairway — winds abruptly to the plateau above, whence a road passes northwesterly by the Wady Hucaceh past Tekoa to Bethlehem and Jerusalem, and another branch goes west to Hebron and Juttah.

Somewhere along these routes must have lain the "Ascent of Ziz" and the "Wilderness of Jeruel," the scene of the events of 2 Chronicles 20. The hill country of Judah is distinguished from other parts of Palestine by certain

physical characteristics. Its central part is a long plateau — or really series of plateaus—running North and South, very stony and barren and supplied with but scanty springs: “dew” is less plentiful than in the north; several of the elevated plains, e.g. about Bethlehem, Beit Jala and Hebron, are well suited to the growth of corn and olive trees; in the sheltered valleys and on the terraced hillsides to the West of the water-parting, vines, olives, figs and other fruit trees flourish exceedingly. There is evidence everywhere that cultivation was far more highly developed in ancient times; on most of the hill slopes to the West traces of ancient terraces can still be seen (*see BOTANY*). This district in many parts, especially on its eastern slopes, is preeminently a pastoral land, and flocks of sheep and goats abound, invading in the spring even the desert itself. This last is ever in evidence, visible from the environs of all Judah’s greater cities and doubtless profoundly influencing the lives and thoughts of their inhabitants.

The altitude attained in this “hill country” is usually below 3,000 ft. in the north (e.g. Ramallah, 2,850 ft., Nebi Samwil, 2,935 ft.), but is higher near Hebron, where we get 3,545 ft. at Ramet el Khulil. Many would limit the term “hill country of Judea” to the higher hills centering around Hebron, but this is unnecessary. Jerusalem is situated near a lower and more expanded part of the plateau, while the higher hills to its north, are, like that city itself, in the territory of Benjamin.

## II. THE TRIBE OF JUDAH AND ITS TERRITORY.

In <sup><009></sup>Numbers 26:19-22, when the tribes of the Hebrews are enumerated “in the plains of Moab by the Jordan at Jericho” (<sup><008></sup>Numbers 26:3), Judah is described as made up of the families of the Shelanites, the Perezites, the Zerahites, the Hezronites and the Hamulites. “These are the families of Judah according to those that were numbered of them,” a total of 76,500 (<sup><002></sup>Numbers 26:22). In <sup><006></sup>Judges 1:16 we read that the Kenites united with the tribe of Judah, and from other references (<sup><046></sup>Joshua 14:6-15; 15:13-19; <sup><002></sup>Judges 1:12-15,20) we learn that the two Kenizzite clans of Caleb and Othniel also were absorbed; and it is clear from <sup><027></sup>1 Samuel 27:10; 30:29 that the Jerahmeelites — closely connected with the Calebites (compare <sup><032></sup>1 Chronicles 2:42) — also formed a part of the tribe of Judah. The Kenizzites and Jerahmeelites were probably of Edomite origin (<sup><031></sup>Genesis 36:11; compare <sup><032></sup>1 Chronicles 2:42), and this large admixture of foreign blood may partly account for the comparative



isolation of Judah from the other tribes (e.g. she is not mentioned in Judges 5).

The territory of the tribe of Judas is described ideally in Joshua 15, but it never really extended over the maritime plain to the West. The natural frontiers to the West and East have already been described as the frontiers of the "hill country"; to the South the boundary is described as going "even to the wilderness of Zin southward, at the uttermost part of the south," i.e. of the Negeb (15:1), and (15:3) as far south as Kadesh-barnea, i.e. the oasis of `Ain Kadis, 50 miles South of Beersheba, far in the desert; the position of the "Ascent of Akrabbim," i.e. of scorpions, is not known. The "Brook of Egypt" is generally accepted to be the Wady el `Arish. The fact is, the actual frontier shaded off imperceptibly into the desert — varying perhaps with the possibilities of agriculture and depending therefore upon the rainfall. The cities mentioned on the boundaries, whose sites are now lost, probably roughly marked the edge of the habitable area (*see* NEGEB).

The northern boundary which separated the land of Judah from that of Benjamin requires brief mention. The various localities mentioned in ~~Joshua~~ Joshua 15:5-12 are dealt with in separate articles, but, omitting the very doubtful, the following, which are generally accepted, will show the general direction of the boundary line: The border went from the mouth of the Jordan to Beth-hoglah (`Ain Hajlah), and from the Valley of Achor (Wady Kelt) by the ascent of Adummin (Tala `at edition Dumm) to the waters of Enoch Shemesh (probably `Ain Haud), Enoch Rogel (Bir Eyyub), and the Valley of Hinnom (Wady er Rababi). The line then crossed the Vale of Rephaim (el Bukeia') to the waters of Nephtoah (Lifta), Kiriath-jearim (Kuryet el `Enab), Chesalon (Kesla), Beth-shemesh (`Ain Shems), Ekron (`Akir), and Jabneel (Yebnah), "and the goings out of the border were at the sea." According to the above line, Jerusalem lay entirely within the bounds of Benjamin, though, according to a tradition recorded in the Talmud, the site of the altar was in a piece of land belonging to Judah. The above frontier line can be followed on any modern map of Palestine, and if it does not in many parts describe a natural frontier, it must be remembered that the frontiers of village and town possessions in modern Palestine are extremely arbitrary, and though undetermined by any natural limits such as streams or mountain summits, they persist from generation to generation, and this too during periods — not long past — when there was constant warfare between different clans.

The territory of Judah was small; even had it included all within its ideal boundaries, it would have been no more than 2,000 square miles; actually it was nearer 1,300 square miles, of which nearly half was desert.

### III. THE BOUNDARIES OF THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH.

These were very circumscribed. In <sup><14105></sup>2 Chronicles 11:5-12 there is a list of the cities — chiefly those on the frontier — which Rehoboam fortified. On the East were Bethlehem, Etam and Tekoa; and on the West and Southwest were Beth-zur, Soco, Adullam, Gath, Mareshah, Ziph, Adoraim, Lachish, Azekah, Zorah, Aijalon and Hebron. The sites of the great majority of these are known, and they are all upon the borders of the Shephelah or the hill country. It will be seen too that the military preparation then made was against an attack from the West. In the 5th year of the reign of Rehoboam the expected attack came, and Shishak (Sheshenq I) of Egypt swept over the land and not only conquered all Judah and Jerusalem, but, according to the reading of some authorities in the account of this campaign given in the great temple of Karnak, he handed over to Jeroboam of Israel certain strongholds of Judah.

The usual northern frontier between the two Hebrew kingdoms appears to have been the southernmost of the three natural lines described in I above, namely by the Valley of Ajalon on the West and the Gorge of Michmash (Wady SuweiniT) on the East. Along the central plateau the frontier varied. Bethel (<sup><1123></sup>1 Kings 12:29; <sup><2109></sup>2 Kings 10:29; <sup><3184></sup>Amos 3:14; 4:4; 7:10,13; <sup><3105></sup>Hosea 10:15) belonged to Israel, though once it fell to Judah when Abijah took it and with it Jeshanah (Ain Sinia) and Ephron (probably et Taiyibeh) (<sup><4439></sup>2 Chronicles 13:19). Geba (Jeba`), just to the South of the Wady Suweinit, was on the northern frontier of Judah, hence, instead of the old term “from Dan to Beer-sheba” we read now of “from Geba to Beersheba” (<sup><1238></sup>2 Kings 23:8). Baasha, king of Israel, went South and fortified Ramah (er Ram, but 4 miles from Jerusalem) against Judah (<sup><1157></sup>1 Kings 15:17), but Asa stopped his work, removed the fortifications and with the materials strengthened his own frontier at Geba and Mizpah (<sup><1152></sup>1 Kings 15:21,22). In the Jordan valley Jericho was held by Israel (<sup><1164></sup>1 Kings 16:34; <sup><1214></sup>2 Kings 2:4).

After the Northern Kingdom fell, the frontier of Judah appears to have extended a little farther North, and Bethel (<sup><1235></sup>2 Kings 23:15-19) and Jericho (to judge from Ezr 2:34; <sup><6182></sup>Nehemiah 3:2; 7:36) also became part

of the kingdom of Judah. For the further history of this district *see* **JUDAEA**.

## LITERATURE.

*See especially H G H L, chapters viii-xv; P E F, III, and Saunders, Introduction to the Survey of Western Palestine.*

*E. W. G. Masterman*

## JUDAH AT (UPON) THE JORDAN

([<sup>h</sup>Deʿ] " h" hdWhy] yehudhah ha-yarden]): A place marking the eastern limit of the territory of Naphtali (<sup>h</sup>Joshua 19:34). It is generally thought among scholars that the text is corrupt; but no very probable emendation has been suggested. Thomson (L B, II, 466) proposes to identify it with Seiyid Jehuda, a small white-domed sanctuary about 3 miles to the Southeast of Tell el-Qady.

## JUDAISM

<joo'-da-iz'-m>.

*See ISRAEL, RELIGION OF.*

## JUDAS

<joo'-das> ([<sup>h</sup> Ιούδας, Ioudas]; Greek form of Hebrew "Judah"):

(1) A Levite mentioned in 1 Esdras 9:23 = JUDAH (3).

(2) Judas Maccabeus, 3rd son of Mattathias (1 Macc 2:4).

*See* **MACCABEES**.

(3) Judas, son of Chalphi, a Jewish officer who supported Jonathan bravely at the battle of Hazor (1 Macc 11:70; Ant, XIII, v, 7).

(4) A person of good position in Jerusalem at the time of the mission to Aristobulus (2 Macc 1:10); he has been identified with Judas Maccabeus and also with an Essene prophet (Ant., XIII, xi, 2; BJ, III, 5).

(5) Son of Simon the Maccabee, and brother of John Hyrcanus (1 Macc 16:2). He was wounded in the battle which he fought along with his

brother against Cendebeus (1 Macc 16:1 ff; Ant, XIII, vii, 3), and was murdered by Ptolemy the usurper, his brother-in-law, at Dok (1 Macc 16:11 ff).

*J. Hutchinson*

## JUDAS, JUDA

(1) The name of an ancestor of Jesus (~~<403>~~ Luke 3:30). In the King James Version it occurs also in ~~<403>~~ Luke 3:26, but the Revised Version (British and American) has “Joda” (Westcott-Hort, [<sup>’</sup> ~~Ιωδᾶ~~, *Ioda*]).

(2) Judas Iscariot (see separate article).

(3) One of the brothers of Jesus (~~<403>~~ Matthew 13:55; ~~<403>~~ Mark 6:3).

*See JUDE.*

(4) An apostle, “not Iscariot” (~~<402>~~ John 14:22). He is generally identified with Lebbaeus (~~<403>~~ Matthew 10:3) and Thaddeus (~~<403>~~ Mark 3:18). *See LEBBAEUS; THADDAEUS.* He is called *JUDAS OF JAMES* (which see) (~~<406>~~ Luke 6:16; ~~<401>~~ Acts 1:13), which means “the son of James” not (the King James Version) “the brother of James.”

(5) A Galilean who stirred up rebellion “in the days of the enrollment” (~~<407>~~ Acts 5:37).

*See JUDAS OF GALILEE.*

(6) One with whom Paul lodged in Damascus, whose house was in “the street which is called Straight” (~~<401>~~ Acts 9:11). Nothing further is known of him. A house is pointed out as his, in a lane off the Straight Street.

(7) Judas Barsabbas (~~<402>~~ Acts 15:22,27,32; see separate article).

*S. F. Hunter*

## JUDAS BARSABBAS

*<bar-sab-’as>* ([<sup>’</sup> ~~Ιούδας Βαρσαββᾶς~~, *Ioudas Barsabbas*]): Judas was, with Silas, a delegate from the church in Jerusalem to the Gentile Christians of Antioch, Syria and Cilicia. They were appointed to convey the letter containing the decision of “the apostles and the elders, with the whole church” regarding the attitude to be taken by Gentile Christians toward the Mosaic law, and also to explain “the same things by word of mouth.” They

accompanied Paul and Barnabas to Antioch, and, “being themselves also prophets,” i.e. preachers, they not only handed over the epistle but stayed some time in the city preaching and teaching. They seem to have gone no farther than Antioch, for “they were dismissed in peace from the brethren unto those that had sent them forth,” and it was Paul and Silas who some time afterward strengthened the churches in Syria and Cilicia (~~4154~~ Acts 15:40,41).

According to ~~4153~~ Acts 15:34 the King James Version, Judas returned to Jerusalem without Silas, who remained at Antioch and afterward became Paul’s companion (~~4150~~ Acts 15:40). The oldest manuscripts, however, omit ~~4153~~ Acts 15:34, and it is therefore omitted from the Revised Version (British and American). It was probably a marginal note to explain ~~4150~~ Acts 15:40, and in time it crept into the text. Judas and Silas are called “chief men among the brethren” (15:22), probably elders, and “prophets” (15:32).

Barsabbas being a patronymic, Judas was probably the brother of Joseph Barsabbas. He cannot be identified with any other Judas, e.g. “Judas not Iscariot” (~~6142~~ John 14:22). We hear no more of Judas after his return to Jerusalem (~~4152~~ Acts 15:22 ff).

*S. F. Hunter*

## JUDAS ISCARIOT

*<is-kar'-i-ot>* ([<sup>1</sup> *Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριώτης*, *Ioudas Iskariotes*], i.e. ‘ish qeriyoth, “Judas, man of Kerioth”): One of the twelve apostles and the betrayer of Jesus; for etymology, etc., *see JUDAS*.

### I. LIFE.

Judas was, as his second name indicates, a native of Kerioth or Karioth. The exact locality of Kerioth (compare ~~6155~~ Joshua 15:25) is doubtful, but it lay probably to the South of Judea, being identified with the ruins of el Karjetein (compare A. Plummer, article “Judas Iscariot” in HDB).

#### *1. Name and Early History:*

He was the son of Simon (~~6162~~ John 13:2) or Simon Iscariot (~~6167~~ John 6:71; 13:26), the meaning of Iscariot explaining why it was applied to his father also. The first Scriptural reference to Judas is his election to the apostleship (compare ~~1004~~ Matthew 10:4; ~~4169~~ Mark 3:19; ~~4166~~ Luke 6:16). He may have

been present at the preaching of John the Baptist at Bethany beyond Jordan (compare ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲛ~~ John 1:28), but more probably he first met Jesus during the return of the latter through Judea with His followers (compare ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲛ~~ John 3:22). According to the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles (see *SIMON THE CANANAEAN*), Judas was among those who received the call at the Sea of Tiberias (compare ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲛ~~ Matthew 4:18-22).

## *2. Before the Betrayal:*

For any definite allusion to Judas during the interval lying between his call and the events immediately preceding the betrayal, we are indebted to John alone. These allusions are made with the manifest purpose of showing forth the nefarious character of Judas from the beginning; and in their sequence there is a gradual development and growing clearness in the manner in which Jesus makes prophecy regarding his future betrayer. Thus, after the discourse on the Bread of Life in the synagogue of Capernaum (~~ⲁⲓⲃⲛ~~ John 6:26-59), when many of the disciples deserted Jesus (~~ⲁⲓⲃⲛ~~ John 6:66) and Peter protested the allegiance of the apostles (~~ⲁⲓⲃⲛ~~ John 6:69), Jesus answered, "Did not I choose you the twelve, and one of you is a devil" (~~ⲁⲓⲃⲛ~~ John 6:70). Then follows John's commentary, "Now he spake of Judas the son of Simon Iscariot, for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve" (~~ⲁⲓⲃⲛ~~ John 6:71), implying that Judas was already known to Jesus as being in spirit one of those who "went back, and walked no more with him" (~~ⲁⲓⲃⲛ~~ John 6:66). But the situation, however disquieting it must have been to the ambitious designs which probably actuated Judas in his acceptance of the apostleship (compare below), was not sufficiently critical to call for immediate desertion on his part. Instead, he lulled his fears of exposure by the fact that he was not mentioned by name, and continued ostensibly one of the faithful. Personal motives of a sordid nature had also influence in causing him to remain. Appointed keeper of the purse, he disregarded the warnings of Jesus concerning greed and hypocrisy (compare ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲛ~~ Matthew 6:20; ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲛ~~ Luke 12:1-3) and appropriated the funds to his own use. As a cloak to his avarice, he pretended to be zealous in their administration, and therefore, at the anointing of Jesus' feet by Mary, he asked "Why was not this ointment sold for 300 shillings, and given to the poor? Now this he said, not because he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and having the bag took away what was put therein" (~~ⲁⲓⲃⲛ~~ John 12:5,6; compare also ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲛ~~ Matthew 26:7-13; ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲛ~~ Mark 14:3-8).

### 3. *The Betrayal*

Yet, although by this craftiness Judas concealed for a time his true nature from the rest of the disciples, and fomented any discontent that might arise among them (compare <sup><114></sup>Mark 14:4), he now felt that his present source of income could not long remain secure. The pregnant words of his Master regarding the day of his burial (compare <sup><132></sup>Matthew 26:12; <sup><148></sup>Mark 14:8; <sup><17></sup>John 12:7) revealed to His betrayer that Jesus already knew well the evil powers that were at work against Him; and it is significant that, according to Matthew and Mk, who alone of the synoptists mention the anointing, Judas departed immediately afterward and made his compact with the chief priests (compare <sup><154></sup>Matthew 26:14,15; <sup><140></sup>Mark 14:10,11; compare also <sup><213></sup>Luke 22:3-6). But his absence was only temporary. He was present at the washing of the disciples' feet, there to be differentiated once more by Jesus from the rest of the Twelve (compare "Ye are clean, but not all" and "He that eateth my bread lifted up his heel against me," <sup><130></sup>John 13:10,18), but again without being named. It seemed as if Jesus wished to give Judas every opportunity, even at this late hour, of repenting and making his confession. For the last time, when they had sat down to eat, Jesus appealed him thus with the words, "One of you shall betray me" (<sup><152></sup>Matthew 26:21; <sup><148></sup>Mark 14:18; <sup><221></sup>Luke 22:21; <sup><132></sup>John 13:21). And at the end, in answer to the anxious queries of His disciples, "Is it I?" He indicated his betrayer, not by name, but by a sign: "He it is, for whom I shall dip the sop, and give it him" (<sup><135></sup>John 13:26). Immediately upon its reception, Judas left the supper room; the opportunity which he sought for was come (compare <sup><130></sup>John 13:30; <sup><156></sup>Matthew 26:16). There is some doubt as to whether he actually received the eucharistic bread and wine previous to his departure or not, but most modern commentators hold that he did not. On his departure, Judas made his way to the high priests and their followers, and coming upon Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane, he betrayed his Master with a kiss (<sup><157></sup>Matthew 26:47-50; <sup><148></sup>Mark 14:43,44; <sup><227></sup>Luke 22:47; <sup><182></sup>John 18:2-5).

### 4. *His Death:*

After the betrayal, Mk, Luke and John are silent as regards Judas, and the accounts given in Matthew and Acts of his remorse and death vary in detail. According to Mt, the actual condemnation of Jesus awakened Judas' sense of guilt, and becoming still more despondent at his repulse by the chief priests and elders, "he cast down the pieces of silver into the

sanctuary, and departed; and he went away and hanged himself.” With the money the chief priests purchased the potter’s field, afterward called “the field of blood,” and in this way was fulfilled the prophecy of Zechariah (11:12-14) ascribed by Matthew to Jeremiah (~~417B~~ Matthew 27:3-10). The account given in ~~411G~~ Acts 1:16-20 is much shorter. It mentions neither Judas’ repentance nor the chief priests, but simply states that Judas “obtained a field with the reward of his iniquity; and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out” (1:18). The author of Acts finds in this the fulfillment of the prophecy in ~~196S~~ Psalm 69:25. The Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) rendering, “When he had hanged himself, he burst asunder,” suggests a means of reconciling the two accounts.

According to a legendary account mentioned by Papias, the death of Judas was due to elephantiasis (compare Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, 5). A so-called “Gospel of Judas” was in use among the Gnostic sect of the Cainites.

## II. CHARACTER AND THEORIES.

### *1. Joined the Apostles to Betray Jesus:*

Much discussion and controversy have centered, not only around the discrepancies of the Gospel narratives of Judas, but also around his character and the problems connected with it. That the betrayer of Jesus should also be one of the chosen Twelve has given opportunity for the attacks of the foes of Christianity from the earliest times (compare Orig., *Con. Cel.*, ii.12); and the difficulty of finding any proper solution has proved so great that some have been induced to regard Judas as merely a personification of the spirit of Judaism. The acceptance of this view would, however, invalidate the historical value of much of the Scriptural writings. Other theories are put forward in explanation, namely, that Judas joined the apostolic band with the definite intention of betraying Jesus. The aim of this intention has again received two different interpretations, both of which seek to elevate the character of Judas and to free him from the charge of sordid motives and cowardly treachery. According to one, Judas was a strong patriot, who saw in Jesus the foe of his race and its ancient creed, and therefore betrayed Him in the interests of his country. This view is, however, irreconcilable with the rejection of Judas by the chief priests (compare ~~417B~~ Matthew 27:3-10). According to the other, Judas regarded



himself as a true servant of Christianity, who assumed the role of traitor to precipitate the action of the Messiah and induce Him to manifest His miraculous powers by calling down the angels of God from heaven to help Him (compare <sup><B75></sup>Matthew 26:53). His suicide was further due to his disappointment at the failure of Jesus to fulfill his expectations. This theory found favor in ancient times with the Cainites (compare above), and in modern days with De Quincey and Bishop Whately. But the terms and manner of denunciation employed by Jesus in regard to Judas (compare also <sup><B72></sup>John 17:12) render this view also untenable.

## *2. Foreordained to Be a Traitor:*

Another view is that Judas was foreordained to be the traitor: that Jesus was conscious from the first that He was to suffer death on the cross, and chose Judas because He knew that he should betray Him and thus fulfill the Divine decrees (compare <sup><B54></sup>Matthew 26:54). Those holding this view base their arguments on the omniscience of Jesus implied in <sup><B24></sup>John 2:24, Jesus “knew all men”; <sup><B64></sup>John 6:64, “Jesus knew from the beginning who should betray him,” and <sup><B84></sup>John 18:4, “knowing all the things that were coming upon him.” Yet to take those texts literally would mean too rigid application of the doctrine of predestination. It would treat Judas as a mere instrument, as a means and not an end in the hands of a higher power: it would render meaningless the appeals and reproaches made to him by Jesus and deny any real existence of that personal responsibility and sense of guilt which it was our Lord’s very purpose to awaken and stimulate in the hearts of His hearers. John himself wrote after the event, but in the words of our Lord there was, as we have seen, a growing clearness in the manner in which He foretold His betrayal. The omniscience of Jesus was greater than that of a mere clairvoyant who claimed to foretell the exact course of future events. It was the omniscience of one who knew on the one hand the ways of His Eternal Father among men, and who, on the other, penetrated into the deepest recesses of human character and beheld there all its secret feelings and motives and tendencies.

## *3. Betrayal the Result of Gradual Development:*

Although a full discussion of the character of Judas would of necessity involve those ultimate problems of Free Will and Original Sin (Westcott) which no theology can adequately solve, theory which regards the betrayal as the result of a gradual development within the soul of Judas seems the

most practical. It is significant that Judas alone among the disciples was of southern extraction; and the differences in temperament and social outlook, together with the petty prejudices to which these generally give rise, may explain in part, though they do not justify, his after treachery — that lack of inner sympathy which existed between Judas and the rest of the apostles. He undoubtedly possessed certain business ability, and was therefore appointed keeper of the purse. But his heart could not have been clean, even from the first, as he administered even his primary charge dishonestly. The cancer of this greed spread from the material to the spiritual. To none of the disciples did the fading of the dream of an earthly kingdom of pomp and glory bring greater disappointment than to Judas. The cords of love by which Jesus gradually drew the hearts of the other disciples to Himself, the teaching by which He uplifted their souls above all earthly things, were as chafing bonds to the selfishness of Judas. And from his fettered greed and disappointed ambition sprang jealousy and spite and hatred. It was the hatred, not of a strong, but of an essentially weak man. Instead of making an open breach with his Lord, he remained ostensibly one of His followers: and this continued contact with a goodness to which he would not yield (compare Swete on [Mark 14:10](#)), and his brooding over the rebukes of his Master, gave ready entrance for “Satan into his soul.” But if he “knew the good and did not do it” (compare [John 13:17](#)), so also he was weak in the carrying out of his nefarious designs. It was this hesitancy, rather than a fiendish cunning, which induced him to remain till the last moment in the supper room, and which prompted the remark of Jesus “What thou doest, do quickly” ([John 13:27](#)). Of piece with this weak-mindedness was his attempt to cast the blame upon the chief priests and elders (compare [Matthew 27:3,4](#)). He sought to set himself right, not with the innocent Jesus whom he had betrayed, but with the accomplices in his crime; and because that world which his selfishness had made his god failed him at the last, he went and hanged himself. It was the tragic end of one who espoused a great cause in the spirit of speculation and selfish ambition, and who weighed not the dread consequences to which those impure motives might lead him (compare also Bruce, *Training of the Twelve*; Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*; Stalker, *Trial and Death of Jesus Christ*).

*C. M. Kerr*

## JUDAS ISCARIOT, GOSPEL OF

A “Gospel of Judas” is mentioned by Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., i.31), Epiphanius (Haer., xxxviii.1), Theodoret, etc., as current in the Gnostic sect of the Cainites, to whom Judas was a hero. It must have been in existence in the 2nd century, but no quotation is given from it (see Baring-Gould, *Lost and Hostile Gospels*, III, chapter v).

## JUDAS, NOT ISCARIOT

([Ἰούδας, οὐχ ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης, *Ioudas ouch ho Iskariotes*]): One of the Twelve Apostles (<sup><842></sup>John 14:22).

*See JUDAS OF JAMES; LEBBAEUS; THADDAEUS.*

## JUDAS MACCABAEUS

*See MACCABAEUS.*

## JUDAS OF DAMASCUS

*See JUDAS, (6).*

## JUDAS OF GALILEE

([ὁ Γαλιλαῖος, *ho Galilaios*]): Mentioned in <sup><485></sup>Acts 5:37 as the leader of an insurrection occasioned by the census of Quirinius in 7 AD (*see QUIRINIUS*). He, and those who obeyed him, it is said, perished in that revolt. Josephus also repeatedly mentions Judas by this same name, “the Galilean,” and speaks of his revolt (Ant., XVIII, i, 6; XX, v, 2; BJ, II, viii, 1; xviii, 8; VII, viii, 1), but in Ant, XVIII, i, names him a Gaulonite, of the city of Gamala. As Gamala was in Gaulonitis, not far from the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee, it may be regarded as belonging to that province. The party of Judas seems to have been identified with the Zealots.

*James Oar*

## JUDAS OF JAMES

([Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, *Ioudas Iakobou*]): One of the twelve apostles (<sup><406></sup>Luke 6:16; <sup><4013></sup>Acts 1:13; for etymology, etc., *see JUDAS*). the King

James Version has the reading “brother of James,” and the Revised Version (British and American) reads “son of James.” The latter is to be preferred. In ~~<342>~~ John 14:22 he is described as “Judas (not Iscariot).” The name corresponds with the “Thaddaeus” or “Lebbaeus whose surname was Thaddaeus” of ~~<003>~~ Matthew 10:3 the King James Version and ~~<038>~~ Mark 3:18 (compare *THADDAEUS*). The identification of Thaddaeus with Judas is generally accepted, though Ewald and others hold that they were different persons, that Thaddeus died during Christ’s lifetime, and that Judas was chosen in his place (compare Bruce, *Training of the Twelve*, 34). If the Revised Version (British and American) is accepted as the correct rendering of ~~<016>~~ Luke 6:16 and ~~<013>~~ Acts 1:13, this Judas cannot be identified either with the Juda (~~<003>~~ Mark 6:3 the King James Version), Judas (~~<003>~~ Mark 6:3 the Revised Version (British and American)), or Judas (~~<035>~~ Matthew 13:55), the brother of Jesus; or with the Judas (~~<003>~~ Jude 1:1 the Revised Version margin) or Jude (~~<001>~~ Jude 1:1 the King James Version), the brother of James, whether these two latter Judases are to be regarded as the same or not. The only incident recorded of Judas of James is in ~~<342>~~ John 14:22, where during Christ’s address to the disciples after the last supper he put the question, “Lord, what is come to pass that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?”

*C. M. Kerr*

## **JUDAS, THE LORD’S BROTHER**

*See JUDE.*

## **JUDDAH**

*<jud’-a>.*

*See JUTTAH.*

## **JUDE**

*<jood>* ([<sup>’</sup> *Ιούδας*, *Ioudas*]): Brother of the Lord, and author of the Epistle of Jude.

*See JUDAS OF JAMES and following article.*

## JUDE, THE EPISTLE OF

### THE WRITER:

The writer of this short epistle calls himself Jude or Judas ([<sup>1</sup> **Ιούδας**, *Ioudas*]). His name was a common one among the Jews: there were few others of more frequent use. Two among the apostles bore it, namely, Judas, mentioned in <sup><B42></sup>John 14:22 (compare <sup><B6></sup>Luke 6:16), and Judas Iscariot. Jude describes himself as “a servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James” (<sup><B></sup>Jude 1:1). The James here mentioned is no doubt the person who is called “the Lord’s brother” (<sup><B19></sup>Galatians 1:19), the writer of the epistle that bears his name. Neither of the two was an apostle. The opening sentence of Jude simply affirms that the writer is a “servant of Jesus Christ.” This, if anywhere, should be the appropriate place for the mention of his apostleship, if he were an apostle. The appellation “servant of Jesus Christ” “is never thus barely used in an address of an epistle to designate an apostle” (Alford). Phil 1:1 has a similar expression, “Paul and Timothy, servants of Jesus Christ,” but “the designation common to two persons necessarily sinks to the rank of the inferior one.” In other instances “servant” is associated with “apostle” (<sup><B></sup>Romans 1:1; <sup><B></sup>Titus 1:1). <sup><B17></sup>Jude 1:17,18 speaks of the “apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; that they said to you” — language which an apostle would hardly use of his fellow-apostles.

In <sup><B></sup>Mark 6:3 are found the names of those of whom Jesus is said to be the brother, namely, James and Joses, and Judas and Simon. It is quite generally held by writers that the James and Judas here mentioned are the two whose epistles are found in the New Testament. It is noteworthy, however, that neither of them hints at his relationship with Jesus; their unaffected humility kept them silent. Jude mentions that he is the “brother of James,” perhaps to give authority and weight to his words, for James was far more distinguished and influential than he. The inference seems legitimate that Jude addresses Christians among whom James was highly esteemed, or, if no longer living, among whom his memory was sacredly revered, and accordingly it is altogether probable that Jude writes to the same class of readers as James — Jewish Christians. James writes to the “Twelve Tribes of the Dispersion.” Jude likewise addresses a wide circle of believers, namely, the “called, beloved in God the Father, and kept for Jesus Christ” (1:1). While he does not designate a special and distinct class, yet as James’s “brother,” as belonging to the family of Joseph, and as in

some true sense related to the Lord Jesus Himself, it seems probable, if not certain, that his Epistle was intended for Christian Hebrews who stood in urgent need of such testimony and appeal as Jude offers.

## **I. JUDE'S POSITION IN THE CANON.**

It is now and for a long while has been an assured one. Its rank, though not altogether that of 1 Peter and 1 John, is high, for centuries indeed undoubted. Almost from the beginning of the Christian era men every way qualified to speak with authority on the question of genuineness and authenticity endorsed it as entitled to a place in the New Testament Scriptures. Origen repeatedly quotes it, in one place describing it as an “ep. of but few lines, but full of powerful words of heavenly grace” (Matt., tom. X, 17). But Origen knew that it was not universally received. Clement of Alexandria “gave concise expositions of all the canonical Scriptures, not omitting the disputed books — the Epistle of Jude and the other Catholic epp.” (quoted by Westcott, Canaanite, 322-23 and Salmon, Intro, 493). Tertullian (Cult. Fem. i.3) in striving to establish the authority of the Book of Enoch urges as a crowning argument that it is quoted by “the apostle Jude.” “We may infer that, Jude’s Ep., was an unquestioned part of Tertullian’s Canon. Athanasius inserted it in his list of New Testament books, but Eusebius placed it among the disputed books in his classification. The Canon of Muratori includes Jude among the books of Scripture, though it omits the Epistles of James, Peter and Hebrews. This is one of the earliest documents containing a list of the New Testament books now known. By the great majority of writers the date of the fragment is given as circa 170 AD, as it claims to have been written not long after Pius was bishop of Rome, and the latest date of Pius is 142-57 AD. The words of the document are, “The Shepherd was written very recently in our own time by Hermas, while his brother Pius sat in the chair of the Church of Rome.” Twenty or twenty-five years would probably satisfy the period indicated by the words, “written very recently in our own time,” which would fix the date of the fragment at circa 170 AD. Salmon, however, strongly inclines to a later date, namely, circa 200-210 AD, as does Zahn.

Zahn (Introduction to the New Testament, II, 259, English Translation), and Professor Chase (H D B) are of the decided opinion that the Didache, ii. 7: “Thou shalt not hate anyone, but some thou shalt rebuke, and for some thou shalt pray, and some thou shalt love above thine own soul (or life),” is rounded on <sup>†112</sup>Jude 1:22. Dr. Philip Schaff dates the Didache

between 90-100 AD. L'Abbe E. Jacquier (*La doctrine des Douze Apotres*, 1891) is persuaded that the famous document was written not later than 80 AD. It appears, therefore, more than probable that the Epistle of Jude was known and referred to as Scripture some time before the end of the 1st century. From the survey we have thus rapidly taken of the field in which the Epistle circulated, we may conclude that in Palestine, at Alexandria, in North Africa, and at Rome, it was received as the veritable letter of Jude, "the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James."

The chief reason why it was rejected by some and regarded with suspicion by others in primitive times is its quotation from the apocryphal Book of Enoch, so Jerome informs us (*Vir. Ill.*, 4). It is possible that Jude had in mind another spurious writing, namely, the Assumption of Moses, when he spoke of the contention of Michael the archangel with the devil about the body of Moses (1:9). This, however, is not quite certain, for the date assigned to that writing is circa 44 AD, and although Jude might have seen and read it, yet its composition is so near his own day that it could hardly have exerted much influence on his mind. Besides, the brevity of the Epistle and its dealing with a special class of errorists would limit to a certain extent its circulation among Christians. All this serves to explain its refusal by some and the absence of reference to it by others.

## **II. THE OCCASION OF ITS COMPOSITION.**

Jude, after his brief introduction (1:1,2), explains very definitely why he writes as he does. He indicates distinctly his anxiety on behalf of the saints (1:3): "Beloved, while I was giving all diligence to write unto you of our common salvation, I was constrained to write unto you exhorting you to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." He had received very distressing knowledge of the serious state into which the Christian brotherhood was rapidly drifting, and he must as a faithful servant of Jesus Christ exhort them to steadfastness and warn them of their danger. He had in mind to write them a doctrinal work on the salvation common to all Christians. Perhaps he contemplated the composition of a book or treatise that would have discussed the great subject in an exhaustive manner. But in face of the perils that threatened, of the evils already present in the community, his purpose was indefinitely postponed. We are not told how he became acquainted with the dangers which beset his fellow-believers, but the conjecture is probably correct that it was by means of his journeys as an evangelist. At any rate, he was

thoroughly conversant with the evils in the churches, and he deals with them as befitted the enormities that were practiced and the ruin that impended.

The address of the Epistle is remarkable for the affection Jude expresses for these saints. Obviously they are distinct from the libertines of whom he speaks with such solemn condemnation. They were the faithful who kept aloof from the ungodly that surrounded them, and who held fast to the truth they had been taught. Jude describes them as those “that are called, beloved in God the Father, and kept for Jesus Christ: Mercy unto you and peace and love be multiplied.” At the close of the Epistle he commends them “unto him that is able to guard you from stumbling, and to set you before the presence of his glory without blemish in exceeding joy.” A separated and devoted band they certainly were, a noble and trustworthy company of believers for whose well-being Jude was supremely anxious.

### III. DESCRIPTION OF THE LIBERTINES AND APOSTATES.

It is needful to gaze with steady vision on the portrait Jude furnishes of these depraved foes, if we are to appreciate in any measure the force of his language and the corruption already wrought in the brotherhood. Some of their foul teachings and their vicious practices, not all, are here set down.

#### *1. Surreptitious Foes.*

“For there are certain men crept in privily .... ungodly men” (~~scribes~~ Jude 1:4). They are enemies who feign to be friends, and hence, in reality are spies and traitors; like a stealthy beast of prey they creep into the company of the godly, actuated by evil intent.

#### *2. Perverters of Grace and Deniers of Christ.*

“Turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ” (~~scribes~~ Jude 1:4). They are those who by a vile perverseness turn the grace and the liberty of the Gospel into a means for gratifying their unholy passions, and who in doctrine and life repudiate their Master and Lord.

#### *3. Censorious and Arrogant Detractors.*

“In their dreamings defile the flesh, and set at nought dominion, and rail at dignities” (~~scribes~~ Jude 1:8). Destitute of true reverence, they rail at the holiest



and best things, and sit in judgment on all rule and all authority. They have the proud tongue of the lawless: “Our lips are our own: who is lord over us?” (~~913~~ Psalm 12:4).

#### *4. Ignorant Calumniators and Brutish Sensualists.*

“These rail at whatsoever things they know not: and what they understand naturally, like the creatures without reason, in these things are they destroyed” (~~910~~ Jude 1:10). What they do not know, as something lofty and noble, they deride and denounce; what they know is that which ministers to their disordered appetites and their debased tastes.

#### *5. Hypocrites and Deceivers.*

“These are they who are hidden rocks in your love-feasts when they feast with you, shepherds that without fear feed themselves; clouds without water .... autumn trees without fruit .... wild waves of the sea .... wandering stars, for whom the blackness of darkness hath been reserved forever” (~~912~~ Jude 1:12,13). A most graphic picture of the insincerity, the depravity, and the doom of these insolents! And yet they are found in the bosom of the Christian body, even sitting with the saints at their love-feasts!

#### *6. Grumblers, Fault-finders, Pleasure-seekers, Boasters, Parasites.*

“These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts .... showing respect of persons for the sake of advantage” (~~916~~ Jude 1:16). They impeach Divine wisdom, are the foes of peace and quietness, boast of their capacities to manage things, and yet they can be servile, even sycophants, when thereby advantage is secured.

#### *7. Schismatics and Sensualists.*

“These are they who make separations, sensual, having not the Spirit” (~~919~~ Jude 1:19). It was characteristic of the false teachers and mockers who had invaded the Christian church that they drew lines of demarcation between themselves and others, or between different classes of believers, which the Holy Spirit did not warrant, but which was the product of their own crafty and wicked wills. There seems to be a hint in these words of incipient Gnosticism, that fatal heresy that boasted of a recondite knowledge, a deep mystery which only the initiated possessed, of which the great mass of Christians were ignorant. Jude brands the pretension as the offspring of their own sensuality, not at all of God’s Spirit.

Such is the forbidding portrait drawn of the libertines in the Epistle. But Jude adds other and even darker features. He furnishes a number of examples of apostates and of apostasy which disclose even more strikingly the spirit and the doom of them that pervert the truth, that deny the Lord Jesus Christ, and that mock at the things of God. These all mark a fatal degeneracy, a “falling away,” which bodes nothing but evil and judgment. Against the corrupters and skeptics Jude writes with a vehemence that in the New Testament is without a parallel. Matters must have come to a dreadful pass when the Spirit of God is compelled to use such stern and awful language.

#### **IV. RELATION OF JUDE TO THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER.**

##### *1. Resemblances:*

The relation is confined to 2 Peter 2 through 3:4. A large portion of Peter’s Epistle, namely, 2 Peter 1 and 3:5-18, bears no resemblance to Jude, at least no more than does James or 1 Pet. Between the sections of 2 Peter indicated above and Jude the parallelism is close, both as to the subjects treated and the historical illustrations introduced, and the language itself to some considerable extent is common to both. All readers must be impressed with the similarity. Accordingly, it is very generally held by interpreters that one of the writers copied from the other. There is not entire agreement as to which of the two epistles is the older, that is, whether Peter copied from Jude, or Jude from Peter. Perhaps a majority favor the former of the two alternatives, though some of the very latest and most learned of those who write on Introductions to the New Testament hold strongly to the view that Jude copied from 2 Pet. Reference is made particularly to Deuteronomy. Theodore v. Zahn, whose magnificent work on Introduction has been but recently translated into English, and who argues convincingly that Jude copied from 2 Pet.

##### *2. Differences:*

However, it must be admitted that there are in the two epistles as pronounced differences and divergences as there are resemblances. If one of the two did actually copy from the other, he was careful to add, subtract, and change what he found in his “source” as best suited his purpose. A servile copyist he certainly was not. He maintained his independence throughout, as an exact comparison of the one with the other will demonstrate.

If we bring them into close proximity, following the example of Professor Lumby in the “Bible Comm.” (Intro to 2 Pet), we shall discover a marked difference between the two pictures drawn by the writers. We cannot fail to perceive how much darker and more sinister is that of Jude. The evil, alarming certainly in Peter, becomes appalling in Jude. Subjoined are proofs of the fact above stated:

~~ROM~~ **2 Peter 2:1**

But there arose false prophets also among the people, as among you also there shall be false teachers ....

~~ROM~~ Jude 1:4

For there are certain men crept in privily ....

~~ROM~~ **2 Peter 2:1**

who shall privily bring in destructive heresies, denying even the Master that bought them ....

~~ROM~~ Jude 1:4

.... ungodly men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, and denying our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ.

~~ROM~~ **2 Peter 2:3**

And in covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you ....

~~ROM~~ Jude 1:16

.... murmerers, complainers, walking after their own lusts (and their mouth speaketh great swelling words), showing respect of persons for the sake of advantage.

These contrasts and comparisons between the two epistles prove

(1) that in Jude the false teachers are worse, more virulent than in Peter, and

(2) that in Peter the whole description is predictive, whereas in Jude the deplorable condition is actually present. If 2 Peter is dependent on Jude, if the apostle cited from Jude, how explain the strong predictive

element in his opening verses (~~6000~~ 2 Peter 2:1-3)? If as Peter-wrote he had lying before him Jude's letter, which represents the corrupters as already within the Christian community and doing their deadly work, his repeated use of the future tense is absolutely inexplicable.

Assuming, however, that he wrote prior to Jude, his predictions become perfectly intelligible. No doubt the virus was working when he wrote, but it was latent, undeveloped; far worse would appear; but when Jude wrote the poison was widely diffused, as 1:12,19 clearly show. The very life of the churches was endangered.

### ~~6000~~ 2 Peter 2:4,5

For if God spared not the angels when they sinned .... and spared not the ancient world, but preserved Noah with seven others ....

~~6000~~ Jude 1:5,6

.... The Lord, having saved a people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed them .... and angels that .... left their proper habitation ....

### *3. Further Contrasts:*

Peter speaks of the angels that sinned, Jude of their apostasy. Peter makes prominent the salvation of Noah and his family when the flood overwhelmed the world of the ungodly, while Jude tells of those who, delivered from bondage, afterward were destroyed because of their unbelief. He speaks of no rescue; we know of but two who survived the judgments of the wilderness and who entered the Land of Promise, Caleb and Joshua. Peter mentions the fate of the guilty cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, but he is careful to remind us of the deliverance of righteous Lot, while Jude makes prominent their nameless crimes and consigns them to "the punishment of eternal fire," but he is silent on the rescue of Lot. Manifestly Jude's illustrations are darker and more hopeless than Peter's.

Peter instances Balsam as an example of one who loved the hire of wrongdoing and who was rebuked for his transgression. But Jude cites three notable instances in the Old Testament to indicate how far in apostasy and rebellion the libertines had gone. Three words mark their course, rising into a climax, "way" "error" "gainsay." They went in the way of Cain, i.e. in the way of self-will, of hate, and the spirit of murder. Moreover, they "ran riotously in the error of Balsam for hire." The words denote an activity of viciousness that enlisted all their eagerness and all

their might. Balaam's error was one that led into error, one that seduced others into the commission of the like sins. The reference seems to be to the whole career of this heathen prophet, and includes his betrayal of the Israelites through the women of Moab (<sup><4016></sup>Numbers 31:16). Balsam is the prototype of Jude's libertines, both in his covetousness and his seductive counsel. Furthermore, they "perished in the gainsaying of Korah." This man with 250 followers rebelled against the Divinely appointed leaders and rulers of Israel, Moses and Aaron, and sought to share their authority in Israel, if not to displace them altogether. Comparable with these rebels in ancient Israel are the treacherous and malignant foes whom Jude so vigorously denounces.

Peter speaks of them as "daring, self-willed, they tremble not to rail at dignities: whereas angels, though greater in might and power, bring not a railing judgment against them before the Lord" (<sup><4010></sup>Jude 1:10,11). Jude is more specific: These dreamers "defile the flesh, and set at nought dominion, and rail at dignities." They repudiate all authority, despise every form of lordship, and revile those in positions of power. He cites the contention of Michael the archangel with the devil about the body of Moses, and yet this loftiest of the heavenly spirits brought no railing judgment against the adversary. Jude's description is more vivid and definite: he describes an advanced stage of apostasy.

Very noteworthy is <sup><4022></sup>Jude 1:22,23. He here turns again to the loyal and steadfast believers whom he addresses at the beginning of his letter, and he gives them directions how they are to deal with those who were ensnared by the wily foes. (The text in 1:22 is somewhat uncertain, but the revision is followed.) There were some who were "in doubt." They were those who had been fascinated by the new teaching, and although not captured by it, they were engaged in its study, were drawn toward it and almost ready to yield. On these the faithful were to have mercy, were to convince them of their danger, show them the enormities to which the false system inevitably leads, and so win them back to Christ's allegiance. As if Jude said, Deal with the wavering in love and fidelity; but rescue them if possible.

There were others whose peril was greater: "And some save, snatching them out of the fire." These were identified with the wicked, were scorched by the fires of destruction and hence, almost beyond reach of rescue; but if possible they are to be saved, however seethed and blackened. Others still there were who were in worse state than the

preceding, who were polluted and smirched by the foul contamination of the guilty seducers, and such were to be saved, and the rescuers were to fear lest they should be soiled by contact with the horrible defilement. This is Jude's tremendous summary of the shameful work and frightful evils wrought in the bosom of the church by the libertines. He discloses in these trenchant verses how deeply sunk in sin the false teachers were, and how awful the ruin they had wrought. The description is quite unparalleled in 2 Pet. The shadings in Jude are darker and deeper than those in 2 Pet.

#### *4. Summary:*

The comparison between the two writings warrants, we believe, the following conclusions:

- (1) that Peter and Jude have in view the same corrupt parties;
- (2) that Peter paints them as godless and extremely dangerous, though not yet at their worst; while Jude sets them forth as depraved and as lawless as they can well be;
- (3) that Peter's is the older writing and that Jude was acquainted with what the apostle had written.

Stronger evidence than any yet produced of Peter's priority is now to be submitted, and here we avail ourselves in part of Zahn's array of evidence.

#### *5. Evidence of Priority of Peter:*

Jude asserts with great positiveness that (1:4) certain men had crept in privily into the Christian fold, "even they who were of old written of beforehand unto this condemnation, ungodly men." Obviously Jude is here speaking of the enemies whom he afterward goes on to describe and denounce in his Epistle. He distinctly affirms that these foes had been of old written of and beforehand designated unto "this condemnation." He clearly has in mind an authoritative writing that spoke of the identical parties Jude himself deals with. He does not tell us whose writing it is that contains the "condemnation" of the errorists; he only declares that there is such a Scripture existing and that he is acquainted with it. Now, to what writing does he refer? Not to any Old Testament prophecy, for none can be found that answers to the words. Nor yet to the prediction of Enoch (1:14,15), for it speaks of the advent of the Lord in judgment at the last day, whereas Jude applies his reference to the ungodly who were then

present in the Christian assemblies, corrupting the churches with their wicked teaching and practices. “In 2 Peter 2 through 3:4, we have a prophecy which exactly suits, namely, the announcement that false teachers whose theory and practice exactly correspond to those godless bearers of the Christian name in Jude will appear among a certain group of Jewish Christian churches” (Zahn). Peter’s account of them is so particular that Jude would encounter no difficulty in identifying them. He is furnished by the apostle with such characteristics of them, with such illustrations and even words and phrases that he has only to place the description alongside of the reality to see how completely they match.

It may be objected that the words, “were of old written of beforehand,” denote a long period, longer than that which elapsed between the two epistles. But the objection is groundless. The original term for “of old” (palai) sometimes indicates but a brief space of time, e.g. <sup>4154</sup>Mark 15:44 (according to the text of Weymouth and Nestle, and the Revised Version (British and American)) relates that Pilate asked the centurion if Jesus had been “any while” (palai) dead, which limits the term to a few hours. In <sup>4729</sup>2 Corinthians 12:19 the word occurs, and there it must be restricted to Paul’s self-defense which occupies the part of the Epistle preceding, and hence, does not extend beyond a day or two. Probably some years lie between the composition of these two epp., ample time to justify Jude’s use of the word if he is referring to 2 Peter 2 through 3:4, as we certainly believe he is.

### *6. Corroborative References:*

This interpretation of <sup>6004</sup>Jude 1:4 is confirmed by <sup>6017</sup>Jude 1:17,18. These verses are intimately connected with <sup>6002</sup>2 Peter 3:2-4. Jude’s readers are told to keep in remembrance the words spoken by the apostles of Christ, namely, “In the last time there shall be mockers, walking after their own ungodly lusts.” Peter writes, “that in the last days mockers shall come with mockery, walking after their own lusts.” The resemblance of the one passage to the other is very close, indeed, they are almost identical. Both urge their readers to remember what had been said by the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ, and both speak of the immoral scoffers who would invade or had invaded the Christian brotherhood. But Peter distinctly asserts that these mockers shall appear in the last days. His words are, “Knowing this first, that in the last days mockers shall come with mockery, walking after their own lusts.” Jude writes that “in the last time there shall be mockers, walking after their own ungodly lusts.” The phrases, “the last

days,” and “the last time,” denote our age, the dispensation in which we live, as ~~ROM~~ Hebrews 1:2 proves. Peter puts the appearance of the scoffers in the future, whereas Jude, after quoting the words, significantly adds, “These are they who make separations, sensual, having not the Spirit.” He means, of course the mockers just mentioned, and he affirms they are now present. With Peter they are yet to come when he wrote, but with Jude the prediction is already fulfilled, so far as the scoffers are concerned. Therefore Jude’s writing is subsequent to Peter’s, and if there be copying on the part of either, it is Jude who copies.

Peter mentions “your apostles,” including himself in the phrase, but Jude does not employ the plural pronoun, for he was not of the apostolic body. But why the plural, “apostles”? Because at least one other apostle had spoken of the perilous times which were coming on the church of God. Paul unites his testimony with that of Peter, and writes, “But know this, that in the last days grievous times shall come” (~~ROM~~ 2 Timothy 3:1-5). His prediction is near akin to that of Peter; it belongs apparently to the same historic time and to the same perilous class of evil-doers and corrupters. In ~~ROM~~ 2 Peter 3:15 the apostle lovingly and tenderly speaks of his “brother Paul,” and says suggestively that in his Epistle he speaks of these things — no doubt about the scoffers of the last days among the rest. He certainly seems to have Paul in mind when he penned the words. “Knowing this first, that in the last days mockers shall come.”

Here, then, is positive ground for the reference in ~~ROM~~ Jude 1:4 to a writing concerning those who had crept into the fold and who were of old doomed to this condemnation, with which writing his readers were acquainted; they had it in the writing of the apostles Peter and Paul both, and so were forewarned as to the impending danger. Jude’s Epistle is subsequent to Peter’s.

## V. DATE OF THE EPISTLE.

There is little or no agreement as to the year, yet the majority of writers hold that it belongs to the latter half of the 1st century. Zahn assigns it to 70-75 AD; Lumby, circa 80 AD; Salmon, before the reign of Domitian (81 AD); Sieffert, shortly prior to Domitian; Chase, not later than 80 AD, probably within a year or two of the Pastoral Epistles. Zahn strongly insists on 64 AD as the date of Peter’s death. If the 2nd Epistle bearing his name is authentic, the apostle could not possibly have copied from Jude, for



Jude's letter was not in existence when he died. Even on the supposition that he suffered death 65-66 AD, there could have been no copying done save by Jude, for it is almost demonstrable that Jude was written after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD. If 2 Peter is pseudonymous and written about the middle of the 2nd century, as some confidently affirm, it has no right to a place in the Canon nor any legitimate relation to Jude. If genuine, it antedates Jude.

## VI. THE LIBERTINES OF JUDE'S EPISTLE.

Their character is very forcibly exhibited, but no information is given us of their origin or to what particular region they belonged. They bore the Christian name, were of the loosest morals, and were guilty of shameful excesses. Their influence seems to have been widespread and powerful, else Jude would not denounce them in such severe language. Their guilty departure from the truth must not be confounded with the Gnosticism of the 2nd century, though it tended strongly in that direction; it was a 1st-century defection. Were they newly risen sensualists, without predecessors? To some extent their forerunners had already appeared. Sensuality in some of its greaser forms disgraced the church at Corinth (~~<4117>~~1 Corinthians 5:1-13; 6:13-20). In the common meals of this congregation which ended in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, they indulged in revelry and gluttony, some of them even being intoxicated (~~<4117>~~1 Corinthians 11:17-22). Participation in a heathen festival exposed the Christians to the danger of sharing in idolatry, and yet some of the Corinthians were addicted to it (1 Corinthians 8; 10:14-32). In reading of the state of things in the church at Colosse, one perceives how fatal certain views and practices there would soon become if suffered to grow (~~<5126>~~Colossians 2:16-23; 3:5-11). Twenty years after the probable date of Jude, in some of the churches of Asia Minor, wicked parties flourished and dominated Christian assemblies that were closely allied in teaching and conduct with the ungodly of Jude. The Nicolaitans, and the "woman Jezebel, who calleth herself a prophetess; and she teacheth and seduceth my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed to idols" (~~<4121>~~Revelation 2:20) belong to the same company of libertines as those of Jude. It should be no surprise to us with these examples before us, that according to Jude there were found in the bosom of the Christian community moral delinquents and shameless profligates whose conduct

shocks our sense of propriety and decency, for the like evils, though not so flagrant, troubled the churches in Paul's lifetime.

Jude brands them as enemies and apostates. He pronounces their doom in the words of Enoch: "Behold, the Lord came with ten thousands of his holy ones, to execute judgment upon all" (~~<4014>~~Jude 1:14,15). It is generally believed that this prophecy of Enoch is quoted by Jude from the apocryphal Book of Enoch. Granting such quotation, that fact does not warrant us to affirm that he endorsed the book. Paul cites from three Greek poets: from Aratus (~~<4173>~~Acts 17:28), from Menander (~~<4353>~~1 Corinthians 15:33; see Earle, Euripides, "Medea," Intro, 30, where this is attributed to Euripides), and from Epimenides (~~<3012>~~Titus 1:12). Does anyone imagine that Paul endorses all that these poets wrote? To the quotation from Epimenides the apostle adds, "This testimony is true" (~~<3013>~~Titus 1:13), but no one imagines he means to say the whole poem is true. So Jude cites a passage from a non-canonical book, not because he accepts the whole book as true, but this particular prediction he receives as from God. Whence the writer of Enoch derived it is unknown. It may have been cherished and transmitted from generation to generation, or in some other way faithfully preserved, but at any rate Jude accepted it as authentic. Paul quotes a saying of the Lord Jesus (~~<4035>~~Acts 20:35) not recorded in the Gospels, but whence he derived it is unknown. As much may be said of this of Enoch which Jude receives as true.

## LITERATURE.

Zahn, Introduction to New Testament; Salmon, Introduction to New Testament; Westcott, Canon of New Testament; Purves, Apostolic Age; Alford, Greek Test.; Plumptre, Commentary, "Cambridge Bible Series"; Lillie, Commentary on 1 and 2 Pet; Bigg, ICC; Vincent, Word Studies.

*William G. Moorehead*

## JUDEA

~~<joo-de'-a>~~: In Ezr 5:8 for "Judah"; thus the Revised Version (British and American). In the New Testament the form is *JUDAEA* (which see).

## JUDGE

<juj> ([fɾɔpɔshopheT]; New Testament [δικαστής, *dikastes*], [κριτής, *krites*]): In the early patriarchal times the heads of families and the elders of the tribes were the judges (compare <0324>Genesis 38:24), and their authority was based on custom. In the wilderness Moses alone was the judge until Jethro suggested a scheme of devolution. On his advice Moses divided the people into groups of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens, and over each group a wise and good man was set as a judge. Thereafter only the most important cases were brought before Moses (Exodus 18:13-26; <0009>Deuteronomy 1:9-17). This arrangement ceased to be practicable when the children of Israel settled down in Canaan. Although David took counsel with the heads of thousands and hundreds (<0330>1 Chronicles 13:1), it need not be assumed that this was a continuation of the plan adopted by Moses. Probably the local courts were not organized till the time of David. In the days of the Judges justice was ministered by those who had risen by wisdom or valor to that rank (<0045>Judges 4:5). An organized circuit court was established by Samuel, who judged cases himself, and also made his sons judges (<0076>1 Samuel 7:16; 8:1). After the monarchy was instituted, the king tried all cases, when requested to do so by the wronged person, in the palace gate (<0007>1 Kings 7:7; <0018>Proverbs 20:8). There was no public prosecutor (<0044>2 Samuel 14:4; 15:2-6; <0384>1 Chronicles 18:14; <0086>1 Kings 3:16; <0285>2 Kings 15:5). Under David and Solomon there were probably local courts (<0334>1 Chronicles 23:4; 26:29). Jehoshaphat organized a high court of justice (<0498>2 Chronicles 19:8). The prophets often complain bitterly that the purity of justice is corrupted by bribery and false witness (<0023>Isaiah 1:23; 5:23; 10:1; <0082>Amos 5:12; 6:12; <0381>Micah 3:11; 7:3; <0069>Proverbs 6:19; 12:17; 18:5). Even kings sometimes pronounced unjust sentences, especially in criminal cases (<0216>1 Samuel 22:6-19; <0226>1 Kings 22:26; <0216>2 Kings 21:16; <0355>Jeremiah 36:26). An evil king could also bend local courts to do his will, as may be gathered from the case of Naboth's vineyard (<0206>1 Kings 21:1-13).

The first duty of a judge was to execute absolute justice, showing the same impartiality to rich and poor, to Jew and foreigner. He was forbidden to accept bribes or to wrest the judgment of the poor (Exodus 23:6-8; <0569>Deuteronomy 16:19). He must not let himself be swayed by popular opinion, or unduly favor the poor (Exodus 23:2,3).

The court was open to the public (Exodus 18:13; <sup><0016></sup>Ruth 4:1,2). Each party presented his view of the case to the judge (<sup><0016></sup>Deuteronomy 1:16; 25:1). Possibly the accused appeared in court clad in mourning (Zec 3:3). The accuser stood on the right hand of the accused (Zec 3:1; <sup><0016></sup>Psalms 109:6). Sentence was pronounced after the hearing of the case, and the judgment carried out (<sup><0016></sup>Joshua 7:24,25). The only evidence considered by the court was that given by the witnesses. In criminal cases, not less than two witnesses were necessary (<sup><0016></sup>Deuteronomy 19:15; <sup><0016></sup>Numbers 35:30; <sup><0016></sup>Deuteronomy 17:6; compare <sup><0016></sup>Matthew 18:16; <sup><0016></sup>2 Corinthians 13:1; <sup><0016></sup>1 Timothy 5:19). In cases other than criminal the oath (*see* OATH) was applied (Exodus 22:11; compare <sup><0016></sup>Hebrews 6:16). The lot was sometimes appealed to (<sup><0016></sup>Joshua 7:14-18), especially in private disputes (<sup><0016></sup>Proverbs 18:18), but this was exceptional. When the law was not quite definite, recourse was had to the Divine oracle (<sup><0016></sup>Leviticus 24:12; <sup><0016></sup>Numbers 15:34).

*Paul Levertoff*

## JUDGES BOOK OF

<juj'-iz>;:

### 1. TITLE:

The English name of the Book of Judges is a translation of the Hebrew title ([<sup><0016></sup>μφρ̄yoshopheTim]), which is reproduced in the Greek [<sup><0016></sup>Κριταί, *Kritai*], and the Latin Liber Judicum. In the list of the canonical books of the Old Testament given by Origen (apud Euseb., HE, VI, 25) the name is transliterated [<sup><0016></sup>Σαφατεΐμ, *Saphateim*], which represents rather “judgments” (*shephatim*; [<sup><0016></sup>κρίματα, *krimata*]) than “judges.” A passage also is quoted from Philo (De Confus. Linguarum, 26), which indicates that he recognized the same form of the name; compare the Greek title of “Kingdoms” ([<sup><0016></sup>Βασιλείαι, *Basileiai*]) for the four books of Samuel and Kings.

### 2. PLACE IN THE CANON:

In the order of the Hebrew Canon the Book of Judges invariably occupies the 7th place, following immediately upon Joshua and preceding Samuel and Kings. With these it formed the group of the four “earlier prophets” ([<sup><0016></sup>μν̄iOariμyājbī] *nebhi'im ri'shonim*), the first moiety of the 2nd

great division of the Hebrew Scriptures. As such the Book of Judges was classified and regarded as “prophetical,” equally with the other historical books, on the ground of the religious and spiritual teaching which its history conveyed. In the rearrangement of the books, which was undertaken for the purposes of the Greek translation and Canon, Judges maintained its position as 7th in order from the beginning, but the short historical Book of Ruth was removed from the place which it held among the Rolls ([meghilloth]) in the 3rd division of the Jewish Canon, and attached to Judges as a kind of appendix, probably because the narrative was understood to presuppose the same conditions and to have reference to the same period of time. The Greek order was followed in all later VSS, and has maintained itself in modern Bibles. Origen (loc. cit.) even states, probably by a mere misunderstanding, that Judges and Ruth were comprehended by the Jews under the one title Saphateim.

### 3. CONTENTS:

The Book of Judges consists of 3 main parts or divisions, which are readily distinguished.

#### *(1) Introductory, Judges 1 through 2:5.*

A brief summary and recapitulation of the events of the conquest of Western Palestine, for the most part parallel to the narrative of Joshua, but with a few additional details and some divergences from the earlier account, in particular emphasizing (<sup><0012></sup>Judges 1:27-36) the general failure of the Israelites to expel completely the original inhabitants of the land, which is described as a violation of their covenant with Yahweh (<sup><0016></sup>Judges 2:1-3), entailing upon them suffering and permanent weakness. The introductory verse (<sup><0016></sup>Judges 1:1), which refers to the death of Joshua as having already taken place, seems to be intended as a general indication of the historical period of the book as a whole; for some at least of the events narrated in Judges 1 through 2:5 took place during Joshua's lifetime.

#### *(2) The Central and Main Portion, <sup><0016></sup>Judges 2:6 through 16.*

A series of narratives of 12 “judges,” each of whom in turn, by his devotion and prowess, was enabled to deliver Israel from thralldom and oppression, and for a longer or shorter term ruled over the people whom he had thus saved from their enemies. Each successive repentance on the part of the people, however, and their deliverance are followed, on the

death of the judge, by renewed apostasy, which entails upon them renewed misery and servitude, from which they are again rescued when in response to their prayer the Lord “raises up” for them another judge and deliverer. Thus the entire history is set as it were in a recurrent framework of moral and religious teaching and warning; and the lesson is enforced that it is the sin of the people, their abandonment of Yahweh and persistent idolatry, which entails upon them calamity, from which the Divine long-suffering and forbearance alone makes for them a way of escape.

**(a) ~~QRI6~~ Judges 2:6 through 3:6:**

A second brief introduction, conceived entirely in the spirit of the following narratives, which seems to attach itself to the close of the Book of Joshua, and in part repeats almost verbally the account there given of the death and burial of Israel’s leader (~~QRI6~~ Judges 2:6-9 parallel ~~QRI8~~ Joshua 24:28-31), and proceeds to describe the condition of the land and people in the succeeding generation, ascribing their misfortunes to their idolatry and repeated neglect of the warnings and commands of the judges; closing with an enumeration of the peoples left in the land, whose presence was to be the test of Israel’s willingness to obey Yahweh and at the same time to prevent the nation from sinking into a condition of lethargy and ease.

**(b) ~~QRI7~~ Judges 3:7 through 3:11:**

Judgeship of Othniel who delivered Israel from the hand of Cushan-rishathaim.

**(c) ~~QRI2~~ Judges 3:12-30:**

Victory of Ehud over the Moabites, to whom the Israelites had been in servitude 18 years. Ehud slew their king Eglon, and won for the nation a long period of tranquillity.

**(d) ~~QRI8~~ Judges 3:31:**

In a few brief words Shamgar is named as the deliverer of Israel from the Philistines. The title of “judge” is not accorded to him, nor is he said to have exercised authority in any way. It is doubtful, therefore, whether the writer intended him to be regarded as one of the judges.

**(e) Judges 4; 5:**

Victory of Deborah and Barak over Jabin the Canaanite king, and death of Sisera, captain of his army, at the hands of Jael, the wife of Kenite chief; followed by a Song of Triumph, descriptive and commemorative of the event.

**(f) Judges 6-8:**

A 7-year oppression at the hands of the Midianites, which is described as peculiarly severe, so that the land became desolate on account of the perpetual raids to which it was subject. After a period of hesitation and delay, Gideon defeats the combined forces of the Midianites and Amalekites and the “children of the east,” i.e. the wandering Bedouin bands from the eastern deserts, in the valley of Jezreel. The locality and course of the battle are traced by the sacred writer, but it is not possible to follow his account in detail because of our inability to identify the places named. After the victory, Gideon is formally offered the position of ruler for himself and his descendants, but refuses; nevertheless, he seems to have exercised a measure of restraining influence over the people until his death, although he himself and his family apparently through covetousness fell away from their faithfulness to Yahweh (<sup><0082></sup>Judges 8:27,33).

**(g) Judges 9:**

Episode of Abimelech, son of Gideon by a concubine, who by the murder of all but one of his brethren, the legitimate sons of Gideon, secured the throne at Shechem for himself, and for 3 years ruled Israel. After successfully stamping out a revolt at Shechem against his authority, he is himself killed when engaged in the siege of the citadel or tower of Thebez by a stone thrown by woman.

**(h)****(i) <sup><0700></sup>Judges 10:1-5:**

Tola and Jair are briefly named as successive judges of Israel for 23 and 22 years respectively.

**(j) <sup><0706></sup>Judges 10:6 through 12:7:**

Oppression of Israel for 18 years by the Philistines and Ammonites. The national deliverance is effected by Jephthah, who is described as an

illegitimate son of Gilead who had been on that account driven out from his home and had become the captain of a band of outlaws. Jephthah stipulates with the elders of Gilead that if he undertakes to do battle on their behalf with the Ammonites, he is afterward to be recognized as their ruler; and in accordance with the agreement, when the victory has been won, he becomes judge over Israel (~~Q11B~~Judges 11:9 f; 12:7).

*See JEPHTHAH.*

**(k)**

**(l) (m)** ~~Q12B~~Judges 12:8-15:

Three of the so-called “minor” judges, Ibzan, Elon and Abdon, judged Israel in succession for 7, 10 and 8 years respectively. As they are not said to have delivered the nation from any calamity or oppression, it is perhaps to be understood that the whole period was a time of rest and tranquillity.

**(n) Judges 13 through 16:**

The history of Samson (see separate article).

*(3) An Appendix, Judges 17 through 21.*

The final section, in the nature of an appendix, consisting of two narratives, independent apparently of the main portion of the book and of one another. They contain no indication of date, except the statement 4 times repeated that “in those days there was no king in Israel” Judges 6; 18:1; 19:1; 21:25). The natural inference is that the narratives were committed to writing in the days of the monarchy; but the events themselves were understood by the compiler or historian to have taken place during the period of the Judges, or at least anterior to the establishment of the kingdom. The lawless state of society, the violence and disorder among the tribes, would suggest the same conclusion. No name of a judge appears, however, and there is no direct reference to the office or to any central or controlling authority. Josephus also seems to have known them in reverse order, and in a position preceding the histories of the judges themselves, and not at the close of the book (Ant., V, ii, 8-12; iii, 1; see E. König in HDB, II, 810). Even if the present form of the narratives is thus late, there can be little doubt that they contain elements of considerable antiquity.



### (a) Judges 17 through 18:

The episode of Micah the Ephraimite and the young Levite who is consecrated as priest in his house. A war party, however, of the tribe of Dan during a migration northward, by threats and promises induced the Levite to accompany them, taking with him the priestly ephod, the household goods of his patron, and a costly image which Micah had caused to be made. These Micah in vain endeavors to recover from the Danites. The latter sack and burn Laish in the extreme North of Palestine, rebuilding the city on the same site and renaming it "Dan." There they set up the image which they had stolen, and establish a rival priesthood and worship, which is said to have endured "all the time that the house of God was in Shiloh" (18:31).

### (b) Judges 19 through 21:

Outrage of the Benjamites of Gibeah against the concubine of a Levite lodging for a night in the city on his way from Bethlehem to the hill country of Ephraim. The united tribes, after twice suffering defeat at the hands of the men of Benjamin, exact full vengeance; the tribe of Benjamin is almost annihilated, and their cities, including Gibeah, are destroyed. In order that the tribe may not utterly perish, peace is declared with the 600 survivors, and they are provided with wives by stratagem and force, the Israelites having taken a solemn vow not to permit intermarriage between their own daughters and the members of the guilty tribe.

### *4. Chronology:*

The period covered by the history of the Book of Judges extends from the death of Joshua to the death of Samson, and adds perhaps a later reference in <sup><1785></sup>Judges 18:31, "all the time that the house of God was in Shiloh" (compare <sup><1908></sup>1 Samuel 1:3). It is, however, difficult, perhaps impossible, to compute in years the length of time that the writer had in mind. That he proceeded upon a fixed chronological basis, supplied probably by tradition but modified or arranged on a systematic principle, seems evident. The difficulty may be due in part to the corruption which the figures have suffered in the course of the transmission of the text. In <sup><1100></sup>1 Kings 6:1 an inclusive total of 480 years is given as the period from the Exodus to the building of the Temple in the 4th year of the reign of Solomon. This total, however, includes the 40 years' wandering in the desert, the time occupied in the conquest and settlement of the Promised Land, and an uncertain

period after the death of Joshua, referred to in the Book of Judges itself (2:10), until the older generation that had taken part in the invasion had passed away. There is also to be reckoned the 40 years' judgeship of Eli (~~<0418>~~ 1 Samuel 4:18), the unknown length of the judgeship of Samuel (~~<0715>~~ Judges 7:15), the years of the reign of Saul (compare ~~<0931>~~ 1 Samuel 13:1, where, however, no statement is made as to the length of his reign), the 40 years during which David was king (~~<1021>~~ 1 Kings 2:11), and the 4 years of Solomon before the building of the Temple. The recurrence of the number 40 is already noticeable; but if for the unknown periods under and after Joshua, of Samuel and of Saul, 50 or 60 years be allowed — a moderate estimate — there would remain from the total of 480 years a period of 300 years in round numbers for the duration of the times of the Judges. It may be doubted whether the writer conceived of the period of unsettlement and distress, of alternate oppression and peace, as lasting for so long a time. The chronological data contained in the Book of Judges itself are as follows: A total of 410 years, or, if the years of foreign oppression and of the usurpation of Abimelech are omitted, of 296. It has been supposed that in some instances the rule of the several judges was contemporaneous, not successive, and that therefore the total period during which the judges ruled should be reduced accordingly. In itself this is sufficiently probable. It is evident, however, that this thought was not in the mind of the writer, for in each case he describes the rule of the judge as over "Israel" with no indication that "Israel" is to be understood in a partial and limited signification. His words must therefore be interpreted in their natural sense, that in his own belief the rulers whose deeds he related exercised control in the order named over the entire nation. Almost certainly, however, he did not intend to include in his scheme the years of oppression or the 3 years of Abimelech's rule. If these be deducted, the resultant number (296) is very near the total which the statement in ~~<1001>~~ 1 Kings 6:1 suggests. No stress, however, must be laid upon this fact. The repeated occurrence of the number 40, with its double and half, can hardly be accidental. The same fact was noted above in connection with earlier and later rulers in Israel. It suggests that there is present an element of artificiality and conscious arrangement in the scheme of chronology, which makes it impossible to rely upon it as it stands for any definite or reliable historical conclusion.

### *5. Authorship and Sources:*

Within the Book of Judges itself no author is named, nor is any indication given of the writer or writers who are responsible for the form in which the book appears; and it would seem evident, also, that the 3 parts or divisions of which the book is composed are on a different footing as regards the sources from which they are drawn. The Talmudic tradition which names Samuel as the author can hardly be seriously regarded. The historical introduction presents a form of the traditional narrative of the conquest of Palestine which is parallel to but not identical with that contained in the Book of Joshua. Brief and disconnected as it is, it is of the greatest value as a historical authority, and contains elements which in origin, if not in their present form, are of considerable antiquity. The main portion of the book, comprising the narratives of the judges, is based upon oral or written traditions of a local and perhaps a tribal character, the value of which it is difficult to estimate, but which undoubtedly in some instances have been more carefully preserved than in others. In particular, around the story of Samson there seem to have gathered elements derived from the folklore and the wonder-loving spirit of the countryside; and the exploits of a national hero have been enhanced and surrounded with a glamor of romance as the story of them has passed from lip to lip among a people who themselves or their forefathers owed so much to his prowess. Of this central part of Judges the Song of Deborah (Judges 5) is the most ancient, and bears every mark of being a contemporary record of a remarkable conflict and victory. The text is often difficult, almost unintelligible, and has so greatly suffered in the course of transmission as in some passages to be beyond repair. As a whole the song is an eloquent and impassioned ode of triumph, ascribing to Yahweh the great deliverance which has been wrought for His people over their foes. The narratives of Jgs, moreover, are set in a framework of chronology and of ethical comment and teaching, which are probably independent of one another. The moral exhortations and the lessons drawn from hardships and sufferings, which the people of Israel incur as the consequence of their idolatry and sin, are conceived entirely in the spirit of Deuteronomy, and even in the letter and form bear a considerable resemblance to the writings of that book. In the judgment of some scholars, therefore, they are to be ascribed to the same author or authors. Of this, however, there is no proof. It is possible, but perhaps hardly probable. They certainly belong to the same school of thought, of clear-sighted doctrine, of reverent piety, and of jealous concern for the

honor of Yahweh. With the system of chronology, the figures and dates, the ethical commentary and inferences would seem to have no direct relation. The former is perhaps a later addition, based in part at least upon tradition, and applied to existing accounts, in order to give them their definite place and succession in the historical record. Finally, the three strands of traditional narrative, moral comment, and chronological framework were woven into one whole by a compiler or reviser who completed the book in the form in which it now exists. Concerning the absolute dates, however, at which these processes took place very little can be determined. The two concluding episodes are distinct, both in form and character, from the rest of the book. They do not relate the life or deeds of a judge, nor do they, explicitly at least, convey any moral teaching or warning. They are also mutually independent. It would seem therefore that they are to be regarded as accounts of national events or experiences, preserved by tradition, which, because they were understood to have reference to the period of the Judges, were included in this book. The internal nature of the narratives themselves would suggest that they belong rather to the earlier than the later part of the time during which the judges held rule; and their ancient character is similarly attested. There is no clue, however, to the actual date of their composition, or to the time or circumstances under which they were incorporated in the Book of Jgs.

## **6. RELATION TO PRECEDING BOOKS:**

The discussion of the relation of the Book of Judges to the generally recognized sources of the Pentateuch and to Joshua has been in part anticipated in the previous paragraph. In the earliest introductory section of the book, and in some of the histories of the judges, especially in that of Gideon (Judges 6 through 8), it is not difficult to distinguish two threads of narrative, which have been combined together in the account as it now stands; and by some scholars these are identified with the Jahwist (Jahwist) and the Elohist (E) in the Pentateuch. The conclusion, however, is precarious and uncertain, for the characteristic marks of the Pentateuch "sources" are in great measure absent. There is more to be said for the view that regards the introduction (Judges 1 through 2:5), with its verbal parallels to Joshua as derived ultimately from the history of JE, from which, however, very much has been omitted, and the remainder adapted and abbreviated. Even this moderate conclusion cannot be regarded as definitely established. The later author or compiler was in possession of

ancient documents or traditions, of which he made use in his composite narrative, but whether these were parts of the same historical accounts that are present in the books of Moses and in Joshua must be regarded as undetermined. There is no trace, moreover, in Judges of extracts from the writing or school of P; nor do the two concluding episodes of the book (Judges 17 through 21) present any features which would suggest an identification with any of the leading “sources” of the Pentateuch.

The moral and religious teaching, on the other hand, which makes the varied national experiences in the times of the Judges a vehicle for ethical instruction and warning, is certainly derived from the same school as Deuteronomy, and reproduces the whole tone and spirit of that book. There is no evidence, however, to identify the writer or reviser who thus turned to spiritual profit the lessons of the age of the Judges with the author of Deuteronomy itself, but he was animated by the same principles, and endeavored in the same way to expound the same great truths of religion and the Providence of God.

## **7. RELATION TO SEPTUAGINT AND OTHER VERSIONS:**

There are two early Greek translations of the Book of Jgs, which seem to be on the whole independent of one another. These are represented by the two great uncial manuscripts, B (Codex Vaticanus) and A (Codex Alexandrinus). With the former is associated a group of cursive manuscripts and the Sahidic or Upper Egyptian version. It is therefore probable that the translation is of Egyptian origin, and by some it has been identified with that of Hesychius. It has been shown, moreover, that in this book, and probably elsewhere, the ancient character of the text of B is not always maintained, but in parts at least betrays a later origin. The other version is contained in A and the majority of the uncial and cursive manuscripts of the Greek texts, and, while certainly a real and independent translation from the original, is thought by some to show acquaintance with the version of B. There is, however, no definite evidence that B’s translation is really older. Some of the cursives which agree in general with A form sub-groups; thus the recension of Lucian is believed to be represented by a small number of cursives, the text of which is printed by Lagarde (*Librorum VT Canonicorum, Pars Prior*, 1883), and is substantially identical with that in the “Complutensian Polyglot” (see G. F. Moore, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*, Edinburgh, 1895, xliii ff). It is probable that the true original text of the Septuagint is not

represented completely either by the one or the other version, but that it partially underlies both, and may be traced in the conflicting readings which must be judged each on its own merits.

Of the other principal versions, the Old Latin and the Hexaplar Syriac, together with the Armenian and the Ethiopic, attach themselves to a subgroup of the manuscripts associated with A. The Bohairic version of the Book of Judges has not hitherto been published, but, like the rest of the Old Testament, its text would no doubt be found to agree substantially with B. Jerome's translation follows closely the Massoretic Text, and is independent of both Greek VSS; and the Peshitta also is a direct rendering from the Hebrew.

### **8. RELIGIOUS PURPOSE AND VALUE:**

Thus the main purpose of the Book of Judges in the form in which it has been preserved in the Old Testament is not to record Israel's past for its own sake, or to place before the writer's contemporaries a historical narrative of the achievements of their great men and rulers, but to use these events and the national experiences of adversity as a text from which to educe religious warning and instruction. With the author or authors spiritual edification is the first interest, and the facts or details of the history, worthy of faithful records, because it is the history of God's people, find their chief value in that they are and were designed to be admonitory, exhibiting the Divine judgments upon idolatry and sin, and conveying the lesson that disobedience and rebellion, a hard and defiant spirit that was forgetful of Yahweh, could not fail to entail the same disastrous consequences. The author is preeminently a preacher of righteousness to his fellow-countrymen, and to this aim all other elements in the book, whether chronological or historical, are secondary and subordinate. In his narrative he sets down the whole truth, so far as it has become known to him through tradition or written document, however discreditable it may be to his nation. There is no ground for believing that he either extenuates on the one hand, or on the other paints in darker colors than the record of the transgressions of the people deserved. Neither he nor they are to be judged by the standards of the 20th century, with its accumulated wealth of spiritual experience and long training in the principles of righteousness and truth. But he holds and asserts a lofty view of the character of Yahweh, of the immutability of His wrath against obstinate transgression and of the certainty of its punishment, and yet of

the Divine pitifulness and mercy to the man or nation that turns to Him with a penitent heart. The Jews were not mistaken when they counted the Book of Judges among the Prophets. It is prophecy, more than history, because it exhibits and enforces the permanent lessons of the righteousness and justice and loving-kindness of God.

## **LITERATURE.**

A complete bibliography of the literature up to date will be found in the Dicts. under the word "Judges," D B2, 1893; HDB, II, 1899; EB, II, 1901; compare G. F. Moore, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jgs*, Edinburgh, 1895; SBOT, Leipzig, 1900; R. A. Watson, "Jgs" and "Ruth," in *Expositor's Bible*, 1889; G. W. Thatcher, "Jgs" and "Ruth," in *Century Bible*; S. Oettli, "Das Deuteronomium und die Bucher Josua und Richter," in *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*, Munchen, 1893; K. Budde, "Das Buch der Richter," in *Kurzer Hand-Kommentar zum Altes Testament*, Tubingen, 1897; W. Nowack, "Richter," in *Hand-kommentar zum Altes Testament*, 1900.

*A. S. Geden*

## **JUDGES, PERIOD OF**

### **I. SOURCES.**

Our chief sources of information are the Book of Judges and 1 Samuel 1 through 12. The material contained in these is not all of the same age. The oldest part, by common consent, is the Song of Deborah (Judges 5). It is a contemporaneous document. The prose narratives, however, are also early, and are generally regarded as presenting a faithful picture of the times with which they deal. The Book of Ruth, which also refers to this period, is probably in its present form a later composition, but there is no adequate ground for denying to it historical basis (Konig, *Einleitung*, 286 ff; Kent, *Student's Old Testament*, I, 310 f).

### **II. CHRONOLOGY.**

The period of the Judges extends from the death of Joshua to the establishment of the monarchy. How long a time elapsed between these limits is a matter of wide difference of opinion. The chronological data in the Book of Judges, i.e. omitting Eli and Samuel, make a total of 410

years. But this is inconsistent with ~~<1000>~~1 Kings 6:1, where the whole period from the Exodus to the 4th year of Solomon is reckoned at 480 years. Various attempts have been made to harmonize these divergent figures, e.g. by eliminating the 70 years attributed to the Minor Judges (10:1-5; 12:7-15), by not counting the 71 years of foreign domination, and by theory that some of the judges were contemporaneous. It is probable that the 480 years of ~~<1000>~~1 Kings 6:1 was a round number and did not rest on exact records. Indeed, it is doubtful if there was any fixed calendar in Israel before the time of the monarchy. The only way then to determine the length of the period of the Judges is from the date of the Exodus. The common view is that the Exodus took place during or just after the reign of Merenptah in the latter half of the 13th century BC. This, however, leaves hardly more than 150 years to the period of the Judges, for Saul's reign fell in the 2nd half of the 11th century BC. Hence, some, to whom this seems too short, assign the Exodus to the reign of Amenophis II, about 1450 BC. This harmonizes with the 480 years of ~~<1000>~~1 Kings 6:1, and is supported by other considerations (POT, 422-24). Still others have connected the Exodus with the expulsion of the Hyksos about 1580 BC (G.A. Reisner); and this would fit in very well with the chronological data in the Book of Jgs. The objection to the last two views is that they require a rather long period of subjection of the Israelites in Canaan to Egypt, of which there is no trace in the Book of Judges.

*See, further, JUDGES, BOOK OF, IV.*

### III. GENERAL POLITICAL SITUATION.

The death of Joshua left much land yet to be possessed by the Israelites.

#### *1. The Canaanites:*

The different tribes had received their respective allotments (~~<1000>~~Judges 1:3), but the actual possession of the territory assigned each still lay in the future and was only gradually achieved. The Canaanites remained in the land, and were for a time a serious menace to the power of Israel. They retained possession of the plains and many of the fortified cities, e.g. Gezer, Harheres, Aijalon, Shaalhim, and Jerusalem on the northern border of Judah (~~<1002>~~Judges 1:21,29,35), and Bethshean, Ibleam, Taanach, Megiddo, and Dot along the northern border of Manasseh (~~<1002>~~Judges 1:27,28).



## 2. *Foes Without:*

Besides these foes within Canaan, the Israelites had enemies from without to contend with, namely, the Moabites, Midianites, Ammonites, and Philistines. The danger from each of these quarters, except that from the Philistines, was successfully warded off. The conflicts in which the Israelites were thus involved were all more or less local in character. In no case did all the tribes act together, though the duty of such united action is clearly taught in the Song of Deborah, at least so far as the 10 northern tribes are concerned. The omission of Judah and Simeon from this ancient song is strange, but may not be so significant as is sometimes supposed. The judges, who were raised up to meet the various emergencies, seem to have exercised jurisdiction only over limited areas. In general the different tribes and clans acted independently of each other. Local home rule prevailed. "Every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (<sup><07706></sup>Judges 17:6).

That Canaan was not during this period subdued and kept in subjection by one of the great world-powers, Egypt or Babylonia, is to be regarded as providential (HPM, I, 214 f). Such subjection would have made impossible the development of a free national and religious life in Israel. The Cushan-rishathaim of <sup><07017></sup>Judges 3:7-10 was more likely a king of Edom than of Mesopotamia (Paton, Early History of Syria and Palestine, 161-62).

## IV. MAIN EVENTS.

### 1. *Struggles of Individual Tribes:*

Much of what took place during this period is unrecorded. Of the struggles through which the individual tribes passed before they succeeded in establishing themselves in the land, little is known. One interesting episode is preserved for us in Judges 17; 18. A considerable portion of the tribe of Dan, hard pressed by the Amorites (<sup><07013></sup>Judges 1:34 f), migrated from their allotted home West of Judah to Laish in the distant north, where they put the inhabitants to the sword, burnt the city and then rebuilt it under the name of Dan. This took place early in the period of the Judges, apparently during the first generation after the conquest (<sup><07183></sup>Judges 18:30).

### 2. *Civil Strife:*

At about the same time also (<sup><07108></sup>Judges 20:28) seems to have occurred the war with Benjamin (Judges 19 through 21), which grew out of an outrage

perpetrated at Gibeah and the refusal of the Benjamites to surrender the guilty parties for punishment. The historicity of this war has been called in question, but it seems to be attested by <sup><800></sup>Hosea 9:9; 10:9. And that civil strife in Israel was not otherwise unknown during this period is clear from the experiences of Gideon (<sup><801></sup>Judges 8:1-3) and Jephthah (<sup><811></sup>Judges 12:1-6), not to mention those of Abimelech (Judges 9). It is a current theory that the tribes of Simeon and Levi early in this period suffered a serious reverse (<sup><845></sup>Genesis 49:5-7), and that a reflection of this event is to be found in Genesis 34; but the data are too uncertain to warrant any confidence in this view.

### *3. The Six Invasions:*

Six wars with other nations are recorded as taking place in this period, and each called forth its judge or judges. Othniel delivered the Israelites from the Mesopotamians or Edomites (<sup><887></sup>Judges 3:7-11), Ehud from the Moabites (<sup><882></sup>Judges 3:12-30), Deborah and Barak from the Canaanites (Judges 4; 5), Gideon from the Midianites (Judges 6 through 8), and Jephthah from the Ammonites (<sup><806></sup>Judges 10:6-12,17). In the strife with the Philistines, which was not terminated during this period, Samson (Judges 13 through 16), Eli (1 Samuel 4 through 6), and Samuel (<sup><808></sup>1 Samuel 7:3-14; 9:16) figure. Of these six wars those which brought Othniel, Ehud and Jephthah to the front were less serious and significant than the other three. The conflicts with the Canaanites, Midianites and Philistines mark distinct stages in the history of the period.

After the first successes of the Israelites in Canaan a period of weakness and disintegration set in. The Canaanites, who still held the fortified cities in the plain of Esdraelon, banded themselves together and terrorized the region round about. The Hebrews fled from their villages to the caves and dens. None had the heart to offer resistance (<sup><885></sup>Judges 5:6,8). It seemed as though they were about to be subdued by the people they had a short time before dispossessed. Then it was that Deborah appeared on the scene. With her passionate appeals in the name of Yahweh she awakened a new sense of national unity, rallied the discouraged forces of the nation and administered a final crushing defeat upon the Canaanites in the plain of Megiddo.

But the flame thus kindled after a time went out. New enemies came from without. The Midianites invaded the land year after year, robbing it of its

produce (<sup>0001</sup>Judges 6:1,3). This evil was suddenly put an end to by the bold stroke of Gideon, whose victory was long treasured in the public memory (<sup>2004</sup>Isaiah 9:4; 10:26; <sup>0830</sup>Psalms 83:9-12). But the people, at least of Manasseh and perhaps also of Ephraim, now realized that it was no longer safe to depend upon such temporary leadership. They needed a permanent organization to ward off the dangers that beset them. They therefore offered the kingship to Gideon. He formally declined it (<sup>0082</sup>Judges 8:22,23), but still set up a government at Ophrah which the people looked upon as hereditary (<sup>0002</sup>Judges 9:2). He was succeeded by his son Abimelech, who, after slaying all but one of his 70 brothers, assumed the title of king. The new kingdom, however, was of short duration. It ended after three years with the ignominious death of the king.

#### *4. Need of Central Government:*

A great danger was needed before the people of Israel could be welded into unity and made to see the necessity of a strong central government. This came eventually from the Philistines, who twice defeated the Israelites in battle, captured the ark, and overran a large part of the country (1 Samuel 4 through 6). In the face of such a foe as this it was clear that only a strong and permanent leadership of the whole people would suffice (<sup>0005</sup>1 Samuel 9:15; 10:1); and thus the rule of the Judges gave way to the monarchy.

### **V. RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS.**

The Hebrew mind to which Moses addressed himself was not a tabula rasa, and the Palestinian world into which the Israelites entered was not an intellectual blank. Formative influences had for ages been at work on the Hebrew mind, and Palestine had long been inhabited by people with fixed institutions, customs and ideas. When then Israel settled in Canaan, they had both a heathen inheritance and a heathen environment to contend with. It should therefore occasion no surprise to find during this period such lapses from the purity of the Mosaic faith as appear in the ephod of Gideon (<sup>0084</sup>Judges 8:24-27), the images of Micah (Judges 17 through 18), and the sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter (<sup>07134</sup>Judges 11:34-40). In the transition from a nomadic to an agricultural life it was inevitable that the Hebrews with their native heathen proclivities would adopt many of the crude and even immoral religious customs and beliefs of the people among whom they settled. But the purer Mosaic faith still had its representatives. The

worship of the central sanctuary at Shiloh remained imageless. Leaders like Deborah and Samuel revived the spirit of Moses. And there can hardly be a doubt that in many a quiet home a true and earnest piety was cultivated like that in the home of Elimelech and Naomi.

## VI. THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION.

The Biblical historian was not content simply to narrate events. What concerned him most was the meaning lying back of them. And this meaning he was interested in, not for its own sake, but because of its application to the people of his own day. Hence, intermingled with the narratives of the period of the Judges are to be found religious interpretations of the events recorded and exhortations based upon them. The fundamental lesson thus inculcated is the same as that continually insisted upon by the prophets. The Divine government of the world is based upon justice. Disobedience to the moral law and disloyalty to Yahweh means, therefore, to Israel suffering and disaster. All the oppressions of the period of the Judges arose in this way. Relief and deliverance came only when the people turned unto Yahweh. This religious pragmatism, as it is called, does not lie on the surface of the events, so that a naturalistic historian might see it. But it is a correlate of the ethical monotheism of the prophets, and constitutes the one element in the Old Testament which makes the study of Israel's history supremely worth while.

## LITERATURE.

Josephus, *Ant*, V, ii-vi, 5; Ottley, *Short History of the Hebrews*, 101-24; Kittel, *History of the Hebrews*, II, 60 f, 2nd German edition, II, 52-135.

*Albert Cornelius Knudson*

## JUDGING JUDGMENT

*<juj'-ing>*, *<juj'-ment>*: Often in the Old Testament for "to act as a magistrate" (Exodus 18:13; <sup><1816></sup>Deuteronomy 1:16; 16:18, etc.), justice being administered generally by "elders" (Exodus 18:13-27), or "kings" (<sup><1820></sup>1 Samuel 8:20) or "priests" (<sup><1815></sup>Deuteronomy 18:15); applied to God as the Supreme Judge (<sup><1807></sup>Psalm 9:7,8; 10:18; 96:13; <sup><1808></sup>Micah 4:3, etc.; <sup><1808></sup>Psalm 7:8: "Yahweh ministereth judgment," vividly describes a court scene, with Yahweh as Judge).

Often in the New Testament, ethically, for

- (1) “to decide,” “give a verdict,” “declare an opinion” (Greek *krino*);
- (2) “to investigate,” “scrutinize” (Greek *anakrino*);
- (3) “to discriminate,” “distinguish” (Greek *diakrino*).

For (1), see <sup><474></sup>Luke 7:43; <sup><4459></sup>Acts 15:19; for (2) see <sup><4125></sup>1 Corinthians 2:15; 4:3; for (3) see <sup><413></sup>1 Corinthians 11:31; 14:29 m. Used also forensically in <sup><4221></sup>Luke 22:30; <sup><4250></sup>Acts 25:10; and applied to God in <sup><4352></sup>John 5:22; <sup><5108></sup>Hebrews 10:30. The judgments of God are the expression of His justice, the formal declarations of His judgments, whether embodied in words (<sup><4881></sup>Deuteronomy 5:1 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) “statutes”), or deeds (Exodus 6:6; <sup><4447></sup>Revelation 16:7), or in decisions that are yet to be published (<sup><4316></sup>Psalms 36:6). Man’s consciousness of guilt inevitably associates God’s judgments as declarations of the Divine justice, with his own condemnation, i.e. he knows that a strict exercise of justice means his condemnation, and thus “judgment” and “condemnation” become in his mind synonymous (<sup><4516></sup>Romans 5:16); hence, the prayer of <sup><4530></sup>Psalms 143:2, “Enter not into judgment”; also, <sup><4129></sup>John 6:29, “the resurrection of judgment” (the King James Version “damnation”); <sup><4129></sup>1 Corinthians 11:29, “eateth and drinketh judgment” (the King James Version “damnation”).

*H. E. Jacobs*

## JUDGMENT, DAY OF

*See JUDGMENT, LAST.*

## JUDGMENT HALL

<sup><juj'-ment hol></sup> ([<sup><40></sup>τὸ πραιτώριον, *to praitorion*], “Then led they Jesus .... unto the hall of judgment .... and they themselves went not into the judgment hall” (<sup><4183></sup>John 18:28 the King James Version); “Then Pilate entered into the judgment hall again” (<sup><4183></sup>John 18:33 the King James Version); “(Pilate) went again into the judgment hall” (<sup><4199></sup>John 19:9); “He commanded him to be kept in Herod’s judgment hall” (<sup><4235></sup>Acts 23:35)):

“Judgment hall” is one of the ways in which the King James Version translates [*praitorion*], which it elsewhere renders “Praetorium” (<sup><4156></sup>Mark 15:16); “the common hall” (<sup><4272></sup>Matthew 27:27). In this passage the English Revised Version renders it “palace”; in <sup><4183></sup>John 18:33; 19:9;

~~4235~~ Acts 23:35, “palace” is also given by the English Revised Version; in Phil 1:13, the King James Version renders, “palace,” while the Revised Version (British and American) gives “the praetorian guard.” *Praetorium* accordingly is translated in all these ways, “Praetorium,” “the common hall,” “the judgment hall,” “the palace,” “the praetorian guard.” In the passages In the Gospels, the American Standard Revised Version renders uniformly “Praetorium.”

The word originally meant the headquarters in the Roman camp, the space where the general’s tent stood, with the camp altar; the tent of the commander-in-chief. It next came to mean the military council, meeting in the general’s tent. Then it came to be applied to the palace in which the Roman governor or procurator of a province resided. In Jerusalem it was the magnificent palace which Herod the Great had built for himself, and which the Roman procurators seem to have occupied when they came from Caesarea to Jerusalem to transact public business.

[*Praetorium*] in Phil 1:13 has been variously rendered, “the camp of the praetorian soldiers,” “the praetorian guard,” etc. For what is now believed to be its true meaning, *see PRAETORIUM.*

*John Rutherford*

## JUDGMENT, LAST

### *1. A Transcendental Doctrine:*

In Christian theology the Last Judgment is an act in which God interposes directly into human history, brings the course of this world to a final close, determines the eternal fate of human beings, and places them in surroundings spiritually adapted to their final condition. The concept is purely transcendental, and is to be distinguished from the hope that God will interfere in the history of this world to determine it undeviatingly toward good. The transcendental doctrine is possible only when an exalted idea of God has been attained, although it may afterward be united with crasser theories, as in certain naive conceptions of Christianity at the present day.

### *2. The Doctrine in the Religion of Israel:*

In the religion of Israel, the doctrine of the Last Judgment arose from “transcendentalizing” the concept of the “Day of the Lord.” Just as hope of

immortality replaced desire for length of days on earth, just the as for “the rejuvenation of Palestine” was substituted “an eternal abode in a new earth,” so the ideal of a military victory over Israel’s enemies expanded into God’s solemn condemnation of evil. The concept thus strictly defined is hardly to be sought in the Old Testament, but <sup><2721></sup>Daniel 12:1-3 may contain it. The first unequivocal assertion would appear to be in Enoch 91:17, where the final state is contrasted with a preceding reign of earthly happiness. (If there has been no redaction in the latter part of this section, its date is prior to 165 BC.) Hereafter the idea is so prevalent in the Jewish writings that detailed reference is needless. But it is by no means universal. Writings touched with Greek thought (En 108; 4 Macc; Philo) are content with an individual judgment at death. A unique theory is that of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (Levi 18:8-14, e.g.), where the world grows into final blessedness without catastrophe. But much more common is the persistence of the non-transcendental ideas, ingrained as they were in the thought of the people (even in Philo; compare his prophecy of national earthly glory in Excr 9). This type of thought was so tenacious that it held its own alongside of the transcendental, and both points of view were accepted by more than one writer. Then the earthly happiness precedes the heavenly (as in Enoch 91), and there are two judgments, one by the Messiah and the other by God (2 Esdras 7; Syriac Baruch 30). So in Revelation 19 where Christ overcomes the enemies in battle-symbolism and establishes the Millennium, while the Last Judgment is held by God (20:11 ff). Otherwise the Messiah is never the judge except in the Parables of Enoch, where He appears as God’s vicar uniformly (in 47:3 God fixes the time of judgment only). Possibly in The Wisdom of Solomon 4:16; 5:1 men share in the judgment-act but otherwise they (and angels) appear only as “assessors” or as executors of the sentence. In The Wisdom of Solomon 3:8, “judging” is used in the Old Testament sense of “rule” (<sup><0781></sup>Judges 3:10, etc.), as is the case in <sup><0628></sup>Matthew 19:28 parallel <sup><0721></sup>Luke 22:30; <sup><0612></sup>1 Corinthians 6:2,3 (in the last case with the word in two senses). Further studies in the variation of the (rather conventionally fixed) details of the judgment will interest the special student only.

For discussions of the relevant Biblical passages, *see DAY OF THE LORD; ESCHATOLOGY; PAROUSIA*. The doctrine has real religious value, for it insists on a culmination in the evolution (or degeneration!) of the race as well as of the individual. So it is contrasted with the pessimism of natural

science, which points only toward the gradual extinction of humanity through the cooling of the sun.

## LITERATURE.

The variations of the concept are treated, fully only in Volz, *Judische Eschatologie*. For general literature *see* **ESCHATOLOGY; PAROUSIA**.

*Burton Scott Easton*

## JUDGMENT SEAT

([βῆμα, *bema*], “a raised place,” “platform,” “tribune,” <sup><4279></sup>Matthew 27:19; <sup><6993></sup>John 19:13; *see* **GABBATHA**; <sup><4422></sup>Acts 12:21 margin (text “throne”); 18:12,16 ff; 25:6,17): In Greek law courts, one [βῆμα, *bema*] was provided for the accuser, another for the accused; but in the New Testament the word designates the official scat of a judge, usually of the Roman governor; also of the emperor (<sup><4250></sup>Acts 25:10); then of God (<sup><6140></sup>Romans 14:10), of Christ (<sup><4750></sup>2 Corinthians 5:10). The word [κρίτηριον, *kriterion*], “a tribunal,” “bench of judges” (<sup><9116></sup>James 2:6) occurs also in <sup><4410></sup>1 Corinthians 6:2-4, and is there translated in the Revised Version margin by “tribunals.”

*See also* **JUDGE**.

## JUDICIAL BLINDNESS

<sup><joo-dish'-al></sup>.

*See* **BLINDNESS, JUDICIAL**.

## JUDICIAL COURTS

*See* **COURTS, JUDICIAL**.

## JUDICIAL HARDENING

*See* **HARDEN**.

## JUDITH

<sup><joo'-dith></sup> (for etymology, see next article):

(1) A wife of Esau, daughter of Beerli the Hittite (<sup><0234></sup>Genesis 26:34).



(2) The heroine of the Book of Judith in Apocrypha — a pious, wealthy, courageous, and patriotic widow who delivered Jerusalem and her countrymen from the assault of Holofernes, the general of Nebuchadnezzar who had arranged the expedition which aimed at making Nebuchadnezzar the object of universal human worship.

The 8th and following chapters of the book describe her actions which resulted in the cutting off of the head of Holofernes, the rout of the Assyrian army, and the deliverance of the Jews.

*See JUDITH, BOOK OF.*

## JUDITH, BOOK OF

### I. NAME.

This apocryphal book is called after the name of its principal character Judith ([tydWhy] yehudhith, “a Jewess”; [ ’ Ioudίθ, Ioudith], [ ’ Ioudήθ, Ioudeth]). The name occurs in <sup>01264</sup>Genesis 26:34 and the corresponding masculine form ([ydWhy] yehudhi, “a Jew”) in <sup>2834</sup>Jeremiah 36:14,21,23 (name of a scribe). In other great crises in Hebrew history women have played a great part (compare Deborah, Judges 5, and Esther). The Books of Ruth, Esther, Judith and Susannah are the only ones in the Bible (including the Apocrypha) called by the names of women, these women being the principal characters in each case.

### II. CANONICITY.

Though a tale of Jewish patriotism written originally in Hebrew, this book was never admitted into the Hebrew Canon, and the same applies to the Book of Tobit. But both Judith and Tobit were recognized as canonical by the Council of Carthage (397 AD) and by the Council of Trent (1545 AD). Though, however, all Romanists include these books in their Bible (the Vulgate), Protestant versions of the Bible, with very few exceptions, exclude the whole of the Apocrypha (*see APOCRYPHA*). In the Septuagint and Vulgate, Tobit and Judith (in that order) follow Nehemiah and precede Esther. In the English Versions of the Bible of the Apocrypha, which unfortunately for its understanding stands alone, 1 Esdras, 2 Esdras, Tobit and Judith occupy the first place and in the order named. In his translation

of the Apocrypha, Luther, for some unexplained reason, puts Judith at the head of the apocryphal books, Wisdom taking the next place.

### III. CONTENTS.

The book opens with an account of the immense power of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Assyria, whose capital was Nineveh. (In the days of the real Nebuchadnezzar, Assyria had ceased to be, and its capital was destroyed.) He calls upon the peoples living in the western country, including Palestine, to help him to subdue a rival king whose power he feared — Arphaxad, king of the Medes (otherwise quite unknown). But as they refused the help he demanded, he first conquered his rival, annexing his territory, and then sent his general Holofernes to subdue the western nations and to punish them for their defiance of his authority. The Assyrian general marched at the head of an army 132,000 strong and soon took possession of the lands North and East of Palestine, demolishing their idols and sanctuaries that Nebuchadnezzar alone might be worshipped as god (Judith 1 through 3). He now directed his forces against the Jews who had recently returned from exile and newly rebuilt and rededicated their temple. Having heard of the ruin of other temples caused by the invading foe, the Jews became greatly alarmed for the safety of their own, and fortified the mountains and villages in the south, providing themselves with food to meet their needs in the event of war. At the urgent request of Joakim (“Eliakim” in the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and Peshitta), the inhabitants of Bethulia (so the Latin, English, and other VSS, but [βευλούα, *Betuloua*] is more correct according to the Greek) and of Betomestham (both places otherwise unknown) defended the adjoining mountain passes which commanded the way to Jerusalem. Holofernes at once laid siege to Bethulia, and by cutting off the water supply aimed at starving the people to submission. But he knows little of the people he is seeking to conquer, and asks the chiefs who are with him who and what these Jews are. Achior, the Ammonite chief, gives an account of the Israelites,

cluding that when faithful to their God they were invincible, but that when they disobeyed Him they were easily overcome. Achior is for this saying expelled and handed over to the Jews. After holding out for some days, the besieged people insisted that Onias their governor should surrender. This he promises to do if no relief comes in the course of five days. A rich, devout and beautiful widow called Judith (daughter of Merari, of the tribe

of Simeon (Jth 8:1)), hearing of these things, rebukes the murmurers for their lack of faith and exhorts them to trust in God. As Onias abides by his promise to the people, she resolves to attempt another mode of deliverance. She obtains consent to leave the fortress in the dead of night, accompanied by her maidservant, in order to join the Assyrian camp. First of all she prays earnestly for guidance and success; then doffing her mourning garb, she puts on her most gorgeous attire together with jewels and other ornaments. She takes with her food allowed by Jewish law, that she might have no necessity to eat the forbidden meats of the Gentiles. Passing through the gates, she soon reaches the Assyrians. First of all, the soldiers on watch take her captive, but on her assuring them that she is a fugitive from the Hebrews and desires to put Holofernes in the way of achieving a cheap and easy victory over her fellow-countrymen, she is warmly welcomed and made much of. She reiterates to Holofernes the doctrine taught by Achior that these Jews can easily be conquered when they break the laws of their Deity, and she knows the necessities of their situation would lead them to eat food prohibited in their sacred laws, and when this takes place she informs him that he might at once attack them. Holofernes listens, applauds, and is at once captured by her personal charms. He agrees to her proposal and consents that she and her maid should be allowed each night to say their prayers out in the valley near the Hebrew fortress. On the 4th night after her arrival, Holofernes arranges a banquet to which only his household servants and the two Jewesses are invited. When all is over, by a preconcerted plan the Assyrian general and the beautiful Jewish widow are left alone. He, however, is dead drunk and heavily asleep. With his own scimitar she cuts off his head, calls her maid who puts it into the provision bag, and together they leave the camp as if for their usual prayers and join their Hebrew compatriots, still frantic about the immediate future. But the sight of the head of their arch foe puts new heart into them, and next day they march upon the enemy now in panic at what had happened, and win an easy victory. Judith became ever after a heroine in Jewish romance and poetry, a Hebrew Joan of Arc, and the tale of the deliverance she wrought for her people has been told in many languages. For later and shorter forms of the tale see VII, 4 (Hebrew Midrash).

#### IV. FACT OR FICTION?

The majority of theologians down to the 19th century regarded the story of Judith as pure history; but with the exception of O. Wolf (1861) and yon Gumpach, Protestant scholars in recent times are practically agreed that the Book of Judith is a historical novel with a purpose similar to Daniel, Esther and Tobit. Schurer classes it with “parenthetic narratives” (paranetische Erzählung). The Hebrew novel is perhaps the earliest of all novels, but it is always a didactic novel written to enforce some principle or principles. Roman Catholic scholars defend the literal historicity of the book, though they allow that the proper names are more or less disguised. But the book abounds with anachronisms, inconsistencies and impossibilities, and was evidently written for the lesson it teaches: obey God and trust Him, and all will be well. The author had no intention to teach history. Torrey, however, goes too far when he says (see Jewish Encyclopedia, “Book of Judith”) that the writer aimed at nothing more than to write a tale that would amuse. A tone of religious fervor and of intense patriotism runs through the narrative, and no opportunity of enforcing the claims of the Jewish law is lost. Note especially what is taught in the speeches of Achior (Jth 5:12-21) and Judith (8:17-24; compare 11:10), that, trusting in God and keeping His commandments, the nation is invulnerable.

According to the narrative Nebuchadnezzar has been for 12 years king of Assyria and has his capital at Nineveh, though we know he never was or could be king of Assyria. He became king of Babylon in 604 BC, upon the death of his father Nabopolassar, who in 608 had destroyed Assyria. The Jews had but recently returned from exile (Jth 4:3; 5:19), but were independent, and Holofernes knew nothing about them (Jth 5:3). Nebuchadnezzar died in 561 BC and the Jews returned under Cyrus in 538. Bethulia to which Holofernes lay siege was otherwise quite unknown: it is probably a disguised form of *Beth ‘Elohim* or *Beth ‘Eloah*, “house of God,” and means the place where God is with His people. The detailed description of the site is but part of the writer’s art; it was the place which every army must pass on its way to Jerusalem. As a matter of fact, there is no such position in Palestine, and least of all Shechem, which Torrey identified with Bethulia. We know nothing besides what Judith 1 tells us of “Arphaxad who reigned over the Medes in Ecbatana”; on the contrary, in every other mention of the name it stands for a country or a race (see ~~Gen~~ Genesis 10:22,24; 11:10-13).

## V. DATE.

### *1. Probably during the Maccabean Age:*

It is evident that this religious romance was prompted by some severe persecution in which the faith of the Jews was sorely tried, and the writer's dominant aim is identical with that of the author of Daniel, namely, to encourage those suffering for their religion by giving instances of Divine deliverance in the darkest hour. "Only trust and keep the law; then deliverance will unfailingly come" — that is the teaching. Judith might well have been written during the persecution of the Maccabean age, as was almost certainly the Book of Daniel. We have in this book that zeal for orthodox Judaism which marked the age of the Maccabees, and the same strong belief that the war in which the nation was engaged was a holy one. The high priest is head of the state (see Jth 4:6), as suiting a period when the religious interest is uppermost and politics are merged in religion, though some say wrongly that John Hyrcanus (135-106 BC) was the first to combine priestly and princely dignities. We have another support for a Maccabean date in the fact that Onias was high priest during the siege of Bethulia (Jth 4:6), the name being suggested almost certainly by Onias III, who became high priest in 195 (or 198) BC, and who died in 171 after consistently opposing the Hellenizing policy of the Syrians and their Jewish allies.

That the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164 BC) supply as good a background for this book as any other event in Jewish history is the least that can be said; but one may not be dogmatic on the matter, as similar conditions recurred in the nation's history, and there is no external or internal evidence that fixes the date definitely. The following scholars decide for a date in the Maccabean age: Fritzsche, Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Schurer, Ball, Cornill and Lohr. The author was certainly a resident in Palestine, as his local knowledge and interests show; and from his punctilious regard for the law one may judge that he belonged to the Hasidean (*chacidhim*) party. Since he so often mentions Dothan (Greek Dothae, Dothaim) (Jth 3:9; 4:6; 7:3,18; 8:3), it is probable that he belonged to that neighborhood. Though, however, the author wrote in the time of the Maccabees, he seems to set his history in a framework that is some 200 years earlier, as Noldeke (*Die alttest. Lit.*, 1868, 96; *Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte*, 1887, 78) and Schurer (*GJV*, III, 323 ff) show. In 350 BC, Artaxerxes Ochus (361-338 BC) invaded Phoenicia and Egypt,

his chief generals being Holofernes (Jth 2:4, etc.) and Bagoas (Jth 12:11), both of whom are in Judith officials of King Nebuchadnezzar and take part in the expedition against the Jews. This was intended probably to disarm the criticism of enemies who might resent any writing in which they were painted in unfavorable colors.

## 2. Other Opinions:

### (1) Invasion of Pompey.

That it was the invasion of Pompey which gave rise to the book is the opinion held by Gaster. If this were so, Judith and the Psalms of Solomon arose under the pressure of the same circumstances (see Ryle and James, *The Psalms of Solomon*, XL, and J. Rendel Harris, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, XIII) But in the Psalms of Solomon the supreme ruler is a king (17:22), not a high priest (Judith 4:6). Besides, anyone who reads the Psalm of Solomon and Judith will feel that in the former he has to do with a different and later age.

### (2) Insurrection under Bar Cochba.

Hitzig (who held that the insurrection under Bar Cochba, 132 AD, is the event referred to), Volkmar and Graetz date this book in the days of the emperor Trajan (or Hadrian?). Volkmar gives himself much trouble in his attempt to prove that the campaigns of Nebuchadnezzar stand really for those of Trajan. But it is a sufficient refutation of this opinion that the book is quoted by Clement of Rome (55), who died in 100 AD, and whose reference to the book shows that it was regarded in his day as authoritative and even as canonical, so that it must have been written long before.

## VI. ORIGINAL LANGUAGE.

That a Hebrew or (less likely) an Aramaic original once existed is the opinion of almost all modern scholars, and the evidence for this seems conclusive. There are many Hebraisms in the book, e.g. [ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις, *en tais hemerais*] (“in the days of,” Jth 1:7, and 9 t besides); the frequent use of [σφόδρα, *sphodra*], in the sense of the Hebrew [דַּמּוּ] *me’odh*], and even its repetition (also a Hebraism, Jth 4:8); compare [ἐπὶ πολὺ σφόδρα, *epi polu sphodra*] (Jth 5:18) and [πλήθος πολὺ σφόδρα, *plethos polu sphodra*] (Jth 2:17). Note further the following: “Let not thy eye spare” etc. (Jth 2:11; compare <sup>אין</sup> Ezekiel 5:11, etc.); “as I live” (in an

oath, Jth 2:12); “God of heaven” (Jth 5:8; 11:17); “son of man,” parallel with “man,” and in the same sense (Jth 8:16); “and it came to pass when she had ceased crying,” etc. (Jth 10:1); “the priests who serve in Jerusalem before the face of our God” (Jth 11:13). In Jth 16:3 we have the words: “For a god that shatters battle is (the) Lord.” Now “Lord” without the article can be only the Hebrew “Yahweh,” read always *‘adhonay*, “Lord.” But the phrase, “to shatter battle,” is not good Greek or good sense. The Hebrew words *shabhath* (“to rest”; compare *shabbath*, “Sabbath”) and *shabhar* (“to break”) are written much alike, and in the original Hebrew we must have had the causative form of the first vb.: “A God that makes war cease is (the) Lord” (see ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 46:9). Moreover, the Hebrew idiom which strengthens a finite verb by placing a cognate (absolute) infinitive before it is represented in the Greek of this book in the usual form in which it occurs in the Septuagint (and in Welsh), namely, a participle followed by a finite verb (see Jth 2:13). The present writer has noted other examples, but is prevented by lack of space from adding them here. That the original book was Hebrew and not Aramaic is made extremely likely by the fact that the above examples of Hebrew idiom are peculiar to this language. Note especially the idiom, “and it came to pass that,” etc. (Jth 2:4), with the implied “waw consecutive,” and what is said above about Jth 11:13, where the senseless Greek arose through the confusion of two similarly written Hebrew (not Aramaic) words. There are cases also of mistakes in the Greek text due to wrong translation from the Hebrew, as in Jth 1:8 (where for “nations” read “cities” or “mountains”); Jth 2:2 (where for “concluded,” Hebrew [l k” y]” , *wa-yekhal*], read “revealed,” [l g” y]” , *wa-ye-ghal*]); Jth 3:1,9,10 (see Fritzsche, under the word), etc.

## VII. VERSIONS.

### 1. Greek:

The Greek text appears in three forms:

- (1) that of the principal Greek uncials (A, B, agreeing closely), which is followed in printed editions of the Septuagint (Septuagint);
- (2) that of codices 19, 108 (Lucian’s text), an evident revision of (1);
- (3) codex 58 which closely resembles (2) and with which the Old Latin and Peshitta agree in most points.

## 2. Syriac:

There are two extant Syriac VSS, both of them dependent on the Greek text (3) noted above. The Peshitta is given in Walton's Polyglot and in a critically revised form in Lagarde, *Lib. Vet. Test Apocrypha Syriac*, 104-26. The so-called Hexaplar Syriac text was made by Paul of Tella in the 6th century

## 3. Latin:

(1) The Old Latin seems to have been made from the Greek text, codex 58 (see above).

(2) Jerome made his Latin version (with which the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) is identical) from a lost Chaldee version. That this last is not the original text of the book is certain, because neither Origen nor his Jewish teachers knew anything of a Hebrew or Aramaic text of Judith.

## 4. Hebrew:

Several late Hebrew versions of the book have been found, no one of them with strong claims to be considered the original text, though Caster (see EB, II, col 2,642) does make such a claim for the manuscript found, edited and translated by him (see PSBA, XVI, 156-63). The Hebrews midrashes were made to be read in Jewish homes and vary according to the circumstances of their origin. But they agree in these points: Proper names are often omitted. Jerusalem is the scene of action, the wars being those of the Maccabees. Judith is a Jewish maiden and daughter of Ahitah, according to the Gaster MS, and she belongs apparently to the Maccabean family. It is Nicanor who is beheaded, the occasion being the Feast of Dedication; in the Gaster manuscript it is the king who is killed. Translations of these midrashes may be seen in Jellinck, *Beth Hammidrash*, I, 130-41; II, 12 f; Lepsius, *Zeitschr. fur wiss. Theologie*, 1867, 337 ff; Ball, *Speaker's Apocrypha*, I, 25 ff; Scholz, *Comm.2, Anhang I and II*; Gaster, in the work quoted Gaster argues that the much shorter form of the tale in his manuscript is older than the longer version. But if a writer were to expand a short story, he would hardly be likely to invent several proper names and to change others. It is probable that Judith came to be represented as a pure maiden (a virgin) under the influence of the low conception of marriage fostered in the medieval Christian church.



## LITERATURE.

For the editions of the Greek text and for commentaries on the Apocrypha, see under *APOCRYPHAL LITERATURE*. But on Judith note in particular the commentaries by Fritzsche and Ball, the latter containing elaborate bibliography. But the following must in addition be mentioned: Scholz, *Commentar uber das Buch Judith und uber Bel und Drache*, 1896; a 2nd edition has appeared; A.S. Weissmann, *Das Buch Judith historisch-kritisch beleuchtet*, Wien, 1891; Schurer, *GJV4*, III, 230-37, with full bibliography; compare HJP, II, iii, 32-37; Pentin, *The Apocrypha in English Lit.*, Judith, 1908; and the relevant articles in the *Bible dicts.*, especially that by F. C. Porter in *HDB*.

*T. Witton Davies*

### JUEL

<joo'-el> ((1) [<sup>ʾ</sup>Ιουνά, *Iouna*];

(2) [<sup>ʾ</sup>Ιουήλ, *Iouel*];

(1) 1 Esdras 9:34 = “Uel” in Ezr 10:34.

(2) 1 Esdras 9:35 = “Joel” in Ezr 10:43.

### JUGGLERY

<jug'-ler-i> [γοητία, *goetia*]: The word occurs once in 2 Macc 12:24 the Revised Version margin (the King James Version “craft,” the Revised Version (British and American) “crafty guile”).

### JUICE

<joo>, <jus>: The word occurs once in <sup><280></sup>Song of Solomon 8:2 (translation of [sys⌈; *`acic*], the Revised Version margin “sweet wine”), and once in the Revised Version margin of <sup><806></sup>Job 6:6, where for “the white of an egg” margin reads, “the juice of purslain.” Septuagint has [ῥήμασιν, *rhemasin kenois*], “empty words.”

### JULIA

<joo'-li-a> ([<sup>ʾ</sup>Ιουλία, *Ioulia*]): The name of a Roman Christian to whom Paul sent greetings, the wife or sister of Philologus with whose name hers

is coupled (<sup><5165></sup>Romans 16:15). The name points to member of the imperial household.

## JULIUS

<joo'-li-us> ([<sup>᾽</sup>Ιούλιος, *Ioulios*]): The centurion of the Augustan cohort under whose charge Paul was sent a prisoner to Rome (<sup><420></sup>Acts 27:1,3).

*See ARMY, ROMAN; BAND, AUGUSTAN.*

## JUMPING

<jum'-ping>.

*See GAMES.*

## JUNIAS; JUNIA

<joo'-ni-as> or <joo'-ni-a> ([<sup>᾽</sup>Ιουνίας, *Iounias*], [<sup>᾽</sup>Ιουνία, *Iounia*]): One to whom, with Andronicus, greetings are sent by Paul at the close of his letter to the Romans (<sup><5167></sup>Romans 16:7). The name may be masculine, Junias, a contraction of Junianus, or feminine Junia; it is [*Iounian*], the accus. form, that is given. In all probability this is the masc., Junias. Paul defines the two as

- (1) “my kinsmen,”
- (2) “my fellow-prisoners,”
- (3) “who are of note among the apostles,” and
- (4) “who also have been in Christ before me.”

(1) They were Jews. Paul calls the Jews “my brethren,” “my kinsmen according to the flesh” (<sup><5168></sup>Romans 9:3). Because Prisca and Aquila, a Jew and Jewess, are not designated as kinsfolk, Conybeare and Howson suppose “the epithet to denote that the persons mentioned were of the tribe of Benjamin.”

(2) They had been companions of Paul in some unrecorded imprisonment. The phrase denotes more than the fact that they, like Paul, had suffered imprisonment for the sake of Christ.

(3) This may mean

(a) that they were well known to the apostolic circle (so Gifford and Weiss), or

(b) distinguished as apostles. The latter is probably correct, “apostle” being used in a wide sense (compare <sup><4537></sup>1 Corinthians 15:7). The prophetic ministry of the early church consisted of apostles, prophets and teachers (<sup><4128></sup>1 Corinthians 12:28; <sup><4041></sup>Ephesians 4:11), the apostles being missionaries in the modern sense (see Lindsay, Church and Ministry, chapter iii). Some apostles were missionaries sent out by particular churches (<sup><4132></sup>Acts 13:2,3; <sup><4183></sup>2 Corinthians 8:23; Phil 2:25).

(4) They were among the first converts, “early disciples” like Mnason of Cyprus (<sup><4216></sup>Acts 21:16).

*S. F. Hunter*

## JUNIPER

<joo'-ni-per> ([<sup>μ</sup>τρο<sup>ο</sup>rothem]; [<sup>ῥ</sup>αθμέν, *rhathmen*], <sup><1194></sup>1 Kings 19:4 f, margin “broom”; <sup><8004></sup>Psalms 120:4, m “broom”; <sup><8304></sup>Job 30:4 translated “broom”): This is quite certainly the Arabic ratam (*Retama retem*, Natural Order, Leguminosae), a variety of broom which is one of the most characteristic shrubs of the deserts of Southern Palestine and southward to Egypt. Though the shade it affords is but scanty, in the absence of other shrubs it is frequently used by desert travelers as a refuge from the sun’s scorching rays (compare <sup><1194></sup>1 Kings 19:4). The root yields good charcoal, giving out much heat (<sup><8004></sup>Psalms 120:4). For people to be reduced to chew it for nourishment betokens the lowest depth of starvation (<sup><8304></sup>Job 30:4). Indeed so hopeless is this root as a source of food that many commentators believe that the accepted text is in error, and by altering a single letter, substituting the Hebrew letter, cheth, (“ch”) for he (“h”), they get a reading, which has been adopted in the Revised Version margin, “to warm them” instead of “their meat,” which certainly is much more probable.

*E. W. G. Masterman*

## JUPITER

<joo'-pi-ter>, <ju'-pi-ter> ([<sup>Ζ</sup>εύς, *Zeus*]): “Jupiter” is mentioned in 2 Macc 6:2; <sup><4442></sup>Acts 14:12,13, with “Zeus” in the Revised Version margin in all cases. In addition the Greek stem appears in [<sup>δ</sup>ιοπετοῦς, *diopetous*], in <sup><4435></sup>Acts 19:35, English Versions of the Bible “which fell down from

Jupiter”; but the word means “from the clear sky” (compare “from heaven” in the Revised Version margin). “Jupiter” was considered the Latin equivalent of the Greek “Zeus,” the highest god in the developed Greek pantheon, and Zeus in turn, in accord with the syncretism of the period, was identified with countless deities in the local cults of Asia Minor and elsewhere. So in <sup><4442></sup>Acts 14:12,13, “Zeus” and “Hermes” are local deities that had been renamed. On the other hand, the Zeus of 2 Macc 6:2 is the genuine Greek deity, who had been adopted as a special patron by Antiochus Epiphanes and to whose temple in Athens Antiochus had contributed largely. The title “Olympius” (2 Macc 6:2) is derived from the early worship on Mt. Olympus, but had come to be thought one of the god’s highest appellations; Xenios, “protector of strangers,” was a title in a cult particularly popular with travelers.

*See ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION, and Smith, HGHL, 333-34.*

*Burton Scott Easton*

## JUPITER AND MERCURY

*See ASTROLOGY, III, 1; MERCURY; JUPITER.*

## JURISDICTION

<sup><joo-ris-dik'-shun></sup> ([ἐξουσία, *exousia*): The word [ἐξουσία, *exousia*] is well known in New Testament Greek. It is derived from the word [*exesti*], and suggests the absence of any hindrance to an act. It contains the idea of right and might (Cremer). In the New Testament it means right, authority, capability (<sup><8191></sup>Romans 9:21); power, strength (<sup><4008></sup>Matthew 9:8); right and might (<sup><8192></sup>John 5:27). Thus it gets the meaning of the powers of the magistrate, which it bears in later Greek (<sup><3081></sup>Titus 3:1; <sup><5103></sup>Romans 13:1-3). And in this sense it is used in <sup><2707></sup>Luke 23:7, where it is translated “jurisdiction.”

## JUSHAB-HESED

<sup><joo'-shab-he'-sed></sup> ([dsj ,nv" Wy, *yushabh checedh*], “loving-kindness is returned”): Son of Zerubbabel. The name is probably symbolical (<sup><1380></sup>1 Chronicles 3:20); compare *SHEAR-JASHUB*.

## JUSTICE

<jus'-tis> ([hqdχ] *tsedhaqah*); [qdχ, *tsedheq*]; [δικαιοσύνη, *dikaiosune*]): The original Hebrew and Greek words are the same as those rendered “righteousness.” This is the common rendering, and in about half the cases where we have “just” and “justice” in the King James Version, the American Standard Revised Version has changed to “righteous” and “righteousness.” It must be constantly borne in mind that the two ideas are essentially the same.

See *RIGHTEOUSNESS*.

### 1. HUMAN JUSTICE:

Justice had primarily to do with conduct in relation to others, especially with regard to the rights of others. It is applied to business, where just weights and measures are demanded (<sup><1695></sup>Leviticus 19:35,36; <sup><1513></sup>Deuteronomy 25:13-16; <sup><3085></sup>Amos 8:5; <sup><2000></sup>Proverbs 11:1; 16:11; <sup><1519></sup>Ezekiel 45:9,10). It is demanded in courts, where the rights of rich and poor, Israelite and sojourner, are equally to be regarded. Neither station nor bribe nor popular clamor shall influence judge or witness. “Justice, justice shalt thou follow” (<sup><1513></sup>Deuteronomy 16:20 m; compare 16:18-20; Exodus 23:1-3,6-9). In general this justice is contrasted with that wickedness which “feared not God, and regarded not man” (<sup><2000></sup>Luke 18:2).

In a larger sense justice is not only giving to others their rights, but involves the active duty of establishing their rights. So Israel waits upon God’s justice or cries out: “The justice due to me (literally, “my justice”) is passed away from my God” (<sup><2407></sup>Isaiah 40:27). Yahweh is to show her to be in the right as over against the nations. Justice here becomes mercy. To “seek justice” means to “relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow” (<sup><2407></sup>Isaiah 1:17; compare 11:4; <sup><2425></sup>Jeremiah 22:15,16; <sup><1812></sup>Psalms 82:2-4). The same idea appears in <sup><1542></sup>Deuteronomy 24:12,13; <sup><1871></sup>Psalms 37:21,26; 112:4-6, where the translation is “righteous” instead of “just.”

In this conception of justice the full meaning of the New Testament is not yet reached. It does not mean sinlessness or moral perfection. Job knows the sin in his heart (<sup><1813></sup>Job 13:23,26; 7:21), and yet speaks of himself as a just or righteous man (12:4; 13:18). The Psalmist confidently depends

upon the righteousness of God though he knows that no man is righteous in God's sight (~~1930~~ Psalm 143:1,2; compare 7:8; 18:20-24). It is not a lack of humility or dependence upon God when the Psalmist asks to be judged according to his righteousness. In relation to God, the just, or righteous, man is the one who holds to God and trusts in Him (~~1938~~ Psalm 33:18-22). This is not the later Judaistic legalism with its merit and reward, where God's justice is simply a matter of giving each man what he has earned.

The word "justice" does not occur in the New Testament, and in most cases where we find "just" in the King James Version it is changed to "righteous" in the American Standard Revised Version. The idea of justice or righteousness (remembering that these are essentially the same) becomes more spiritual and ethical in the New Testament. It is a matter of character, and God's own spirit is the standard (~~1917~~ 1 John 3:7; ~~1918~~ Matthew 5:48). The mere give-and-take justice is not enough. We are to be merciful, and that to all. The ideal is righteousness, not rights. As Holtzmann says, "The keynote of the Sermon on the Mount is justitia and not jus."

## 2. JUSTICE OF GOD:

God's justice, or righteousness, is founded in His essential nature. But, just as with man, it is not something abstract, but is seen in His relation to the world. It is His kingship establishing and maintaining the right. It appears as retributive justice, "that reaction of His holy will, as grounded in His eternal being, against evil wherever found." He cannot be indifferent to good and evil (~~1913~~ Habakkuk 1:13). The great prophets, Isaiah, Micah, Amos, Hosea, all insist upon Yahweh's demand for righteousness.

But this is not the main aspect of God's justice. Theology has been wont to set forth God's justice as the fundamental fact in His nature with which we must reconcile His mercy as best we may, the two being conceived as in conflict. As a matter of fact, the Scriptures most often conceive God's justice, or righteousness, as the action of His mercy. Just as with man justice means the relief of the oppressed and needy, so God's justice is His kingly power engaged on behalf of men, and justice and mercy are constantly joined together. He is "a just God and a Saviour" (~~1912~~ Isaiah 45:21). "I bring near my righteousness (or "justice") .... and my salvation shall not tarry" (~~1913~~ Isaiah 46:13; compare ~~1914~~ Psalm 51:14; 103:17; 71:15; 116:5; ~~1915~~ Isaiah 51:5,6). The "righteous acts of Yahweh" mean His deeds of deliverance (~~1911~~ Judges 5:11). And so Israel sings of the justice, or

judgments, or righteousness of Yahweh (they are the same), and proclaims her trust in these (<sup><1977></sup>Psalm 7:17; 35:23,24,28; 36:6; 140:12,13; 50:5,6; 94:14,15; 103:6; 143:1).

The New Testament, too, does not lack the idea of retributive justice. The Son of Man “shall render unto every man according to his deeds” (<sup><167></sup>Matthew 16:27; compare 25:14-46; <sup><126></sup>Luke 12:45-48; <sup><112></sup>Romans 2:2-16; 6:23; <sup><150></sup>2 Corinthians 5:10; <sup><134></sup>Colossians 3:24,25; <sup><108></sup>2 Thessalonians 1:8,9; <sup><112></sup>Hebrews 2:2,3; 10:26-31). But God’s justice is far more than this. The idea of merit and reward is really superseded by a higher viewpoint in the teaching of Jesus. He speaks, indeed, of recompense, but it is the Father and not the judge that gives this (<sup><112></sup>Matthew 6:1,4,6,18). And it is no mere justice of earth, because the reward transcends all merit (<sup><146></sup>Matthew 24:46,47; <sup><112></sup>Mark 10:30; <sup><127></sup>Luke 12:37). This is grace not desert (<sup><170></sup>Luke 17:10). And the parable of <sup><110></sup>Matthew 20:1-15 gives at length the deathblow to the whole Judaistic scheme of merit and reward.

And God’s justice is not merely gracious, but redemptive. It not simply apportions rights, it establishes righteousness. Thus, just as in the Old Testament, the judge is the Saviour. The difference is simply here: in the Old Testament the salvation was more national and temporal, here it is personal and spiritual. But mercy is opposed to justice no more here than in the Old Testament. It is by the forgiveness of sins that God establishes righteousness, and this is the supreme task of justice. Thus it is that God is at the same time “just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus” (<sup><112></sup>Romans 3:26). “He is faithful and righteous (or “just”; see the King James Version) to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness” (<sup><109></sup>1 John 1:9).

## LITERATURE.

*See Comm., and Biblical Theologies under “Justice” and “Righteousness,” and especially Cremer, Biblical-Theol. Lex. of New Testament Greek*

**Harris Franklin Rall**

## JUSTIFICATION

<jus-ti-fi-ka'-shun> ([qdx, tsedheq], verb [qdx; tsadheq]; Septuagint and New Testament [δικαίωμα, *dikaïoma*], [δικαίωσις, *dikaïosis*], verb [δικαίω, *dikaïoo*], “justification” “to justify,” in a legal sense, the declaring just or righteous. In Biblical literature, [δικαιοῦν, *dikaïoun*], without denying the real righteousness of a person, is used invariably or almost invariably in a declarative or forensic sense. See Simon, HDB, II, 826; Thayer, Grimm, and Cremer under the respective words):

### I. THE WRITINGS OF PAUL.

#### 1. *The Universality of Sin:*

In this article reference will first be made to the writings of Paul, where justification receives its classic expression, and from there as a center, the other New Testament writers, and finally the Old Testament, will be drawn in. According to Paul, justification rests on the following presuppositions:

The universality of sin. All men are not only born in sin (<sup><Eph></sup>Ephesians 2:3), but they have committed many actual transgressions, which render them liable to condemnation. Paul proves this by an appeal to the Old Testament witnesses (<sup><Rom></sup>Romans 3:9 ff), as well as by universal experience, both of the heathen (<sup><Rom></sup>Romans 1:18-32) and Jews (<sup><Rom></sup>Romans 2:17-28; 3:9).

#### 2. *Perfection of the Law of God:*

The perfection of the Law of God and the necessity of its perfect observance, if justification is to come by it (<sup><Rom></sup>Romans 3:10). The modern notion of God as a good-natured, more or less nonchalant ruler, to whom perfect holiness is not inexorable, was not that of Paul. If one had indeed kept the law, God could not hold him guilty (<sup><Rom></sup>Romans 2:13), but such an obedience never existed. Paul had no trouble with the law as such. Those who have tried to find a difference here between Galatians and Romans have failed. The reminder that the law was ordained by angels (<sup><Gal></sup>Galatians 3:19) does not mean that it was not also given by God. It might be reckoned in a sense among the elements of the world ([kosmos], <sup><Gal></sup>Galatians 4:3), as it is an essential part of an ordered universe, but that does not at all mean that it is not also holy, right and good (<sup><Rom></sup>Romans 7:12). It was added, of course, on account of transgressions (<sup><Gal></sup>Galatians 3:19), for it is only a world of intelligent, free spirits capable of sin which



needs it, and its high and beautiful sanctions make the sin seem all the more sinful (~~EBB~~ Romans 7:13).

### *3. Life, Work and Death of the Atoning Savior:*

It was fundamental in Paul's thinking that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures (~~EBB~~ 1 Corinthians 15:3). In due season He died for the ungodly (~~EBB~~ Romans 5:6); while we were yet sinners He died for us (~~EBB~~ Romans 5:8); we are justified in His blood (~~EBB~~ Romans 5:9), and it is through Him that we are saved from the wrath (~~EBB~~ Romans 5:9). While we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son (~~EBB~~ Romans 5:10), being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus whom God set forth as a propitiation (~~EBB~~ Romans 3:24,25). There is no reconciliation, no justification, except through and by and for Christ.

#### **(1) Paul's Own Experience.**

Paul's own experience cannot be left out of the account. He lived through the doctrine, as well as found it through illumination of the Spirit in the Old Testament. It was not that he had only outwardly kept the law. He had been jealous for it, and had been blameless in every requirement of its righteousness (Phil 3:6). What was borne in upon him was how little such blamelessness could stand before the absolute standard of God. Just how far he was shaken with doubts of this kind we cannot say with certainty; but it seems impossible to conceive the Damascus conversion scene in the case of such an upright man and strenuous zealot without supposing a psychological preparation, without supposing doubts as to whether his fulfilling of the law enabled him to stand before God. Now, for a Pharisaically educated man like himself, there was no way of overcoming these doubts but in a renewed struggle for his own righteousness shown in the fiery zeal of his Damascus journey, pressing on even in the blazing light of noonday. This conversion broke down his philosophy of life, his Lebensgewissheit, his assurance of salvation through works of the law done never so conscientiously and perfectly. The revelation of the glorified Christ, with the assurance that He, the God-sent Messiah, was the very one whom he was persecuting, destroyed his dependence on his own righteousness, a righteousness which had led him to such shocking consequences. Although this was for him an individual experience, yet it had universal applications. It showed him that there was an inherent

weakness in the law through flesh, that is, through the whole physical, psychical and spiritual nature of man considered as sinful, as working only on this lower plane, and that the law needed bracing and illuminating by the Son, who, though sent in the likeness of the flesh of sin, yet (as an offering) for sin condemned sin and cast it out (~~<RB>~~Romans 8:3), to the end that the law might be fulfilled in those who through Him walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit (~~<RB>~~Romans 8:4). That was the glory of the new righteousness thus revealed. If the law had been able to do that, to give life, Christ need not have come, righteousness would have been by the law (~~<RB>~~Galatians 3:21). But the facts show that the law was not thus able, neither the law written on the heart given to all, nor the law given to Moses (~~<RB>~~Romans 1:18 through 3:19). Therefore every mouth is stopped, and all flesh is silent before God. On the ground of law-keeping, what the modern man would call morality, our hope of salvation has been shattered. The law has spoken its judgment against us (~~<RB>~~Galatians 3:10). It cannot therefore lead us to righteousness and life, nor was that its supreme intention: it was a pedagogue or tutor (“paidagogos”) to lead us to Christ that we might be justified by faith (~~<RB>~~Galatians 3:24; see Ihmels in RE3, 16, 483-84). What made Paul to differ from his companions in the faith was that his own bitter experience under the revelation of Christ had led him to these facts.

## **(2) The Resurrection Connected with the Death.**

It was remarked above that the ground of justification according to Paul is the work of Christ. This means especially. His death as a sacrifice, in which, as Ritschl well says (Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung, 3. Aufl., 1899, II 157), the apostles saw exercised the whole power of His redemption. But that death cannot be separated from His resurrection, which first awakened them to a knowledge of its decisive worth for salvation, as well as finally confirmed their faith in Jesus as the Son of God. “The objective salvation,” says Ritschl (p. 158), “which was connected with the sacrificial death of Christ and which continued on for the church, was made secure by this, that it was asserted also as an attribute of the resurrected one,” who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification (~~<RB>~~Romans 4:25). But this last expression is not to be interpreted with literal preciseness, as though Paul intended to distinguish between the forgiveness of sins as brought about by the death, and justification, by the resurrection, for both forgiveness and justification are identified in ~~<RB>~~Romans 4:6-8. It was the resurrection which gave Christians their assurance concerning Christ (~~<H73>~~Acts 17:31); by that

resurrection He has been exalted to the right hand of God, where He maketh intercession for His people (~~4084~~Romans 8:34), which mediatorship is founded upon His death — the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (~~4038~~Revelation 13:8 m; compare Greek text).

B. Weiss well says: “It was by the certainty of the exaltation of Christ to Messianic sovereignty brought about by the resurrection that Paul attained to faith in the saving significance of His death, and not conversely.

Accordingly, the assurance that God cannot condemn us is owing primarily to the death of Christ, but still more to His resurrection and exaltation to God’s right hand (~~4084~~Romans 8:34), inasmuch as these first prove that His death was the death of the mediator of salvation, who has redeemed us from condemnation. .... The objective atonement was accomplished by the death of Christ, but the appropriation of it in justification is possible only if we believe in the saving significance of His death, and we can attain to faith in that only as it is sealed by the resurrection” (Biblical Theology of the New Testament, I, 436-37).

### **(3) Faith, Not Works, the Means of Justification.**

The means or condition of justification is faith (~~4082~~Romans 3:22,25,26,28, etc.) which rests upon the pure grace of God and is itself, therefore, His gift (~~4008~~Ephesians 2:8). This making faith the only instrument of justification is not arbitrary, but because, being the receptive attitude of the soul, it is in the nature of the case the only avenue through which Divine blessing can come. The gifts of God are not against the laws of the soul which He has made, but rather are in and through those laws. Faith is the hand outstretched to the Divine Giver, who, though He sends rain without our consent, does not give salvation except through an appropriate spiritual response. This faith is not simply belief in historical facts, though this is presupposed as to the atoning death (~~4085~~Romans 3:25), and the resurrection (~~4009~~Romans 10:9) of Jesus, but is a real heart reception of the gift (~~4000~~Romans 10:10), and is therefore able to bring peace in our relation to God (~~4001~~Romans 5:1). The object of this faith is Jesus Christ (~~4082~~Romans 3:22, etc.), through whom only comes the gift of righteousness and the reigning in life (~~4057~~Romans 5:17), not Mary, not angels, not doctrine, not the church, but Jesus only. This, to be sure, does not exclude God the Father as an object of faith, as the redeeming act of Christ is itself the work of God (~~4059~~2 Corinthians 5:19), whose love expressed itself toward us in this way (~~4008~~Romans 5:8). Faith in the only

one God is always presupposed (~~406~~ 1 Corinthians 8:6), but it was the apostolic custom rather to refer repentance to God and faith to Christ (~~407~~ Acts 20:21). But the oneness of God the Father and Christ the Son in a work of salvation is the best guaranty of the Divinity of the latter, both as an objective fact and as an inner experience of the Christian.

The justification being by faith, it is not by works or by love, or by both in one. It cannot be by the former, because they are lacking either in time or amount or quality, nor could they be accepted in any case until they spring from a heart renewed, for which faith is the necessary presupposition. It cannot be by the latter, for it exists only where the Spirit has shed it abroad in the heart (~~408~~ Romans 5:5), the indispensable prerequisite for receiving which is faith. This does not mean that the crown of Christianity is not love, for it is (~~409~~ 1 Corinthians 13:13); it means only that the root is faith. Nor can love be foisted in as a partial condition of justification on the strength of the word often quoted for that purpose, "faith working through love" (~~410~~ Galatians 5:6). The apostle is speaking here only of those who are already "in Christ," and he says that over against the Galatian believers bringing in a lot of legal observances, the only availing thing is not circumcision or its lack, but faith energizing through love. Here the interest is, as Ritschl says (II, 343), in the kingdom of God, but justification proper has reference to the sinner in relation to God and Christ. See the excellent remarks of Bruce, *Paul's Conception of Christianity*, 1894, 226-27. At the same time this text reveals the tremendous ethical religious force abiding in faith, according to Paul. It reminds us of the great sentence of Luther in his preface to the Epistles to the Romans, where he says: "Faith is a Divine work within us which changes and renews us in God according to ~~411~~ John 1:13, 'who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.' This destroys the old Adam and makes new creatures of us in heart, will, disposition, and all our powers. Oh, faith is a living, active, jealous, mighty thing, inasmuch as it cannot possibly remain unproductive of good works" (Werke, Erl. Ausg., 63, 124-25).

#### **(4) Baptism also Eliminated.**

Not only are good works and love removed as conditions or means of justification of the sinner, but baptism is also eliminated. According to Paul, it is the office of baptism not to justify, but to cleanse, that is, symbolically to set forth and seal the washing away of sin and the entrance into the new life by a dramatic act of burial, which for the subject and all

witnesses would mark a never-to-be-forgotten era in the history of the believer. “Baptism,” says Weiss (I, 454), “presupposes faith in Him as the one whom the church designates as Lord, and also binds to adherence to Him which excludes every dependence upon any other, inasmuch as He has acquired a claim upon their devotion by the saving deed of His self-surrender on the cross.” So important was baptism in the religious atmosphere at that time that hyperbolical expressions were used to express its cleansing and illuminating office, but these need not mislead us. We must interpret them according to the fundamental conceptions of Christianity as a religion of the Spirit, not of magic nor of material media. Baptism pointed to a complete parting with the old life by previous renewal through faith in Christ, which renewal baptism in its turn sealed and announced in a climax of self-dedication to him, and this, while symbolically and in contemporary parlance of both Jew and Gentile called a new birth, was probably often actually so in the psychological experience of the baptized. But while justification is often attributed to faith, it is never to baptism.

### (5) Elements of Justification.

What are the elements of this justification? There are two:

#### (a) Forgiveness of Sins

Forgiveness of sins (~~4015~~ Romans 4:5-8; compare ~~4138~~ Acts 13:38,39). With this are connected peace and reconciliation (~~4811~~ Romans 5:1,9,10; compare 10:11).

#### (b) The Declaring or Approving as Righteous

The declaring or approving as righteous or just (~~4813~~ Romans 3:21-30; 4:2-9,22; 5:1,9-11,16-21, etc.). C.F. Schmid is perfectly right when he says that Paul (and James) always uses [*dikaïoun*] in the sense of esteeming and pronouncing and treating as righteous, both according to the measure of the law (~~4813~~ Romans 2:13; 3:20) and also according to grace (Biblical Theology of the New Testament, 1870, 497). The word is a forensic one, and Godet goes so far as to say that the word is never used in all Greek literature for making righteous (Commentary on Romans, English translation, I, 157, American edition, 95). This is shown further by the fact that it is the ungodly who are justified (~~4015~~ Romans 4:5), and that the justification is a reckoning or imputation (*logizesthai*) of righteousness

(~~4045~~ Romans 4:6,22), not an infusing or making righteous. The contrast of “to justify” is not “to be a sinner” but is “to accuse” or “to condemn” (~~4083~~ Romans 8:33,14), and the, contrast of “justification” is “condemnation” (~~4058~~ Romans 5:18). Besides, it is not the infusing of a new life, of a new holiness, which is counted for righteousness, but it is faith which is so counted (~~4045~~ Romans 4:5; Phil 3:9). That upon which God looks when He justifies is not the righteousness He has imparted or is to impart, but the atonement He has made in Christ. It is one of the truest paradoxes of Christianity that unless a righteous life follows, there has been no justification, while the justification itself is for the sake of Christ alone through faith alone. It is a “status, rather than a character,” says Stevens (The Pauline Theology, 1892, 265); “it bears the stamp of a legal rather than of an ethical conception,” and he refers to the elaborate and convincing proof of the forensic character of Paul’s doctrine of justification,” in Morison, Exposition of Romans, chapter III, 163-200. An interesting illustration of how further study may correct a wrong impression is given by Lipsius, who, in his *Die Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre*, 1853, maintained that righteousness or justification meant not “exclusively an objectively given external relation to God, but always at the same time a real inner condition of righteousness” (p. 10), whereas in his *Lehrbuch der evangelisch-protestantischen Dogmatik*, 1876, 3. Aufl., 1893, he makes the righteousness of God properly an “objective gift of grace, not simply in the sense in which the Old Testament just one judged his position of salvation as a gift of grace, but as a righteousness specially reckoned and adjudicated by way of grace and acknowledged before the judgment (or court, Gericht) of God” (~~4045~~ Romans 4:6; compare 4:1-8,11; 3:23; ~~4086~~ Galatians 3:6). This is always the meaning of *dikaïoun*, *dikaïousthai*, or *dikaïosis* in Paul. It consists in the not-reckoning of sins,” etc. (p. 658). Of course justification is only a part of the process of salvation, which includes regeneration and sanctification, but these are one thing and justification is another.

### **(6) Justification Has to Do with the Individual.**

Finally it is asked whether justification in Paul’s mind has to do with the individual believer or with the society or Christian congregation. Ritschl (II, 217 f) and Sanday-Headlam (The Epistle to the Rom, 122-23) say the latter; Weiss (I, 442), the former. It is indeed true that Paul refers to the church as purchased with Christ’s blood (~~4085~~ Acts 20:28, or God’s blood, according to the two oldest manuscripts and ancient authorities; compare

⌚Ephesians 5:25), and he uses the pronoun “we” as those who have received redemption, etc. (⌚Colossians 1:14; ⌚Ephesians 2:18); but it is evident on the other hand that faith is an individual matter, a thing first between man and his God, and only after a man has been united to Christ by faith can he enter into a spiritual fellowship with fellow-believers. Therefore the subject of justification must be in the first place the individual, and only in the second place and by consequence the society. Besides, those justified are not the cleansed and sanctified members of churches, but the ungodly (⌚Romans 4:5).

As to the argument from baptism urged by Sanday-Headlam, it must be said that Paul always conceives of baptism as taking place in the Christian community with believers and for believers, that that for and to which they are baptized is not justification, but the death and resurrection of Christ (⌚Romans 6:3,4), and that the righteousness of God has been manifested not through baptism but through faith in Jesus Christ unto all that believe (⌚Romans 3:22), being justified freely, not through baptism, but through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus (⌚Romans 3:24). With Paul baptism has always a mystical significance as symbolizing and externally actualizing union with the death of the Lord, and would be both impossible and impertinent in the case of those not already believers in Christ and thus inwardly united to His society.

## II. THE OTHER NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS.

So much for Paul. Let us now take a glance at the other New Testament books. It is a commonplace of theology that is called “modern” or “critical,” that Paul and not Jesus is the founder of Christianity as we know it, that the doctrines of the Divinity of Christ, atonement, justification, etc., are Paul’s work, and not his Master’s. There is truth in this. It was part of the humiliation of Christ as well as His pedagogical method to live, teach and act under the conditions of His time and country, on the background of Palestine of 30 AD; and it was specially His method to do His work and not His disciples’, to live a life of love and light, to die for the sins of the world, and then go back to the Father that the Holy Spirit might come and lead His followers into all truth. A full statement of the doctrines of Christianity on His part would have been premature (⌚John 16:12), would have been pedagogically unwise, if not worthless. First the blade, then the ear, then the full grain in the ear (⌚Mark 4:28). It would also have been spiritually and philosophically impossible, for Christianity was



not a set of teachings by Christ — but a religion springing out of His life, death, resurrection, ascension, intercession, mediatorial activity in history through the Spirit who works in His disciples and on the world through and by that life, death, etc. The only question is whether the apostles were true to the spirit and content of His teachings in its moral and religious outlines. And especially in this matter of justification, a teaching by Christ is not to be looked for, because it is the very peculiarity of it that its middle point is the exalted Lord, who has become the mediator of salvation by His death and resurrection. Did the Pauline doctrine fit into the concrete situation made by the facts of Christ mentioned above, and was it the necessary consequence of His self-witness? Let us look into the Synoptic Gospels.

### *1. The Synoptic Gospels:*

So far is it from being true, as Harnack says (What Is Christianity? 2nd edition, revised, New York, 1901, 68), that the “whole of Jesus’ message may be reduced to these two heads: God as Father, and the human soul so ennobled that it can and does unite with Him,” that an essential part of His message is omitted, namely, that salvation is bound up in His (Christ’s) own person. (The reader is asked to verify the references for himself, as space will not allow quotation.) See <sup><4007></sup>Matthew 10:37-39; 16:24-27. Confession of Him (not simply of the Father) determines acknowledgment above (<sup><4002></sup>Matthew 10:32), where judgment is rendered according to our attitude to Him in His unfortunate ones (<sup><4055></sup>Matthew 25:35 ff). No sooner was His person rightly estimated than He began to unfold the necessity of His death and resurrection (<sup><4001></sup>Matthew 16:21). The evening before that death occurred, He brings out its significance, perpetuates the lesson in the institution of the Supper (<sup><4104></sup>Mark 14:24), and reenforces it after His resurrection (<sup><4205></sup>Luke 24:26). Paul himself could hardly have expressed the fact of the atonement through Christ’s death more decisively than <sup><4008></sup>Matthew 20:28; 26:28. With this foundation, could the Christian doctrine of salvation take any other course than that it actually did take? Instead of referring men to the Father, Christ forgives sins Himself (<sup><4002></sup>Matthew 9:2-6), and He reckons all men as needing this forgiveness (<sup><4002></sup>Matthew 6:12). While the time had not arrived for the Pauline doctrine of righteousness, Jesus prepared the way for it, negatively, in demanding a humble sense of sin (<sup><4005></sup>Matthew 5:3), inner fitness and perfection (<sup><4005></sup>Matthew 5:6,8,20,48), and positively in requiring recourse to Him by those who felt the burden of their sins (<sup><4008></sup>Matthew 11:28), to Him who



was the rest-giver, and not simply to God the Father, a passage of which <sup><R1></sup>Romans 5:1 is an echo. For it was specially to those to whom, as to the awakened Paul, the law brought condemnation that He came, came to heal and to save (<sup><M27></sup>Mark 2:17; <sup><M93></sup>Matthew 9:13; <sup><L57></sup>Luke 15:7). It was for sinners and to sinners that He came (<sup><L52></sup>Luke 15:2; 7:39; 19:7; <sup><M19></sup>Matthew 11:19), just as Paul understood; and the way for their salvation was not better law-keeping, but trusting prayer in the confession of sin (<sup><L83></sup>Luke 18:13), really equivalent to faith, the humble heart and a hunger for righteousness (= faith). See <sup><M8></sup>Matthew 5:3,6. He who brings most of himself, of his own pride and works, is the least likely to obtain the kingdom of heaven (<sup><M8></sup>Matthew 18:3,1; <sup><M4></sup>Mark 10:14). Not only entrance, but the final reward itself is of grace (<sup><M30></sup>Matthew 19:30; 20:1-16), a parable in the true spirit of Paul, and in anticipation of whose message was the promise of Paradise to the penitent robber (<sup><L23></sup>Luke 23:43). At the very beginning the message sounded out, "Repent ye, and believe in the gospel" (<sup><M15></sup>Mark 1:15), the gospel which was summed up in Christ, who would gather the people, not directly to God the Father, but to Himself (<sup><M37></sup>Matthew 23:37). All this means justification through that faith in Himself, in His Divine-human manifestation (<sup><M63></sup>Matthew 16:13-16), of which faith He expresses Himself with anxiety in <sup><L8></sup>Luke 18:8, and the presence of which he greeted with joy in <sup><M80></sup>Matthew 8:10. Ihmels is right therefore in holding (RE3, XVI, 490) that Paul's proclamation was continuous with the self-witness of Jesus, which conversely pointed as a consequence to the witness of Paul.

## *2. John's Writings:*

Justification by faith is not more implicit in John's Gospel than in the first three; it is only more explicit (<sup><R14></sup>John 3:14-16). Eternal life is the blessing secured, but this of course is only possible to one not under condemnation (<sup><R36></sup>John 3:36). The new Sonship of God came also in the wake of the same faith (<sup><R12></sup>John 1:12). The Epistles of John vary from Paul in word rather than in substance. The atoning work of Jesus is still in the background; walking in the light is not conceivable in those under condemnation and without faith; and the confession of sins that leads to forgiveness seems only another name for the justification that brings peace (<sup><J10></sup>1 John 1:9,10; compare 2:1,2). Everything is, as with Paul (<sup><E27></sup>Ephesians 2:7; <sup><T4></sup>Titus 3:4), led back to the love of God (<sup><J10></sup>1 John 3:1), who sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins (<sup><J10></sup>1 John 4:10).

### 3. 1 Peter and Hebrews:

Seeberg's point that the "Pauline doctrine of justification is not found in any other New Testament writer" (History of Doctrine, I, 48) is true when you emphasize the word "doctrine." Paul gave it full scientific treatment, the others presuppose the fact, but do not unfold the doctrine. Peter's "Repent ye, and be baptized .... in the name of Jesus Christ" (~~<4008>~~ Acts 2:38) is meaningless unless faith were exercised in Christ. It is He in whom, though we **see** Him not, yet believing, we rejoice greatly with joy unspeakable (~~<4008>~~ 1 Peter 1:8), receiving the end of our faith, the salvation of our souls (~~<4009>~~ 1 Peter 1:9). It is only, however, through the precious blood as of a lamb without blemish, even that of Christ (~~<4019>~~ 1 Peter 1:19), and is only through Him that we are believers in God (~~<4021>~~ 1 Peter 1:21). The familiar expression, "Come to Jesus," which simply means have faith in Jesus for justification and salvation, goes back to Peter (~~<4021>~~ 1 Peter 2:4). The Epistle to the Hebrews has other interests to look after, but it does not deny faith, but rather exhorts us to draw near with a true heart in fullness of faith (10:22), which it lays at the foundation of all true religion, thinking and achievement (Hebrews 11). The writer can give no better exhortation than to look unto Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith (12:2), an exhortation in the true spirit of Paul, whose gospel of faith for justification is also summed up in 4:16.

### 4. Epistle of James:

We come lastly to the core of the matter in regard to New Testament representations of justification — the famous passage in ~~<5024>~~ James 2:14-26, which at first sight seems a direct blow at Paul. Here we are met by the interesting question of the date of James. As we cannot enter into this (*see JAMES, EPISTLE OF*), what we say must be independent of this question. A careful look at this vigorous and most valuable letter (valuable in its own place, which is not that of Paul's letters, in comparison with which it is a "right strawy epistle," as Luther truthfully said (Erl. Ausg., 63, 115; see also pp. 156-57), in saying which he did not mean to reject it as useless (straw has most important uses), but as giving the doctrine of salvation, for which we must look to Paul) will show us that contradiction on the part of James to Paul is apparent and not real.

(1) In this section James uses the word faith simply for intellectual belief in God, and especially in the unity of God (2:19; see also

context), whereas Paul uses it for a saving trust in Christ. As Feine well says (Theol. d. New Testament, Leipzig, 2 1911, 660-63), for Paul faith is the appropriation of the life-power of the heavenly Christ. Therefore he knows no faith which does not bring forth good works corresponding to it. What does not come from faith is sin. For James faith is subordination of man to the heavenly Christ (2:1), or it is theoretic acknowledgment of one God (2:19). Justification is for James a speaking just of him who is righteous, an analytical judgment. (Feine also says that James did not understand Paul, but he did not fight him. It was left to Luther through his deep religious experience first to understand Paul's doctrine of justification.)

**(2)** James uses the word “works” as meaning practical morality, going back behind legalism, behind Pharisaism, to the position of the Old Testament prophets, whereas Paul uses the word as meritorious action deserving reward.

**(3)** When James is thinking of a deeper view, faith stands central in Christianity (1:3,6; 2:1; 5:15).

**(4)** Paul also on his part is as anxious as James vitally to connect Christianity and good works through faith (~~1~~ 1 Thessalonians 1:3; ~~Galatians~~ Galatians 5:6; ~~1~~ 1 Corinthians 13:2; ~~Romans~~ Romans 2:6,7; see Mayor, The Epistle of Jas, 1892, lxxxviii ff; Franks, in DCG, I, 919-20; Findlay in HDB, 1-vol edition, 511).

**(5)** The whole argument of James is bent on preserving a real practical Christianity that is not content with words merely (2:15-16), but shows itself in deeds. He is not trying to show, as Paul, how men get rid of their guilt and become Christians, but how they prove the reality of their profession after they receive the faith. He is not only writing to Christians, as of course Paul was, but he was writing to them as Christians (“my brethren,” 2:14), as already justified and standing on the “faith of our Lord Jesus Christ” (2:1), whereas Paul was thinking of men, Gentile and Jew, shivering in their guilt before the Eternal Justice, and asking, How can we get peace with God? “There is not,” says Beyschlag (New Testament Theology, Edinburgh, 1895, I, 367-68), “an objective conflict between the Pauline and Jacobean doctrines; both forms of teaching exist peacefully beside each other. James thought of justification in the simple and most natural sense of justificatio justī, as

the Divine recognition of an actually righteous man, and he thought of it as the final judgment of God upon a man who is to stand in the last judgment and become a partaker of the final soteria (‘salvation’). Paul also demands as a requisite for this last judgment and the final soteria right works, the love that fulfills the law and the perfected sanctification, but he (except in <sup><813></sup>Romans 2:13) does not apply the expression [dikaïousthai] (‘to be justified’) to the final judgment of God, which recognizes this righteousness of life as actual. He applies it rather to that first sentence of God with which He graciously receives the believing sinner returning to Him, and takes him into fellowship with Himself.” Beyschlag rightly insists that James undoubtedly taught with the first apostles that whoever believes in Christ and is baptized receives the forgiveness of sins (<sup><428></sup>Acts 2:38; 3:19; 10:43), and that he would not have contested the Pauline idea of justification by grace on account of faith, insisting only that works must follow. Theologically, the chief if not the only difference is that James has not yet made the cross of Christ the center of his point of view, while the atonement was fundamental with all Paul’s thinking.

*See, further, JAMES, EPISTLE OF.*

### III. THE OLD TESTAMENT.

A word in conclusion as to the Old Testament. All the New Testament writers built on the Old Testament. That there should be a cleft or contradiction between the Old Testament and what we call the New Testament would have been to them inconceivable. But they realized that that was the early dawn, while they lived in the light of day. Abraham believed in Yahweh; and He reckoned it to him for righteousness (<sup><156></sup>Genesis 15:6; <sup><848></sup>Romans 4:3). Who does not keep all parts of the law all the time is condemned (<sup><576></sup>Deuteronomy 27:26 Septuagint; <sup><880></sup>Galatians 3:10; compare Psalm 14; 143:2; <sup><810></sup>Romans 3:20; see 3:9-20, and the references to the Old Testament in the American Standard Revised Version). The prophets insisted upon the practical works of righteousness — “What doth Yahweh require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?” (<sup><308></sup>Micah 6:8). No religious attitude or services could take the place of uprightness of life. This does not mean that the Old Testament writers understood that men were justified simply by their good deeds, for it was always believed that underneath all was the mercy and lovingkindness of God, whose forgiving

grace was toward the broken and contrite spirit, the iniquities of whom were to be carried by the Servant of Yahweh, who shall justify many (~~19478~~ Psalm 103:8-13; 85:10; ~~28715~~ Isaiah 57:15; 53:11, and many other passages).

#### IV. LATER DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE.

##### *1. Apostolic and Early Church Fathers:*

A brief statement now on the development of the doctrine in the Christian church. It is humiliating to confess that the witness immediately after the apostles (the apostolic Fathers) did not reach the serene heights of Paul, or even the lower levels of his brethren. There are passages which remind one of him, but one feels at once that the atmosphere is different. Christianity is conceived as a new law rather than as a gospel of the grace of God. We cannot go into the reasons for this: suffice it to say that in Gentile Christendom the presuppositions for that gospel failed, and the New Testament writings were not yet in the consciousness of the church to the extent that they dominated her thinking. The fine passage in Clement of Rome (97 AD, chapter xxxii: "They all therefore (i.e. Abraham and other early saints) were glorified and magnified, not through themselves or their own works or the righteous doings which they wrought, but through His (God's) will. And so we, having been called through His will in Christ Jesus, are not justified through ourselves or through our own wisdom or understanding or piety or works which we wrought in holiness of heart, but through faith, whereby the Almighty God justified all men that ever have been from the beginning; to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen.") is not at all on a paragraph with his whole Epistle, as he coordinates faith with other virtues in chapter xxxv, makes hospitality and godliness the saving virtues for Lot in chapter xi, couples hospitality and faith together as equal for Rahab in chapter xii, and represents forgiveness of sins through keeping commandments and love in chapter I. Ignatius (about 110-15 AD) speaks in one place about Jesus Christ dying for us, that believing on His death we might escape death (Tral. 2), but with him the real saving things are love, concord, obedience to bishops, and the indwelling God = Christ, though he has also the excellent passage: "None of these things is hidden from you if ye be perfect in your faith and love toward Jesus Christ, for these things are the beginning and end of life — faith is the beginning and love the end, and the two being found in unit are God, while all things else follow in their train unto true nobility" (Ephesians 14). The so-called

Barnabas (date uncertain) puts the death of Christ Jesus at the foundation of salvation, which is expressed by the remission of sins through His blood (Ephesians 5), the kingdom of Jesus being on the cross, so that they who set their hope on Him shall live forever (Ephesians 8), while at the time even believers are not yet justified (Ephesians 4), for which finally a whole series of works of light must be done and works of darkness avoided (Ephesians 19). The Shepherd of Hermas and the Ancient Homily = 2 Clem are even more moralistic, where with whatever praise of faith we have the beginning of merit. The same legalistic tone sounds through that invaluable little roll found by Bryennios in 1873 and first published by him in Constantinople in December, 1883, The Teaching (Didache) of the Twelve Apostles. That Catholic trend went forward till it is almost full-fledged as early as Tertullian (fl. 200 AD) and Cyprian (250 AD). See a full statement in my Cyprian, 1906, 146 ff. And thus it continued until — as far as our outline is concerned — it struck Augustine, bishop of Hippo (396 ff), who in a masterly and living way united, so far as they could be united, the Pauline thoughts of sin, grace, and justification with the regular Catholic legalism. His book, *De Spiritu et Litera* (412 AD), was largely after Paul's own heart, and the Reformers hailed it with joy. But the Catholic elements he still kept, as for instance, that in justification a good concupiscence and a good-will are infused, that justification grows, that our merits must be taken into the account even though they are God's merits, that the faith which justifies is a faith which works by love, that faith is the holding true what God (and the church) says, though occasionally a deeper view of faith is seen, and that works are emphasized, as in *De fide et operibus*, in a Catholic fashion. With profound and thoroughly Christian thoughts, Augustine had not so worked himself clear of his Catholic inheritance that he could reproduce Paul purely. He made a bridge by which we could go either back to Paul or forward to Aquinas. As Harnack well says, Augustine experienced, on the one hand, the last revival in the ancient church of the principle that "faith alone saves," and, on the other, he silenced that principle for a thousand years. The very Catholic theologian who stood nearest to that principle overcame it (*Zeitschrift f. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1891, 177). His misunderstanding of Paul's "faith that worketh through love" had momentous consequences.

## *2. Council of Trent:*

Those consequences are best seen in the decrees of the Council of Trent (Session 6, 1547), to which we now turn, and which are the definite and

final crystallization of the medieval development, so far as that development was Catholic.

(1) Justification is a translation from a natural state to a state of grace. With this works prevenient grace, awakening and assisting, and with this in his man cooperates and prepares himself for justification. This cooperation has the merit of congruity, though the first call comes before any merit.

(2) Faith is an element in justification. “Receiving faith by hearing, they of free will draw near to God, believing those things to be true which have been Divinely revealed and promised.” Faith as a living trust in a personal Saviour for salvation is lacking. Among the truths believed is the mercy of God and that He wishes to justify the sinner in Christ.

(3) This faith begets love to Christ and hatred to sin, which are elements also of the justifying process.

(4) Now follows justification itself, “which is not a bare remission of sins, but also sanctification and renewal of the inner man through the voluntary reception of grace and of gifts.”

(5) But this renewal must take place through baptism, which, to the prepared adult, both gives and seals all the graces of salvation, forgiveness, cleansing, faith, hope and love.

(6) Justification is preserved by obeying the commandments and by good works, which also increase it.

(7) In case it is lost — and it can be lost, not by venial, but by mortal sin and by unbelief — it can be regained by the sacrament of penance.

(8) To get it, to keep or regain it, it is also necessary to believe the doctrines as thus laid down and to be laid down by this Council (see the decrees in any edition, or in Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums*, 2. Aufl., 206-16, or in Buckley’s or in Waterworth’s translations, and for an admirable and objective summary see Seeberg, *History of Doctrine*, II, 433-38).

### *3. Luther:*

Recent researches in Luther’s early writings have shown that almost from the beginning of his earnest study of religious questions, he mounted up to

Paul's view of justification by faith alone (Loofs, DG, 4. Aufl., 1906, 696-98). Faith is the trust in the mercy of God through Christ, and justification is the declaring righteous for His sake, which is followed by a real making righteous. From the beginning to the end of his life as a religious teacher these are the elements of his doctrine. Speaking of 1513-15, Loofs says (p. 697): "Upon these equations (to justify = to forgive, grace = mercy of the non-imputing God, faith = trust in His mercy) as the regulators of his religious self-judgment, Luther's piety rests, and corresponding to them his view of Christianity, and even later" (than 1513-15); and he adds that "to reckon as righteous" (*reputari justum*) must not be understood with Luther as an opposition "to make righteous," for his "to be justified without merits" in the sense of "to forgive" (*absolvi*) is at the same time the beginning of a new life: *remissio peccati .... ipsa resurrectio*. "His constantly and firmly held view, even more deeply understood later than in 1513-15, that 'to be justified without merit' = 'to be resurrected (to be born again)' = 'to be sanctified' is a pregnant formulation of his Christianity." So much being said, it is not necessary to draw out Luther's doctrine further, who in this respect "rediscovered Christianity as a religion," but it will suffice to refer to the *Histories of Doctrine* (Seeberg gives a full and brilliant exposition), to Kostlin, *Luthers Theologie*, 2. Aufl., 1901 (see Index under the word "Rechtfertigung," and I, 349), and especially to Thieme, *Die sittliche Triebkraft des Glaubens: eine Untersuchung zu Luthers Theologie*, 1895, 103-314.

From Luther and the other reformers the New Testament doctrine went over to the Protestant churches without essential modification, and has remained their nominal testimony until the present. A classic expression of it, which may be taken as representing evangelical Christendom, is the 11th of the 39 Articles of Religion of the Church of England: "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings: wherefore that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort; as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification." It is true that at one time Wesley's opponents accused him of departing from this doctrine, especially on account of his famous Minute of 1770, but this was due to a radical misunderstanding of that Minute, for to the last he held staunchly Paul's doctrine (for proof see my article in *Lutheran Quarterly*, April, 1906, 171-75).



#### 4. *Schleiermacher:*

A new point of view was brought into modern theology by Schleiermacher, who starts from the fundamental fact of Christian experience that we have redemption and reconciliation with Christ, which fact becomes ours by union with Christ through faith. This union brings justification with other blessings, but justification is not considered as even in thought a separate act based on Christ's death, but as part of a great whole of salvation, historically realized step by step in Christ. The trend of his teaching is to break down the distinction between justification and regeneration, as they are simply different aspects of union with Christ.

Ritschl carried forward this thought by emphasizing the grace of the heavenly Father mediated in the first instance through the Son to the Christian community, "to which God imputes the position toward him of Christ its founder," and in the second instance to individuals "as by faith in the Gospel they attach themselves to this community. Faith is simply obedience to God and trust in the revelation of his grace in Christ." This brings sinners into fellowship with God which means eternal life, which is here and now realized, as the Fourth Gospel points out, in lordship over the world (compare Franks in DCG, I, 922-23). The judicial or forensic aspect of justification so thoroughly in-wrought in Paul's thought is denied by Ritschl. "In whatsoever way we view the matter," he says, "the attitude of God in the act of justification cannot be conceived as that of a judge" (*Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, English translation, 1900, 90). W.N. Clarke agrees with Schleiermacher in eliminating justification as a separate element in the work of salvation, and harks back to the Catholic view in making it dependent on the new life and subsequent to it (*Christian Theology*, 407-8). No book has had as much influence in destroying the New Testament conception of justification among English-speaking readers as that of J. H. Newman, *Lectures on Justification*, 1838, 3rd edition, 1874, which contains some of the finest passages in religious literature (pp. 270-73, 302, 338-39), but which was so sympathetic to the Catholic view that the author had nothing essential to retract when he joined Rome in 1845. "Whether we say we are justified by faith, or by works, or by sacraments, all these but mean this one doctrine that we are justified by grace which is given through sacraments, impetrated by faith, manifested in works" (p. 303).

### *5. Meaning and Message to the Modern Man:*

Lastly, has the New Testament conception of justification by faith any message to the modern man, or is it, as Lagarde held, dead in the Protestant churches, something which went overboard with the old doctrine of the Trinity and of Atonement? After an able historical survey, Holl concludes (*Die Rechtfertigungslehre im Licht der Geschichte d. Protestantismus*, Tübingen, 1906, 40-42) that there are two principles thoroughly congenial to modern thought which favor this doctrine, namely, that of the sanctity and importance of personality, the "I" that stands face to face with God, responsible to Him alone; and second, the restoration of the Reformation-thought of an all-working God. Whoever feels the pressure of these two principles, for him the question of justification becomes a living one. "The standard on which he must measure himself is the Absolute God, and who can stand in this judgment? Not simply on account of single acts, but with his 'I' and even with his good-willing. For that is just the curse which rests upon a man that his 'I' is the thing with which alone he wills and can seek God, and that it is this very 'I' which by its willfulness, vanity and self-love poisons all his willing. Accordingly, it remains true, what the Reformers said, that man is entirely corrupt, and that he can do no otherwise than to despair when the majesty of God dawns upon him" (p. 41). There is, then, no other solution than the venture of faith that the same God who crushes our self-deceit lifts up with His sovereign grace, that we live through Him and before Him. Luther is right that religiously we can find no hold except on the Divine act of grace, which through faith in the Divine love and power working in us and for us ever makes us new in Christ. To give up the doctrine of justification, says Holl rightly (p. 42), is to give up conscious personal religion. Holl writes as a liberal, and he quotes a stronger liberal still, Treitschke, as saying that in the 19th century it was the orthodox preachers who proclaimed this doctrine, who built better than the liberals. Nor, says Holl in another book (*Was hat die Rechtfertigungslehre dem modernen Menschen zu sagen?* Tübingen, 1907, 26), can anyone who has experienced justification as an inner transformation be misled into moral unconcern. A moral ideal becomes his, much stronger and more compelling than worldly ethics. The new attitude toward God constituted by justification impels to an unending movement in the service of God and man. The doctrine has not had its day. It is a part of the eternal gospel. As long as sinful man has to do with an

all-holy God, the experience of Paul, Luther and Wesley becomes in a sense normative for the race.

## LITERATURE.

Besides the books mentioned in the text, the following on justification itself may be consulted (those marked with a star are Protestant, those with a dagger are Catholic or High Church Anglican): Goodwin, new edition, with preface by Wesley, 1807; Junkins, 1839; Hare, new edition, 1839 (1st edition with preface by Jackson, 1817); Kerwick, 1841; Heurtley, 1846 (Bampton Lectures for 1845); McIlvaine, 1861, 3rd edition, 1868 (Righteousness of Faith, important); Buchanan, 1867 (important); Body, 1870; Bunyan, new edition, 1873; Harkey, 1875; Davies, 1878; Sadler, 1888; and Holden, 1901. Besides these, Laurence, Bampton Lectures for 1804, sermon 6; Drummond, Apostolic Teaching and Christ's Teaching (see index); Schlatter, New Testament Theology, 2 volumes, 1909-10; the various systematic Theologies; Theologies of the New Testament, and Commentaries may be consulted; also Menegoz, Die Rechtfertigungslehre nach Paulus und nach Jakobus, 1903; Kuhl, Die Stellung des Jakobusbriefes z. alttest. Gesetz u. z. Paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre, 1905.

*John Alfred Faulkner*

## JUSTLE

<jus'-l> ([q̄q" v; shaqaq]): The word occurs once in ~~<300>~~ Nahum 2:4 (in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)), where the American Standard Revised Version has "rush to and fro."

## JUSTUS

<jus'-tus> ([ ' Ιοῡστος, Ioustos]): There are three of this name mentioned in the New Testament.

(1) It was the Roman surname of *JOSEPH BARSABBAS* (which see) (~~<402>~~ Acts 1:23).

(2) A Corinthian proselyte (sebomenos ton Theon), whose house adjoined the synagogue and who received Paul when the Jews opposed him (~~<407>~~ Acts 18:7). He was probably a Roman citizen, one of the colonies, and so he would be of assistance to the apostle in his work among the better

class of Corinth. There is some disagreement among manuscripts regarding the name. Textus Receptus of the New Testament gives “Justus” alone. the Revised Version (British and American) following Codex Sinaiticus, Codex E, Vulgate, Bohairic, Armenian, gives “Titus Justus”; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Tischendorf, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Bezae, give “Titius Justus”; Cheyne (EB, under the word “Justus”) thinks these forms a corruption of “Tertius Justus,” and that the bearer of the name was the “Tertius” of <sup><5162></sup>Romans 16:22. Paul still continued his lodgings with Aquila and Priscilla, but made the house of Justus his own synagogue.

(3) A Jew, Jesus Justus, mentioned with Mark and Aristarchus by Paul in his letters to the Colossians (<sup><51041></sup>Colossians 4:11), is a fellow-worker and one that had been a comfort unto him.

*S. F. Hunter*

## JUTTAH; JUTAH

<jut'-a>, <joo'-ta> ([<sup>h</sup>Fy<sup>mu</sup>TTah], <sup><6216></sup>Joshua 21:16; Septuagint [<sup>T</sup>ανύ, *Tanu*]; and in <sup><6155></sup>Joshua 15:55 the King James Version, Septuagint [<sup>Ἰ</sup>τάν, *Itan*, A, Ietta]); ju'-ta (<sup>h</sup>F<sup>W</sup>ly, *yaTah*], <sup><6155></sup>Joshua 15:55): A town in the hill country of Judah, mentioned with Maon, Carmel and Ziph; a Levitical city (<sup><6216></sup>Joshua 21:16). In some versions of Septuagint it occurs ([<sup>Ἰ</sup> Ιοτά, *Iota*]) in <sup><13157></sup>1 Chronicles 6:57. In the Eusebius, Onomasticon (266 49; 133 10) a large village called “Juttah” is described as 18 Roman miles from Eleutheropolis. This agrees with the position of *YuTTa*, a large and prosperous Moslem village, 3,740 ft. above sea-level, 5 1/3 miles South of Hebron and 15 1/2 miles from Beit Jebrin (Eleutheropolis). There are many rock-cut tombs and ancient winepresses all around the village.

Reland (Pal, 870) suggested (and many others have followed him) that the [<sup>π</sup>όλις Ἰούδα, *polis Iouda*], translated “city of Judah,” in <sup><4119></sup>Luke 1:39, should be *polis Iouta*, “the city Yuta.” The translation “city of Judah” is suspicious, because *Iouda* is without the article, which is usually put before the name of a district; the interchange of “t” and “d” is a very common one. Dr. Paterson, resident many years in Hebron, states that there is a local Moslem tradition in the district that Yutta was the home of John the Baptist. For *YuTTa* see PEF, III, 310, Sh XXI.

*E. W. G. Masterman*

# K

## KAB

<*kab*> (**bq**" [qabh], "something hollowed out," <sup><1165></sup>2 Kings 6:25; the King James Version Cab): A Hebrew dry measure and liquid measure equal to about 2 quarts.

*See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.*

## KABZEEL

<*kab'-ze-el*>, <*kab'-zel*> (**l aʔbq**" [kabhtse'el] "(whom) God collects"): One of the "uttermost cities" of Judah toward the border of Edom in the South (Negeb) (<sup><1652></sup>Joshua 15:21). It was the native place of Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada, one of David's mighty men (<sup><10231></sup>2 Samuel 23:20; <sup><13112></sup>1 Chronicles 11:22). "Jekabzeel and the villages thereof," one of the places re-inhabited by the men of Judah (<sup><16125></sup>Nehemiah 11:25), appears to be the same place. The site is unknown.

## KADESH

<*ka'-desh*> (**vdq**:[qadhesh]; [**Kαδής**, *Kades*], <sup><13218></sup>Psalms 29:8; Judith 1:9).

*See KADESH-BARNEA.*

## KADESH-BARNEA

<*ka'-desh-bar'-ne-a*> (**[ʔe" B" vdq]**:[qadhesh barnea`]; [**Kαδής**, *Kades*]): Mentioned 10 times; called also "Kadesh" simply. The name perhaps means "the holy place of the desert of wandering." There are references to Kadesh in early history. At En-mishpat ("the same is Kadesh") Chedorlaomer and his allies smote the Amalekite and Amorite. Abraham dwelt near Kadesh, and it was at Beer-lahai-roi between Kadesh and Bered that the Angel of Yahweh appeared to Hagar (<sup><11417></sup>Genesis 14:7; 16:14; 20:1). It was an important camp of the Israelites during their

wanderings, and seems to have been their headquarters for 38 years (<sup><QDDE></sup>Deuteronomy 1:2; 2:14; Judith 5:14). There the returning spies found the camp (<sup><QHE35></sup>Numbers 13:26); there Miriam died and was buried (<sup><QDDE></sup>Numbers 20:1); from thence messengers were sent to the king of Edom (<sup><QDDE></sup>Numbers 20:14; <sup><QDDE></sup>Judges 11:16 ff). There the people rebelled because of the want of water, and Moses brought water from the rock (<sup><QDDE></sup>Numbers 20:2 ff); it was called therefore Meribath — or Meriboth-Kadesh (<sup><QDDE></sup>Numbers 27:14; <sup><QDDE></sup>Ezekiel 47:19; 48:28). It was situated in the wilderness of Zin (<sup><QDDE></sup>Numbers 20:1; 33:36,37) in the hill country of the Amorites (<sup><QDDE></sup>Deuteronomy 1:19), 11 days' journey from Horeb, by the way of Mt. Seir (<sup><QDDE></sup>Deuteronomy 1:2), “in the uttermost” of the border of Edom (<sup><QDDE></sup>Numbers 20:16), and on the southern border, probably the Southeast corner, of Judah (<sup><QDDE></sup>Ezekiel 47:19; compare Judith 19). See Cobern, Homiletic Review, April and May, 1914.

*S. F. Hunter*

## KADESH IN GALILEE

See *KEDESH*, 3.

## KADESH ON THE ORONTES

<sup><o-ron'-tez></sup> (in Massoretic Text of <sup><QDDE></sup>2 Samuel 24:6, under the corrupt form <sup>yvd" j</sup> <sup>μyThT</sup> [tachtim chodhshi], which should be corrected from the Septuagint (Luc.) reading: <sup>εἰς τὴν γῆν Χεττιεὶμ Καδής</sup>, *eis ten genitive Chettieim Kades*], “to the land of the Hittites unto Kadesh,” into <sup>hvdq;μyTj h" Āra</sup>, [erets ha-chittim qadheshah]. Ewald and others, fixing the northern ideal boundary of Israel at the sources of the Jordan, would read “Hermon” for [chodhshi], but the conjectures of Thenius and Hitzig of a reference to the northern Kadesh are fully confirmed by the reading given): Kadesh was the southern capital of the Hittites, and was situated on the upper waters of the Orontes, 80 miles North of Damascus. It is now represented by a large mound 5 miles South of what, till the Middle Ages, was called the Lake of Kades, but now the Lake of Homs. Here Thothmes III of Egypt (flourished circa 1650 BC), after the battle of Megiddo, met and received hostages from the Assyrians, and here too Rameses II defeated Hatesar, king of the Hittites (circa 1320 BC), and concluded with him a treaty, which was formally inscribed on a disk of silver. The incidents of the battle are depicted on the walls of the

Ramesseum, and an Egyptian epic records the heroic deeds of Rameses. Under the name Kadytis, it is mentioned as being taken by Pharaoh-necoh (Herodotus ii.159) in 609 BC. In the only Bible reference (<sup><1046></sup>2 Samuel 24:6), it is named as the northern limit of the census made by

*David.W. M. Christie*

## KADMIEL

<sup><kad'-mi-el></sup> (l <sup>aymd</sup> " q" [qadhmi'el], "before God," "priest"(?); "Cadmiel" in parallel lists in 1 Esdras 5:26,58 the King James Version; omitted in Septuagint Codex Vaticanus; Codex Alexandrinus reads [*kai Kadmielon*]): A Levite (<sup><1510></sup>Ezra 2:40; <sup><1074></sup>Nehemiah 7:43), founder of a family whose descendants returned from captivity with Zerubbabel (<sup><1510></sup>Ezra 2:1; <sup><1074></sup>Nehemiah 7:43; 12:1,8). He is named among those who praise God for the return (<sup><1074></sup>Nehemiah 9:4,5; 12:24); was of those who "set forward" the work of the Lord's house (<sup><1510></sup>Ezra 3:9; 1 Esdras 5:26,58), and is again mentioned with those who "seal" the new Return Covenant (<sup><1074></sup>Nehemiah 10:28 ff) after the re-establishment of worship (<sup><1074></sup>Nehemiah 10:1,9).

## KADMONITE

<sup><kad'-mon-it></sup> (ynmd " q" [qadhmoni]; [*Κεδμωναῖοι*, *Kedmonaioi*], signifies "the Easterner," or, less probably, "one of the ancient race"): The Kadmonites are mentioned in <sup><0159></sup>Genesis 15:19 along with the Kenites and Kenizzites of Edom, and are doubtless the same as "the children of the east," whose wisdom was celebrated (<sup><1080></sup>1 Kings 4:30). <sup>Hmd</sup> " qe [qedhemah], "the East," was a son of Ishmael (<sup><0255></sup>Genesis 25:15; compare 25:6). In an Egyptian story describing the adventures of a political refugee who fled from Egypt in the time of the XIIth Dynasty, it is said that he found a refuge in Canaan in the land of Kaduma or Kedem.

*A. H. Sayce*

## KAIN (1)

<sup><kan></sup> (ˆyQ " h" [ha-qayin]; the King James Version Cain): A town in the hill country of Judah (<sup><0157></sup>Joshua 15:57). There is, too, apparently a reference to this place in <sup><0021></sup>Numbers 24:21,22:"And he looked on the

Kenite, and took up his parable, and said, Strong is thy dwelling-place, And thy nest is set in the rock. Nevertheless Kain shall be wasted, Until Asshur shall carry thee away captive.”

This place has been very doubtfully identified as the ruin Yukin, a place on a lofty hill Southeast of Hebron, overlooking the wilderness of Judah; the tomb of Cain is shown there. See PEF, III, 312, Sh XXI.

*E. W. G. Masterman*

## KAIN (2)

(<sup>h</sup>yq<sub>i</sub>[qayin]): A clan name, the King James Version “the Kenite” (<sup>Q022</sup>Numbers 24:22; <sup>Q041</sup>Judges 4:11). In the first passage the Revised Version (British and American) has “Kain” and margin “the Kenites”; in the second, the Revised Version (British and American) has “the Kenite” in text and margin “Kain.” Compare preceding article.

## KALLAI

<ka'-a-i>, <ka'-i> (yL" q" [qallay], l q" [qal], “swift”): A priest among those who returned with Zerubbabel (<sup>Q121</sup>Nehemiah 12:1). He represented the family of Sallai (<sup>Q121</sup>Nehemiah 12:20).

## KAMON

<ka'-mon> (<sup>W00Q</sup>[qamon]; the King James Version Camon): The place where Jair was buffed (<sup>Q018</sup>Judges 10:3-5). It is possibly represented either by Kamm or Kumeim, ruins which lie about 6 and 7 miles respectively to the South-Southeast of Umm Keis. See further *HAVVOTHJAIR*. The ruins of Kamm, about 200 yds. square, crown a small elevation, and point to an important place in the past. There are large rock-hewn cisterns to the South. Among the ruins of Kumeim, which are not considerable, a few mud huts are built, occupied today by about 200 souls (Schumacher, Northern 'Ajlun, 137).

## KANAH

<ka'-na> (hnq<sub>i</sub>[qanah], “reeds”):



(1) The name of a “brook,” i.e. wady, or “torrent bed,” which formed part of the boundary between Ephraim and Manasseh (<sup><666></sup>Joshua 16:8; 17:9). The border of Ephraim went out westward from Tappuah to the brook Kanah, ending at the sea; the border of Manasseh from Tappuah, which belonged to Ephraim, “went down unto the brook of Kanah, southward of the brook.” There seems no good reason to doubt the identification of “the brook Kanah” with the modern Wady Kanah. The transition from the heavy “q” to the lighter “k” is easy, so the phonetic difficulty is not serious. The stream rises in the Southwest of Shechem, flows through Wady Ishkar, and, joining the `Aujeh, reaches the sea not far to the North of Jaffa. Guerin, influenced, apparently, by the masses of reeds of various kinds which fill the river, argues in favor of Nahr el-Fallq, to the North of Arsuf. He identifies it with Nahr el-Kasab, “river of reeds,” mentioned by Beha ed-Din, the Moslem historian. But this last must be identified with Nahr el-Mafjir, 13 miles farther North, too far North for “the brook Kanah.”

(2) A town on the northern boundary of Asher (<sup><698></sup>Joshua 19:28), probably identical with the village of [Qana], about 7 miles Southeast of Tyre (SWP, I, 51, 64, Sh I).

*W. Ewing*

## KAPH

<sup><kaf></sup> (K k \_ [”k”]) : The 11th letter of the Hebrew alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia as “k”, with daghesh, and “kh” (=German ch) without daghesh. It came also to be used for the number 20. For name, etc., *see* **ALPHABET**.

## KAREAH

<sup><ka-re’-a></sup> (j " r q; [qareach], “bald head”): The father of Johanan and Jonathan, who after the fall of Jerusalem joined Gedaliah at Mizpah (<sup><1253></sup>2 Kings 25:23; <sup><408></sup>Jeremiah 40:8).

## KARIATHIARIUS

<sup><ka-ri-ath-i-a’-ri-us></sup> ([Kαριαθαριαίος, *Kariathiarios*]; Codex Vaticanus reads [*Kartattheiareios*]; the King James Version, Kiriathiarim (1 Esdras 5:19))=Kiriath-jearim in <sup><4679></sup>Nehemiah 7:29.

## KARKA

**<kar'-ka>** (**h[qr" Q" h"** [ha-qarqa`ah] — with the article and locale; the King James Version Karkaa): A place in the South of Judah, between Addar and Wady el-`Arish (**<0613B>** Joshua 15:3). Eusebius, Onomasticon speaks of a village in Judah lying toward the wilderness, named Akarka. It cannot now be identified. The name means “the pavement,” or “ground.”

## KARKOR

**<kar'-kor>** (**r qo" q"** [qarqor]): An unidentified place where Gideon surprised and overwhelmed the remnants of the army of Zeba and Zalmunnah (**<0080>** Judges 8:10 ff). It probably corresponds to [Qarkar] mentioned by Shalmaneser II, S. of Hamath (KB, I, 173).

## KARTAH

**<kar'-ta>** (**hTr" q"** [qartah]): A city in the territory of Zebulun, assigned to the Levites (**<06234>** Joshua 21:34). It is not identified. Possibly it is a variant of **KATTATH**, or of **KARTAN** (which see).

## KARTAN

**<kar'-tan>** (**^Tr" q"** [qartan]): A city in the territory of Naphtali, given to the Gershonite Levites (**<0622>** Joshua 21:32). It is called Kiriathaim in **<0366>** 1 Chronicles 6:76. Kartan may be a contraction of this. Cheyne (EB, under the word) suggests that both names may be corruptions from “Chinnereth.” Neither is mentioned in **<06234>** Joshua 19:32,38, in the list of Naphtalite cities, while Chinnereth is.

## KATTATH

**<kat'-ath>** (**tFq" q"** [qaTTath]): A city in the territory of Zebulun, named with Iphtah-el, Nahalel, and Shimron (**<06215>** Joshua 19:15), perhaps to be identified with Kitron (**<0083>** Judges 1:30), from which Zebulun did not expel the Canaanites; and with Kartah (**<06234>** Joshua 21:34), which was given to the Merarite Levites. The Babylonian Talmud (Meg. 6a) identifies Kattath with Sepphoris, the modern Seffuriyeh (but see Neubauer, Geographie du

Talmud, 191). The Jerusalem Talmud takes it as identical with Ketunith, Kuteineh, to the West of Esdraelon. It should probably, however, be sought near to Shimron, the modern Semuniyeh.

*W. Ewing*

## KEDAR

<ke'-dar> (**rdqē** [qedhar]; [**Κηδάρ**, *Kedar*]): Second in order of the sons of Ishmael (<sup><02513></sup>Genesis 25:13 parallel <sup><13029></sup>1 Chronicles 1:29). The name occurs as typical of a distant eastern country in opposition to the lands of the Mediterranean (<sup><24120></sup>Jeremiah 2:10). The author of Second Isaiah introduces this tribe in company with Nebaioth, and both are represented as owners of flocks (<sup><23107></sup>Isaiah 60:7). Evidence of their nomadic habits appears in <sup><24428></sup>Jeremiah 49:28,29, where they are classed among the [Bene-Qedhem], and mention is made of their flocks, camels, tents, curtains and furniture. They are spoken of (<sup><23211></sup>Isaiah 42:11) as dwelling in [chatserim] ("villages"), from which it would appear that they were a somewhat settled tribe, corresponding to the Arabic chadariya or "town-dwellers," as distinct from wabariya or "nomads." Ezekiel (27:21) gives another hint of their pastoral nature where, in his detailed picture of the wealth of Tyre, Kedar and Arabia provide the Tyrians with lambs, rams and goats. The fame of the tribe is further reflected in <sup><23216></sup>Isaiah 21:16,17 (the only allusion to their might in war), and in the figurative references to their tents (<sup><19015></sup>Psalms 120:5; <sup><22105></sup>Song of Solomon 1:5). In this last passage where the tents are made symbolic of dark beauty, the word [qadhar] ("to be black") may have been in the writer's mind.

The settlements of Kedar were probably in the Northwest of Arabia, not far from the borders of Palestine. Assyrian inscriptions have thrown light upon the history of the tribe. There Kedar is mentioned along with the Arabs and Nebaioth, which decides its identity with Kedar of the Old Testament, and there is found also an account of the conflicts between the tribe and King Assurbanipal (see Margoliouth in HDB).

Of the Ishmaelite tribes, Kedar must have been one of the most important, and thus in later times the name came to be applied to all the wild tribes of the desert. It is through Kedar (Arabic, keidar) that Muslim genealogists trace the descent of Mohammed from Ishmael.

*A. S. Fulton*

## KEDEMAH

<ked'-e-ma>, <ke-de'-ma> (**hmd**" **qē**[qedhemah], "eastward"): Son of Ishmael (<sup><02516></sup>Genesis 25:16), head of a clan (<sup><13018></sup>1 Chronicles 1:31). *See KADMONITE.*

## KEDEMOTH

<ked'-e-moth>, <ke-de'-moth> (**twōdq**[qedhemoth], "eastern parts"): From the wilderness to which this town gave its name, Moses sent messengers to Sihon, king of the Amorites in Heshbon (<sup><18126></sup>Deuteronomy 2:26). It was given by Moses to the tribe of Reuben (<sup><06318></sup>Joshua 13:18), and assigned to the Merarite Levites (<sup><02137></sup>Joshua 21:37; <sup><11659></sup>1 Chronicles 6:79). It must probably be sought on the upper course of the Arnon. Buhl (GAP, 268) suggests that it may be identified with Umm er-Resas. *See JAHAZ.*

## KEDESH (1)

<ke'-desh> (**vdēq**[qedhesh]; [**Κάδης**, *Kades*]):

(1) One of the "uttermost cities" of Judah "toward the border of Edom in the South" (<sup><06523></sup>Joshua 15:23). Possibly it is to be identified with **KADESHBARNEA** (which see); otherwise it is strange that this latter should be omitted from the list. Dillmann would identify it with Kadus, to the South of Hebron, mentioned by Muqaddasi.

(2) A town in the territory of Issachar, given to the Gershonite Levites (<sup><13172></sup>1 Chronicles 6:72). In the list of Joshua (21:28) its place is taken by **KISHION** (which see). Conder suggests identification with Tell Abu Qades, near Megiddo.

(3) Kedesh-naphtali, the famous city of refuge in the uplands of Naphtali. It is called "Kedesh," simply, in <sup><06222></sup>Joshua 12:22, etc.; Kedesh-naphtali in <sup><10016></sup>Judges 4:6; Tobit 1:2; Kedesh in Galilee in <sup><13176></sup>Joshua 20:7, etc. It was assigned to the Gershonite Levites (<sup><13176></sup>1 Chronicles 6:76). From the name "holy," we gather that it was a sanctuary from old time. It was therefore a place of asylum, and only preserved its ancient character in this respect when chosen as one of the cities of refuge. It was the home of Barak, and here his host assembled. When the Assyrians invaded the land under Tiglath-pileser, it was among the first cities to be captured, and its

inhabitants were deported (<sup><1265></sup>2 Kings 15:29). Near Kedesh was fought the great battle between Jonathan the Maccabee and Demetrius (1 Macc 11:63 ff). Josephus says that in his time it belonged to the Tyrians, lying between their land and that of Galilee (Ant., XIII, v, 6; B J, II, xviii, 1; IV, ii, 3, etc.). Eusebius, Onomasticon places it 20 miles from Tyre, near to Paneas. It is represented by the modern village of Kedes, which lies on the plateau to the West of el-Chuleh. It crowns a tell which runs out in a low ridge into the little plain to the West. Near the fountain, which rises under the ridge to the North, are the most interesting of the ancient remains. There are many fine sarcophagi, some of them being used as watering-troughs. From its lofty situation, Kedesh commanded a spacious view over a richly varied landscape, With smiling cornfields, and hills clothed with oak and terebinth.

*W. Ewing*

## **KEDESH (2)**

(1 Macc 11:63,73, Codex Alexandrinus, [Κήδεϛ, *Kedes*]; the King James Version Cades): Scene of a battle between Judas Maccabeus and the forces of Demetrius.

*See KEDESH-NAPHTALI, under KEDESH, 3.*

## **KEDESH-NAPHTALI**

*<ke'-desh-naf'-ta-li>.*

*See KEDESH, 3.*

## **KEEPER; KEEPERS**

*<kep'-er>*, (mostly from **רמ"ו** **ו**<sub>1</sub>[shamar]; [**φύλαξ**, *phulax*]): The word is used of keepers of sheep, vineyards, doors, prisons (in <sup><1632></sup>Genesis 39:21 ff, [car]; compare <sup><4163></sup>Acts 5:23), etc. In <sup><2113></sup>Ecclesiastes 12:3, "The keepers of the house shall tremble," the allusion is to the decay of bodily powers, the "keepers" being specially the arms, which had become feeble through age.

## KEHELATHAH

<ke-he-la'-tha>, <ke-hel'-a-tha> (**htl** **həq**)[qehlathah], “gathering,” “assembly”): A desert camp of the Israelites between Rissah and Mt. Shepher (<sup>Q632</sup>Numbers 33:22,23). Situation is unknown.

*See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.*

## KEILAH

<ke-i'-la> (**hl** **y**[**q**][qe`ilah]; [**Κεειλάμ**, *Keeilam*]):

**(1)** A city of the Shephelah mentioned (<sup>Q654</sup>Joshua 15:44) along with Nezib, Aehzib and Mareshah. Among those who repaired the walls of Jerusalem was “Hashabiah, the ruler of half the district of Keilah, for his district. After him repaired their brethren, Bavvai the son of Henadad, the ruler of half the district of Keilah” (<sup>Q687</sup>Nehemiah 3:17,18).1. David and Keilah:

It is, however, from the story of the wandering of David that we have most information regarding this place. It was a city with gates and bars (<sup>Q637</sup>1 Samuel 23:7). The Philistines came against it and commenced robbing the threshing-floors. David, after twice inquiring of Yahweh, went down with his 600 men (<sup>Q633</sup>1 Samuel 23:13) and “fought with the Philistines, and brought away their cattle, and slew them with great slaughter.” Saul hearing that David and his men were within a fortified town “summoned all the people to war, to go down to Keilah, to besiege David and his men” (<sup>Q638</sup>1 Samuel 23:8). Then David asked Abiathar the priest to bring him an ephod, and he inquired of Yahweh whether, if Saul came, the men of Keilah would surrender him to save that city; hearing from Yahweh, “They will deliver thee up,” he and all his men escaped from Keilah and went into the wilderness. The reputed strength of Keilah is confirmed by its mention in 5 tablets in the Tell el-Amarna Letters under the name of Kilts (qilti, Petrie) with Gedor, Gath, Rabbah and Gezer.2. Identification:

Although other identifications were proposed by the older topographers, there is now a general consensus of opinion that the site of this city is Khurbet Kila (Josephus, Ant, VI, xiii, 1, in his account of David’s adventure calls the place “Killa”). It is a hill covered with ruins in the higher part of Wady es Sur, 1,575 ft. above sea-level, whose terraced sides are covered with grainfields. The Eusebius, Onomasticon (Latin text) states

that it was 8 miles from Eleutheropolis, which is about the distance of Khurbet Kila from Beit Jibrin. Beit Nusib (Nezib) is a couple of miles away, and Tell Sandahannah (Mareshah) but 7 miles to the West (<sup><0654></sup>Joshua 15:44). An early Christian tradition states that the prophet Habakkuk was buried at Keilah.

(2) The Garmite (which see), <sup><13049></sup>1 Chronicles 4:19; see PEF, 314, Sh XXI.

*E. W. G. Masterman*

## KELAIAH

<sup><ke-la'-ya></sup>, <sup><ke-li'-a></sup> (<sup>h</sup>yl <sup>q</sup>elayah), “swift for Yah”[?]; [<sup>Κωλίας</sup>, Kolios]; Codex Vaticanus, [<sup>Κώνος</sup>, Konos]): One of the priests who had “foreign wives” (<sup><1502></sup>Ezra 10:23, also “Kelita”). In parallel list of 1 Esdras 9:23, he again has a double name — “Colius” and “Calitas.” A “Kelita” is named as helping Ezra at the expounding of the law (<sup><0607></sup>Nehemiah 8:7; compare 1 Esdras 9:48, “Calitas”), and also among the signatories of the covenant (<sup><0609></sup>Nehemiah 10:9; for nature of covenant see 10:28 ff). They may not, however, be the same person.

## KELITA

<sup><kel'-i-ta></sup>, <sup><ke-li'-ta></sup> (<sup>a</sup>fyl <sup>q</sup>liTa'] [qeliTa'] “dwarf”).

*See KELAIAH.*

## KEMUEL

<sup><kem'-u-el></sup>, <sup><ke-mu'-el></sup> (<sup>l</sup>a <sup>w</sup>yq] [qemu'el], “God’s mound”):

(1) Nephew of Abraham (<sup><0221></sup>Genesis 22:21), father of Aram, whom Ewald identifies with Ram of <sup><0302></sup>Job 32:2; but compare <sup><0102></sup>Genesis 10:22, where Aram is described as one of the children of Shem. They may not be the same person.

(2) Prince of Ephraim, one of the land commissioners who divided Canaan (<sup><0304></sup>Numbers 34:24).

(3) A Levite, father of Hashabiah, one of the tribal princes of David’s time, a ruler among the Levites (<sup><1377></sup>1 Chronicles 27:17).

## KENAN

<ke'-nan> (<sup>nyqe</sup>qenan); [<sup>Καινόν</sup>, *Kainan*] : A son of Enosh, the son of Seth (<sup>0089</sup>Genesis 5:9,10,12,13,14; <sup>1300</sup>1 Chronicles 1:2). the King James Version form (except in <sup>1300</sup>1 Chronicles 1:2), is “Cainan.”

## KENATH

<ke'-nath> (<sup>tnqj</sup>qenath); [<sup>Καάθ</sup>, *Kaath Kaanath*], in Septuagint, Codex Alexandrinus): A city in Bashan, taken along with its “daughters,” i.e. “villages” from the Amorites by Nobah who gave it his own name (<sup>0030</sup>Numbers 32:42). It was recaptured by Geshur and Aram (<sup>1323</sup>1 Chronicles 2:23). It is probably identical with the modern Kanawat, which is built on the site, and largely from the materials of an ancient city. It lies about 16 miles to the North of Bosra eski Sham, the Bostra of the Romans, on both sides of Wady Kanawat, where, descending from the slopes of Jebel ed-Druze, it plunges over a precipice, forming a picturesque waterfall. On the plateau above the modern village, there is a striking collection of Roman and Christian remains, the shapely forms of many columns lending distinction to the scene. One large building is associated with the name of the patriarch Job — Maqam Ayyub. The position commands a spacious and interesting view over the whole of the Chauran. The identification has been rejected by Socin (Baedeker, Pal3, 207), but his reasons are not given. Moore (Judges, 222) also rejects it, but for reasons that are not convincing.

*W. Ewing*

## KENAZ; KENEZ

<ke'-naz>, <ke'-nez> (<sup>znqj</sup>qenaz) “hunting”):

(1) A “duke” of Edom, grandson of Esau (<sup>0036</sup>Genesis 36:11,15,42; <sup>1305</sup>1 Chronicles 1:36,53).

(2) Father of Othniel (<sup>0057</sup>Joshua 15:17; <sup>0013</sup>Judges 1:13; 3:9,11; <sup>1343</sup>1 Chronicles 4:13).

(3) The unidentified [qenaz] of <sup>1345</sup>1 Chronicles 4:15, who appears to be a descendant of (2). There is, however, some difficulty with the passage here.



## KENEZITE

<ke'-nez-it> (yḏḥq̄)[qenizzi]; [Κενεζαῖος, *Kenezaios*): the King James Version in <sup><0159></sup>Genesis 15:19 and the Revised Version (British and American) uniformly, spell “Kenizzite.” The Kenezites were the clan whose name-father was *KENAZ* (which see). Their land, along with that of their Canaanite tribes, was promised to Abram (<sup><0159></sup>Genesis 15:19). To this clan belonged Jephunneh, the father of Caleb (<sup><0622></sup>Numbers 32:12; <sup><0346></sup>Joshua 14:6,14). It had evidently been absorbed by the tribe of Judah. If the Kenezites went down with Jacob into Egypt, they may have become identified with his family there.

## KENITES

<ke'-nits> (ynQb̄a" [ha-qeni], ynyQb̄a" [haqeni]; in <sup><0622></sup>Numbers 24:22 and <sup><0041></sup>Judges 4:11, ḡyq̄[qayin]; of [οἱ Κεναῖοι, *hoi Kenaioi*], [οἱ Κιναῖοι, *hoi Kinaioi*): A tribe of nomads named in association with various other peoples. They are first mentioned along with the Kadmonites and Kenizzites among the peoples whose land was promised to Abram (<sup><0159></sup>Genesis 15:19). Balaam, seeing them from the heights of Moab; puns upon their name, which resembles the Hebrew [ken], “a nest,” prophesying their destruction although their nest was “set in the rock” — possibly a reference to Sela, the city. Moses’ father-in-law, Jethro, is called “the priest of Midian” in <sup><0201></sup>Exodus 3:1; 18:1; but in <sup><0016></sup>Judges 1:16 he is described as a Kenite, showing a close relation between the Kenites and Midian. At the time of Sisera’s overthrow, Heber, a Kenite, at “peace” with Jabin, king of Hazor, pitched his tent far North of his ancestral seats (<sup><0047></sup>Judges 4:17). There were Kenites dwelling among the Amalekites in the time of Saul (<sup><0156></sup>1 Samuel 15:6). They were spared because they had “showed kindness to all the children of Israel, when they came up out of Egypt.” David, in his answer to Achish, links the Kenites with the inhabitants of the South of Judah (<sup><0270></sup>1 Samuel 27:10). Among the ancestors of the tribe of Judah, the Chronicler includes the Kenite Hammath, the father of the Rechabites (<sup><0125></sup>1 Chronicles 2:55). These last continued to live in tents, practicing the ancient nomadic customs (<sup><0316></sup>Jeremiah 35:6 ff).

The word [qeni] in Aramaic means “smith.” Professor Sayce thinks they may really have been a tribe of smiths, resembling “the gipsies of modern

Europe, as well as the traveling tinkers or blacksmiths of the Middle Ages” (HDB, under the word). This would account for their relations with the different peoples, among whom they would reside in pursuit of their calling.

In Josephus they appear as Kenetides, and in Ant, IV, vii, 3 he calls them “the race of the Shechemites.”

*W. Ewing*

## KENIZZITE

<ken'-i-zit>.

*See KENEZITE.*

## KENOSIS

<ke-no'-sis>: The word “kenosis” ([**κένωσις**, *kenosis*]) has entered theological language from <sup><100></sup>Philippians 2:7, where in the sentence he “emptied himself” the Greek verb is [*ekenosen*]. “Kenosis,” then, the corresponding noun, has become a technical term for the humiliation of the Son in the incarnation, but in recent years has acquired a still more technical sense, i.e. of the Son’s emptying Himself of certain attributes, especially of omniscience.

### 1. THE NEW TESTAMENT:

(1) The theological question involved was one about as far as possible from the minds of the Christians of the apostolic age and apparently one that never occurred to Paul. For in <sup><100></sup>Philippians 2:7 the only “emptying” in point is that of the (external) change from the “form of God” to the “form of a servant.” Elsewhere in the New Testament it is usually taken as a matter of course that Christ’s knowledge was far higher than that of other men ( <sup><124></sup>John 2:24 is the clearest example). But passages that imply a limitation of that knowledge do exist and are of various classes. Of not much importance are the entirely incidental references to the authorship of Old Testament passages where the traditional authorship is considered erroneous, as no other method of quotation would have been possible. Somewhat different are the references to the nearness of the Parousia (especially <sup><103></sup>Matthew 10:23; 24:29). But with these it is always a question how far the exact phraseology has been framed by the evangelists

and, apart from this, how far Christ may not have been consciously using current imagery for the impending spiritual revolution, although knowing that the details would be quite different (*see PAROUSIA*). Limitation of knowledge may perhaps be deduced from the fact that Christ could be amazed (<sup>4080</sup>Matthew 8:10, etc.), that He could be really tempted (especially <sup>8045</sup>Hebrews 4:15), or that He possessed faith (<sup>8070</sup>Hebrews 12:2; see commentary). More explicitly Christ is said to have learned in <sup>4025</sup>Luke 2:52; <sup>8088</sup>Hebrews 5:8. And, finally, in <sup>4132</sup>Mark 13:32 parallel <sup>4286</sup>Matthew 24:36, Christ states categorically that He is ignorant of the exact time of the [*Parousia*].

(2) An older exegesis felt only the last of these passages as a real difficulty. A distinction constructed between knowledge naturally possessed and knowledge gained by experience (i.e. although the child Jesus knew the alphabet naturally, He was obliged to learn it by experience) covered most of the others. For <sup>4132</sup>Mark 13:32 a variety of explanations were offered. The passage was translated “neither the Son, except the Father know it,” a translation that can be borne by the Greek. But it simply transfers the difficulty by speaking of the Father’s knowledge as hypothetical, and is an impossible translation of <sup>4286</sup>Matthew 24:36, where the word “only” is added. The explanations that assume that Christ knew the day but had no commission to reveal it are most unsatisfactory, for they place insincere words in His mouth; “It is not for you to know the day” would have been inevitable form of the saying (<sup>4007</sup>Acts 1:7).

## 2. DOGMATIC:

(1) Yet the attempt so to misinterpret the verses is not the outcome of a barren dogmatic prejudice, but results from a dread lest real injury be done to the fundamentals of Christian consciousness. Not only does the mind of the Christian revolt from seeing in Christ anything less than true God, but it revolts from finding in Him two centers of personality — Christ was One. But as omniscience is an essential attribute of God, it is an essential attribute of the incarnate Son. So does not any limitation of Christ’s human knowledge tend to vitiate a sound doctrine of the incarnation? Certainly, to say with the upholders of the kenosis in its “classical” form that the Son, by an exercise of His will, determined to be ignorant as man, is not helpful, as the abandonment by God of one of His own essential attributes would be the preposterous corollary.

(2) Yet the Biblical data are explicit, and an explanation of some kind must be found. And the solution seems to lie in an ambiguous use of the word “knowledge,” as applied to Christ as God and as man. When we speak of a man’s knowledge in the sense discussed in the kenotic doctrine, we mean the totality of facts present in his intellect, and by his ignorance we mean the absence of a fact or of facts from that intellect. Now in the older discussions of the subject, this intellectual knowledge was tacitly assumed (mystical theology apart) to be the only knowledge worthy of the name, and so it was at the same time also assumed that God’s knowledge is intellectual also — “God geometrizes.” Under this assumption God’s knowledge is essentially of the same kind as man’s, differing from man’s only in its purity and extent. And this assumption is made in all discussions that speak of the knowledge of the Son as God illuminating His mind as man.

(3) Modern critical epistemology has, however, taught man a sharp lesson in humility by demonstrating that the intellect is by no means the perfect instrument that it has been assumed to be. And the faults are by no means faults due to lack of instruction, evil desires, etc., but are resident in the intellect itself, and inseparable from it’ as an intellect. Certain recent writers (Bergson, most notably) have even built up a case of great strength for regarding the intellect as a mere product of utilitarian development, with the defects resulting naturally from such an evolution. More especially does this restriction of the intellect seem to be true in religious knowledge, even if the contentions of Kant and (especially) Ritschl be not fully admitted. Certain it is, in any case, that even human knowledge is something far wider than intellectual knowledge, for there are many things that we know that we never could have learned through the intellect, and, apparently, many elements of our knowledge are almost or quite incapable of translation into intellectual terms. Omniscience, then, is by no means intellectual omniscience, and it is not to be reached by any mere process of expansion of an intellect. An “omniscient intellect” is a contradiction in terms.

(4) In other words, God’s omniscience is not merely human intellectual knowledge raised to the infinite power, but something of an entirely different quality, hardly conceivable to human thought — as different from human intellectual knowledge as the Divine omnipotence is different from muscular strength. Consequently, the passage of this

knowledge into a human intellect is impossible, and the problem of the incarnation should be stated: What effect did Divine omniscience in the person have on the conscious intellect of the manhood? There is so little help from the past to be gained in answering this question, that it must remain open at present — if, indeed, it is ever capable of a full answer. But that ignorance in the intellect of the manhood is fully consistent with omniscience in the person seems to be not merely a safe answer to the question as stated, but an inevitable answer if the true humanity of Christ is to be maintained at all.

## LITERATURE.

Sanday's Christology and Personality, 1911, and Lamentations Zouche, The Person of Christ in Modern Thought, 1912, are among the latest discussions of the subject, with very full references to the modern literature.

*Burton Scott Easton*

## KERAS

<ke'-ras> ([Κίρας, *Kiras*]): In 1 Esdras 5:29, the head of a family of temple-servants, called "Keroz" in ⲕⲉⲣⲟⲗ Ezra 2:44; ⲕⲉⲣⲁ Nehemiah 7:47.

## KERCHIEF

<ker'-chif> (ⲕⲉⲣⲥⲏⲓ [micpachoth]; [ἐπιβόλαια, *epibolaia*]): Occurs only in ⲕⲉⲣⲥⲏⲓ Ezekiel 13:18,21, in a passage which refers to some species of divination. Their exact shape or use is unknown. They were apparently long veils or coverings put over the heads of those consulting the false prophetesses and reaching down to the feet, for they were for "persons of every stature."

## KEREN-HAPPUCH

<ker'-en-hap'-uk>, <ke'-ren-hap'-uk> (ⲕⲉⲣⲏⲁⲡⲭⲁ [qeren happukh], "horn of antimony," i.e. beautifier; Septuagint [Ἀμακθείας κέρασ, *Amaltheias keras*]): The 3rd daughter of Job (ⲕⲉⲣⲏⲁⲡⲭⲁ Job 42:14), born after his restoration from affliction. Antimony, producing a brilliant black, was used among the Orientals for coloring the edges of the eyelids, making the eyes

large and lustrous. Hence, the suggestiveness of this name of an article of the ladies' toilet, a little horn or receptacle for the eye-paint.

## KERIOOTH

<ke'-ri-oth>, <-oth> (twɔb)[qeriyoth]:

(1) A city of Moab, named with Beth-meon and Bozrah (<sup><2483></sup>Jeremiah 48:24,41). Here was a sanctuary of Chemosh, to which Mesha says (M S, l. 13) he dragged "the altar hearths of Davdoh." It may possibly be represented by the modern Kuraiat, between Diban and `Attarus. Some (e.g. Driver on <sup><300></sup>Amos 2:2) think it may be only another name for Ar-Moab. Buhl (GAP, 270) would identify it with Kir of Moab (Kerak). No certainty is yet possible.

(2) A city of Judah (<sup><6155></sup>Joshua 15:25; the Revised Version (British and American) **KERIOOTH-HEZRON** (which see)), possibly the modern el-Kuryatain, to the Northeast of Tell `Arad.

W. Ewing

## KERIOOTH-HEZRON

<ke'-ri-oth-hez'-ron> (ˈwɒx] , twɔb)[qeriyoth chetsron]; <sup><6155></sup>Joshua 15:25 says, "The same is Hazor"; the King James Version "Kerioth and Hezron which is Hazor"): One of the cities in the "south" of Judah. Robinson (BR, II, 101) identifies it with the ruined site of Kuryatain, 4 1/2 miles North of Tell `Arad. It has been suggested that Kerioth was the birth place of **JUDAS ISCARIOT** (which see). Compare KERIOOTH, 2.

## KERNEL

<kur'-nel> (pyNix" r" j" [chartsannim], English Versions of the Bible "kernels"; Septuagint reads [stemphullon] used by Aristophanes as olives from which oil has been pressed, later, in same, of raisin pulp): Mentioned in <sup><000></sup>Numbers 6:4 along with gz:[zagh], translated "husks." This translates, "kernels" or "grape stones," is from the Targum and Talmud, but is doubtful, and it may be the word should be translated "sour grapes."

## KEROS

<ke'-ros> (סְרֹסֶרֶק [qeroc], “fortress”(?)): One of the Nethinim (<sup><1914></sup>Ezra 2:44; <sup><1974></sup>Nehemiah 7:47), an order appointed to the liturgical offices of the temple.

See *NETHINIM*.

## KESIL

<ke'-zil> (Orion).

See *ASTRONOMY*.

## KESITAH

<kes'-i-ta>, <ke-se'-ta> (הִפְסִיתָ [qesiTah]).

See *PIECE OF MONEY*.

## KETAB

<ke'-tab> ([Κητάβ, *Ketab*): Ancestor of a family of Nethinim (1 Esdras 5:30).

## KETTLE

<ker'-'l>: In English Versions of the Bible only in <sup><1914></sup>1 Samuel 2:14 for dudh, “a vessel for cooking.” The same word in <sup><1453></sup>2 Chronicles 35:13 is rendered “caldrons,” and in <sup><1842></sup>Job 41:20 (Hebrew 12), “pot.” <sup><1806></sup>Psalms 81:6 (Hebrew 7) (the King James Version “pots”) belongs rather to another signification of the word (the Revised Version (British and American) “basket,” for carrying clay or bricks).

## KETURAH

<ke-tu'-ra>, <ke-too'-ra> (הַרְטֻרָה [qeTurah]; [Χεττούρα, Chettoura], “incense”): The second wife of Abraham (<sup><1920></sup>Genesis 25:1; <sup><1912></sup>1 Chronicles 1:32 f). According to the Biblical tradition, he contracted this second marriage after the death of Sarah (compare Genesis 23), and very likely after the marriage of Isaac (compare Genesis 24). It is not

improbable that, as some writers have suggested, this change in the life of his son prompted Abraham to remarry in order to overcome the feeling of lonesomeness caused by Isaac's entering the state of matrimony.

<B0B>1 Chronicles 1:32 (and also <O2B6>Genesis 25:6) shows us that Keturah was not considered to be of the same dignity as Sarah who, indeed, was the mother of the son of promise, and, for obvious reasons, the sons of Abraham's concubines were separated from Isaac. She was the mother of 6 sons representing Arab tribes South and East of Palestine (<O2B6>Genesis 25:1-6), so that through the offspring of Keturah Abraham became "the father of many nations."

*William Baur*

## KEY

<ke> (j " Tḡḡḡ) [maphteach], an "opener"; compare [κλείς, *kleis*], "that which shuts"): Made of wood, usually with nails which fitted into corresponding holes in the lock, or rather bolt (<O0B5>Judges 3:25). Same is rendered "opening" in <B0B7>1 Chronicles 9:27.

*See HOUSE.*

Figurative: Used figuratively for power, since the key was sometimes worn on the shoulder as a sign of official authority (Isaiah 22-22). In the New Testament it is used several times thus figuratively: of Peter: "the keys of the kingdom of heaven" (<O6B9>Matthew 16:19); of Christ, in Revelation, having the "keys of death and of Hades" (<B0B8>Revelation 1:18), also having "the key of David" (<B0B7>Revelation 3:7). An angel was given "the key of the pit of the abyss" (<B0B1>Revelation 9:1; 20:1). our Lord accused the teachers of the law of His day of taking away "the key of knowledge" from men, that is, locking the doors of truth against them (<B1B5>Luke 11:52; compare <O2B3>Matthew 23:13).

*Edward Bagby Pollard*

## KEYS, POWER OF

<kez>

There is no more stubbornly contested conception in Christian terminology. The thought connects itself immediately with <O6B9>Matthew 16:19, but it is hardly correct to say that it originates there, for the



controversy is one that grows out of the conflict of forces inherent in the institutional development of religion and of society. It must have arisen, in any event, if there had been no such word as that in ~~1069~~ Matthew 16:19, although not in the same terms as it is now found. Since the Reformation it has been recognized, by Catholic and Protestant, that on the interpretation of this passage depends the authority of the Church of Rome and its exclusive claims, so far as their foundation in Scripture is concerned; while on the other hand there is involved the “validity” of the “sacraments,” “ordinances” and “orders” of Protestantism and the very hope of salvation of Protestants.

## **I. THE PROBLEMS INVOLVED.**

### *1. The Keys; and the Binding and Loosing:*

The crucial passage has two declarations, commonly spoken of as promises to Peter: to him Christ will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven; whatsoever he shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, while whatsoever he shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. How are the facts of having committed to him the keys and the function of binding and loosing related? Are they two forms of one declaration? Is the first general, and the second a specific sphere of its application?

Both statements are made in figurative terms. That of the keys is supposed to be drawn from the duties of the chief steward of a house, or establishment. The idea of the keys of a city turned over to some distinguished person is advanced, but is hardly to be considered. We need, then, to know the functions of the chief steward and how they apply to the kingdom of heaven, and to Peter as its steward.

### *2. Meaning of the Statements:*

What was Peter to bind and loose, men or things, persons or teachings? Numerous examples could be cited of the use of these terms to signify forbidding (binding) and permitting (loosing) conduct as legitimate under the law of the Old Testament (Lightfoot, McClintock and Strong, Schaff-Herzog, Hastings, etc.). The strict school of Shammai bound many things loosed by the laxer school of Hillel (Broadus, Matthew). Is this conclusive that Jesus is here giving Peter authority for “laying down the law for his fellow-disciples,” “authority to say what the law of God allows, and what it

forbids,” “the power of legislation for the church”? (Compare Mason in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), IV, 30.)

### *3. How Peter Is Related to These Powers:*

Ecclesiastical contentions turn especially on Peter's relation to these words of Jesus. Do they signify powers and “privileges” conferred on Peter, exclusively or representatively? Are they official or personal? Do they belong to other apostles, and to other officers besides apostles? Can the powers be exercised by individuals or by the church alone? If any besides Peter have these powers, do they pass to them from Peter, and how?

### *4. Is the Primary Idea That of Position and Authority?:*

What seems to the writer a fundamental question here is either passed over very lightly or entirely omitted in the discussions of this subject. Did Jesus mean by these words to confer on Peter, or on anyone to whom they may apply, authority, or obligation; privilege, or responsibility? Does He promise position, or does He impose duty? These alternatives are not necessarily exclusive, but the interpretation of the thought will be determined in no small measure by where the stress is laid.

## **II. VIEWS MAINTAINED.**

### *1. Agent of the Power:*

The possibilities have been exhausted in the interpretations and applications advocated. It is not possible to classify on lines of the creeds, except very generally, for there is little uniformity of view existing within the various communions.

**(1)** Generally speaking, the Roman Catholic church gives to Peter a unique position. Her theologians also agree that all the powers and privileges of Peter descend to his successors in the vicarate of Christ. When the question is raised of the extension of these prerogatives beyond Peter and the popes, all sorts of views are held, concerning both the fact and the method of that extension.

**(2)** Among Protestants there is general agreement that the church is the agent of this power, but there is not uniformity as to the nature of the authority or the manner of its exercise.

**(3)** Some think that Peter has no peculiar relation to the keys; that these words were spoken to him only as the first who gave expression to that conception and experience, on the basis of which Jesus commits the keys of the kingdom to any believer in Him as the Christ of God.

We may summarize the more important views as to Peter thus:

- (a)** the power committed to him alone and exercised,
  - (i)** at Pentecost, or
  - (ii)** at Pentecost, Caesarea and other places;
- (b)** the power committed to Peter and to the other apostles, including Paul, discharged by them, and descended to no others;
- (c)** the power conferred on Peter officially and on his official successors;
- (d)** the power conferred on Peter and the other apostles and to such as hold their place in the church;
- (e)** that the power belongs to Peter as representative of the church, and so to the church to be exercised
  - (i)** by the officials of the church
  - (ii)** by the officials and those to whom they commit it,
  - (iii)** by all priests and persons allowed to represent the church, de facto,
  - (iv)** by the church in its councils, or other formal and official decisions,
  - (v)** by the church in less formal way than (iv),
  - (vi)** by all members the church as representing it without specific commission;
- (f)** that it belongs to the Christian as such, and so is imposed upon, or offered to, all Christians.

## *2. Nature of the Power:*

There is general — not absolute — agreement that the holder of the keys is to admit men into the kingdom. It is not agreed that the holder of the keys may, or can, determine who are members of the kingdom. Both sides are-taken. Some think that the power is that of announcing authoritatively the conditions of entrance, while others insist that the holder of the keys also determines what individuals have accepted the conditions.

## *3. Scope of the Power:*

**(1)** There is strong support for the view that the primary function of the keys lies in determining the teaching of the kingdom, maintaining purity of doctrine. Emphasis is laid on the use of the neuter, “whatsoever” — not “whomsoever” — with the binding and loosing. This would lead, however, to the secondary and implied function of declaring who had or had not accepted the teaching of the kingdom.

**(2)** In the Roman Catholic church we find insistence on distinguishing between the general authority of the keys in all affairs of the church and religion, and the binding and loosing which they specifically apply to absolution. Only on this last are Catholics in full agreement. That the church administers salvation is held by Roman and Greek Catholics and by not a few Protestants, although Protestants do not, as a rule, claim exclusive power in salvation as do the others. Absolution is held to be a general (derived) priestly function, while the authority of the keys resides in the pope alone.

**(3)** Eminent Catholic authorities admit that the Fathers generally understood the keys to signify the power of forgiving sins, and that they seldom make any reference to the supremacy of Peter. But they claim that rarely the Fathers do take “Christ’s promise in the fuller meaning of the gift of authority over the church.” Suarez was the first to develop the doctrine that it conferred on Peter and his successors authority in its widest sense, administrative and legislative.

**(4)** The extension of the authority of the keys to include civil matters is a contention of the Roman church, shared in modified form by some Protestants. Indeed the relation of ecclesiastical to civil authority must be said still to be awaiting clear definition in Protestantism. Macedo (Deuteronomy Clavibus Petri) claims theologians of the church for the civil

authority of the keys. Joyce in the Catholic Encyclopedia affirms that he is unable to verify this claim, but, on the contrary, finds that the opponents of the extension of the authority of the church to civil matters use ~~✠~~Matthew 16:19 in support of their position on the ground that to Peter were committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven, not of the kingdoms of this world.

### III. DATA FOR DECIDING THE QUESTIONS INVOLVED.

#### *1. Passages Employing the Terms “Key,” “Binding and Loosing”:*

We must first examine the Scriptures employing the terms we seek to define.

(1) ~~✠~~Matthew 16:19, the crucial passage, is part of paragraph over which there is no end of controversy. The incident at Caesarea Philippi was understood then and afterward to mark an epoch in the life and teaching of Jesus. Having elicited Peter’s confession, Jesus pronounces a benediction on him because his insight represented a Divinely mediated experience of fundamental significance in His own plan and mission. Jesus goes on to say: “And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter (“a stone”), and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it” (~~✠~~Matthew 16:18). The controversy rages about “Peter” ([πέτρος, *petros*]) and the “rock” ([πέτρα, *petra*]), “gates of Hades,” and “prevail against it.” Are the church to be built on the rock and the kingdom whose keys are to be given to Peter the same? Such a shifting of figure is not conclusive against the thought. Perhaps the church is the organic form of the kingdom, its personal content and expression on earth at any given time. This church exists wherever men consciously accept and are included in the kingdom. The kingdom will always embrace influences, institutions, individuals, not be reckoned in any organized or visible church. The church has never had — in the nature of the case can never have — one complete organization including all the organized life of the kingdom, or even of the church. Any claims to this are contradicted by facts obvious at every moment of history. The change in figure from ~~✠~~Matthew 16:18 to 16:19 is not conclusive against supposing the church to be built in him. But it seems far better to understand that Peter is the first stone in the building, while the foundation is that vital experience in which Peter came to know Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God. On this is erected the church, out of those living stones ([λίθοι ζῶντες, *lithoi zontes*], ~~✠~~1 Peter 2:4) that

know and confess Jesus the Christ. The transition is thus easy to giving Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the reason for giving them to him rather than to any other may be found in the fact that he is now the first so to enter into the kingdom as to be fitted for church functions.

It is not needful to determine, for our purpose, the exact meaning of “gates of Hades” and their not prevailing against the church (compare various commentaries). It is clear that the church is to persist in the life of the world and so the kingdom will not lack organized and aggressive expression. Nor does the relation of binding and loosing depend at all upon the critical question of reading or omitting “and” between the two parts of the verse. The conviction could hardly be escaped that the latter function is intimately related to the former, and is either directly or indirectly involved within it.

**(2)** The plural “keys,” occurs elsewhere only in ~~4018~~ Revelation 1:18, where the Christ represents Himself as holding the keys of death and of Hades. The word “Hades” might connect this with ~~4069~~ Matthew 16:19. The immediate occasion for the statement is that He who was dead, is alive; He has not only overcome death in His own person but has conquered it and its realm, so that they can no more have power except as subject to Him, since He holds their keys. Men on earth will either fall under the power of death and Hades or they must enter the kingdom of heaven. If the living Christ has the keys of the kingdom in the hands of Peter, or other friends, and holds the keys of its enemies in His own hands, the work will go on with success. It is not certain that the two passages can properly be so closely connected, but they thus afford just the assurance that is contained for the churches in Revelation.

**(3)** In ~~4017~~ Revelation 3:7 Christ appears in the character, “he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key (singular) of David, he that openeth and none can shut, and that shutteth and none openeth.” The idea is not restricted but indicates mastery over all things in the Messianic kingdom, its own operations and all forms of opposition. In the next verse, as a specific instance, He has set before the church at Philadelphia an open door (opportunity and progress) which none can shut. Compare as to this ~~4012~~ Ephesians 1:22.

**(4)** It seems to be taken for granted that Jesus, in ~~4069~~ Matthew 16:19, had direct reference to ~~4022~~ Isaiah 22:22, yet the passage is not Messianic except

in a general sense and on the assumption that the power of Yahweh over the nations in the Old Testament is wielded by the Christ in the New Testament (*see JEHOVAH; LORD*). Eliakim is to have absolute power, holding the key of the house of David. The use of the words “open” and “shut,” as well as the general conception, connects the passage rather with ~~REV~~ Revelation 3:7.

(5) ~~REV~~ Revelation 9:1; 20:1 are to be taken together. “The key of the pit of the abyss” in the hands of the angel or angels signifies, in these specific circumstances, the same power as that indicated in 1:18.

(6) In ~~LUK~~ Luke 11:52 Jesus pronounces a woe upon the “lawyers” who had “taken away the key of knowledge” from the people, neither entering in nor allowing those about to go in, to enter. The knowledge of God and Divine things was in the control, in great measure, of these scribes. This connects the figure directly with the idea of ~~MAT~~ Matthew 16:19, and the connection is emphasized by comparing ~~MAT~~ Matthew 23:2 f; and is made definite by the word of Jesus in ~~MAT~~ Matthew 13:52 with which is to be compared ~~LUK~~ Luke 12:42, where it would not be allowable, to suppose that Jesus meant to limit the idea of “the faithful and wise steward” to Peter. This passage with the references seems to be highly important for our subject.

## *2. Related Passages:*

Light is to be drawn from several passages that do not use the exact terms of ~~MAT~~ Matthew 16:19, but that deal with the same general ideas.

(1) ~~MAT~~ Matthew 18:18 places the responsibility for binding and loosing on all disciples (18:1), and the reason is explained in the assured presence of the Christ Himself in any company of two or three who have come together in prayer touching any matter in His name, i.e. as His representatives. The immediate reference is to matters of discipline in the effort to rescue any “brother” from sin. The passage is to be taken of sin generally, for the reading “against thee” (18:15) is to be rejected, in spite of both revised versions. The reference of binding and loosing here to the man is conclusive against limiting the idea in 16:19 to teaching (compare also ~~LUK~~ Luke 17:1 ff). It is also to be noted that the responsibility is placed upon the individual Christian to cooperate with others when necessary.

(2) <sup><108></sup>Matthew 9:8 shows that the multitude recognized that God had given power on earth to pronounce forgiveness of sins, and apparently they do not limit this power to the Divine Person, for they do not yet know Him as such.

(3) <sup><104></sup>James 5:14 ff recognizes the value of elders, and probably of others also, in securing the forgiveness of them that have sinned.

(4) What one must regard as the proper starting-point for studying this subject is <sup><107></sup>John 20:21 ff. Appearing to ten of the apostles and to others on the first night after the resurrection, Jesus says: “As the Father sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whose soever ye retain, they are retained.” By comparing this with the corresponding account in Luke 24 we see that Jesus is directing that they shall carry on His work (see also <sup><142></sup>John 14:12-14; 15:15,16), that He teaches them at length of the nature of His work as seen in the Old Testament, and that the method of their work is to be preaching repentance and remission of sins in His name among all nations. Significant for our purpose are the presence of others than the apostles, the gift of the Holy Spirit, His own self-projection in His messengers, and the solemn statement that the sins of men will be retained or forgiven as it is done through these followers.

### *3. Examples of Exercise of This Power:*

(1) It is remarkable that there is no distinct reference to this authority of the keys in the records of the work of the apostles and others in the New Testament. Their consciousness seems most of all to have been dominated by the fact that they were witnesses of Jesus, and this corresponds exactly with the point of emphasis in all the various forms and occasions of the giving of the commission (see <sup><123></sup>Acts 2:32; 3:15; 4:33; 5:32; 10:39,41; 13:31; <sup><101></sup>1 Peter 5:1; compare Carver, *Missions in the Plan of the Ages*). It is said of Paul and Barnabas (<sup><147></sup>Acts 14:27) that after their first missionary journey they rehearsed to the church at Antioch “all things that God had done with them, and that he had opened a door of faith unto the Gentiles.” At Pentecost and at other times Peter was the chief speaker, and so opened the door of the kingdom. Referring to his preaching to Cornelius and his friends, Peter reminds the saints in the conference at Jerusalem (Acts 15) that God made choice among them, that by his mouth the



Gentiles should hear the word of God and believe, but this was said by way of conciliating the Jewish party and not as claiming any priority in authority. It was Philip, the deacon-evangelist, who first preached to the Samaritans (Acts 8), and some “men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Greeks also, preaching the Lord Jesus” (~~<411>~~Acts 11:20), the first example of “opening a door of faith” to full heathen. Peter appears in the Jerusalem conference with no authority above that of other apostles and elders. By reference to Galatians 2 we see that Paul was here only as a matter of prudence and fraternity, not recognizing any authority to legislate for his churches or his ministry. The decision there reached is promulgated as that of the brethren as a body, loosing all the law of Moses save four matters that were “necessary” on account of fundamental morals and of the universal presence of Jews in every city (~~<415>~~Acts 15:20 f, 28 f). In the sense of teaching Christian conduct all Paul’s letters are examples of binding and loosing.

(2) As to binding and loosing sins Peter speaks in the cases of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5), Simon Magus (Acts 8), and in deciding upon the baptism of Cornelius and his household (~~<410>~~Acts 10:48). Paul speaks with equal boldness in the judgment of Elymas (~~<413>~~Acts 13:10), where we are told that he was under the Spirit; passes upon the faith of a dozen men at Ephesus, and requires their new baptism after instruction (~~<419>~~Acts 19:3-7); commands the church at Corinth to turn over to Satan the incestuous man (~~<418>~~1 Corinthians 5:5; compare ~~<502>~~1 Timothy 1:20), and later urges the man’s restoration to loving fellowship, declaring that he has been forgiven (~~<412>~~2 Corinthians 2:5 ff). Obscure men like Philip (Acts 8) and Ananias of Damascus in the case of Paul himself (Acts 9) exercised the same sort of judgment as to the forgiveness and reception of men into the fellowship.

## IV. CONCLUSION.

### *1. Nature of the Power:*

We sum up what seems to be the teaching of Scripture. We conclude that the power is not a special privilege and extraordinary authority, but a responsibility entrusted by Jesus Christ as the method of extending His work. There is in it nothing magical, mysterious, or arbitrary; not ecclesiastical or official, but spiritual and primarily personal. The keys of the kingdom of heaven are first of all the gospel of salvation through Jesus Christ. By this means men are admitted into the kingdom. The fully

attested method of using the keys is that of witnessing personally to an experience of Jesus Christ. He was conferring power for saving and not for barring from salvation. Let it be borne in mind always that Jesus was offering Peter not power but duty, not privilege but responsibility. Neither of these terms, “power” and “privilege,” that have come to be associated with the gift of the keys occurs with that gift in the words of the Master. The keys are primarily for admitting to the kingdom of heaven, not for barring from the church.

### *2. Agent of the Power:*

The holder of the keys is any man with that experience that called forth from Jesus the assurance that Peter should have the keys. Such a man will be in fellowship and cooperation with like men, in a church, and the Spirit of Jesus will be present in them, so that their decisions and their testimony will be His as well as theirs. There is a corporate, or church, agency, therefore, and the man who would ignore that lacks the experience or the Spirit needful for the use of the keys. Yet the church is never to overshadow or exclude the individual responsibility and authority.

### *3. Scope of the Power:*

It is to be understood that the keys of the kingdom of heaven confer no political authority or power, save that of holy and redemptive influence. The kingdom of Jesus is not of this world. Its power is spiritual and is to be exercised always primarily in the saving of men. Men do not need to be locked out of the kingdom. They are out, and too contented to remain so. It does happen that evil men seek to take possession of the kingdom for evil ends, and then it is that the authority rests in spiritual men to exclude. Men that are to be brought into the kingdom of heaven are now in sin, and where the duty of releasing them is not discharged by Christians, the sinners are left bound in their sins.

There is also involved of necessity the duty of declaring not only the conditions of entrance into the kingdom, but the courses of conduct appropriate to the kingdom. It is thus that binding and loosing in teaching devolve upon the holders of the keys. To that extent, and in that sense, alone, is there the power of “legislating” within the kingdom. This is only interpreting and applying the principles that are given us in the Scriptures.

*See further ABSOLUTION; IMPOSITION OF HANDS; PETER; ROCK.*

*William Owen Carver*

## KEZIAH

<ke-zi'-a> (h[**y**xq̣][qetsi`ah], “cassia”; [**Κασία**, *Kasia*], Codex Alexandrinus, Kassia): The 2nd daughter of Job (<sup><8214></sup>Job 42:14), born after his restoration from affliction. The word “cassia” became a feminine name from the fragrance of the flower.

## KEZIZ

<ke'-ziz> (**Āy**xq̣[**q**etsits]).

*See EMEK-KEZIZ.*

## KHAN

<kan>, <kan>.

*See INN.*

## KIBROTH-HATTAVAH

<kib-roth-ha-ta'-a-va>, <kib-roth> (hwa**ṭ**" h" tr**ḥ**q̣i[qibhroth ha-ta'awah] “the graves of greed”): A desert camp of the Israelites, one day’s journey from the wilderness of Sinai. There the people lusted for flesh to eat, and, a great number of quails being sent, a plague resulted; hence, the name (<sup><04134></sup>Numbers 11:34; 33:16; <sup><18322></sup>Deuteronomy 9:22).

## KIBZAIM

<kib-za'-im>, <kib'-za-im>

*See JOKMEAM.*

## KICK

([**λακτίζω**, *laktizo*]): In the famous vision on the road to Damascus the unseen voice said to Saul: “Why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to

kick against the goad” (~~<490>~~ Acts 9:4 f; 26:14). The words are omitted from the best manuscripts in ~~<490>~~ Acts 9:4. This was a familiar proverb in both Greek and Latin literature, and refers to the severer goading received by an ox which kicks back at the goad used to guide or urge him on. The words seem to mean that Paul’s paroxysm of persecution was a painful as well as profitless resistance to the pricks of conscience by which God was leading him into the light.

## KID

- (1) **ydḡ**[gedhi] (~~<9239>~~ Exodus 23:19, etc.);
- (2) feminine gedhiyah (~~<23106>~~ Isaiah 11:6, etc.);
- (3) **μyZ**[**lydḡ**][gedhi `izzim], English Versions of the Bible “kid,” literally, “kid of the goats,” the King James Version margin (~~<1069>~~ Judges 6:19, etc.);
- (4) **z**[ḡez], literally, “goat” (~~<6142>~~ Deuteronomy 14:21; ~~<1317>~~ 1 Kings 20:27);
- (5) **μyZ**[**lry**[ḡ][se`ir `izzim], the King James Version “kid of the goats,” the Revised Version (British and American) “he-goat” (~~<1373>~~ Genesis 37:31; ~~<8908>~~ Leviticus 9:3, etc.);
- (6) [**ἐριφος**, *eriphos*] (~~<9159>~~ Luke 15:29).

See **GOAT**.

## KIDNAPPING (MANSTEALING)

~~<kid'-nap-ing>~~ The term itself occurs only in the New Testament [**ἀνδραποδιστής**, *andrapodistes*] = “manstealer”) in ~~<5010>~~ 1 Timothy 1:10. The crime was directly forbidden in the Hebrew law (~~<9216>~~ Exodus 21:16; ~~<6247>~~ Deuteronomy 24:7), and was made punishable with death.

## KIDNEYS

~~<kid'-niz>~~ (always in the plural: **twḡ K**[kelayoth]; [**νεφροι**, *nephroi*]; Latin *renes*, whence the English “reins”): “Reins” and “kidneys” are synonyms, but the King James Version undertook a distinction by using the

former word in the figurative, the latter in the literal passages. the English Revised Version has followed the King James Version exactly, but the American Standard Revised Version has retained “reins” only in <sup><18163></sup>Job 16:13; <sup><21813></sup>Lamentations 3:13; <sup><11223></sup>Revelation 2:23, elsewhere substituting “heart,” except in <sup><19193></sup>Psalms 139:13, where “inward parts” is used. the King James Version and the English Revised Version also have “reins” for **מַיְכָלִי** [chalatsayim], in <sup><21115></sup>Isaiah 11:5 (the American Standard Revised Version “loins”). The physiological function of the kidneys is not referred to in the Bible, but has been introduced (quite wrongly) by the King James Version margin to <sup><18152></sup>Leviticus 15:2; 22:4.

**(1)** The kidneys owe their importance in the Bible partly to the fact that they are imbedded in fat, and fat of such purity that fat of the kidneys was a proverbial term for surpassing excellence (<sup><18214></sup>Deuteronomy 32:14 margin). For the visceral fat was the part of the animal best adapted for sacrificial burning, and hence, came to be deemed peculiarly sacred (<sup><18172></sup>Leviticus 7:22-25; <sup><11116></sup>1 Samuel 2:16). Accordingly, the kidneys with the fat surrounding them were burned in every sacrifice in which the entire animal was not consumed, whether in peace (<sup><18104></sup>Leviticus 3:4,10,15; 9:19), sin (<sup><12193></sup>Exodus 29:13; <sup><18104></sup>Leviticus 4:9; 8:16; 9:10), or trespass, (<sup><18104></sup>Leviticus 7:4) offerings; compare the “ram of consecration” (<sup><12192></sup>Exodus 29:22; <sup><18125></sup>Leviticus 8:25). So in <sup><23116></sup>Isaiah 34:6, “fat of the kidneys of rams” is chosen as a typical sacrificial term to parallel “blood of lambs and goats.”

**(2)** The position of the kidneys in the body makes them particularly inaccessible, and in cutting up an animal they are the last organs to be reached. Consequently, they were a natural symbol for the most hidden part of a man (<sup><19193></sup>Psalms 139:13), and in <sup><18163></sup>Job 16:13 to “cleave the reins asunder” is to effect the total destruction of the individual (compare <sup><18197></sup>Job 19:27; <sup><21813></sup>Lamentations 3:13). This hidden location, coupled with the sacred sacrificial use, caused the kidneys to be thought of as the seat of the innermost moral (and emotional) impulses. So the reins instruct (<sup><19167></sup>Psalms 16:7) or are “pricked” (<sup><19121></sup>Psalms 73:21), and God can be said to be far from the reins of sinners (<sup><24112></sup>Jeremiah 12:2). In all of these passages “conscience” gives the exact meaning. So the reins rejoice (<sup><12136></sup>Proverbs 23:16), cause torment (2 Esdras 5:34), or tremble in wrath (1 Macc 2:24). And to “know” or “try the reins” (usually joined with “the heart”) is an essential power of God’s, denoting His complete knowledge of the nature of every human being (<sup><18109></sup>Psalms 7:9; 26:2; <sup><24112></sup>Jeremiah 11:20; 17:10;

20:12; The Wisdom of Solomon 1:6; <sup><4023></sup>Revelation 2:23). *See FAT; PSYCHOLOGY; SACRIFICE*. Compare RS2, 379-80, and for Greek sacrificial parallels Journal of Philology, XIX (1890), 46. The anatomical relations are well exhibited in the plate in Sacred Books of the Old Testament, "Leviticus."

*Burton Scott Easton*

## KIDRON

*<kid'-ron>* ([*Κεδρών*, *Kedron*]; the King James Version Cedron): A place which, in obedience to Antiochus Sidetes, Cendebaeus fortified (1 Macc 15:39 ff), to which, when defeated, he fled, hotly pursued by John and Judas, sons of Simon the Maccabee, who burned the city (1 Macc 16:4 ff). It is named along with Jamnia (Yebna) and Azotus (Esdud). It is possibly identical with Katrah], a village about 3 miles Southwest of `Aqir (Ekron).

## KIDRON, THE BROOK

(*^w0d" qil j " n'*[nachal qidhron]; in <sup><380></sup>John 18:1 (the King James Version Cedron), [*ὁ χειμάρρους τῶν Κέδρων*, *ho cheimarrhous ton Kedron*], according to the Revised Version margin, the last two words are to be considered as meaning "of the cedars." The Hebrew word has been very generally accepted as from *rdq*:[qadhar], "to become black," but it is an attractive suggestion (Cheyne) that it may be a phonetic variation of *^w0d0*:[gidderon], "a spot for enclosures for cattle," of which latter there must have been many around the now buried caves which lay at the base of the cliffs around the spring Gihon):

### 1. WADY SITTI MIRIAM:

The Nachal Qidhron is the valley known today as the Wady Sitti Miriam, which lies between the eastern walls of Jerusalem and the Mount of Olives. It commences in the plateau to the North of the city, and after making a wide sweep Southeast, under the name Wady el Joz ("Valley of the Walnuts"), passes South until level with the southeastern corner of the temple-area where its bed is spanned by an old bridge; here the bottom of the valley, 40 ft. beneath the present surface level, is 400 ft. below the temple-platform. From this point it narrows and deepens gradually, bending slightly West of South, and, after receiving the Tyropoeon valley,

joins a little farther Southwest with the Valley of Hinnom to form the Wady en Nar which winds on through the “wilderness of Judea” to the Dead Sea. Where the three valleys run together is a large open space filled with gardens (the *KING’S GARDENS*, which see), which are kept irrigated all the year round by means of the overflow waters from the `Ain Silwan (see *SILLOAM*). It is where the Hinnom valley runs into the Kidron that some would locate *TOPHETH* (which see). Except at the irrigated gardens, the ravine is a dry valley containing water only during and immediately after heavy rain, but in ancient times the rocky bottom — now buried beneath many feet of rich soil — must have contained a little stream from Gihon for at least some hundreds of yards. This was the “brook that flowed through the midst of the land” (~~484~~ 2 Chronicles 32:4). The length of the valley from its head to Bir Eyyub is 2 3/4 miles.

## 2. TRADITIONS:

Since the 4th century AD, this valley has been known as the *VALLEY OF JEHOASHAPHAT* (which see), and from quite early times it was a favorite situation for interments (~~1234~~ 2 Kings 23:4,6,12; ~~484~~ 2 Chronicles 34:4,5); it is by Moslem and Jewish tradition the scene of the last judgment, and was known to the Moslems in the Middle Ages as Wady Jehannum; see *GEHENNA*. It is probable that the “graves of the common people,” where King Jehoiakim cast the body of the prophet Uriah, were here (~~2823~~ Jeremiah 26:23), and it has been suggested, with less probability, that here too may have been the scene of Ezekiel’s vision of the “valley of dry bones” (Ezekiel 37; compare ~~2814~~ Jeremiah 31:40).

## 3. THE FIELDS OF KIDRON:

The Fields of Kidron (~~1234~~ 2 Kings 23:4), though generally identified with the open, lower part of this valley, where it is joined by the Tyropoeon valley, may more probably have been in the upper part where the wide expanded valley receives the name Wady el Joz; this part is actually on the road to Bethel.

## 4. HISTORICAL ASSOCIATIONS:

The most dramatic scene associated with the Kidron is that recorded in connection with its earliest Scriptural mention (~~10523~~ 2 Samuel 15:23), when David, flying before his rebellious son Absalom, here stood on the

Jerusalem side of the valley while all his adherents passed over. “And all the country wept with a loud voice, and all the people passed over: the king also himself passed over the brook Kidron .... toward the way of the wilderness.” The passing over this brook appears to have been viewed as the solemn abandonment of the Jerusalem territory (compare <sup><1025></sup>1 Kings 2:37). In <sup><1153></sup>1 Kings 15:13; <sup><1456></sup>2 Chronicles 15:16, we read that Asa burnt at the brook Kidron “an abominable image for an Asherah” which Maacah, his mother, had set up. In the reforms of Hezekiah, “all the uncleanness that they found in the temple of Yahweh” was carried by the Levites to the brook Kidron (<sup><1296></sup>2 Chronicles 29:16); “All the altars for incense took they away, and cast them into the brook Kidron” (<sup><1814></sup>2 Chronicles 30:14). This locality was again used in the reforms of Josiah when the king “brought out the Asherah from the house of Yahweh, without Jerusalem, unto the brook Kidron, and burned it at the brook Kidron, and beat it to dust, and cast the dust thereof upon the graves of the common people” (<sup><1236></sup>2 Kings 23:6). The same treatment was given to the vessels made for Baal, the Asherah and the host of heaven (<sup><1234></sup>2 Kings 23:4), and the two idolatrous altars of Manasseh (<sup><1232></sup>2 Kings 23:12). Josephus (Ant., IX, vii, 3) states that Athaliah was slain in the valley of Kidron, but this does not quite tally with the account (<sup><12116></sup>2 Kings 11:16). It was a valley associated with graves and the ashes of abominations, but it was prophesied that it should be “holy unto Yahweh” (<sup><2614></sup>Jeremiah 31:40). Twice it is mentioned simply as “the valley,” [nachal] (<sup><14314></sup>2 Chronicles 33:14; <sup><14215></sup>Nehemiah 2:15). Very different from these earlier scenes is the last Scriptural reference (<sup><1810></sup>John 18:1), when Jesus “went forth with his disciples over the brook Kidron” for His last hours of spiritual struggle and prayer before the turmoil of the end.

*E. W. G. Masterman*

## KILAN

<sup><ki'-lan></sup> ([<sup><Kilán></sup>, *Kilan*]; the King James Version Ceilan): Mentioned with Azetas in 1 Esdras 5:15; their sons returned among the exiles with Zerubbabel. The names do not appear in the lists of Ezra and Nehemiah.

## KIMAH

<sup><ki'-ma></sup> (Pleiades).

*See ASTRONOMY.*



## KIN

See *KINDRED*.

## KIN, NEXT OF

See *KINSMAN*.

## KINAH

<ki'-na> (**hnyqi** [qinah]): An unidentified town on the southern boundary of Judah, toward Edom (<sup><1652></sup>Joshua 15:22). The word [qinah] means “elegy,” “dirge,” “lament for the dead.” The name, however, may have been derived from the Kenites, **ynycq** [qeniy], who had settlements in the South (<sup><1270></sup>1 Samuel 27:10, etc.).

## KINDNESS

<kind'-nes> (**dsj** ,[checedh]; [**χρηστότης**, *chrestotes*): “Kindness” in the Old Testament is (with one exception) the translation of [checedh], “kindness,” “favor,” “mercy,” etc., used chiefly of man but also of God (<sup><1213></sup>Genesis 20:13; 40:14; <sup><1456></sup>1 Samuel 15:6; 20:14,15; <sup><1018></sup>2 Samuel 9:3; <sup><1017></sup>Nehemiah 9:17; <sup><1415></sup>Psalms 141:5; <sup><2518></sup>Isaiah 54:8,10, etc.); [Tobh], “good,” is once so translated (<sup><1016></sup>2 Samuel 2:6). In the New Testament [chrestotes], “usefulness,” “beneficence,” is rendered “kindness” 4 t in the King James Version (<sup><1016></sup>2 Corinthians 6:6; <sup><1017></sup>Ephesians 2:7; <sup><1012></sup>Colossians 3:12; <sup><1014></sup>Titus 3:4, and in <sup><1012></sup>Galatians 5:22 the Revised Version (British and American)); see *GENTLENESS*; *GOODNESS*. [*Philanthropia*], “love of mankind,” is translated “kindness” <sup><1012></sup>Acts 28:2), and [*philadelphia*], “love of the brotherhood” (<sup><1012></sup>2 Peter 1:7, the English Revised Version “love of the brethren,” the American Revised Version margin “Gr, love of the brethren”).

For “kindness” (<sup><1812></sup>Psalms 31:21) the Revised Version (British and American) has “lovingkindness,” and the American Standard Revised Version in other places where the reference is to God; for “shew,” “shewed kindness” (<sup><1012></sup>Joshua 2:12) “deal,” “dealt kindly”; for “The desire of man is his kindness” (<sup><1012></sup>Proverbs 19:22) the American Standard Revised Version has “That which maketh a man to be desired is his kindness,” the English Revised Version “The desire of man is (the measure of) his kindness,” like

the American Standard Revised Version in m; for “merciful kindness” (<sup><1370></sup>Psalm 117:2) the American Standard Revised Version has “lovingkindness,” the English Revised Version “mercy”; both have “lovingkindness” (<sup><1376></sup>Psalm 119:76); for “of great kindness” (<sup><1397></sup>Nehemiah 9:17; <sup><1213></sup>Joel 2:13; <sup><3112></sup>Jonah 4:2) the American Standard Revised Version has “abundant in lovingkindness,” the English Revised Version “plenteous in mercy”; the Revised Version (British and American) has “kindness” for “mercy” (<sup><1321></sup>Genesis 39:21); for “pity” (<sup><1614></sup>Job 6:14); for “goodness” (<sup><1216></sup>Proverbs 20:6); “favor and kindness” the American Standard Revised Version, for “grace and favor” (<sup><1717></sup>Esther 2:17).

*See LOVINGKINDNESS; MERCY.*

## KINDRED

*<kin'-dred>*: Several words are rendered “kindred” in the King James Version. **j a**; [ʾach,] “brother,” was used loosely among Hebrews for a member of the same tribe or family, a relative; and is once translated “kindred” (<sup><1329></sup>1 Chronicles 12:29 the King James Version). Once also somewhat loosely as the translation of **t** [ṭamm [modha`ath], literally, “acquaintance” (<sup><1812></sup>Ruth 3:2; compare same root in 2:1, rendered “kinsman”); once, for the, figurative expression, “men of thy redemption” (**hLaṭr** [ge`ullah], referring to the law of the redemption of land by kinsmen, <sup><1255></sup>Leviticus 25:25). The two most common words for kindred are:

- (1) **tdkw** [moledheth], “related by birth” (<sup><1121></sup>Genesis 12:1; 24:4,7; 31:3,13; 32:9; 43:7; <sup><1410></sup>Numbers 10:30; <sup><1720></sup>Esther 2:10,20; 8:6);
- (2) **hj Pvjni** [mishpachah], “family” (<sup><1238></sup>Genesis 24:38,40,41; <sup><1613></sup>Joshua 6:23; <sup><1818></sup>Ruth 2:3; <sup><1363></sup>1 Chronicles 16:28; <sup><1812></sup>Job 32:2; <sup><1727></sup>Psalm 22:27; 96:7).

In the New Testament (several times), [γένος, *genos*], “kindred by birth,” so, of same family, tribe or race (<sup><406></sup>Acts 4:6; 7:13,19 the Revised Version (British and American) “race”); so also [συγγένεια, *suggeneia*] (<sup><1161></sup>Luke 1:61; <sup><4103></sup>Acts 7:3,14). In the King James Version [φυλή, *phule*], “tribe,” rendered “kindred” (<sup><1607></sup>Revelation 1:7; 5:9; 7:9; 11:9; 13:7; 14:6), but better “tribe” as in the Revised Version (British and American). [πατριά,

patria], rendered “kindred” in <sup><H825></sup>Acts 3:25, is better “families,” as in the Revised Version (British and American).

*Edward Bagby Pollard*

## KINE

<kin>:

(1) **μῦπλ α**['alaphim], plural of **ἵλ α**['eleph], “ox,” or “cow,” the American Standard Revised Version “cattle,” the King James Version and the English Revised Version “kine” (<sup><H8713></sup>Deuteronomy 7:13; 28:4,18,51);

(2) **ῥαῖ**[baqar], “ox” or “cow,” the American Standard Revised Version “herd,” the King James Version and the English Revised Version “kine” (<sup><H5214></sup>Deuteronomy 32:14; <sup><H7729></sup>2 Samuel 17:29);

(3) **ἑῤῥ**[paroth] plural of **ἑῤῥ**[parah], “young cow” or “heifer,” the Revised Version (British and American) “kine” in <sup><H4412></sup>Genesis 41:2-27; <sup><H907></sup>1 Samuel 6:7-14; <sup><H1001></sup>Amos 4:1; in <sup><H3215></sup>Genesis 32:15, the American Standard Revised Version has “cows.”

See *CATTLE*; *COW*.

## KING; KINGDOM

<king'-dum>:

### I. KING.

#### 1. Etymology and Definition:

The Hebrew word for king is **מלך** [melekh]; its denominative **מלך** [malakh], “to reign” “to be king.” The word is apparently derived from the [mlkh] which denotes:

(1) in the Arabic (the verb and the noun) it means “to possess,” “to reign,” inasmuch as the possessor is also “lord” and “ruler”;

(2) in the Aramaic **מלך** [melekh]), and Assyrian “counsel,” and in the Syrian “to consult”; compare Latin, consul.

If, as has been suggested, the root idea of “king” is “counsellor” and not “ruler,” then the rise of the kingly office and power would be due to intellectual superiority rather than to physical prowess. And since the first form of monarchy known was that of a “city-state,” the office of king may have evolved from that of the chief “elder” or intellectual head of the clan.

## *2. Earliest Kings:*

The first king of whom we read in the Bible was Nimrod (<sup><0108></sup>Genesis 10:8-10), who was supposedly the founder of the Babylonian empire. Historical research regarding the kings of Babylonia and Egypt corroborates this Biblical statement in so far as the ancestry of these kings is traced back to the earliest times of antiquity. According to <sup><2391></sup>Isaiah 19:11, it was the pride of the Egyptian princes that they could trace their lineage to most ancient kings. The Canaanites and Philistines had kings as early as the times of Abraham (<sup><0142></sup>Genesis 14:2; 20:2). Thus also the Edomites, who were related to Israel (<sup><0331></sup>Genesis 36:31), the Moabites, and the Midianites had kings (<sup><0204></sup>Numbers 22:4; 31:8) earlier than the Israelites.

In <sup><0148></sup>Genesis 14:18 we read of Melchizedek, who was a priest, and king of Salem. At first the extent of the dominion of kings was often very limited, as appears from 70 of them being conquered by Adonibezek (<sup><0007></sup>Judges 1:7), 31 by Joshua (<sup><6172></sup>Joshua 12:7 ff), and 32 being subject to Ben-hadad (<sup><1001></sup>1 Kings 20:1).

## *3. Biblical Signification of the Title:*

The earliest Biblical usage of this title “king,” in consonance with the general oriental practice, denotes an absolute monarch who exercises unchecked control over his subjects. In this sense the title is applied to Yahweh, and to human rulers. No constitutional obligations were laid upon the ruler nor were any restrictions put upon his arbitrary authority. His good or bad conduct depended upon his own free will.

The title “king” was applied also to dependent kings. In the New Testament it is used even for the head of a province (<sup><6672></sup>Revelation 17:12). To distinguish him from the smaller and dependent kings, the king of Assyria bore the title “king of kings.”

## II. KINGDOM.

The notable fact that Israel attained to the degree of a kingdom rather late, as compared with the other Semitic nations, does not imply that Israel, before the establishment of the monarchy, had not arrived at the stage of constitutional government, or that the idea of a kingdom had no room in the original plan of the founder of the Hebrew nation. For a satisfactory explanation we must take cognizance of the unique place that Israel held among the Semitic peoples.

### *1. Israel's Theocracy:*

It is universally recognized that Israel was a singular community. From the beginning of its existence as a nation it bore the character of a religious and moral community, a theocratic commonwealth, having Yahweh Himself as the Head and Ruler. The theocracy is not to be mistaken for a hierarchy, nor can it strictly be identified with any existent form of political organization. It was rather something over and above, and therefore independent of the political organization. It did not supersede the tribal organization of Israel, but it supplied the centralizing power, constituting Israel a nation. In lieu of a strong political center, the unifying bond of a common allegiance to Yahweh, i.e. the common faith in Him, the God of Israel, kept the tribes together. The consciousness that Yahweh was Israel's king was deeply rooted, was a national feeling, and the inspiration of a true patriotism (<sup><0258></sup>Exodus 15:18; 19:6; Judges 5). Yahweh's kingship is evinced by the laws He gave to Israel, by the fact that justice was administered in His name (<sup><0228></sup>Exodus 22:28), and by His leading and siding Israel in its wars (<sup><0144></sup>Exodus 14:14; 15:3; <sup><0214></sup>Numbers 21:14; <sup><0187></sup>1 Samuel 18:17; 25:28). This decentralized system which characterized the early government of Israel politically, in spite of some great disadvantages, proved advantageous for Israel on the whole and served a great providential purpose. It safeguarded the individual liberties and rights of the Israelites. When later the monarchy was established, they enjoyed a degree of local freedom and self-control that was unknown in the rest of the Semitic world; there was home rule for every community, which admitted the untrammelled cultivation of their inherited religious and social institutions.

From the political point of view Israel, through the absence of a strong central government, was at a great disadvantage, making almost impossible

its development into a world-empire. But this barrier to a policy of self-aggrandizement was a decided blessing from the viewpoint of Israel's providential mission to the world. It made possible the transmission of the pure religion entrusted to it, to later generations of men without destructive contamination from the ungodly forces with which Israel would inevitably have come into closer contact, had it not been for its self-contained character, resulting from the fashion of a state it was providentially molded into. Only as the small and insignificant nation that it was, could Israel perform its mission as "the depository and perpetuating agency of truths vital to the welfare of humanity." Thus its religion was the central authority of this nation, supplying the lack of a centralized government. Herein lay Israel's uniqueness and greatness, and also the secret of its strength as a nation, as long as the loyalty and devotion to Yahweh lasted. Under the leadership of Moses and Joshua who, though they exercised a royal authority, acted merely as representatives of Yahweh, the influence of religion of which these leaders were a personal embodiment was still so strong as to keep the tribes united for common action. But when, after the removal of these strong leaders, Israel no longer had a standing representative of Yahweh, those changes took place which eventually necessitated the establishment of the monarchy.

## *2. Period of Judges:*

In the absence of a special representative of Yahweh, His will as Israel's King was divined by the use of the holy lot in the hand of the highest priest. But the lot would not supply the place of a strong personal leader. Besides, many of the Israelites came under the deteriorating influence of the Canaanite worship and began to adopt heathenish customs. The sense of religious unity weakened, the tribes became disunited and ceased to act in common, and as a result they were conquered by their foes. Yahweh came to their assistance by sending them leaders, who released the regions where they lived from foreign attacks. But these leaders were not the strong religious personalities that Moses and Joshua had been; besides, they had no official authority, and their rule was only temporary and local. It was now that the need of a centralized political government was felt, and the only type of permanent organization of which the age was cognizant was the kingship. The crown was offered to Gideon, but he declined it, saying: "Yahweh shall rule over you" (~~(OR22)~~ Judges 8:22,23). The attempt of his son, Abimelech, to establish a kingship over Shechem and the adjacent country, after the Canaanitic fashion, was abortive.

The general political condition of this period is briefly and pertinently described by the oft-recurring statement in Judges: “In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes.”

### *3. Establishment of the Monarchy:*

Not until the time of Samuel was a formal kingdom established over Israel. An attempt to ameliorate conditions by a union of civil and religious functions in the hands of Eli, the priest, had failed through the degeneracy of his sons. Similarly the hopes of Israel in a hereditary judgeship had been disappointed through the corruption of the sons of Samuel. The Philistines were threatening the independence and hope of Israel. Its very existence as a distinct race, and consequently the future of Yahweh’s religion, imperatively demanded a king. Considering that it was the moral decline of the nation that had created the necessity for a monarchy, and moreover that the people’s desire for a king originated from a purely national and not from a religious motive, the unwillingness of Samuel, at first, to comply with the demand for a king is not surprising. Even Yahweh declared: “They have not rejected thee but they have rejected me,” etc. Instead of recognizing that they themselves were responsible for the failures of the past, they blamed the form of government they had, and put all their hopes upon a king. That it was not the monarchy as such that was objectionable to Yahweh and His prophet is evidenced by the fact that to the patriarchs the promise had been given: “Kings shall come out of thy loins” (<sup><0176></sup>Genesis 17:6; 35:11). In view of this Moses had made provision for a kingship (<sup><0174></sup>Deuteronomy 17:14-20). According to the Mosaic charter for the kingship, the monarchy when established must be brought into consonance with the fact that Yahweh was Israel’s king. Of this fact Israel had lost sight when it requested a kingship like that of the neighboring peoples. Samuel’s gloomy prognostications were perfectly justified in view of such a kingship as they desired, which would inevitably tend to selfish despotism (<sup><0081></sup>1 Samuel 8:11 f). therefore God directs Samuel to give them a king — since the introduction of a kingship typifying the kingship of Christ lay within the plan of His economy — not according to their desire, but in accordance with the instructions of the law concerning kings (<sup><0174></sup>Deuteronomy 17:14-20), in order to safeguard their liberties and prevent the forfeiture of their mission.

#### *4. Appointment of King:*

According to the Law of Moses Yahweh was to choose the king of Israel, who was to be His representative. The choice of Yahweh in the case of Saul is implied by the anointing of Saul by Samuel and through the confirmation of this choice by the holy lot (~~<900>~~ 1 Samuel 10:1-20). This method of choosing the king did not exclude the people altogether, since Saul was publicly presented to them, and acknowledged as king (~~<900>~~ 1 Samuel 10:24). The participation of the people in the choice of their king is more pronounced in the case of David, who, having been designated as Yahweh's choice by being anointed by Samuel, was anointed again by the elders of Israel before he actually became king (~~<1000>~~ 2 Samuel 2:4).

The anointing itself signified the consecration to an office in theocracy. The custom of anointing kings was an old one, and by no means peculiar to Israel (~~<900>~~ Judges 9:8,15). The hereditary kingship began with David. Usually the firstborn succeeded to the throne, but not necessarily. The king might choose as his successor from among his sons the one whom he thought best qualified.

#### *5. Authority of the King:*

The king of Israel was not a constitutional monarch in the modern sense, nor was he an autocrat in the oriental sense. He was responsible to Yahweh, who had chosen him and whose vicegerent and servant he was. Furthermore, his authority was more or less limited on the religious side by the prophets, the representatives of Yahweh, and in the political sphere by the "elders," the representatives of the people, though as king he stood above all. Rightly conceived, his kingship in relation to Yahweh, who was Israel's true king, implied that he was Yahweh's servant and His earthly substitute. In relation to his subjects his kingship demanded of him, according to the Law, "that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren" (~~<670>~~ Deuteronomy 17:20).

#### *6. Duties of the King:*

In a summary way the king was held responsible for all Israel as the Lord's people. His main duty was to defend it against its enemies, and for this reason it devolved upon him to raise and maintain a standing army; and it was expected of him that he be its leader in case of war (~~<900>~~ 1 Samuel 8:20). In respect to the judiciary the king was a kind of supreme court, or



court of final appeal, and as such, as in the days of Solomon, might be approached by his most humble subjects (<sup><1052></sup>2 Samuel 15:2; <sup><1086></sup>1 Kings 3:16 ff). Legislative functions he had none and was himself under the law (<sup><1204></sup>1 Kings 21:4; <sup><679></sup>Deuteronomy 17:19). The king was also in a way the summus episcopus in Israel. His very kingship was of an entirely religious character and implied a unity of the heavenly and earthly rule over Israel through him who as Yahweh's substitute sat "upon the throne of the kingdom of Yahweh over Israel" (<sup><374></sup>1 Chronicles 17:14; 28:5; 29:23), who was "Yahweh's anointed" (<sup><940></sup>1 Samuel 24:10; 26:9; <sup><1014></sup>2 Samuel 1:14), and also bore the title of "son of Yahweh" and "the first-born," the same as Israel did (<sup><1092></sup>Exodus 4:22; <sup><810></sup>Hosea 11:1; <sup><1074></sup>2 Samuel 7:14; <sup><1827></sup>Psalms 89:27; 2:7). Thus a place of honor was assigned to the king in the temple (<sup><1104></sup>2 Kings 11:4; 23:3; <sup><340></sup>Ezekiel 46:1,2); besides, he officiated at the national sacrifices (especially mentioned of David and Solomon). He prayed for his people and blessed them in the name of Yahweh (<sup><1058></sup>2 Samuel 6:18; 24:25; <sup><1030></sup>1 Kings 3:4,8; 8:14,55,62; 9:25). Apparently it was the king's right to appoint and dismiss the chief priests at the sanctuaries, though in his choice he was doubtless restricted to the Aaronites (<sup><1367></sup>1 Chronicles 16:37,39; <sup><1087></sup>2 Samuel 8:17; <sup><1027></sup>1 Kings 2:27,35). The priesthood was under the king's supervision to such an extent that he might concern himself about its organization and duties (<sup><1356></sup>1 Chronicles 15:16,23,24; 16:4-6), and that he was responsible for the purity of the cult and the maintenance of the order of worship. In general he was to watch over the religious life and conduct of his people, to eradicate the high places and every form of idolatry in the land (<sup><1284></sup>2 Kings 18:4). <sup><362></sup>Ezekiel 45:22 demands of the prince that he shall provide at the Passover a bullock for a sin offering for all the people.

### *7. The Symbols of Royal Dignity:*

The marks of royal dignity, besides the beautiful robes in which the king was attired (<sup><1220></sup>1 Kings 22:10), were:

- (1) the diadem (<sup><1234></sup>ezzer]) and the crown (<sup><1234></sup>tarah], <sup><1010></sup>2 Samuel 1:10; <sup><1212></sup>2 Kings 11:12; <sup><1023></sup>2 Samuel 12:30), the headtire;
- (2) the scepter (<sup><1234></sup>shebheT]), originally a long, straight staff, the primitive sign of dominion and authority (<sup><1490></sup>Genesis 49:10; <sup><1047></sup>Numbers 24:17; <sup><2345></sup>Isaiah 14:5; <sup><2487></sup>Jeremiah 48:17; <sup><1019></sup>Psalms 2:9; 45:7). Saul had a spear (<sup><1080></sup>1 Samuel 18:10; 22:6);

(3) the throne (**aS**~~kings~~ [kicce'], ~~<1108>~~1 Kings 10:18-20), the symbol of majesty. Israel's kings also had a palace (~~<1006>~~1 Kings 7:1-12; 22:39; ~~<1024>~~Jeremiah 22:14), a royal harem (~~<1062>~~2 Samuel 16:21), and a bodyguard (~~<1088>~~2 Samuel 8:18; 15:18).

### *8. Maintenance and Establishment:*

#### **(1) Income.**

(a) According to the custom of the times presents were expected of the subjects (~~<0917>~~1 Samuel 10:27; 16:20) and of foreigners (~~<1082>~~2 Samuel 8:2; ~~<1006>~~1 Kings 5:1 ff; 10:25; ~~<1023>~~2 Chronicles 32:23), and these often took the form of an annual tribute.

(b) In time of war the king would lay claim to his share of the booty (~~<1081>~~2 Samuel 8:11; 12:30; ~~<1357>~~1 Chronicles 26:27).

(c) Various forms of taxes were in vogue, as a part of the produce of the land (~~<1091>~~1 Kings 9:11; ~~<0975>~~1 Samuel 17:25), forced labor of the Canaanites (~~<1091>~~1 Kings 9:20; ~~<1426>~~2 Chronicles 2:16) and also of the Israelites (~~<1053>~~1 Kings 5:13; 11:28; 12:4), the first growth of the pasture lands (~~<1006>~~Amos 7:1), toll collected from caravans (~~<1105>~~1 Kings 10:15).

(d) Subdued nations had to pay a heavy tribute (~~<1081>~~2 Kings 3:4).

(e) The royal domain often comprised extensive possessions (~~<1375>~~1 Chronicles 27:25-31).

#### **(2) The Royal Court.**

The highest office was that of the princes (~~<1042>~~1 Kings 4:2), who were the king's advisers or counselors. In ~~<1259>~~2 Kings 25:19 and ~~<1452>~~Jeremiah 52:25 they are called "they that saw the king's face" (compare also ~~<1126>~~1 Kings 12:6, "stood before Solomon"). The following officers of King David are mentioned: the captain of the host (commander-in-chief), the captain of the Cherethites and the Pelethites (bodyguard), the recorder (chronicler and reminder), the scribe (secretary of state), the overseer of the forced labor, the chief ministers or priests (confidants of the king, usually selected from the royal family) (~~<1086>~~2 Samuel 8:16-18; 20:23-26).

During the reign of Solomon other officers were added as follows: the overseer over the twelve men "who provided victuals for the king and his

household” (<sup><1045></sup>1 Kings 4:5,7), the officer over the household (<sup><1046></sup>1 Kings 4:6; 18:3) (steward, the head of the palace who had “the key” in his possession, <sup><2722></sup>Isaiah 22:22); the king’s friend (<sup><1045></sup>1 Kings 4:5; <sup><1373></sup>1 Chronicles 27:33) is probably the same as the king’s servant mentioned among the high officials in <sup><1221></sup>2 Kings 22:12. It is not stated what his duties were. Minor officials are servants, cupbearer (<sup><1105></sup>1 Kings 10:5), keeper of the wardrobe (<sup><1224></sup>2 Kings 22:14; 10:22), eunuchs (chamberlains, not mentioned before the division of the kingdom) (<sup><1279></sup>1 Kings 22:9; <sup><1286></sup>2 Kings 8:6).

### *9. Short Character Sketch of Israel’s Kingdom:*

No higher conceptions of a good king have ever been given to the world than those which are presented in the representations of kingship in the Old Testament, both actual and ideal. Though Samuel’s characterization of the kingship was borne out in the example of a great number of kings of Israel, the Divine ideal of a true king came as near to its realization in the case of one king of Israel, at least, as possibly nowhere else, namely, in the case of David. Therefore King David appears as the type of that king in whom the Divine ideal of a Yahweh-king was to find its perfect realization; toward whose reign the kingship in Israel tended. The history of the kingship in Israel after David is, indeed, characterized by that desire for political aggrandizement which had prompted the establishment of the monarchy, which was contrary to Israel’s Divine mission as the peculiar people of the Yahweh-king. When Israel’s kingdom terminated in the Bah exile, it became evident that the continued existence of the nation was possible even without a monarchical form of government. Though a kingdom was established again under the Maccabees, as a result of the attempt of Antiochus to extinguish Israel’s religion, this kingdom was neither as perfectly national nor as truly religious in its character as the Davidic. It soon became dependent on Rome. The kingship of Herod was entirely alien to the true Israelite conception.

It remains to be said only that the final attempt of Israel in its revolt against the Roman Empire, to establish the old monarchy, resulted in its downfall as a nation, because it would not learn the lesson that the future of a nation does not depend upon political greatness, but upon the fulfillment of its Divine mission.

## LITERATURE.

J.P. McCurdy, History, Prophecy and the Monuments; Riehm, Handwörterbuch des bibl. Altertums; Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes); Kinzler, Bibl. Altes Testament.

*S. D. Press*

## KING, CHRIST AS

### I. THE REALITY OF CHRIST'S KINGSHIP.

There can be no question but that Christ is set before us in Scripture as a king. The very title Christ or "Messiah" suggests kingship, for though the priest is spoken of as "anointed," and full elucidation of the title as applied to Jesus must take account of His threefold office of prophet, priest and king, yet generally in the Old Testament it is the king to whom the epithet is applied.

#### *1. The Old Testament Foreshadowings:*

We may briefly note some of the Old Testament predictions of Christ as king. The first prediction which represents the Christ as having dominion is that of Jacob concerning the tribe Of Judah: "Until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the obedience of the peoples be" (<sup>(1491)</sup>Genesis 49:10); then kingly dignity and dominion are suggested by the star and scepter in Balaam's prophecy (<sup>(1415)</sup>Numbers 24:15-17). As yet, however, Israel has no king but God, but when afterward a king is given and the people become familiar with the idea, the prophecies all more or less have a regal tint, and the coming one is preeminently the coming king.

#### In the Psalms and Prophets

We can only indicate a few of the many royal predictions, but these will readily suggest others. In Psalm 2 the voice of Yahweh is heard above all the tumult of earth, declaring, "Yet I have set my king upon my holy hill of Zion." So in Psalms 24; 45; 72; 89 and 110 we have special foreshadowings of the Messianic king. The babe that Isaiah sees born of a virgin is also the "Prince of Peace" (<sup>(2006)</sup>Isaiah 9:6,7), of the increase of whose government there shall be no end, and as the prophet gazes on him he joyfully exclaims: "Behold, a king shall reign in righteousness" (<sup>(2301)</sup>Isaiah 32:1). Jeremiah, the prophet of woe, catches bright glimpses of his coming Lord, and with rapture intensified by the surrounding sorrow

cries: “Behold, the days come, saith Yahweh, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land” (23:5). Ezekiel, dwelling amid his wheels, sees in the course of Providence many revolutions, but they are all to bring about the dominion of Christ: “I will overturn, overturn, overturn .... until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him” (21:27). Daniel sees the rise and progress, the decline and fall of many mighty empires, but beyond all he sees the Son of man inheriting an everlasting kingdom (7:13). Hosea sees the repentant people of Israel in the latter days seeking Yahweh their God, and David (the greater David) their king (3:5). Micah sees the everlasting Ruler coming out of Bethlehem clad in the strength and majesty of Yahweh, who shall “be great unto the ends of the earth” (5:4). Zechariah, exulting in His near approach, cries: “Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy king cometh unto thee” (9:9), and he follows His varied course through gloom and through glory, until the strong conviction is born in his heart and expressed in the glowing words: “Yahweh shall be King over all the earth” (14:9). The more extreme higher critics would, of course, deny that these are direct predictions of Jesus Christ, but most, if not all, would admit that they are ideal representations which were only fully realized in Jesus of Nazareth.

## *2. The Gospel Presentation:*

The Gospels present Christ as king. Matthew, tracing His genealogy, gives special prominence to His royal lineage as son of David. He tells of the visit of the Magi who inquire for the newborn king of the Jews, and the scribes answer Herod’s question by showing from Micah’s prophecy that the Christ to be born in Bethlehem would be a “governor,” and would rule, “be shepherd of my people Israel” (~~4015~~ Matthew 2:5,6). Luke’s account of the Nativity contains the angel’s declaration that the child to be born and named Jesus would occupy the throne of David and reign over the house of Jacob forever (~~4012~~ Luke 1:32,33). In John’s account of the beginning of Christ’s ministry, one of His early disciples, Nathanael, hails Him as “King of Israel” (~~4014~~ John 1:49), and Jesus does not repudiate the title. If Mark has no such definite word, he nevertheless describes the message with which Jesus opens His ministry as the “gospel” of “the kingdom of God” (1:14,15). The people nurtured in the prophetic teaching expect the coming one to be a king, and when Jesus seems to answer to their ideal of

the Messiah, they propose taking Him by force and making Him king (~~4065~~ John 6:15).

### (1) Christ's Claim to Be King

Christ Himself claimed to be king. In claiming to be the Messiah He tacitly claimed kingship, but there are specific indications of the claim besides. In all His teaching of the kingdom it is implied, for though He usually calls it the "kingdom of God" or "of heaven," yet it is plain that He is the administrator of its affairs. He assumes to Himself the highest place in it. Admission into the kingdom or exclusion from it depends upon men's attitude toward Him. In His explanation of the parable of the Tares, He distinctly speaks of His kingdom, identifying it with the kingdom of God. "The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them that do iniquity. .... Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father" (~~4034~~ Matthew 13:41-43). He speaks of some seeing "the Son of man coming in his kingdom" (~~4068~~ Matthew 16:28), of the regeneration, "when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory" (~~4068~~ Matthew 19:28), of Himself under the guise of a nobleman who goes "into a far country, to receive for himself a kingdom," and does receive it (~~4092~~ Luke 19:12-15).

### (2) Christ's Acceptance of the Title

When the mother of John and James comes asking that her two sons may occupy the chief places of honor in His kingdom, He does not deny that He is a king and has a kingdom, while indicating that the places on His right and left hand are already determined by the appointment of the Father (~~4020~~ Matthew 20:21-23). He deliberately takes steps to fulfill the prediction of Zec: "Behold, thy king cometh," and He accepts, approves and justifies the hosannas and the homage of the multitude (~~4200~~ Matthew 21:1-16; Mark 11; Luke 19; John 12). In His great picture of the coming judgment (Matthew 25), the Son of man sits upon the throne of His glory, and it is as "the king" that He blesses and condemns. The dying thief prays, "Remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom" (~~4242~~ Luke 23:42), and Jesus gives His royal response which implies full acceptance of the position.

### (3) Christ Charged and Condemned as King

His claim throughout had been so definite that His enemies make this the basis of their charge against Him before Pilate, that He said that “he himself is Christ a king,” and when Pilate asks, “Art thou the King?” He answers, “Thou sayest,” which was equivalent to “yes” (<sup><423></sup>Luke 23:2,3). In the fuller account of John, Jesus speaks to Pilate of “my kingdom,” and says “Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end have I been born” (<sup><483></sup>John 18:37). His claim is perpetuated in the superscription of the cross in the three languages: “This is the King of the Jews,” and although the priests wished it to be altered so as to detract from His claim, they yet affirm the fact of that claim when they say: “Write not, The King of the Jews; but, that he said, I am King of the Jews” (<sup><482></sup>John 19:21). The curtain of His earthly life falls upon the king in seeming failure; the taunt of the multitude, “Let the Christ, the King of Israel, now come down from the cross” (<sup><415></sup>Mark 15:32), meets with no response, and the title on the cross seems a solemn mockery, like the elaborate, cruel jest of the brutal soldiers clothing Him with purple, crowning Him with thorns and hailing Him King of the Jews.

#### (4) The Witness of the Resurrection and of Apostolic Preaching.

But the resurrection throws new light upon the scene, and fully vindicates His claims, and the sermon of Peter on the day of Pentecost proclaims the fact that the crucified one occupies the throne. “Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified” (<sup><425></sup>Acts 2:36). The early preaching of the apostles, as recorded in the Acts, emphasizes His lordship, His kingship; these men were preachers in the literal sense — heralds of the king.

#### (5) The Testimony of the Epistles and Apocalypse.

We need not consider in detail the testimony of the Epistles. The fact that Christ is king is everywhere implied and not infrequently asserted. He is “Lord of both the dead and the living” (<sup><549></sup>Romans 14:9). He is risen “to rule over the Gentiles” (<sup><552></sup>Romans 15:12). “He must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet” (<sup><555></sup>1 Corinthians 15:25). He is at the right hand of God “above all rule, and authority,” etc. (<sup><400></sup>Ephesians 1:20-22). Evil men have no “inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God” (<sup><405></sup>Ephesians 5:5), and believers are “translated into the kingdom of the Son of his love” (<sup><5013></sup>Colossians 1:13). He has been given the name that is above every name “that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow,” etc.

(<sup><1049></sup>Philippians 2:9-11). Those who suffer with Christ are to “reign with him” (<sup><8122></sup>2 Timothy 2:12), at “his appearing and his kingdom” (<sup><8104></sup>2 Timothy 4:1), and He will save them “unto his heavenly kingdom” (<sup><8048></sup>2 Timothy 4:18); “the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ” (<sup><6011></sup>2 Peter 1:11). Of the Son it is said: “Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever” (<sup><8008></sup>Hebrews 1:8), and He is a King-Priest “after the order of Melchizedek” (<sup><8077></sup>Hebrews 7:17). In the Apocalypse, appropriately, the predominant aspect of Christ is that of a king. He is the “ruler of the kings of the earth” (<sup><6005></sup>Revelation 1:5), “King of the ages” (<sup><6058></sup>Revelation 15:3), “King of kings” (<sup><6074></sup>Revelation 17:14; 19:16), “and he shall reign for ever and ever” (<sup><6115></sup>Revelation 11:15). The reality of Christ’s kingship is thus placed beyond all doubt.

## II. CHRIST’S TITLE TO KINGSHIP.

### *1. By Birth:*

After the analogy of earthly kingships it might be said that Jesus Christ is a king by birth. He was born a king. His mother, like His reputed father, “was of the house and family of David” (<sup><6104></sup>Luke 2:4). The angel in nouncing His birth declares that He will occupy the throne of His father David. The Pharisees have no hesitation in affirming that the Christ would be Son of David (<sup><1225></sup>Matthew 22:45; <sup><1125></sup>Mark 12:35; <sup><1204></sup>Luke 20:41). Frequently in life He was hailed as “Son of David,” and after His ascension, Peter declares that the promise God had made to David that “of the fruit of his loins he would set one upon his throne” (<sup><4030></sup>Acts 2:30) was fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth; while Paul declares that the gospel of God was “concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh” (<sup><6003></sup>Romans 1:3). So that on the human side He had the title to kingship as son of David, while on the Divine side as Son of God He had also the right to the throne.

### *2. By Divine Appointment:*

David was king by Divine choice and appointment, and this was the ideal in the case of his successors. The figment of “Divine right” — by virtue of which modern kings have claimed to rule — was, in the first instance, a reminiscence of the Biblical ideal. But the ideal is realized in Christ. Of the coming Messianic King, Yahweh said: “Yet I have set my king upon my holy hill of Zion” (<sup><1916></sup>Psalms 2:6), and the great proclamation of Pentecost was an echo of that decree: “Let all the house of Israel therefore know



assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified” (~~4126~~ Acts 2:36), while the apostle declares that “God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name” (~~3809~~ Philippians 2:9), and again and again the great Old Testament word of Yahweh is applied to Christ: “Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet” (~~8013~~ Hebrews 1:13).

### *3. By Conquest:*

Often in the olden times kingship was acquired by conquest, by superior prowess. According to one etymology of our word “king,” it means the “able man,” “the one who can,” and everyone remembers Carlyle’s fine passage thereon. In the highest sense, this is true of Christ, who establishes His sway over men’s hearts by His matchless prowess, the power of His infinite love and the charm of His perfect character.

### *4. By the Free Choice of His People:*

Except in the most autocratic form of kingship, some place has been given to the suffrage of the people, and the other phases of the title have been confirmed and ratified by the voice of the people as they cry, “God save the king!” and no king is well established on the throne if he is not supported by the free homage of his subjects. Christ as king wins the love of His people, and they gladly acknowledge His sway. They are of one heart to make Him king.

## **III. THE NATURE OF CHRIST’S KINGSHIP.**

We know that the Jews expected a material kingdom, marked by earthly pomp and state; a kingdom on the lines of the Davidic or Solomonic kingdom, and others since have made the same mistake.

### *1. Spiritual:*

The Scriptures plainly declare, Christ Himself clearly taught, that His kingship was spiritual. “My kingdom,” said He, “is not of this world” (~~4886~~ John 18:36), and all the representations given of it are all consistent with this declaration. Some have emphasized the preposition [*ek*] here, as if that made a difference in the conception: “My kingdom is not of this world.” Granted that the preposition indicates origin, it still leaves the statement an assertion of the spirituality of the kingdom, for if it is not from this [*kosmos*], from this earthly state of things, it must be from the

other world — not the earthly but the heavenly; not the material but the spiritual. The whole context shows that origin here includes character, for Christ adds, “If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews.” Because it is of an unworldly origin, it is not to be propagated by, worldly means, and the non-use of worldly means declares it to be of an unworldly character. So that to assert that Christ means that His kingdom was not to arise out of this world, but to come down from heaven, is not at all to deny, but rather, indeed, to declare its essential spirituality, its unworldliness, its otherworldliness.

Throughout the New Testament, spirituality appears as the prevailing characteristic of Christ’s reign. Earthly kingdoms are based upon material power, the power of the sword, the power of wealth, etc., but the basal factor of Christ’s kingdom is righteousness (<sup><4083></sup>Matthew 5:20; 6:33; <sup><6417></sup>Romans 14:17; <sup><8008></sup>Hebrews 1:8, etc.). The ruling principle in earthly kingdoms is selfish or sectional or national aggrandizement; in the kingdom of Christ it is truth. Christ is king of truth. “Art thou a king then?” said Pilate. “I am,” said Christ (for that is the force of “thou sayest that I am a king”). “To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth,” and He adds, “Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice” (<sup><6187></sup>John 18:37). Elsewhere He says: “I am the .... truth” (<sup><6146></sup>John 14:6), and at the head of the armies of heaven He still wears the title “Faithful and True” (<sup><6691></sup>Revelation 19:11); but if righteousness and truth occupy such a prominent place in His kingdom, it follows that it must be distinguished by its spirituality. His immediate subjects are spiritual men and women; its laws are spiritual; its work is spiritual; all the forces emanating from it, operating through it, centering in it, are spiritual.

## *2. Universal:*

The Jewish idea of the Messiah’s reign was a narrow national one. For them it meant the glorification of the sons of Abraham, the supremacy of Judaism over all forms of faith and all systems of philosophy; the subjection to Jewish sway of the haughty Roman, the cultured Greek and the rude barbarian. The Messiah was to be a greater king than David or Solomon, but still a king after the same sort; much as the limits of the kingdom might extend, it would be but an extension on Jewish lines; others might be admitted to a share in its privileges, but they would have to become

naturalized Jews, or occupy a very subordinate place. The prophetic ideal, however, was a universal kingdom, and that was the conception endorsed and emphasized by Christ. (For the prophetic ideal such passages may be noted as Psalms 2; 22; 72; <sup><3110></sup>Isaiah 11:10; <sup><2073></sup>Daniel 7:13,14, etc.) Of course, the predictions have a Jewish coloring, and people who did not apprehend the spirituality might well construe this amiss; but, closely examined, it will be found that the prophets indicate that men's position in the coming kingdom is to be determined by their relation to the king, and in that we get the preparation for the full New Testament ideal. The note of universality is very marked in the teaching of Christ. All barriers are to be broken down, and Jews and Gentiles are to share alike in the privileges of the new order. "Many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven" (<sup><4081></sup>Matthew 8:11), and stranger still to the Jewish ear: "The sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness" (<sup><4082></sup>Matthew 8:12). In the parables of the kingdom (Matthew 13), the field, in which is sown the good seed of the kingdom, is the world, and the various other figures give the same idea of unlimited extent. The same thought is suggested by the declaration, "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold" (<sup><3016></sup>John 10:16), also by the confident affirmation: "I, if I be lifted up, from the earth, will draw all men unto myself" (<sup><3122></sup>John 12:32), and so with many other statements of the Gospels.

The terms of the commission are enough to show the universal sovereignty which Christ claims over men: "Go ye therefore," He says, as possessing all authority in heaven and on earth, "and make disciples of all the nations" (<sup><4089></sup>Matthew 28:19), coupled with the royal assurance, "Ye shall be my witnesses .... unto the uttermost part of the earth" (<sup><4008></sup>Acts 1:8). The Book of Acts shows, in the carrying out of the commission, the actual widening of the borders of Christ's kingdom to include believers of all tions. Peter is taught, and announces clearly, the great truth that Gentiles are to be received upon the same terms as the Jews. But through Paul as the apostle of the Gentiles this glorious truth is most fully and jubilantly made known. In the dogmatic teaching of his Epistles he shows that all barriers are broken down, the middle wall of the fence between Jew and Gentile no longer exists. Those who were aliens and strangers are now made nigh in Christ, and "are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God" (<sup><4019></sup>Ephesians 2:19). That household, that commonwealth, is, in Pauline language, equivalent to

the kingdom, and in the same epistle, he describes the same privileged position as being an “inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God” (~~<4015>~~ Ephesians 5:5). The Saviour’s kingdom cannot be bounded by earthly limits, and all attempts to map it out according to human rules imply a failure to recognize the true Scriptural idea of its universality.

### (1) Kingdom of Grace, of Power.

Most of what we have said applies to that phase of Christ’s kingdom which is generally called his kingdom of grace; there is another phase called the kingdom of power. Christ is in a special sense king in Zion, king in His church — that is universal in conception and destined to be so in reality — but He is also king of the universe. He is “head over all things”; ~~<4022>~~ Ephesians 1:22; ~~<5018>~~ Colossians 1:18, and other passages clearly intimate this. He rules over all. He does so not simply as God, but as God-man, as mediator. It is as mediator that He has the name above every name; it is as mediator that He sits upon the throne of universal power.

### (2) Kingdom of Glory.

There is also the phase of the kingdom of glory. Christ’s reign now is truly glorious. The essential spirituality of it implies its glory, for as the spiritual far surpasses the material in value, so the glory of the spiritual far transcends the glory of the material. The glory of worldly pomp, of physical force, of human prowess or genius, must ever pale before the glory of righteousness, truth, spirituality. But Christ’s kingdom is glorious in another sense; it is a heavenly kingdom. It is the kingdom of grace into which saved sinners now enter, but it is also the kingdom of heavenly glory, and in it the glorified saints have a place. Entrance into the kingdom of grace in this earthly state secures entrance into the kingdom of glory. Rightly does the church confess: “Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ.” The kingdom is yet to assume an externally glorious form. That is connected with the appearing of Christ (~~<5001>~~ 2 Timothy 4:1), the glory that shall be revealed, the heavenly kingdom. The kingdom in that stage cannot be entered by flesh and blood (~~<4650>~~ 1 Corinthians 15:50), man in his mortality — but the resurrection change will give the fitness, when in the fullest sense the kingdom of this world shall have “become the kingdom of our Lord,, and of his Christ” (~~<6015>~~ Revelation 11:15).

### 3. *Eternal:*

It would be easy to multiply quotations in proof of this. The great passage in Daniel 7 emphatically declares it. The echo of this is heard in the angel's announcement: "He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end" (~~<4013>~~ Luke 1:33). The reign of 1,000 years which so greatly occupies the thoughts of so many brethren, whatever we may decide as to its nature, is but an episode in the reign of Christ. He is reigning now, He shall reign forever. ~~<6115>~~ Revelation 11:15, above quoted, is often cited as applying to the millennium, but it goes on to say "and he shall reign (not for 1,000 years simply, but) for ever and ever." So, many of the glowing predictions of the Old Testament, which are often assigned to the millennium, indicate no limit, but deal with the enduring and eternal.

The difficult passage in ~~<46524>~~ 1 Corinthians 15:24-28 must be interpreted in the light of those declarations concerning the eternity of Christ's reign. It is evidently as mediator that He delivers up the kingdom to the Father. The dispensation of mediator comes to an end. All has been done according to the purpose of redemption. All the ransomed are finally gathered home. He sees of the travail of His soul and is satisfied. Obdurate enemies are subdued. God's glory has been fully vindicated. The Son becoming subject to the Father, God governs directly and is all in all. But the Son in some sense still reigns and through Him God's glory will ever shine, while the kingdom eternally rests upon redemption.

We may summarize by saying that Christ is king of truth, king of salvation (~~<4205>~~ Matthew 21:5; ~~<3099>~~ Zechariah 9:9); king of grace; king of peace (~~<2638>~~ Luke 19:38; ~~<3002>~~ Hebrews 7:2); king of righteousness (~~<3008>~~ Hebrews 1:8; 7:2); king of glory (~~<4253>~~ Matthew 25:31-34); king eternal; king of saints, king of the ages; king of kings (~~<6916>~~ Revelation 19:16). "Upon his head are many diadems" (~~<6912>~~ Revelation 19:12).

*See also CHRIST, OFFICES OF.*

*Archibald M'caig*

## KING OF THE JEWS

The title applied in mockery of Jesus, and put by Pilate on His cross (~~<4273>~~ Matthew 27:29,37 parallel ~~<4153>~~ Mark 15:26, etc.).

*See JESUS CHRIST; KING, CHRIST AS.*

## KINGDOM OF GOD (OF HEAVEN), THE

([ἡ Βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν — τοῦ θεοῦ, *he basileia ton ouranon — tou theou*]):

The “kingdom of God” is one of the most remarkable ideas and phrases of all time, having begun to be used very near the beginnings of history and continuing in force down to the present day.

### I. MEANING AND ORIGIN OF THE TERM

#### *1. Place in the Gospels:*

Its use by Jesus is by far its most interesting aspect; for, in the Synoptists, at least, it is His watchword, or a comprehensive term for the whole of His teaching. Of this the ordinary reader of Scripture may hardly be aware, but it becomes evident and significant to the student. Thus, in <sup><1023></sup>Matthew 4:23, the commencement of the ministry is described in these words, “And Jesus went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness among the people”; and, somewhat later, in <sup><1021></sup>Luke 8:1, the expansion of His activity is described in the following terms, “And it came to pass soon afterwards, that he went about through cities and villages, preaching and bringing the good tidings of the kingdom of God, and with him the twelve.” When the Twelve are sent forth by themselves, the purpose of their mission is, in <sup><1002></sup>Luke 9:2, given in these words, “And he sent them forth to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick.” In <sup><1031></sup>Matthew 13:11, the parables, which formed so large and prominent a portion of His teaching, are denominated collectively “the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven”; and it will be remembered how many of these commence with the phrase, “The kingdom of heaven is like.”

#### *2. “Kingdom of Heaven” and “Kingdom of God”:*

In these quotations, and in others which might easily be adduced, it will be observed that the phrases “the kingdom,” “the kingdom of God,” “the kingdom of heaven” are used interchangeably. The last of the three, “the kingdom of heaven,” is confined to the First Gospel, which does not, however, always make use of it; and it is not certain what may have been the reason for the substitution. The simplest explanation would be that heaven is a name for God, as, in the parable of the Prodigal Son, the

penitent says, "I have sinned against heaven," and we ourselves might say, "Heaven forbid!" It is not, however, improbable that the true meaning has to be learned from two petitions of the Lord's Prayer, the one of which is epexegetic of the other, "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven." Here the disciples are instructed to pray that the kingdom of God may come, but this is equivalent to the petition that the will of God may be done on earth; Jesus is, however, aware of a region in the universe where the will of God is at present being perfectly and universally done, and, for reasons not difficult to surmise, He elevates thither the minds and hearts of those who pray. The kingdom of heaven would thus be so entitled because it is already realized there, and is, through prayer and effort, to be transferred thence to this earth.

### *3. Relation to the Old Testament (Daniel, etc.):*

Although, however, the phrase held this master position in the teaching of Jesus, it was not of His invention. It was employed before Him by John the Baptist, of whom we read, in ~~401B~~ Matthew 3:1 f, "And in those days cometh John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, saying, Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Indeed, the phrase is far older; for, on glancing toward the Old Testament, we come at once, in ~~204B~~ Daniel 2:44, to a passage where the young prophet, explaining to the monarch the image of gold, silver, iron and clay, which, in his dream, he had seen shattered by "a stone cut out without hands," interprets it as a succession of world-kings, destined to be destroyed by "a kingdom of God," which shall last forever; and, in his famous vision of the "son of man" in 7:14, it is said, "There was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

These passages in Daniel form undoubtedly the proximate source of the phrase; yet the idea which it represents mounts far higher. From the first the Jewish state was governed by laws believed to be derived directly from heaven; and, when the people demanded a king, that they might be like other nations, they were reproached for desiring any king but God Himself. With this sublime conception the actual monarchy was only a compromise, the reigning monarch passing for Yahweh's representative on earth. In David, the man after God's own heart, the compromise was not unsatisfactory; in Solomon it was still tolerable; but in the majority of the

kings of both Judah and Israel it was a dismal and disastrous failure. No wonder that the pious sighed and prayed that Yahweh might take to Himself His great power and reign, or that the prophets predicted the coming of a ruler who would be far nearer to God than the actual kings and of whose reign there would be no end. Even when the political kingdom perished and the people were carried away into Babylon, the intelligent and truly religious among them did not cease to cherish the old hope, and the very aspect of the worldpowers then and subsequently menacing them only widened their conceptions of what that kingdom must be which could overcome them all. The return from Babylon seemed a miraculous confirmation of their faith, and it looked as if the day long prayed for were about to dawn. Alas, it proved a day of small things. The era of the Maccabees was only a transitory gleam; in the person of Herod the Great a usurper occupied the throne; and the eagles of the Romans were hovering on the horizon. Still Messianic hopes flourished, and Messianic language filled the mouths of the people.

## II. ITS USE BY JESUS — CONTRAST WITH JEWISH CONCEPTIONS.

### *1. Current Jewish Opinions:*

Schurer, in his *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (II, 11, 126 ff), has drawn up a kind of Messianic creed, in no fewer than eleven articles, which he believes was extensively diffused at this period. The Sadducees, indeed, had no participation in these dreams, as they would have called them, being absorbed in money-making and courtiership; but the Pharisees cherished them, and the Zealots received their name from the ardor with which they embraced them. The true custodians, however, of these conceptions were the Prosdechomenoi, as they have been called, from what is said of them in the New Testament, that they “waited for the kingdom of God.” To this class belonged such men as Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea (<sup><425></sup>Luke 23:51), but it is in the beginning of the Gospel of Luke that we are introduced to its most numerous representatives, in the groups surrounding the infant Baptist and the infant Saviour (<sup><425></sup>Luke 2:25,38); and the truest and amplest expression of their sentiments must be sought in the inspired hymns which rose from them on this occasion. The center of their aspirations, as there depicted, is a kingdom of God — not, however, of worldly splendor and force, but of



righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit; beginning in humility, and passing to exaltation only through the dark valley of contrition.

## *2. Relation of Jesus to Same:*

Such was the circle in which both the Baptist and Jesus were reared and it was out of this atmosphere that the conception of the kingdom of God came into their minds. It has frequently been said that, in making use of this term, Jesus accommodated Himself to the opinions and language of His fellow-countrymen; and there is truth in this, because, in order to secure a footing on the solid earth of history, He had to connect His own activity with the world in which He found Himself. Yet the idea was native to His home and His race, and therefore to Himself; and it is not improbable that He may at first have been unaware of the wide difference between His own thoughts on the subject and those of His contemporaries.

## *3. Growing Divergence and Contrast:*

When, however, He began, in the course of His ministry, to speak of the kingdom of God, it soon became manifest that by Him and by His contemporaries it was used in different senses; and this contrast went on increasing until there was a great gulf fixed between Him and them. The difference cannot better be expressed than by saying, as is done by B. Weiss, that He and they laid the accent on different halves of the phrase, they emphasizing “the kingdom” and He “of God.” They were thinking of the expulsion of the Romans, of a Jewish king and court, and of a world-wide dominion going forth from Mt. Zion; He was thinking of righteousness, holiness and peace, of the doing of the will of God on earth as it is done in heaven. So earthly and fantastic were the expectations of the Jewish multitude that He had to escape from their hands when they tried to take Him by force and make Him a king. The authorities never acknowledged the pretensions of One who seemed to them a religious dreamer, and, as they clung to their own conceptions, they grew more and more bitter against One who was turning the most cherished hopes of a nation into ridicule, besides threatening to bring down on them the heavy hand of the Roman. And at last they settled the controversy between Him and them by nailing Him to a tree.

#### *4. Prophetic Character of the "Temptation":*

At one time Jesus had felt the glamor of the popular Messianic ideas, and at all times He must have been under temptation to accommodate His own ideas to the prejudices of those on whose favor His success seemed to be dependent. The struggle of His mind and will with such solicitations is embodied in what is called the Temptation in the Wilderness (~~and~~ Matthew 4:1-11). There He was tempted to accept the dominion of the world at the price of compromise with evil; to be a bread-king, giving panem et circenes; and to curry favor with the multitude by some display, like springing from the pinnacle of the temple. The incidents of this scene look like representative samples of a long experience; but they are placed before the commencement of His public activity in order to show that He had already overcome them; and throughout His ministry He may be said to have been continually declaring, as He did in so many words at its close, that His kingdom was not of this world.

#### *5. Modern "Futuristic" Hypothesis (J. Weiss, Schweitzer):*

It is very strange that, in spite of this, He should be believed, even by Christian scholars, to have held a purely futuristic and apocalyptic view of the kingdom Himself. He was all the time expecting, it is said, that the heavens would open and the kingdom descend from heaven to earth, a pure and perfect work of God. This is exactly what was expected by the Jewish multitude, as is stated in ~~and~~ Luke 19:11; and it is precisely what the authorities believed Him to be anticipating. The controversy between Him and them was as to whether Yahweh would intervene on His behalf or not; and, when no intervention took place, they believed they were justified in condemning Him. The premises being conceded, it is difficult to deny the force of their argument. If Jesus was all the time looking out for an appearance from heaven which never arrived, what better was He than a dreamer of the ghetto?

#### *6. Weakness of This View:*

It was by Johannes Weiss that this hypothesis was started in recent times; and it has been worked out by Schweitzer as the final issue of modern speculation on the life of Christ (see his *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*). But in opposition to it can be quoted not a few sayings of Jesus which indicate that, in His view, the kingdom of God had already begun and was making progress during His earthly ministry, and that it was destined to

make progress not by catastrophic and apocalyptic interference with the course of Providence, but, as the grain grows — first the blade, then the ear, after that the full grain in the ear (~~409b~~ Mark 4:26-29). Of such sayings the most remarkable is ~~427a~~ Luke 17:20 f, “And being asked by the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God cometh, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, There! for lo, the kingdom of God is within you.”

“Observation,” in this quotation, is an astronomical term, denoting exactly such a manifestation in the physical heavens as Jesus is assumed to have been looking for; so that He denies in so many words the expectation attributed to Him by those representatives of modern scholarship.

### *7. Positive Conceptions of Jesus:*

In the nature of the case the kingdom must have been growing from stage to stage during His earthly ministry. He Himself was there, embodying the kingdom in His person; and the circle gathered around Him partook of the blessings of the kingdom. This circle might have grown large enough to be coextensive with the country; and, therefore, Jesus retained the consciousness of being the Messiah, and offered Himself in this character to His fellow-countrymen by the triumphal entry into Jerusalem. But the citizens of the kingdom had to enter it one by one, not in a body, as the Jews were expecting. Strait was the gate; it was the narrow gate of repentance. Jesus began by repeating the initial word of the teaching of His forerunner; and He had too much reason to continue repeating it, as the hypocrisy and worldliness of Pharisees and Sadducees called for denunciation from His lips. To the frailties of the publicans and sinners, on the contrary, He showed a strange mildness; but this was because He knew the way of bringing such sinners to His feet to confess their sins themselves. To the penitent He granted pardon, claiming that the Son of man had power on earth to forgive sins. Then followed the exposition of righteousness, of which the Sermon on the Mount is a perfect specimen. Yet it commences with another watchword — that of blessedness, the ingredients of which are set forth in all their comprehensiveness. In the same way, in other passages, He promises “rest” “peace” and the like; and again and again, where He might be expected to employ the term “kingdom of God,” He substitutes “life” or “eternal life.” Such were the blessings He had come into the world to bestow; and the most comprehensive designation for them all was “the kingdom of God.”

It is true, there was always imperfection attaching to the kingdom as realized in His lifetime, because He Himself was not yet made perfect. Steadily, from the commencement of the last stage of His career, He began to speak of His own dying and rising again. To those nearest Him such language was at the time a total mystery; but the day came when His apostles were able to speak of His death and ascension as the crown and glory of His whole career. When His life seemed to be plunging over the precipice, its course was so diverted by the providence of God that, by dying, He became the Redeemer of mankind and, by missing the throne of the Jews, attained to that of the universe, becoming King of kings and Lord of lords.

### III. THE IDEA IN HISTORY.

#### *1. Apostolic and Post-apostolic Age:*

After the death of Jesus, there soon ensued the destruction of the Jewish state; and then Christianity went forth among the nations, where to have spoken of it as a kingdom of God would have unnecessarily provoked hostility and called forth the accusation of treason against the powers that be. Hence, it made use of other names and let “the kingdom of God” drop. This had commenced even in Holy Scripture, where, in the later books, there is a growing infrequency in the use of the term. This may be alleged as proof that Jesus was being forgotten; but it may only prove that Christianity was then too much alive to be trammelled with words and phrases, even those of the Master, being able at every stage to find new language to express its new experience.

#### *2. Early Christian Centuries:*

In the early Christian centuries, “the kingdom of God” was used to designate heaven itself, in which from the first the development of the kingdom was to issue; this, in fact, being not infrequently the meaning of the phrase even in the mouth of Jesus. The Alexandrian thinkers brought back the phrase to designate the rule of God in the conscience of men. Augustine’s great work bears a title, *Deuteronomy Civitate Dei*, which is a translation of our phrase; and to him the kingdom of God was the church, while the world outside of the church was the kingdom of Satan. From the time of Charlemagne there were in the world, side by side, two powers, that of the emperor and that of the pope; and the history of the Middle Ages is the account of the conflict of these two for predominance, each

pretending to struggle in the name of God. The approaching termination of this conflict may be seen in Wycliffe's great work *Deuteronomy Dominio Divino*, this title also being a translation of our phrase.

### *3. Reformation Period:*

During the struggles of the Reformation the battles of the faith were fought out under other watchwords; and it was rather among such sectaries as the Baptists, that names like Fifth Monarchy and Rule of the Saints betrayed recollection of the evangelic phraseology; but how near, then and subsequently, the expression of men's thoughts about authority in church and state came to the language of the Gospels could easily be demonstrated, for example, from the Confessions and Books of Discipline of the Scottish church.

### *4. Later Ideas:*

The very phrase, "the kingdom of God," reappeared at the close of the Reformation period among the Pietists of Germany, who, as their multiplying benevolent and missionary activities overflowed the narrow boundaries of the church, as it was then understood, spoke of themselves as working for the kingdom of God, and found this more to their taste than working for the church. The vague and humanitarian aspirations of Rationalism sometimes assumed to themselves the same title; but it was by Ritschl and his followers that the phrase was brought back into the very heart of theology. In the system of Ritschl there are two poles — the love of God and the kingdom of God. The love of God enfolds within itself God's purpose for the world, to be realized in time; and this progressive realization is the kingdom of God. It fulfils itself especially in the faithful discharge of the duties of everyone's daily vocation and in the recognition that in the course of Providence all things are working together for good to them that love God.

## **IV. PLACE IN THEOLOGY.**

### *1. Danger of Exageration:*

There are those to whom it appears self-evident that what was the leading phrase in the teaching of Jesus must always be the master-word in theology; while others think this to be a return from the spirit to the letter. Even Jesus, it may be claimed, had this phrase imposed upon Him quite as much as He chose it for Himself; and to impose it now on theology would

be to entangle the movements of Christian thought with the ceremonies of the dead.

## *2. Elements of Living Power in Idea:*

This is an interesting controversy, on both sides of which much might be said. But in the phrase “the kingdom of God” there are elements of living power which can never pass away.

(1) It expresses the social Power inside of Christianity. A kingdom implies multitude and variety, and, though religion begins with the individual, it must aim at brotherhood, organization and expansion.

(2) It expresses loyalty. However much kings and kingdoms may fail to touch the imagination in an age of the world when many countries have become or are becoming republican, the strength to conquer and to endure will always have to be derived from contact with personalities. God is the king of the kingdom of God, and the Son of God is His vicegerent; and without the love of God the Father and the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ no progress can be made with the Christianization of the world.

(3) It keeps alive the truth, suggested by Jesus in the Lord’s Prayer, that the doing of the will of God on earth is the one thing needful. This is the true end of all authority in both church and state, and behind all efforts thus directed there is at work the potency of heaven.

(4) It reminds all generations of men that their true home and destiny is heaven. In not a few of our Lord’s own sayings, as has been remarked, our phrase is obviously only a name for heaven; and, while His aim was that the kingdom should be established on earth, He always promised to those aiding in its establishment in this world that their efforts would be rewarded in the world to come. The constant recognition of a spiritual and eternal world is one of the unfailing marks of genuine Christianity.

## **LITERATURE.**

*See the works on New Testament Theology by Weiss, Beyschlag, Holtzmann, Feine, Schlatter, Weinelt, Stevens, Sheldon; and on the Teaching of Jesus by Wendt, Dalman, Bruce; Candlish, The Kingdom of God; Robertson, Regnum Dei; Stalker, The Ethic of Jesus.*

*James Stalker*

## KINGDOM OF ISRAEL

*See ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.*

## KINGDOM OF JUDAH

*See JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.*

## KING'S DALE

*See DALE, KING'S.*

## KING'S GARDEN

**גן המלך** **Aḡ'**[gan-ha-melekh]): In <sup><1685></sup>Nehemiah 3:15, mention is made of “the pool of Shelah by the king’s garden”; in <sup><1294></sup>2 Kings 25:4; <sup><2537></sup>Jeremiah 52:7, “All the men of war fled by night by the way of the gate between the two walls, which was by the king’s garden”; see also <sup><2804></sup>Jeremiah 39:4. The “king’s winepresses” (<sup><3840></sup>Zechariah 14:10), which must have been to the extreme South of the city, were clearly in this neighborhood. The references all point to the one situation in Jerusalem where it is possible for gardens to flourish all the year round, namely, the part of the Kidron valley below the Tyropoeon which is watered by the overflow from the Pool of Siloam (*see* **SILLOAM**). Here the vegetable gardens of the peasants of Siloam present an aspect of green freshness unknown elsewhere in Jerusalem.

*E. W. G. Masterman*

## KING'S MOTHER

The queen-dowager occupied a very important position at the court of the kings of Israel, e.g. Bathsheba (<sup><1029></sup>1 Kings 2:19); Maacah (<sup><1153></sup>1 Kings 15:13); Athaliah (<sup><1212></sup>2 Chronicles 22:2); and Nehushta (<sup><1248></sup>2 Kings 24:8; <sup><2438></sup>Jeremiah 13:18).

*See* **QUEEN**; **QUEEN MOTHER**.

## KING'S POOL

[**]** **Mh" tk" rB** [berekhath hamelekh]): This is possibly the Pool of Siloam (<sup><K24></sup>Nehemiah 2:14), and may have been so named as being near to the “king’s garden.”

## KING'S VALE

(**]** **Mh" Aqm** [ʕemeq ha-melekh]; Septuagint in Genesis reads *to pedion* (“the plain”) *basileos*, in 2 Sam, *he koilas* (“valley”) *tou basileos*; the King James Version King’s Dale): The place where the king of Sodom met Abram (<sup><Q147></sup>Genesis 14:17), and the situation of Absalom’s monument (<sup><Q818></sup>2 Samuel 18:18). It was identical with the Vale of Shaveh, and was evidently near Salem, the city of Melchizedek (<sup><Q147></sup>Genesis 14:17). If SALEM (which see) is Jerusalem, then Absalom’s pillar was also near that city, Josephus writes (Ant., VII, x, 3), “Absalom had erected for himself a marble pillar in the king’s dale, two furlongs (stadia) from Jerusalem, which he named Absalom’s Hand.” In all probability this “pillar” was a rough upright stone — a [matstsebhah] — but its site is lost. The traditional Greek-Egyptian tomb of perhaps 100-200 years BC which has been hewn out of the rock on the eastern side of the Kidron valley is manifestly misnamed “Absalom’s pillar,” and the Kidron ravine ([nachal]) cannot be the King’s Vale ([ʕemeq]).

*E. W. G. Masterman*

## KINGS, BOOKS OF

### I. TITLE.

The Hebrew title reads, **μykl m** [melakhim], “kings,” the division into books being based on the Septuagint where the Books of Kings are numbered 3rd and 4th, the Books of Kingdoms (**Βασιλείων**, *Basileion*), the Books of Samuel being numbered respectively 1st and 2nd. The separation in the Hebrew into 2 Books of Kings dates to the rabbinic Bible of Daniel Bomberg (Venice, 1516-17), who adds in a footnote, “Here the non-Jews (i.e. Christians) begin the 4th Book of Kings.” The Hebrew Canon treats the 2 Books of Samuel as one book, and the 2 Books of Kings as one. Hence, both the King James Version and the Revised



Version (British and American) read incorrectly, “The First Book of Kings,” even the use of the article being superfluous.

## II. SCOPE.

The Books of Kings contain 47 chapters (I, 22 chs; II, 25 chs), and cover the period from the conspiracy of Adonijah and the accession of Solomon (975 BC) to the liberation of Jehoiachin after the beginning of the Exile (561 BC). The subject-matter may be grouped under certain heads, as the last days of David (1 Kings 1 through 2:11); Solomon and his times (~~<1126>~~1 Kings 2:12 through 11:43); the Northern Kingdom to the coming of Assyria (~~<1126>~~1 Kings 12:16 through ~~<1274>~~2 Kings 17:41) (937-722 BC), including 9 dynastic changes; the Southern Kingdom to the coming of Babylon (~~<1126>~~1 Kings 12:1 through ~~<1252>~~2 Kings 25:21, the annals of the two kingdoms being given as parallel records until the fall of Israel) (937-586 BC), during which time but one dynasty, that of David, occupied the throne; the period of exile to 561 BC (~~<1252>~~2 Kings 25:22-30). A simpler outline, that of Driver, would be:

- (1) Solomon and his times (1 Kings 1 through 11);
- (2) Israel and Judah to the fall of Israel (1 Kings 12 through 2 Kings 17); Judah to the fall of Jerusalem (586 BC), and the captivity to the liberation of Jehoiachin (561 BC) (2 Kings 18 through 25).

“Above all, there are three features in the history, which, in the mind of the author, are of prime importance as shown by the prominence he gives them in his narrative.

- (1) The dynasty of David is invested with peculiar dignity. This had two aspects. It pointed back to the Divine election of the nation in the past, and gave the guaranty of indefinite national perpetuity in the future. The promise of the ‘sure mercies of David’ was a powerful uniting influence in the Exile.
- (2) The Temple and its service, for which the writer had such special regard, contributed greatly to the phase of national character of subsequent times. With all the drawbacks and defacements of pure worship here was the stated regular performance of sacred rites, the development and regulation of priestly order and ritual law, which stamped themselves so firmly on later Judaism.

(3) Above all, this was the period of bloom of Old Testament prophecy. Though more is said of men like Elijah and Elisha, who have left no written words, we must

not forget the desires of pre-exilic prophets, whose writings have come down to us — men who, against the opposition of rulers and the indifference of the people, testified to the moral foundation on which the nation was constituted, vindicated Divine righteousness, rebuked sin, and held up the ideal to which the nation was called.” — Robertson, Temple B D, 369 f.

### III. CHARACTER OF BOOKS AND POSITION IN HEBREW CANON.

The Books of Kings contain much historical material, yet the historical is not their primary purpose. What in our English Bibles pass for historical books are in the Hebrew Canon prophetic books, the Books of Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, 1 Kings and 2 Kings being classed as the “Earlier Prophets.”

#### *1. Purpose:*

The chief aim of these books is didactic, the imparting of great moral lessons backed up by well-known illustrations from the nation’s history and from the lives of its heroes and leaders. Accordingly, we have here a sort of historical archipelago, more continuous than in the Pentateuch, yet requiring much bridging over and conjecture in the details.

#### *2. Character of Data:*

The historical matter includes, in the case of the kings of Israel, the length of the reign and the death; in the case of the kings of Judah there are included also the age at the date of accession, the name of the mother, and mention of the burial. The beginnings of the reigns in each case are dated from a point in the reign of the contemporary ruler, e.g. <sup><1180></sup>1 Kings 15:1: “Now in the 18th year of king Jeroboam the son of Nebat began Abijam to reign over Judah.”

## IV. HISTORICAL VALUE.

### *1. Treatment of Historical Data:*

These books contain a large amount of authentic data, and, along with the other books of this group which constitute a contemporaneous narrative, Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, must be accorded high rank among ancient documents. To be sure the ethical and religious value is first and highest, nevertheless the historical facts must be reckoned at their true worth. Discrepancies and contradictions are to be explained by the subordination of historical details to the moral and religious purpose of the books, and to the diversity of sources whence these data are taken, that is, the compilers and editors of the Books of Kings as they now stand were working not for a consistent, continuous historical narrative, but for a great ethical and religious treatise. The historical material is only incidental and introduced by way of illustration and confirmation. For the oriental mind these historical examples rather than the rigor of modern logic constitute the unanswerable argument.

### *2. Chronology:*

There cannot be as much said relative to the chronological value of the books. Thus, e.g., there is a question as to the date of the close of Ahaz' reign. According to <sup><12180></sup>2 Kings 18:10, Samaria fell in the 6th year of Hezekiah's reign. The kings who followed Hezekiah aggregate 110 years; 586 plus 110 plus 29 (Hezekiah, <sup><12182></sup>2 Kings 18:2) = 725. But in <sup><12183></sup>2 Kings 18:13 we learn that Sennacherib's invasion came in the 14th year of Hezekiah's reign. Then 701 plus 14 = 715. With this last agrees the account of Hezekiah's sickness (<sup><12184></sup>2 Kings 20). In explanation of <sup><12183></sup>2 Kings 18:13, however, it is urged by some that the writer has subtracted the 15 years of <sup><12185></sup>2 Kings 20:6 from the 29 years of Hezekiah's reign. Again, e.g. in <sup><10018></sup>1 Kings 6:1, we learn that Solomon began to build the temple 480 years "after the children of Israel were come out of the Land of Egypt" (Septuagint here reads 440 years). This would make between Moses and David 12 generations of 40 years each. But counting the Exodus in the reign of Merenptah, 1225-1215 BC, and the beginning of the erection of the temple 975 BC, or after, we could not make out more than (1225-975) 250 years. Further, if the total length of reigns in Israel and Judah as recorded in the parallel accounts of Kings be added for the two kingdoms, the two amounts do not agree. And, again, it is not certain whether in their

annals the Hebrews predated or post-dated the reigns of their kings, i.e. whether the year of a king's death was counted his last year and the first year of his successor's reign, or whether the following year was counted the first year of the succeeding king (compare Curtis in H D B, I, 400, 1, f; Marti in E B, I, coll. 777 ff).

### *3. Value of Assyrian Records:*

The Babylonians and Assyrians were more skilled and more careful chronologers, and it is by reference to their accounts of the same or of contemporary events that a sure footing is found. Hence, the value of such monuments as those of Shalmaneser IV and Sennacherib — and here mention should be made also of the Moabite Stone.

### *4. Plan:*

The plan of the books is prevailingly chronological, although at times the material is arranged in groups (e.g. ~~<1218>~~ 2 Kings 2:1 through 8:15, the Elisha stories).

## **V. COMPOSITION.**

### *1. Nature of the Books:*

The Books of Kings are of the nature of a compilation. The compiler has furnished a framework into which he has arranged the historical matter drawn from other sources. There are chronological data, citations of authorities, judgments on the character and deeds of the several rulers, and moral and religious teachings drawn from the attitude of the rulers in matters of religion, especially toward heathen cults. The point of view is that of the prophets of the national party as one against foreign influence. "Both in point of view and in phraseology the compiler shows himself to be strongly influenced by Deuteronomy." (The principal editor is styled RD, i.e. Deuteronomic Redactor.) The Deuteronomic law was the touchstone, and by his loyalty to, or apostasy from, that standard, each king stands approved or condemned. This influence also appears in passages where the editor takes liberties in the expansion and adaptation of material. There is marked recurrence of phrases occurring elsewhere chiefly or even wholly in Deuteronomy, or in books showing Deuteronomic influence (Burney in H D B, II, 859 f). In 2 Kings 17 we have a test of the nation on the same standards; compare also ~~<1218>~~ 1 Kings 2:3 f; 9:1-9; ~~<1246>~~ 2 Kings 14:6; ~~<1546>~~ Deuteronomy 24:16.

## 2. Sources:

In numerous instances the sources are indicated, as “the book of the acts of Solomon” (~~<1114>~~ 1 Kings 11:41), “the chronicles of the kings of Judah” (~~<1143>~~ 1 Kings 14:29), “the chronicles of the kings of Israel” (~~<1153>~~ 1 Kings 15:31). A score or more of these sources are mentioned by title in the several books of the Old Testament. Thus “the history of Samuel the seer,” “the history of Nathan the prophet,” “the history of Gad the seer” (~~<1329>~~ 1 Chronicles 29:29); “the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite,” “the visions of Iddo the seer concerning Jeroboam the son of Nebat” (~~<1419>~~ 2 Chronicles 9:29; compare ~~<1425>~~ 2 Chronicles 12:15; 13:22; 20:34; 32:32). Thus the “book of the kings of Israel” is mentioned 17 times (for all kings except Jehoram and Hoshea); the “book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah” is mentioned 15 times (for all except Ahaziah, Athaliah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiachin and Zedekiah). Whether the compiler had recourse to the archives themselves or to a work based on the archives is still a question.

## 3. Kent's Scheme:

Kent, *Student's Old Testament* (II, chart, and pp. ix-xxvi), gives the following scheme for showing the sources:

**(1)** Early stories about the Ark (circa 950 BC or earlier), Saul stories and David stories (950-900 BC) were united (circa 850 BC) to make early Judean Saul and David stories. With these last were combined (circa 600 BC) popular Judean David stories (circa 700 BC) later Ephraimite Samuel narratives (circa 650 BC), and very late popular prophetic traditions (650-600 BC) in a first edition of the Books of Samuel.

**(2)** Annals of Solomon (circa 950 BC), early temple records (950-900 BC), were united (circa 800 BC) with popular Solomon traditions (850-800 BC) in a “Book of the Acts of Solomon.” A Jeroboam history (900-850 BC), an Ahab history (circa 800 BC), and a Jehu history (circa 750 BC) were united with the annals of Israel (after 950 to circa 700 BC) in the “Chronicles of the Kings of Israel” (700 or after). Early Ephraimite Elisha narratives (800-750 BC), influenced by a Samaria cycle of Elisha stories (750-700 BC) and a Gilgal cycle of Elisha stories (700-650 BC), were joined about 600 BC with the “Book of the Acts of Solomon” and the “Chronicles of the Kings of Israel” in a “first edition of the Books of Kings.”

(3) The first edition of Samuel, the first edition of Kings and Isaiah stories (before 550 BC) were united (circa 550 BC) in a final revision of Samuel and Kings.

(4) From “annals of Judah” (before 900 to 650 BC or after), temple records (before 850 to after 650 BC), and a Hezekiah history (circa 650 BC), was drawn material for the “Chronicles of the kings of Judah” (circa 600 BC).

(5) From this last work and the final revision of Samuel and Kings was taken material for a “Midhrash of the Book of the kings of Israel and Judah” (circa 300 BC), and from this work, the final revision of Samuel and Kings, and a possible temple history (after 400) — itself from the final revision of Samuel and Kings — came the Books of Chronicles (circa 250 BC).

#### *4. The Jahwist (Jahwist) and the Elohist (E):*

The distinctions between the great documents of the Pentateuch do not appear so clearly here. The summary, “epitome”) is the work of a Jewish redactor; the longer narratives (e.g. 1 Kings 17 through 2 Kings 8; 13:14-21) “are written in a bright and chaste Hebrew style, though some of them exhibit slight peculiarities of diction, due, doubtless (in part), to their North Israelite origin” (E). The writers of these narratives are thought to have been prophets, in most cases from the Northern Kingdom.

### **VI. DATE.**

There are numerous data bearing on the date of Kings, and indications of different dates appear in the books. The closing verses bring down the history to the 37th year of the Captivity (<sup><1257></sup>2 Kings 25:27); yet the author, incorporating his materials, was apparently not careful to adjust the dates to his own time, as in <sup><1188></sup>1 Kings 8:8; 12:19; <sup><1182></sup>2 Kings 8:22; 16:6, which refer to conditions that passed away with the Exile. The work was probably composed before the fall of Jerusalem (586 BC), and was revised during or shortly after the Exile, and also supplemented by the addition of the account of the downfall of the Judean kingdom. There are traces of a post-exilic hand, as, e.g., the mention of “the cities of Samaria” (<sup><1132></sup>1 Kings 13:32), implying that Samaria was a province, which was not the case until after the Exile. The existence of altars over the land (<sup><1190></sup>1 Kings 19:10), and the sanctuary at Carmel, were illegal according to the

Deuteronomic law, as also was the advice given to Elisha (<sup><1201></sup>2 Kings 3:19) to cut down the fruit trees in time of war; (<sup><0019></sup>Deuteronomy 20:19).

## LITERATURE.

K. Budde, *Das Buch der Richter*, Mohr, Leipzig; John Skinner, "Kings," in *New Century Bible*, Frowde, New York; C.F. Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1903; R. Kittel, *Die Bucher der Konige*, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Leipzig, 1900; I. Benzinger, *Die Bucher der Konige*, Mohr, 1899; C.F. Kent, *Student's Old Testament*, Scribner, 1905; S.R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, Scribner, new revised edition, 1910; J.E. McFadyen, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, Armstrong, New York, 1906; Carl H. Cornill, *Einleitung in die kanonischen Bucher Altes Testament*, Mohr, 6th edition, 1908; A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The Divine Library of the Old Testament*, Macmillan, 1891.

*Wallace N. Stearns*

## KINGS' SEPULCHRES

(<sup><1211></sup>2 Chronicles 21:20).

*See JERUSALEM, VIII.*

## KINSFOLK

<sup><kinz'-fok></sup>.

*See KINDRED.*

## KINSMAN KINSWOMAN

<sup><kinz'-man></sup>, <sup><kinz'-woom-an></sup>: Most frequently of the <sup>l a60</sup>[go'-el], the one who had a right to "redeem"; referring to the custom of avenging the blood of a slain kinsman; hence, a blood relative (<sup><0108></sup>Numbers 5:8; <sup><0121></sup>Ruth 2:20; 3:9,12; 4:1,3,6,8,14; compare "performing the part of a kinsman," <sup><0103></sup>Ruth 3:13); in <sup><0101></sup>Ruth 2:1, better rendered "acquaintance." Also <sup>bw6q</sup>[qarobh], one near, rendered "kinsman" (<sup><0101></sup>Psalm 38:11); probably better, "neighbor." Once, <sup>ra6</sup>[she'-er], "flesh kin," rendered "kinsman" (<sup><0271></sup>Numbers 27:11; compare <sup><0105></sup>Leviticus 18:6; 25:49; 20:19;

21:2, rendered “kin”). [**συγγενής**, *suggenes*], “of same race” (compare [**συγγένεια**, *suggebeia*], “kindred”), used of blood relationship of varying degrees of nearness (~~2412~~ Luke 14:12; ~~3195~~ John 18:26; ~~4114~~ Acts 10:24; ~~808~~ Romans 9:3; 16:7,11,21). Rendered “kin” in ~~4004~~ Mark 6:4.

## KINSWOMAN:

**rae** [she'er], “kin by blood,” or “by flesh” (compare above; also ~~6812~~ Leviticus 18:12 f; also compare 18:6, “near of kin” the King James Version); also same root, fem. form, **hrai** [sha'-arah] (~~6817~~ Leviticus 18:17), is thy “kinswoman.” In ~~4006~~ Proverbs 7:4, “Call understanding thy kinswoman” might be more accurately rendered, “thy familiar friend,” the Revised Version margin (from [**dm** [modha`], “acquaintance”); compare similar rendering of modha`ath, under KINDRED. ~~4135~~ Luke 1:36 the Revised Version (British and American), “kinswoman” ([**συγγενίς**, *suggenis*]), the King James Version “cousin” (*suggenes*); same is rendered “kinsfolk” (~~4138~~ Luke 1:58 the Revised Version (British and American)).

*Edward Bagby Pollard*

## KIR

<*kur*>, <*kir*> (**ryqi**[kir]):

### 1. MEANING:

The meaning of Kir is “inclosure” or “walled place,” and it is therefore doubtful whether it is a place-name in the true sense of the word. In ~~2169~~ 2 Kings 16:9 it is mentioned as the place whither Tiglath-pileser IV carried the Syrian (Aramean) captives which he deported from Damascus after he had taken that city. In Amos 1:5 the prophet announces that the people of Syria (Aram) shall go into captivity unto Kir, and in 9:7 it is again referred to as the place whence the Lord had brought the Syrians (Arameans) as Israel had been brought out of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor.

### 2. HOW RENDERED IN THE SEPTUAGINT:

Except in one manuscript (Septuagint, Codex Alexandrinus), where it appears as the Libyan Cyrene (~~1269~~ 2 Kings 16:9), it is never rendered in the Septuagint as a place-name. Thus the place whence the Syrians were



brought (<sup>3007</sup>Amos 9:7) is not Kir, but “the deep” or “the ditch” Septuagint [*ἐκ βόθρου*, *ek bothrou*], “pit”), probably a translation of some variant rather than of the word “Kit” itself. Comparing the Assyrian-Babylonian *kiru* (for *qiru*), “wall,” “inclosure,” “interior,” or the like, Kir might have the general meaning of a place parted off for the reception of exiled captives. Parallels would be Kir Moab, “the enclosure of Moab,” Kir Heres or Kir Chareseth, “the enclosure of brick” Septuagint [*hoi lithoi toni toichou*]). It seems probable that there was more than one place to which the Assyrians transported captives or exiles, and if their practice was to place them as far as they could from their native land, one would expect, for Palestinian exiles, a site or sites on the eastern side of the Tigris and Euphrates.

### 3. AN EMENDATION OF <sup>3016</sup>ISAIAH 22:5:

In <sup>3016</sup>Isaiah 22:5 occurs the phrase, “a breaking down of the walls, and a crying to the mountains” ([*meqarqar qir we-shoa` ‘el ha-har*] — “a surrounding of the wall,” etc., would be better), and the mention of *qir* and *shoa`* here has caused Fried. Delitzsch to suggest that we have to read, instead of [*qir*], [*qoa`*], combined with [*shoa`*], as in <sup>3023</sup>Ezekiel 23:23. Following this, but retaining [*qir*], Cheyne translates “Kir undermineth, and Shoa is at the mount,” but others accept Delitzsch’s emendation, Winckler conjecturing that the rendering should be “Who stirreth up Koa` and Shoa` against the mountain” (Alttest. Untersuchungen, 177). In the next verse (<sup>3016</sup>Isaiah 22:6) Kir is mentioned with Elam — a position which a city for western exiles would require.

### 4. SOLDIERS OF KIR IN ASSYRIAN ARMY:

The mention of Elam as taking the quiver, and Kir as uncovering the shield, apparently against “the valley of the vision” (in or close to Jerusalem), implies that soldiers from these two places, though one might expect them to be hostile to the Assyrians in general, were to be found in their armies, probably as mercenaries. See Fried. Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies?* 233; Schrader, *COT*, 425.

*T. G. Pinches*

## KIR OF MOAB

(**ba**ⲱⲛ **ryqi**[qir moa'-abh]; Septuagint has [τὸ τεῖχος, *to teichos*], “the wall,” “fortress”):

### 1. IDENTIFICATION:

The name, at least in this form, appears only once (~~2350~~ Isaiah 15:1) as that of a city in Moab. It is named with Ar of Moab, with which possibly it may be identical, since [ʿar] or [ʿir] is the Hebrew equivalent of the Moabite Qir. The Targum hence reads “Kerak in Moab.” There can be no doubt that the Kerak here intended is represented by the modern town of that name, with which, consequently, Kir Moab is almost universally identified. It must always have been a place of importance. It is mentioned as Charakmoba ([**Χαρακμῶβα**, *Karakmoba*]) in the Acts of the Council of Jerusalem (536 AD) and by the early geographers. It dominated the great caravan road connecting Syria with Egypt and Arabia. The Crusaders therefore directed attention to it, and held possession from 1167 till it fell again into the hands of the Moslems under Saladin, 1188. The Chroniclers speak of it as in el Belqa, and the chief city of Arabia Secunda. Under the title of Petra Deserti the Crusaders founded here a bishop's see. The Greek bishop of Petra still has his seat in Kerak.

### 2. DISCRIPTION:

Kerak stands upon a lofty spur projecting westward from the Moab plateau, with Wady `Ain Franjy on the South, and Wady el-Kerak on the North, about 10 miles from the Dead Sea. The sides of the mountain sink sharply into these deep ravines, which unite immediately to the West, and, as Wady el-Kerak, the great hollow runs northwestward to the sea. It is a position of great natural strength, being connected with the uplands to the East only by a narrow neck. It is 3,370 ft. above the level of the sea. The mountains beyond the adjacent valleys are much higher. The place was surrounded by a strong wall, with five towers, which can still be traced in its whole length. The most northerly tower is well preserved. The most interesting building at Kerak is the huge castle on the southern side. It is separated from the adjoining hill on the right by a large artificial moat; and it is provided with a reservoir. A moat also skirts the northern side of the fortress, and on the East the wall has a sloped or battered base. The castle is then separated from the town. The walls are very thick, and are well

preserved. Beneath the castle is a chapel in which traces of frescoes are still visible. In days of ancient warfare the place must have been practically impregnable. It could be entered only by two roads passing through rock-cut tunnels. The main danger must always have been failure of water supply. There are springs immediately outside the city; but those alone would not be sufficient. Great cisterns were therefore constructed in the town and also in the castle. The half-nomadic inhabitants of Kerak today number some 1,140 families (Musil, Arabia Petrea, III, 97). The Greek church claims about 2,000 souls; the rest are Moslems. They are wild and fearless people, not greatly inclined to treat strangers with courtesy and kindness. In the spring of 1911 the town was the center of a rising against the government, which was not quelled until much blood had been shed.

*W. Ewing*

## KIRAMA

<ki-r'-ma>, <kir'-a-ma> ([Κῖραμά, *Kirama*]; the King James Version, *Cirama*): The people of Kirama returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (1 Esdras 5:20); the “Ramah” of <sup><1426></sup>Ezra 2:26 (which see).

## QIR-HARESETH; KIR-HERES

<kur-har'-seth, <-ha-re'-seth> (tcrjAryqi[qir-charesh], <sup><23417></sup>Isaiah 16:7; in <sup><1400></sup>2 Kings 3:25 the King James Version reads Kir-haraseth (pausal form)); (vrj, ryqi[qir cheres], <sup><4481></sup>Jeremiah 48:31,36; in <sup><23411></sup>Isaiah 16:11 the King James Version reads Kir-haresh (pausal form)): Modern scholars unanimously identify this city with Kir of Moab. In Jehoram's invasion of Moab it alone withstood his attack; and on the city wall the king of Moab sacrificed his son (<sup><1400></sup>2 Kings 3:25 ff). It was obviously the capital, i.e. Kir Moab. The name is generally taken to mean “city of the sun.” Cheyne, however, points out (EB, under the word):

- (1) that this explanation was unknown to the ancients;
- (2) that “kir” is nowhere supposed to mean “city,” except in the compound names [Kir-heres], [Kir-hareseth], and [Kir Moab];
- (3) that cheres, “sun,” nowhere has a feminine ending, and
- (4) that <sup><23417></sup>Isaiah 16:7 Septuagint and Aquila.) indicates “d” and not “r” in the second part of the name ([Deseth]). He suggests, therefore,

that we should possibly read **hvdj }tyr" qi**[qiryath chadhdshah],  
 “new city.”

*W. Ewing*

## KIRIATH

**<kir'-i-ath>** (**tyr" qi**[qiryath], “city”; the King James Version Kirjath):  
 Mentioned (<sup><0688></sup>Joshua 18:28) as a city of Benjamin; has been identified  
 with Kuriet el `Enab, “town of grapes,” a prosperous town on the highroad  
 between Jerusalem and Jaffa; it is sometimes spoken of by the inhabitants  
 as Qurieh. It is, however, generally thought that Kiriath here stands for  
**KIRIATH-JEARIM** (which see). See P E F, III, 132, Sh XVII.

## KIRIATHAIM

**<kir-i-aitha'-im>** (**pylt" yr" qi**[qiryathaym], “two cities”; the King  
 James Version, Kirjathaim):

**(1)** A city in the uplands of Moab formerly held by Sihon, and given by  
 Moses to Reuben, who is said to have fortified it (<sup><0637></sup>Numbers 32:37;  
<sup><0639></sup>Joshua 13:19). It is named along with Elealeh and Nebo in the former  
 passage, and with Sibmah in the latter. It was in the hands of Moab in  
 Mesha's time, and he claims to have fortified it (M S, 1.10). For Jeremiah  
 (48:1,23) and Ezekiel (25:9) it is a Moabite town. Eusebius, Onomasticon,  
 identifies it with Coraitha, a Christian village 10 Roman miles West of  
 Madeba. This is the modern Qaraiyat, about 11 miles West of Madeba, and  
 5 miles East of Macherus. This, however, may represent Kerioth, while the  
 towns with which it is named would lead us to look for Kiriathaim to the  
 North of Wady Zerqa Ma`in. From this city was named Shaveh-kiriathaim,  
 “the plain of Kiriathaim” (<sup><0145></sup>Genesis 14:5).

**(2)** A city in the territory of Naphtali, assigned to the Gershonite Levites  
 (<sup><1365></sup>1 Chronicles 6:76), corresponding to “Kartan” in <sup><0613></sup>Joshua 21:32.

*W. Ewing*

## KIRIATH-ARBA

**<kir-i-ath-ar'-ba>**.

See **HEBRON**.

## KIRIATH-ARIM

<kir-i-ath-a'-rim> (<sup><1925></sup>Ezra 2:25).

See KIRIATH-JEARIM.

## KIRIATH-BAAL

<kir-i-ath-ba'-al>

See KIRIATH-JEARIM.

## KIRIATH-HUZOTH

<kir-i-ath hu'-zoth>: **tw**Ⓜ**j** **uty**r**qi** [qiryath-chutsoth], “city of streets”; Septuagint reads) **π**όλεις ἐπαύλεων, *poleis epauleon*], “city of villages,” from which we may infer a reading **tw**r**x****j** [chatseroth], for **tw**x**j** [chutsoth]; the King James Version, Kirjathhuzoth): A place to which, after their meeting, Balak and Balaam went together (<sup><1929></sup>Numbers 22:39). They met at “the City of Moab” (<sup><1926></sup>Numbers 22:36), which is probably identical with **KIR OF MOAB** (which see); Kiriath-huzoth was probably therefore not far from that city. Some would identify it with Kiriathaim; some with Kerioth; as yet there is no certainty.

## KIRIATH-JEARIM

<kir-i-ath je'-a-rim>, <kir-i-ath je-a'-rim> (**μ**yr[**y**" **A**tyr" **q**i [qiryath-ye`-arim], “city of thickets”; Septuagint [**ἡ πόλις Ἰαρεῖμ**, *he polis Iareim*]; the King James Version Kirjathjearim): One of the four chief cities of the Gibeonites (<sup><1917></sup>Joshua 9:17); a city of Judah (<sup><1950></sup>Joshua 15:60), evidently an ancient, Semitic “high place”, hence, the name “Kiriath-Baal” (same place) ; it was one of the places on the border line between Judah and Benjamin (<sup><1984></sup>Joshua 18:14,15; 15:11 (where it is called “Baalah”); compare <sup><1306></sup>1 Chronicles 13:6). It is mentioned as in Judah (<sup><1950></sup>Joshua 15:60; 18:14; <sup><1982></sup>Judges 18:12), but if **KIRIATH** (which see) is identical with it, it is mentioned as belonging to Benjamin (<sup><1933></sup>Joshua 18:28; in <sup><1912></sup>2 Samuel 6:2, Baale-judah).

## 1. SCRIPTURE REFERENCES:

<sup><07812></sup>Judges 18:12 records that the men of Dan set forth out of Zorah and Eshtaol and encamped in Mahaneh-dan behind (West of) Kiriath-jearim. (In <sup><07125></sup>Judges 13:25 Mahaneh-dan (“the camp of Dan”) is described as between Zorah and Eshtaol; *see* **MAHANEH-DAN**.) To this sanctuary the ark of Yahweh was brought, from Beth-shemesh by the people of Kiriath-jearim, and they “brought it into the house of Abinadab in the hill (m “Gibeah”]; and sanctified Eleazar his son to keep the ark of Yahweh” (<sup><09011></sup>1 Samuel 7:1). Here it abode twenty years (<sup><09012></sup>1 Samuel 7:2; <sup><09012></sup>2 Samuel 6:2-4; compare <sup><13116></sup>1 Chronicles 13:6; <sup><14004></sup>2 Chronicles 1:4). Clearly it was in the hills somewhere to the East of Beth-shemesh.

The prophet Uriah-ben-shemaiah, killed by Jehoiskim, belonged to Kiriath-jearim (<sup><24511></sup>Jeremiah 26:20 f).

In <sup><15125></sup>Ezra 2:25 (compare <sup><14129></sup>Nehemiah 7:29), this place occurs under the name “Kiriath-arim.” In 1 Esdras 5:19 the name occurs as “Kiriathiarus.”

## 2. POSITION:

The exact position of this important Israelite sanctuary has never been satisfactorily settled. Some of the data appear to be contradictory. For example, Josephus (Ant., VI, i, 4) says it was a city in the neighborhood of Beth-shemesh, while Eusebius and Jerome (Onomasticon) speak of it (“Cariathiareim”) in their day as a village 9 or 10 miles from Jerusalem on the way to Lydda. But it is open to doubt whether the reputed site of their day had any serious claims. Any suggested site should fulfill the following conditions:

- (1) It must harmonize with the boundary line of Judah and Benjamin between two known points — the “waters of Nephtoth,” very generally supposed to be Lifta, and Chesalon, certainly Kesla (<sup><06510></sup>Joshua 15:10).
- (2) It should not be too far removed from the other cities of the Gibeonites — Gibeon, Chephirah and Beeroth — but those places, which are all identified, are themselves fairly widely apart.
- (3) Mahaneh-dan (“the camp of Dan”) is described as between Zorah and Eshtaol, and was West of Kiriath-jearim; this, and the statement of Josephus that it was in the neighborhood of Beth-shemesh, makes it

probable that the site was near the western edge of the mountains of Judah. Zorah (now Sara`), Eshtaol (now Eshu`a) and Beth-shemesh (now `Ain Shems), are all within sight of each other close to the Vale of Sorek.

(4) The site should be a sanctuary (or show signs of having been such), and be at least on a height (Gibeah, ~~9000~~ 1 Samuel 7:1 margin).

(5) The name may help us, but it is as well to note that the first part of the name, in the form “Kiratharius” (1 Esdras 5:19), appears to have survived the exile rather than the second.

### 3. SUGGESTED IDENTIFICATIONS:

The first suggested identification was that of Robinson (BE, II, 11,12), namely, Kuriet el `Enab, the “town of grapes,” a flourishing little town about 9 miles West of Jerusalem on the carriage road to Jaffa. The district around is still fairly well wooded (compare ye`arim = “thickets”). This village is commonly known as Abu Ghosh, from the name of a robber chieftain who, with his family, flourished there in the first half of the last century. Medieval ecclesiastical tradition has made this place the Anathoth of Jer, and a handsome church from the time of the Crusades, now thoroughly repaired, exists here to mark this tradition. This site suits well as regards the border line, and the name Quriet is the exact equivalent of Kiriath; it also fits in with the distance and direction given the Eusebius, Onomasticon, but it cannot be called satisfactory in all respects. Soba, in the neighborhood, has, on account of its commanding position, been selected, but except for this one feature it has no special claims. The late Colonel Conder has very vigorously advocated the claims of a site he discovered on the south side of the rugged Wady Ismae`n, called Khurbet `Erma, pointing out truly that `Erma is the exact equivalent of `Arim (~~4325~~ Ezra 2:25). Unfortunately the 2nd part of the name would appear from the references in 1 Esdras and in Eusebius (Onomasticon) to be that part which was forgotten long ago, so that the argument even of the philological — the strongest — grounds cannot be of much value. The greatest objections in the minds of most students are the unsuitability of the position to the requirements of the Judah-Benjamin frontier and its distance from the other Gibeonite cities.

The present writer suggests another site which, in his opinion, meets at least some of the requirements better than the older proposals. Standing on

the hill of Beth-shemesh and looking Northwest, with the cities of Zorah (Sur`ah) and Eshtaol (Eshu'-a) full in view, a lofty hill crowned by a considerable forest catches the eye. The village a little below the summit is called Beit Machcir, and the hilltop itself is the shrine of a local saint known as Sheikh el Ajam. So “holy” is the site, that no trees in this spot are ever cut, nor is fallen brushwood removed. There is a Wely or sanctuary of the saint, and round about are scores of very curious and apparently ancient graves. Southward from this site the eye follows the line of Judean hills — probably the Mt. Jearim of <sup><1650></sup>Joshua 15:10 — until it strikes the outstanding point of Kesla (Chesslon), some 2 miles to the South. If the ark was taken here, the people of Beth-shemesh could have followed its progress almost the whole way to its new abode. Although the name, which appears to mean “besieged” or “confined,” in no degree helps, in all the other respects (see 2 above), this site suits well the conditions of Kiriath-jearim.

## LITERATURE.

*See P E F S, 1878, 196-99; P E F, III, 43-52; H G H L, 225 f; BR, II, 11 f; Buhl, G A the Priestly Code (P), Index.*

*E. W. G. Masterman*

## KIRIATH-SANNAH

<sup><kir-i-ath-san'-a></sup> (hNs" tyr" qi[qiryath sannah]; the King James Version Kirjath Sannah): In <sup><1650></sup>Joshua 15:49 it is called “Debir,” and is identical with **KIRIATH-SEPHER** (which see). As [πόλις γραμμάτων, *polis grammaton*], “city of books,” is the reading in Septuagint, the most natural explanation is that hNs [cannah], is a copyist’s error for rps [cepher], but Sayce considers this an ancient Canaanite name meaning “city of instruction,” and that it occurs in the Tell el-Amarna Letters in the form “Bit’ sani.”

## KIRIATH-SEPHER

<sup><kir-i-ath-se'-fer></sup> (rpsetyr" qi[qiryath cepher]; translated by many, as if it were Hebrew, as “house of books.” Septuagint [πόλις γραμμάτων, *polis grammaton*]; the King James Version, Kirjath Sepher; other suggestions have been made: “border-town” (Moore) or “tolltown”



(G.A. Smith): In two parallel passages (<sup><G515></sup>Joshua 15:15 f; <sup><D011></sup>Judges 1:11 f), it is mentioned as identical with DEBIR (which see), which has been frequently identified with edh-Dhaheriyeh. Sayce would place Kiriath-Sepher to the W. of Gath. See P E F S, 1893, 33-35.

## KIRJATH

<sup><kur'-jath></sup>, <sup><kir'-jath></sup>.

*See KIRIATH.*

## KIRJATH-ARBA

<sup><kur-jath-ar'-ba></sup>, <sup><kir-jath-ar'-ba></sup>.

*See KIRIATH-ARBA.*

## KIRJATH-BAAL

<sup><kur-jath-ba'-al></sup>, <sup><kir-jath-ba'-al></sup>.

*See KIRIATH-JEARIM.*

## KIRJATHAIM

<sup><kur-ja-tha'-im></sup>, <sup><kir-ja-tha'-im></sup>.

*See KIRIATHAIM.*

## KISEUS

<sup><kis-e'-us></sup> ([<sup>K</sup>ισεύς, *Kiseus*]; Septuagint, Codex Vaticanus (Swete) reads [*Keisaios*]; the King James Version, Cisai): The great-grandfather of Mordecai (Additions to Esther 11:2).

*See KISH, (5).*

## KISH

<sup><kish></sup> (<sup>vyqi</sup>[qish]; [<sup>K</sup>ίς, *Kis*], [<sup>K</sup>είς, *Keis*], “bow,” “power”): The name of five persons mentioned in the Bible:

(1) The son of Abiel and the father of Saul, the first king of Israel. He was of the tribe of Benjamin, of the family of the Matrites (<1001>1 Samuel 9:1; 14:51; compare <1421>Acts 13:21; <1902>1 Samuel 10:21). According to <1083>1 Chronicles 8:33 and 9:39, “Ner begat Kish” By reading “Ner begat Abner” (compare <1945>1 Samuel 14:51; <1068>1 Chronicles 6:28), the difficulty is at least partly overcome. In <1321>1 Chronicles 12:1, Kish is also mentioned as the father of Saul, and again in <10214>2 Samuel 21:14, we are told that the sepulcher of Kish was located in the country of Benjamin, in Zela. His place of residence seems to have been at Gibeah.

(2) Another Kish is mentioned (<1309>1 Chronicles 8:29 f; 9:35 f) as the son of Jeiel and his wife Maacah. He is usually supposed to be the uncle of Saul’s father.

(3) A Levite, the son of Mahli the Merarite (<1329>1 Chronicles 23:21 f; compare 24:29).

(4) Another Merarite Levite in the time of Hezekiah (<1090>2 Chronicles 29:12).

(5) The great-grandfather of Mordecai, of the tribe of Benjamin (<1006>Esther 2:5).

*William Baur*

## KISHI

<*kish’i*> (yvyqi[qishi], “snarer,” “fowler”): Father of Ethan, one of the singers David “set over the service of song” in the house of the Lord (<1061>1 Chronicles 6:31); the “Kushaiah” of <1357>1 Chronicles 15:17 (compare <1064>1 Chronicles 6:44).

## KISHION

<*kish’-i-on*>, <*kish’-yon*> (wvqi[qishyon]): A city in the territory of Issachar (<1090>Joshua 19:20), given to the Gershonite Levites (21:28; the King James Version wrongly “Kishon”). The parallel passage in <1062>1 Chronicles 6:72 reads “Kedesh” instead of “Kishion.” The true reading is probably wvqi[qidhshon]. Conder suggests a likely identification with Tell Abu Kedes, not far from Taanach.

## KISHON

<ki'-shon>, <kish'on> (<sup>^</sup>wOyqi[qishon]; [Κεισών, *Keison*]): The “watercourse” or “torrent stream” along the banks of which the great battle was fought between Israel, led by Deborah and Barak, and the army of Sisera, in the waters of which so many perished (<sup><0704></sup>Judges 4:7, etc.). It is probably mentioned earlier as “the brook that is before Jokneam” (<sup><0891></sup>Joshua 19:11; *see JOKNEAM*). It appears again as the scene of Elijah’s slaughter of the prophets of Baal (<sup><1180></sup>1 Kings 18:40). “The torrent” paragraph excellence in the district is the modern el-MuqaTTa`, a stream which drains all the plain of Esdraelon to the West of the watershed — a line drawn from Iksal to Nain, and thence to el-Fuleh and Zer`in. All the water East of this line, from the Nazareth hills, Tabor and Little Hermon, flows down Wady esh-Sherrar and Nahr Jalud into the Jordan. The Kishon collects the streams from the western slopes of Gilboa in the rainy season; and the water from the strong spring at Jenin. Contributions also come from the copious fountains in the neighborhood of Megiddo. At Sa`adiyeh, again, some 3 miles East of Chaifa, its volume is largely increased by springs rising at the base of Carmel, on the edge of the plain of Acre. From Jenin in the Southeast, the deep torrent bed follows a westerly direction, with numerous windings cutting the plain in two, until it reaches the pass at the northeastern base of Carmel. Through the gorge between the mountain and the hills of Galilee it reaches the plain of Acre. From Sa`adiyeh it flows in a deep sluggish stream through the marsh-land to the sea near Chaifa. In this part the crocodile is said to have been seen at times.

In the summer season the water from the springs is largely absorbed by irrigation, and the upper reaches of the river are soon dry. The bed runs along the bottom of a trench some 20 ft. deep through the plain. It is easily crossed at the fords by those who know how to avoid the localities of the springs. In time of heavy rains the trench is swiftly filled, and the soft soil of the plain goes to mud. Remembering this, it is easy to understand the disaster that overwhelmed the heavily armed cavalry and chariots of Sisera. The chief ford for long was to the West of the gorge where the stream issues into the plain of Acre, on the highway from Chaifa to Nazareth. Here it is now spanned by a substantial bridge, while the railway crosses a little higher up. At the mouth of the river it is generally easily forded on the

sand bank thrown up by the waves beating against the current of the stream. The main traffic here is now carried by a wooden bridge.

The phrase [nachal qedhumim] in <sup><0762></sup>Judges 5:21 is not easy of interpretation. English Versions of the Bible translates, “that ancient river”; G.A. Smith, “torrent of spates”; while others think it may refer to a stream other than the Kishon. Guthe suggests that both names may be derived from those of places adjoining the river. Kishon may possibly mean the “tortuous” stream, referring to the windings of its course.

*W. Ewing*

## KISLEV

<sup><kis'-lef></sup> (𐤊𐤍 𐤌𐤍𐤊𐤍𐤏 [kiclew]; the King James Version Chisleu, the Revised Version (British and American) “Chislev”): The 9th month of the Jewish year, corresponding to December. The word is found in <sup><0001></sup>Nehemiah 1:1 and <sup><0001></sup>Zechariah 7:1. The derivation is uncertain.

*See CALENDAR.*

## KISS

(<sup><qv"></sup> n:[nashaq]; [<sup><0146></sup>φιλέω, *phileo*], [<sup><0146></sup>καταφιλέω, *kataphilo*], [<sup><0146></sup>φίλημα, *philema*]): The kiss is common in eastern lands in salutation, etc., on the cheek, the forehead, the beard, the hands, the feet, but not (in Pal) the lips (Cheyne, E B, under the word “Salutations”). In the Bible there is no sure instance of the kiss in ordinary salutation. We have in the Old Testament naschaq, “to kiss,” used

(1) of relatives (which seems the origin of the practice of kissing; compare <sup><0146></sup>Song of Solomon 8:1, “Oh that thou wert as my brother .... I would kiss thee; yea, and none would despise me”); <sup><0146></sup>Genesis 27:26,27 (Isaac and Jacob); 29:11 (Jacob and Rachel); 33:4 (Esau and Jacob); 45:15 (Joseph and his brethren); 48:10 (Jacob and Joseph’s sons); 50:1 (Joseph and his father); <sup><0146></sup>Exodus 4:27 (Aaron and Moses); 18:7 (Moses and Jethro, united with obeisance); <sup><0146></sup>Ruth 1:9,14 (Naomi and her daughters-in-law — a farewell); <sup><0146></sup>2 Samuel 14:33 (David and Absalom); <sup><0146></sup>1 Kings 19:20 (Elisha and his parents — a farewell); see also <sup><0146></sup>Genesis 29:13; 31:28,55; Tobit 7:6; 10:12.

(2) Of friendship and affection; compare <sup><0904></sup>1 Samuel 20:41 (David and Jonathan); <sup><0916></sup>2 Samuel 15:5 (Absalom and those who came to him); 19:39 (David and Barzillai — a farewell); 20:9 (Joab and Amasa); <sup><0976></sup>Proverbs 27:6 (“the kisses ([neshiqah]) of an enemy”); 1 Esdras 4:47 (“the king stood up, and kissed him”).

(3) Of love; compare <sup><2002></sup>Song of Solomon 1:2, “Let him kiss me with the kisses ([neshiqah]) of his mouth”; <sup><0973></sup>Proverbs 7:13 (of the feigned love of “the strange woman”).

(4) Of homage, perhaps; compare <sup><0900></sup>1 Samuel 10:1 (Samuel after anointing David king); <sup><0440></sup>Genesis 41:40, “Unto thy word shall all my people be ruled,” the Revised Version margin “order themselves,” or “do homage,” the King James Version margin “Hebrew be armed or kiss” ([nashaq]); <sup><0902></sup>Psalms 2:12, “Kiss the son” (American Standard Revised Version), the English Revised Version margin “Some versions render, ‘Lay hold of (or receive) instruction’; others, ‘Worship in purity’ “; some ancient versions give ‘Kiss (or, do homage) purely.’

(5) Of idolatrous practices; compare <sup><1198></sup>1 Kings 19:18; <sup><3172></sup>Hosea 13:2 (compare 8:5,6; 10:5); <sup><0807></sup>Job 31:27, probably, “kissing the hand to the sun or moon” (compare 31:26,27). *See* ADORATION.

(6) A figurative use may be seen in <sup><0850></sup>Psalms 85:10; <sup><0903></sup>Proverbs 24:26; <sup><0813></sup>Ezekiel 3:13, where “touched” is [nashaq] (see the King James Version margin).

(7) In Additions to Esther 13:13 we have “I could have been content .... to kiss the soles of his feet,” and in Ecclesiasticus 29:5, “Till he hath received, he will kiss a man’s hands” — marks of self-humiliation or abasement.

In the New Testament we have *phileo*, “to kiss,” “to be friendly,” and [*kataphileo*], “to kiss thoroughly,” “to be very friendly” — the first in <sup><0168></sup>Matthew 26:48; <sup><0144></sup>Mark 14:44; <sup><0227></sup>Luke 22:47, of the kiss with which Judas betrayed his Master. This was probably meant to be taken as an expression of special regard, which is expressed by the [*kataphileo*] of <sup><0169></sup>Matthew 26:49; <sup><0145></sup>Mark 14:45; the same word is used of the woman who kissed the feet of Christ (<sup><0173></sup>Luke 7:38,45); of the father’s greeting of the returning prodigal (<sup><0173></sup>Luke 15:20); and of the farewell to Paul of the Ephesian Christians (<sup><0187></sup>Acts 20:37); [*philema*], “a kiss,” “a mark of

friendship,” is used by our Lord as that which Simon omitted to give him (which may refer to ordinary hospitality), but which the woman had bestowed so impressively (~~4745~~ Luke 7:45); of the kiss of Judas (~~42248~~ Luke 22:48); and of the “holy kiss” wherewith Christians greeted each other, which, according to the general usage we have seen, would be as the members of one family in the Lord, or as specially united in holy love (~~45666~~ Romans 16:16; ~~46661~~ 1 Corinthians 16:20; ~~47132~~ 2 Corinthians 13:12; ~~4866~~ 1 Thessalonians 5:26; ~~4154~~ 1 Peter 5:14). There is reason to believe that, as a rule, men only thus greeted men, and women, women. In the Apostolical Constitutions (3rd century) it is so enjoined.

*W. L. Walker*

## KITE

~~<kit>~~ (**hYa**" [’ayyah]; [**ἰκτῖνος**, *iktinos*]; Latin *Milvus ictinus* or *regalis*): A medium-sized member of the hawk tribe (*see* HAWK). This bird is 27 inches long, of bright reddish-brown color, has sharply pointed wings and deeply forked tail. It is supposed to have exceptionally piercing eyes. It takes moles, mice, young game birds, snakes and frogs, as well as carrion for food. Its head and facial expression are unusually eagle-like. It was common over Palestine in winter, but bred in the hills of Galilee and rough mountainous places, so it was less conspicuous in summer. It is among the lists of abominations (*see* ~~48114~~ Leviticus 11:14 and ~~45413~~ Deuteronomy 14:13). It is notable that this is the real bird intended by Job to be used as that whose eye could not trace the path to the silver mine:

*“That path no bird of prey knoweth,  
Neither hath the falcon’s eye seen it”* (~~48307~~ Job 28:7).

The word used here in the original Hebrew is [’ayyah], which was the name for kite. Our first translators used “vulture”; our latest efforts give “falcon,” a smaller bird of different markings, not having the kite’s reputation for eyesight.

*Gene Stratton-Porter*

## KITHLISH

~~<kith’-lish>~~ (**vyI itKngs** [kithlish]).

*See CHITLISH.*

## KITRON

<kit'-ron> (װ׳ר׳ן[qiTron]): An unidentified place in Zebulun, not possessed by the tribe (<ר׳ן> Judges 1:30). It may be identical with Kattath of <ר׳ן> Joshua 19:15. In the Talmud it is identified with Sepphoris, which is represented by the modern village of Seffuriyeh].

## KITTIM

<kit'-im> (כִּיִּיִּם [kittim], <ר׳ן> Isaiah 23:12; <ר׳ן> Jeremiah 2:10;

כִּיִּיִּם [kittiyim], apparently plural of kitti (not found, but compare (4) below); [Κήτιοι, Ketioi], [Κίτιοι, Kitioi], [Κητείμ, Keteim], <ר׳ן> Jeremiah 2:10; [Χεττιέμ, Chettieim], [Χεττιείν, Chettein):

### 1. TWO USAGES OF THE NAME:

In <ר׳ן> Genesis 10:4 the word is applied to the descendants of Javan, and indicates, therefore, the Greek-Latin races, whose territory extended along the coasts of the Mediterranean, and included its islands. By the side of Kittim are mentioned Elisha, Tarshish, and Dodanim (= Rodanim of <ר׳ן> 1 Chronicles 1:7), generally explained respectively as Sicily with Southern Italy, Spain and Rhodes. In its narrower sense Kittim appears simply to have stood for the island of Cyprus — it is mentioned between Bashan (= Pal) and the isles of Elisha in <ר׳ן> Ezekiel 27:6,7, and with this <ר׳ן> Isaiah 23:1,12 agree, Kittim occurring in these passages between Tarshish, Tyre and Sidon.

### 2. IN ITS LIMITED SENSE:

The oldest etymology is apparently that of Josephus, who connects Kittim with the well-known old Cypriote city Kition (Citium) (Ant., I, vi, 1), testifying to the settling of the Kittim on the island. This word he further connects with Chethima, from Chethimus, and states that it was on account of Cyprus being the home of those people that all islands were called Chethim by the Hebrews. The derivation of an ancient Chethim from Chethimus, however, would make the m to be a radical, and this, with the substitution of Chronicles (= Kh) for Kittim, renders his proposed etymology somewhat doubtful.

### 3. IN ITS EXTENDED SENSE:

The statement of Josephus, that “all islands, and the greatest part of the sea-coast, are called Chethim (= Kittim) by the Hebrews,” on the other hand, must be taken as the testimony of one well acquainted with the opinions of the learned world in his time. In <sup>2470</sup>Jeremiah 2:10 and <sup>2576</sup>Ezekiel 27:6 the isles of Kittim are expressly spoken of, and this confirms the statement of Josephus concerning the extended meaning of the name. This would explain its application to the Roman fleet in <sup>2713</sup>Daniel 11:30 (so the Vulgate), and the Macedonians in 1 Macc 1:1 ([*Χεττιεῖμ*, *Chettieim*) and 8:5 (*Kitians*). In the latter passage the Greek writer seems to have been thinking more of the Cyprian Kition than of the Hebrew [Kittim].

### 4. COLONIZATION OF CYPRUS:

According to Herodotus (vii.90), Cyprus was colonized from Greece, Phoenicia, and Ethiopia. Referring to the plundering of the temple of Aphrodite at Askalon by the Scythians (i.105), he states that her temple in Cyprus was an offshoot from that ancient foundation, as reported by the Cyprians themselves, Phoenicians having founded it at Cythera, on arriving from Syria. The date of the earliest Phoenician settlements in Cyprus is unknown, but it has been suggested that they were anterior to the time of Moses. Naturally they brought with them their religion, the worship of the moon-goddess Atargatis (Derceto) being introduced at Paphos, and the Phoenician Baal at Kition. If Kition be, then, a Semitic word (from the same root as the Hebrew [Kittim]), it has been transferred from the small band of Phoenician settlers which it at first designated, to the non-Sem Japhethites of the West. Kition occurs in the Phoenician inscriptions of Cyprus under the forms K(i)t(t) and K(i)t(t)i, the latter being by far the more common (CIS, I, i, 10,11,14,19, etc.).

### 5. ITS SUCCESSIVE MASTERS:

The early history of Cyprus is uncertain. According to the Assyrian copy of Sargon of Agade's omens, that king (about 3800 BC in the opinion of Nabonidus; 2800 BC in the opinion of many Assyriologists) is said to have crossed “the sea of the setting sun” (the Mediterranean), though the Babylonian copy makes it that of “the rising sun” — i.e. the Persian Gulf. Be this as it may, General Cesnola discovered at Curium, in Cyprus, a seal-



cylinder apparently inscribed “Mar-Istar, son of Ilu-bani, servant (worshipper) of Naram-Sin,” the last named being the deified son of Sargon. In the 16th century BC, Cyprus was tributary to Thothmes III. About the year 708 BC, Sargon of Assyria received the submission of the kings of the district of Ya’, in Cyprus, and set up at Citium the stele bearing his name, which is now in the Royal Museum at Berlin. Esarhaddon and his son Assur-bani-apli each received tribute from the 10 Cyprian princes who acknowledged Assyrian supremacy. The island was conquered by the Egyptian king Amasis, and later formed part of the Persian empire, until the revolt of Evagoras in 410 BC. The Assyrians knew the island under the name of Yad(a)nanu, the “Wedan” (Vedan) of ~~3279~~ Ezekiel 27:19 Revised Version (British and American) (Sayce, PSBA, 1912, 26).

## **6. THE RACES THEREIN AND THEIR LANGUAGES:**

If the orthodox date for the composition of Genesis be accepted, not only the Phoenicians, but also the Greeks, or a people of Greek-Latin stock, must have been present in Cyprus, before the time of Moses, in sufficient number to make them the predominant portion of the population. As far as can be judged, the Phoenicians occupied only the eastern and southern portion of the island. Paphos, where they had built a temple to Ashtoreth and set up an [’asherah] (a pillar symbolizing the goddess), was one of their principal settlements. The rest of the island was apparently occupied by the Aryans, whose presence there caused the name of Kittim to be applied to all the Greek-Latin countries of the Mediterranean. Greek and Phoenician were the languages spoken on the island, as was proved by George Smith’s demonstration of the nature of the non-Phoenician text of the inscription of King Melek-yathon of Citium (370 BC). The signs used in the Greek-Cyprian inscriptions are practically all syllabic.

## **7. THE TESTIMONY OF CYPRIAN ART:**

The many influences which have modified the Cyprian race are reflected in the ancient art, which shows the effect of Babylonian, Egyptian Phoenician and Greek contacts. Specimens are to be found in many museums, but the finest collection of examples of Cyprian art is undoubtedly that of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. Some of the full-length figures are life-size, and the better class of work is exceedingly noteworthy.

See *CYPRUS*.

*T. G. Pinches*

## KNEADING

<ned'ing>.

See *BREAD*, III, 2.

## KNEE; KNEEL

<ne> <nel> (“knee,”  $\text{𐤁𐤓}$ [berekh]; Aramaic  $\text{ܠܒܟܐ}$  “a”

[’arekhubbah]; [ $\gamma\acute{o}\nu\upsilon$ , *gonu*]; “kneel”;  $\text{𐤁𐤓}$ [barakh]; Aramaic  $\text{ܠܒܟ}$ [berakh]; [ $\gamma\acute{o}\nu\upsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ , *gonupeto*]): Most of the uses are obvious, and the figurative use of “knees” as the symbol of strength (<sup><1841></sup>Job 4:4; <sup><1842></sup>Hebrews 12:12, etc.) needs no explanation. The disease of the knees mentioned in <sup><1835></sup>Deuteronomy 28:35 is perhaps some form of leprosy. In <sup><1842></sup>Job 3:12 the “knees” seem to be used for the lap, as the place where a child receives its first care. Three times in Genesis the knees appear in connection with primitive adoption customs. In 30:3 a fiction is enacted that purports to represent Rachel as the actual mother of Bilhah’s children. By a somewhat similar rite in 48:12, Jacob (the “knees” here are Jacob’s, not Joseph’s) adopts Ephraim and Manasseh, so that they are counted as two of the twelve patriarchs and not as members of a single Joseph tribe. In the same way Machir’s children are adopted by Joseph in 50:23, and this is certainly connected with the counting of Machir (instead of Manasseh) as one of the tribes in <sup><10054></sup>Judges 5:14. See *TRIBES*; and for the idea underlying this paternal adoption, compare *THIGH*. From among classical instances of the same customs compare Homer, *Odyssey*, xix. 401 ff, where Autolukos, grandfather of Ulysses, receives the newborn grandchild on his knees and gives him his name. Thus also we have to understand the numerous representations in Egyptian sculpture, showing the king as an infant on the knees or the lap of a goddess.

Kneeling was less commonly an attitude of prayer among the Jews than was standing, but references to kneeling are of course abundant. For kneeling (or prostrating one’s self) before a superior, see *ATTITUDE*, 2; *SALUTATION*.

*Burton Scott Easton*

## KNIFE

<nif>:

(1) **tl kaḿ** [ma'akheleth], literally, an instrument for eating; but used of large knives for slaying animals, cutting up a carcass or a sacrificial victim (<sup><1216></sup>Genesis 22:6,10; <sup><1719></sup>Judges 19:29; <sup><1914></sup>Proverbs 30:14).

(2) **brjk**, [cherebh], rendered generally “sword,” but in <sup><1618></sup>Joshua 5:2,3 of stone knives for circumcision (compare <sup><1925></sup>Exodus 4:25), probably of similar knives in <sup><1183></sup>1 Kings 18:28, used by Baal prophets in gashing themselves. In <sup><2152></sup>Ezekiel 5:12 the King James Version, “knife,” probably better the Revised Version (British and American), “sword.”

(3) **r[ṭ]** [ta`ar], usually rendered “razor,” in combination with **rpṣb** [ha-copher], “knife of the writer,” or “penknife” (<sup><2453></sup>Jeremiah 36:23).

(4) **μypl j ḥ** [machalaphim], “slaughter-knives” (<sup><5109></sup>Ezra 1:9).

(5) **ʿyKḥ** [sakkin], Aramaic, “knife” (<sup><2120></sup>Proverbs 23:2). Early knives were commonly made of sharp stones, especially of flint, later of bronze and iron. The former remained in use in religious ceremonies long after the latter were in common use. Knives were not generally used at meals, meats being cut into bits before served, and bread being broken into fragments. Herod used a knife for paring apples, and attempted suicide with the instrument (Josephus, Ant, XVII, vii, 1; BJ, I, xxxiii, 7).

*Edward Bagby Pollard*

## KNOCK

<nok> ([**κρούω**, krouo]): The oriental house was fitted with heavy doors which were bolted and locked with wooden keys too large to be carried about, so that even a member of the household could not secure entrance until in response to his knock or call the door should be opened by someone within. At night the delay would be increased by the difficulty of

arousing the inmates sleeping within the inner chambers. To persons familiar with such experiences, the words of Jesus concerning a higher entrance, “Knock, and it shall be opened unto you” (<sup><4107></sup>Matthew 7:7; <sup><2126></sup>Luke 12:36), would have a unique force not easy for us to appreciate.

*Russell Benjamin Miller*

## **KNOP**

<sup><no></sup>: In <sup><1251></sup>Exodus 25:31 ff; 37:17 ff (kaphtor), part of the ornaments of the golden candlestick; in <sup><1058></sup>1 Kings 6:18; 7:24 (peqa`im), gourd-like ornaments of the lining of Solomon’s temple, and of the brazen sea (in <sup><1068></sup>1 Kings 6:18, the Revised Version margin “gourds”).

*See CANDLESTICK, GOLDEN; TEMPLE; SEA, THE MOLTEN.*

## **KNOW; KNOWLEDGE**

<sup><no></sup>, <sup><nol’-ej></sup> (in Hebrew chiefly [d̥y:[yadha`], noun t [D” [da`ath; in Greek [γινώσκω, *ginosko*], [οἶδα, *oida*] “to know fully,” [ἐπιγινώσκω, *epiginosko*], noun [γνώσις, *gnosis*] [ἐπίγνωσις, *epignosis*]): Knowledge strictly is the apprehension by the mind of some fact or truth in accordance with its real nature; in a personal relation the intellectual act is necessarily conjoined with the element of affection and will (choice, love, favor, or, conversely, repugnance, dislike, etc.). Knowledge is distinguished from “opinion” by its greater certainty. The mind is constituted with the capacity for knowledge, and the desire to possess and increase it. The character of knowledge varies with its object. The senses give knowledge of outward appearances; the intellect connects and reasons about these appearances, and arrives at general laws or truths; moral truth is apprehended through the power inherently possessed by men of distinguishing right and wrong in the light of moral principles; spiritual qualities require for their apprehension spiritual sympathy (“They are spiritually judged,” <sup><4124></sup>1 Corinthians 2:14). The highest knowledge possible to man is the knowledge of God, and while there is that in God’s infinity which transcends man’s power of comprehension (<sup><8107></sup>Job 11:7,9), God is knowable in the measure in which He has revealed Himself in creation (<sup><8119></sup>Romans 1:19,20, “that which is known of God,” etc.), and supremely in Jesus Christ, who alone perfectly knows the Father, and reveals Him to man (<sup><4117></sup>Matthew 11:27). This knowledge of God in Jesus Christ is “life eternal” (<sup><8178></sup>John 17:3). Knowledge is affirmed of both God

and man, but with the wide contrast that God's knowledge is absolute, unerring, complete, intuitive, embracing all things, past, present, and future, and searching the inmost thoughts of the heart (<sup><490></sup>Psalm 139:1,23); whereas man's is partial, imperfect, relative, gradually acquired, and largely mixed with error ("Now we see in a mirror darkly .... in part," <sup><4932></sup>1 Corinthians 13:12). All these points about knowledge are amply brought out in the Scripture usage of the terms. A large part of the usage necessarily relates to natural knowledge (sometimes with a carnal connotation, as <sup><904></sup>Genesis 4:1,17), but the greatest stress also is laid on the possession of moral and spiritual knowledge (e.g. <sup><4936></sup>Psalm 119:66; <sup><9004></sup>Proverbs 1:4,7,22,29; 8:10, etc.; <sup><4917></sup>Luke 1:77; <sup><4954></sup>Romans 15:14; <sup><9005></sup>2 Peter 1:5,6). The highest knowledge, as said, is the knowledge of God and Christ, and of God's will (<sup><806></sup>Hosea 6:6; <sup><4913></sup>Romans 11:33; <sup><4917></sup>Ephesians 1:17; 4:13; <sup><9009></sup>Philippians 1:9; 3:8; <sup><9009></sup>Colossians 1:9,10, etc.). The moral conditions of spiritual knowledge are continually insisted on ("If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God," <sup><4917></sup>John 7:17). On the other hand, the pride of intellectual knowledge is condemned; it must be joined with love ("Knowledge puffeth up, <sup><4981></sup>1 Corinthians 8:1). The stronger term [*epignosis*] is used to denote the full and more perfect knowledge which is possessed in Christ, the conditions of which are humility and love. Of knowledge as connoting favor, choice, on the part of God, there are many examples (<sup><4906></sup>Psalm 1:6, "Yahweh knoweth the way of the righteous"; <sup><8049></sup>Galatians 4:9, "know God, or rather to be known by God"; compare <sup><4929></sup>Romans 8:29, "whom he fore-knew").

See *FOREKNOWLEDGE*.

*James Orr*

## KOA

<sup><ko'-a></sup> (<sup>[wqo]</sup>qoa`): A people named with Pekod and Shoa as enemies of Jerusalem (<sup><4923></sup>Ezekiel 23:23). Their location was probably Northeast of Babylonia.

## KOHATH; KOHATHITES

<sup><ko'-hath></sup>, <sup><ko'-hath-its></sup> (<sup>[thq]</sup>qehath], <sup>[ythq']</sup>qohathi]; [<sup>Kαάθ</sup>, *Kaath*]): Second son of Levi, and ancestor of Moses and Aaron

(<sup><0461></sup>Genesis 46:11; <sup><0766></sup>Exodus 6:16-20; <sup><0487></sup>Numbers 3:17; <sup><1701></sup>1 Chronicles 6:1, etc.). The Kohathites formed one of the three divisions of the tribe of Levi; the other two being the Gershonites and the Merarites (<sup><0487></sup>Numbers 3:17 ff). The Kohathites consisted of four families, the Amramites, the Izharites, the Hebronites, and the Uzzielites (<sup><0489></sup>Numbers 3:19,27, etc.). Their place in the wilderness was on the southern side of the tabernacle (<sup><0489></sup>Numbers 3:29), and their number is given (from a month old) as 8,600 (<sup><0488></sup>Numbers 3:28). Their special charge was “the ark, and the table, and the candlestick, and the altars, and the vessels of the sanctuary wherewith they minister, and the screen, and all the service thereof” (<sup><0489></sup>Numbers 3:31; compare 7:9). After the conquest 23 cities were assigned them by lot (<sup><0206></sup>Joshua 21:4,5 ff). In David’s time and after, Heman, a Kohathite, and his family had a prominent place in the service of the music of the sanctuary (<sup><1063></sup>1 Chronicles 6:33 ff; 16:41 ff; 25:1 ff); David likewise divided the Levites into courses (the Kohathites, <sup><1332></sup>1 Chronicles 23:12-20; 24:20-25). We read of the Kohathites in the reign of Jehoshaphat at Engedi (<sup><1409></sup>2 Chronicles 20:19), and in connection with the cleansing of the temple under Hezekiah (<sup><1492></sup>2 Chronicles 29:12,14).

*James Orr*

## KOHELETH

<sup><ko-hel'-eth></sup> (<sup>t</sup>l <sup>hq</sup> [qohemoth]).

*See ECCLESIASTES.*

## KOLAIAH

<sup><ko-la'-ya></sup>, <sup><ko-li'-a></sup> (<sup>hyl</sup> <sup>wq</sup> [qolayah], “voice of Yah”):

- (1) A Benjamite, son of Maaseiah (<sup><1607></sup>Nehemiah 11:7).
- (2) Father of Ahab, a false prophet and a lecherous man (<sup><2021></sup>Jeremiah 29:21-23).

## KONAE

<sup><ko'-ne></sup> ([<sup>Kωνά</sup>, *Kona*): Some manuscripts have [<sup>κώμας</sup>, *komas*], from which we have in the King James Version “the villages.” The name occurs in the account of the measures taken to secure the country against

Holofernes (Judith 4:4). If Kona be correct, we may possibly identify the place with Cyamon.

## QOPH

<koḡ> (**q** [qoph]): The 19th letter of the Hebrew alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia as q (intense k). It came also to be used for the number 100. For name, etc., *see* **ALPHABET**.

## KOR

<kor>.

*See* **COR**.

## KORAH

<ko'-ra>, **j r q q** [qorach], “baldness,” possibly; [**Kópe**, *Kore*]):

**(1)** One of the 3 sons of Oholibamah, Esau’s Hivite wife. The account says that the 3 were born in Canaan before Esau withdrew to the Seir mountain country. They are mentioned 3 times in the brief account from 3 points of view (<sup><1316></sup>Genesis 36:5,14,18; <sup><1315></sup>1 Chronicles 1:35), the 3rd mention being in the list of “chiefs.”

**(2)** One of the sons of Eliphaz, the son of Adah, Esau’s Hittite wife (<sup><1316></sup>Genesis 36:16). He is mentioned as one of the Edomite “chiefs.”

If one has the habit, finding a statement anywhere, of thinking that the statement ought to be changed into something else, he will be interested in the attempts to identify these Edomite Korahs with Korah **(3)**.

**(3)** A son of Hebron (<sup><1318></sup>1 Chronicles 2:43), the son of Mareshah, mentioned in the Caleb group of families in Judah.

**(4)** The son of Izhar the son of Kohath the son of Levi (<sup><1316></sup>Exodus 6:16 ff; <sup><1311></sup>Numbers 16:1; <sup><1318></sup>1 Chronicles 6:18,31-38), a younger contemporary of Moses. There may have been generations, omitted in the record, between Izhar and Korah; that is a natural way of accounting for Amminadab (<sup><1312></sup>1 Chronicles 6:22-30).

## 1. THE CATASTROPHE IN THE WILDERNESS:

This Korah is best known as the man whom the opening earth is said to have swallowed up along with his associates when they were challenging the authority of Moses and Aaron in the wilderness (Numbers 16; 17). Korah is presented as the principal in the affair. The company is spoken of as his company, and those who were swallowed up as being “all the men that appertained unto Korah.” (Numbers 16:11,32). It is under his name that the affair is referred to (Numbers 26:9; 27:3). But Dathan and Abiram of the tribe of Reuben are not much less prominent than Korah. In Numbers 16 and 26 they are mentioned with Korah, and are mentioned without him in Deuteronomy 11:6 and Psalm 106:17. Another Reubenite, On, the son of Peleth, was in the conspiracy. It has been inferred that he withdrew, but there is no reason either for or against the inference. Equally baseless is the inference that Zelophehad of Manasseh joined it, but withdrew (Numbers 27:3). The account implies that there were other Levites in it besides Korah (Numbers 16:7-10), and it particularly mentions 250 “men of renown,” princes, such men as would be summoned if there were a public assembly (Numbers 16:2,17,35). These men, apparently, were of different tribes.

The position taken by the malcontents was that “all the congregation are holy, every one of them,” and that it was therefore a usurpation for Moses and Aaron to confine the functions of an incense-burning priest to Aaron alone. Logically, their objection lay equally against the separation of Aaron and his sons from the rest of the Levites, and against the separation of the Levites from the rest of the people. On the basis of this, Moses made expostulation with the Levites. He arranged that Korah and the 250, along with Aaron, should take their places at the doorway of the tent of meeting, with their censers and fire and incense, so that Yahweh might indicate His will in the matter. Dathan and Abiram insolently refused his proposals.

The record says that Korah’s “whole congregation,” including himself and the 250 with their censers, met Moses and Aaron and “all the congregation” of Israel at the doorway of the tent of meeting. For the purposes of the transaction in hand the tent was now “the mishkan of Korah, Dathan and Abiram,” and their followers. Yahweh directed Moses to warn all other persons to leave the vicinity. Dathan and Abiram, however, were not at the mishkan. The account says that Moses, followed by the elders of Israel, went to them to their tents; that he warned all



persons to leave that vicinity also; that Dathan and Abiram and the households stood near the tents; that the earth opened and swallowed them and their property and all the adherents of Korah who were on the spot; that fire from Yahweh devoured the 250 who offered incense. The narrative does not say whether the deaths by fire and by the opening of the earth were simultaneous. It does not say whether Korah's sons participated in the rebellion, or what became of Korah himself. In the allusion in Numbers 26 we are told, apparently, that Korah was swallowed up, and that "the sons of Korah died not." The deaths of the principal offenders, by fire and by being swallowed up, were followed by plague in which 14,700 perished (~~ca. 1469~~ Numbers 16:49 (Hebrew 17:14)).

## 2. CRITICAL TREATMENTS OF THIS STORY:

Any appreciative reader sees at once that we have here either a history of certain miraculous facts, or a wonder-story devised for teaching religious lessons. As a story it is artistically admirable — sufficiently complicated to be interesting, but clear and graphic and to the point. In the Hebrew there are 2 or 3 instances of incomplete grammatical construction, such as abound in the early literary products of any language, when these have been fortunate enough to escape editorial polishing. In such a case it is possibly not unwise just to take a story as it stands. Nothing will be added to either its religious or its literary value by subjecting it to doubtful alleged critical processes.

If, however, one has committed himself to certain critical traditions concerning the Hexateuch, that brings him under obligation to lead this story into conformity with the rest of his theory. Attempts of this kind have been numerous. Some hold that the Korah of this narrative is the Edomite Korah, and that Peleth means Philistine, and that our story originally grew out of some claim made by Edomites and Philistines. It is held that the story of Korah was originally one story, and that of Dathan and Abiram another, and that someone manipulated the two and put them together. See the treatments of the Book of Numbers in Driver, Introduction; Addis, Documents of the Hexateuch; Carpenter and Battersby, Hexateuch; Bacon, Exodus; Paterson on Numbers, in the Polychrome Bible. These and other like works give source-analyses of our story. Some of the points they make are plausible. In such a case no one claims any adequate basis of fact for his work; each theory is simply a congeries of ingenious guesses, and no two of the guessers guess alike.

As in many other Biblical instances, one of the results of the alleged critical study is the resolving of a particularly fine story into two or more supposed earlier stories each of which is absolutely bald and crude and uninteresting, the earlier stories and the combining of these into their present form being alike regarded as processes of legendary accretion. The necessary inference is that the fine story we now have was not the product of some gifted mind, guided by facts and by literary and religious inspiration, but is an accidental result of mere patchwork. Such a theory does not commend itself to persons of literary appreciation.

*Willis J. Beecher*

## **KORAHITES; SONS OF KORAH**

*<ko'-ra-its>* (yj r" q;<sub>i</sub>[qorchi]), (j r<sub>q</sub>qyn<sub>B</sub>)[beno qorach]; in the King James Version appears also as Korhite, Kohathite, Kore): This phrase is used to denote Assir and Elkanah and Abiasaph, Korah's 3 individual sons (~~<1624>~~ Exodus 6:24; compare ~~<0251>~~ Numbers 26:11). But its more frequent use, and that to which interest attaches, is in the titles of some of the Psalms.

The genealogical details concerning Korahites are rather full. In 3 places we find the list of the 7 successive generations closing with the prophet Samuel and his son Joel (~~<1361>~~ 1 Chronicles 6:31-38,22-30; ~~<0000>~~ 1 Samuel 1:1,20; 8:2); the two in Chronicles mention most of the generations between Korahites and Joel. The fragmentary lists in ~~<1325>~~ 1 Chronicles 9:25; 26 connect the list with the 4 generations following Joel (~~<1363>~~ 1 Chronicles 6:33; 9:19-31; 26:1 ff), and with 2 generations in the very latest Bible times (~~<1398>~~ 1 Chronicles 9:31).

The adjective "Korhite" appears also in the King James Version as "Korathite," Kore," and "Korahite," the last being the form preferred in the English Revised Version. It is used 4 times in the singular. Once it designates an individual (~~<1391>~~ 1 Chronicles 9:31); 3 times it denotes the successors of Korahites taken collectively (~~<0024>~~ Exodus 6:24; ~~<0258>~~ Numbers 26:58; ~~<1369>~~ 1 Chronicles 26:19); 4 times it is used in the plural, denoting the members of this succession of men (~~<1399>~~ 1 Chronicles 9:19; 12:6; 26:1; ~~<1409>~~ 2 Chronicles 20:19). As variants of this use, "the sons of the Korahites" appears once, and "the children of the Korahites" once (~~<1369>~~ 1 Chronicles 26:19; ~~<1409>~~ 2 Chronicles 20:19).

In these various passages the Korahites families are counted like the other Levitical families. In <sup><1307></sup>1 Chronicles 12:6 we have an account of 5 men who are designated as “the Korahites,” who joined David when he was at Ziklag — Elkanah, Isshiah, Azarel, Joezer, Jashobeam. They are described as expert warriors, especially with the bow and sling, and as being “of Saul’s brethren of Benjamin.” Some of them may plausibly be identified with men of the same name mentioned elsewhere. These Korahites may have been cousins of the Samuel family, and they may have resided not very far apart.

The record speaks with some emphasis of a line of Korahites doorkeepers.

In the latest Old Testament times one Mattithiah, “the first-born of Shallum the Korahite,” held “the office of trust over the things that were baked in pans” (<sup><1308></sup>1 Chronicles 9:31). Shallum was “the son of Kore, the son of Ebiasaph, the son of Korah.” In this expression 15 or more generations are omitted between Ebiasaph and Kore, and perhaps as many between Kore and Shallum. The record proceeds to supply some of the omitted names between Kore and Shallum. The representative of the line in David’s time was “Zechariah the son of Meshelemiah” (<sup><1302></sup>1 Chronicles 9:21). In all periods the Korahites were “keepers of the thresholds of the tent.” Back in the time of “Phinehas the son of Eleazar,” “their fathers had been over the camp of Yahweh” (<sup><1309></sup>1 Chronicles 9:19,20). Zechariah was, in his time, “porter of the door of the tent of meeting” (<sup><1302></sup>1 Chronicles 9:21), and Shallum was still the chief of the porters (<sup><1307></sup>1 Chronicles 9:17). The record for David’s time supports and supplements this. It says that the doorkeepers, according to the arrangements made by David, included a Korahites contingent, its leading men being Meshelemiah and his son Zechariah (<sup><1301></sup>1 Chronicles 26:1,2,9,14), and that Meshelemiah was “the son of Kore, of the sons of Asaph.” Adopting the common conjecture that Asaph is here a variant for Ebiasaph, we have here the same abridgment of the genealogical list as in 1 Chronicles 9.

More interesting, however, than the fighting Korahites who claimed succession from Moses to Nehemiah, are the “sons of Korah” who were somehow connected with the service of song. One of the genealogies is introduced by the statement: “These are they whom David set over the service of song in the house of Yahweh, after that the ark had rest. And they ministered with song before the tabernacle of the tent of meeting, until Solomon had built the house of Yahweh in Jerus” (<sup><1315></sup>1 Chronicles

6:31,32). Then the writer proceeds to mention first “Heman the singer, the son of Joel, the son of Samuel,” and so on, carrying the genealogy back to Korah and Levi. After thus mentioning Heman, he speaks of “his brother Asaph, who stood on his right hand,” and traces Asaph’s descent back to Gershom the son of Levi; and then says, “and on the left hand their brethren the sons of Merari.” Of these the principal leader is Ethan (otherwise called Jeduthun), and his descent is here traced back to Levi.

In this way we are introduced to David’s 3 great leaders in choral and orchestral music. Among them Heman the Korahite has at first the place of primacy, though Asaph, later, comes to the front. The events just referred to are mentioned again, more in detail, in the account of David’s bringing the ark to Jerusalem. There it is said that at the suggestion of David “the Levites appointed Heman the son of Joel,” and also Asaph and Ethan, “and with them” several others, “their brethren of the second degree” (<sup><1357></sup>1 Chronicles 15:17,18). The record proceeds to speak of the services of “the singers, Heman, Asaph, and Ethan,” and their associates, in the pageantry of the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem. After that, it says, Asaph had charge of the services of thanksgiving and praise before the ark in Jerusalem, while Heman and Jeduthun served in the high place at Gibeon (<sup><1366></sup>1 Chronicles 16:4 ff,37,39-42). Later, the record says (1 Chronicles 25), David made an elaborate organization, under Asaph and Heman and Jeduthun, for prophesying with song and instrumental music.

As the records of David’s time, according to the Chronicler, thus attribute to him great achievements in sacred music and song, so the records of subsequent times reiterate the same thing. David’s interest in sacred music is mentioned in connection with Solomon’s temple, in connection with the times of Joash and Hezekiah and Josiah, in connection with the institutions and exploits of the times after the exile (e.g. <sup><4076></sup>2 Chronicles 7:6; 23:18; 29:25 ff; 35:15; <sup><1580></sup>Ezra 3:10; <sup><1622></sup>Nehemiah 12:24,36,45,46). Asaph and Heman and Jeduthun led the magnificent choir and orchestra at the dedication of the temple (<sup><462></sup>2 Chronicles 5:12). One of the sons of Asaph prophesied, and the sons of the Korahites sang at the crisis in the time of Jehoshaphat (<sup><4014></sup>2 Chronicles 20:14,19). The sons of Asaph and the sons of Heman and the sons of Jeduthun were present, and there was instrumental music and loud singing, according to the appointment of David and his associates, at the time of Hezekiah’s Passover (<sup><4093></sup>2 Chronicles 29:13 ff). Singing, and Asaph and Heman and Jeduthun and David have an important place in the record concerning Josiah. And the

records of the post-exilian times make the singers and the “sons of Asaph” and the arrangements of David as conspicuous as the law of Moses itself.

Add to this that the names Asaph or Heman or Ethan or Jeduthun, or the designation “the sons of Korah” are attached to 25 or more of the Psalms (e.g. Psalms 42 through 49; 50; 62; 72 through 85), and we have a body of testimony that is at least abundant and intelligible. It is to the effect that there was elaborate organization, on a large scale, in connection with the musical services of the temple at Jerusalem; that this began in the time of David, as a part of the preparation for building the temple, under the influence of the family traditions of the prophet Samuel; and that the movement continued in the generations following David, either surviving the exile, or being revived after the exile. In connection with this movement, the phrases “sons of Korah,” “sons of Asaph,” “sons of Heman,” “sons of Jeduthun” denote, in some cases, merely lineal descent; but in other cases they denote each an aggregate of persons interested in sacred song and music — a guild or society or succession or group — arising out of the movement which originated in David’s time. See, for example, “sons of Asaph” (~~1320~~ 1 Chronicles 25:1,2; ~~1404~~ 2 Chronicles 20:14; compare 20:19; 29:13; 35:15; ~~1504~~ Ezra 2:41; 3:10; ~~1674~~ Nehemiah 7:44; 11:22) and “sons of Korah” in the titles of Psalms 42 through 49 and 84; 85; 87 through 89. Traces of these aggregates appear in the times of Solomon, of Jehoshaphat, of Joash, of Hezekiah, of Josiah, of Zerubbabel, of Ezra and Nehemiah.

If a person holds that the mention of an event in Chronicles is to be regarded as proof that the event never occurred, that person will of course deny that the testimony thus cited is true to fact. He is likely to hold that the guilds of singers arose in the exile, and that, some generations after Nehemiah, they fabricated for themselves the ecclesiastical and physical pedigrees now found in the Books of Chronicles. If, however, we accord fair play to the Chronicler as a witness, we shall be slow to discredit the minute and interfitting testimony which he has placed before us.

*Willis J. Beecher*

## **KORATHITES**

~~ko'-rath-its~~: In the King James Version for “Korabites,” ~~1405~~ Numbers 26:58.

See **KORAH**, 4.

## KORE

<ko-'re> (**arwq** [qore], “one who proclaims”):

(1) A Levite of David’s time, descended from Kohath and Korah. See **KORAH**, 4. Shallum, Chief doorkeeper in the latest Bible times, is described as “the son of Kore, the son of Ebiasaph, the son of Korah” (~~1398~~1 Chronicles 9:19). This expression omits the generations between Shallum and Kore, and those between Kore and Ebidsaph, perhaps 15 generations or more in each case. The context supplies two of the omitted names, of the time of David, Meshelemiah and his son Zechariah (~~1392~~1 Chronicles 9:21,22). The record for the time of David mentions these two, with some particulars, calling Meshelemiah the son of Kore (~~1391~~1 Chronicles 26:1,2,9,14). It describes them as “Korahites” “of the sons of Asaph.” It is usual to regard this last clause as a variant for “the son of Ebiasaph,” thus making the description identical with that in ~~1398~~1 Chronicles 9:19. With this understanding, the text claims that “the Korahites,” Kore and Meshelemiah and Zechariah, come midway in a line of sanctuary ministrants, extending continuously from Moses to Nehemiah.

(2) “The son of Imnah the Levite, the porter at the east gate,” who “was over the freewill-offerings,” in the time of Hezekiah (~~1414~~2 Chronicles 31:14). Very likely in the same line with (1) above.

(3) In ~~1391~~1 Chronicles 26:1 the King James Version for **KORAHITES** (which see).

*Willis J. Beecher*

## KORHITES

<kor'-hits>: In the King James Version for “Korahites” in ~~1034~~Exodus 6:24; ~~1326~~1 Chronicles 12:6; 26:1; ~~1409~~2 Chronicles 20:19.

See **KORAH**, 3.

## KOZ

<koz>.

See **HAKKOZ**.

## KUSHAIAH

*<ku-sha'-ya>*, *<ku-shi'-a>* (**𐤒𐤕𐤔𐤕𐤕** [qushayahu], “bow of Yah”): A Merarite Levite (<sup><13157></sup>1 Chronicles 15:17), called in <sup><13164></sup>1 Chronicles 6:44 KISHI (which see).

## **PUBLISHERS NOTES**

### **CONTACTING AGES SOFTWARE**

For more information regarding the AGES Digital Library, whether it be about pricing structure, trades for labor or books, current listings, policies — or if you wish to offer suggestions — please write us at...

AGES SOFTWARE • PO BOX 1926 • ALBANY OR 97321-0509

### **WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE DIGITAL LIBRARY?**

The Library consists of books and other literature of enduring value to the Christian community. Our goal since the beginning has been to “make the words of the wise available to all —inexpensively.” We have had in mind the student, teacher, pastor, missionary, evangelist and church worker who needs a high quality reference library, one that is portable, practical and low in cost.

### **ON WHAT BASIS WERE THEY SELECTED?**

Volumes in the Library have been added based on several criteria: usefulness, user request, breadth of content or reputation. This has meant that the collection is eclectic and may include works that contain positions with which we at AGES Software do not agree. This paradox is consistent with our design, however: any useful library consists of books on a wide variety of subjects and sometimes includes information for reference purposes only. The AGES Digital Library hopefully will reflect — as its components are released — the necessary breadth and depth for a solid personal library.

### **HOW WERE THESE VOLUMES PREPARED?**

Most of the books and documents have been scanned or typed from works that have entered the public domain. Some have been reproduced by special arrangement with the current publisher or holder of the copyright. They have been put in a format that can be readily used by computer users everywhere.

### **ARE THESE EXACT COPIES OF THE ORIGINAL WORKS?**

Usually not. In the process of preparing the Library, we at SAGE Software have taken the liberty to make certain edits to the text. As we discovered



errors in spelling, certain archaic forms, typographical mistakes or omissions in the original we have done our best to correct them. Our intention has been to remove anything that might obscure the meaning or otherwise detract from the usefulness of a book for the modern reader. We have, however, attempted to retain the essential content and thoughts of the original — even when we found ourselves in disagreement.

### **WHY IS THE DIGITAL LIBRARY COPYRIGHTED?**

While much of the content is in the public domain, the transcription, form and edits of these works took many people many hours to accomplish. We ask each purchaser to respect this labor and refrain from giving away copies of this or any volume of the Library without written permission from AGES Software. Our policy, however, is to work with each individual or organization to see that the price of Digital Library volumes not be a hindrance in their reaching the hands of those who need them. If price is an obstacle, please contact us at the address above and present your situation