

▲

**CYCLOPÆDIA**

OF

**BIBLICAL LITERATURE**

EDITED BY

**JOHN KITTO, D.D., F.S.A.,**

RECTOR OF 'THE PICTORIAL BIBLE,' AUTHOR OF 'THE HISTORY AND PHYSICAL  
GEOGRAPHY OF PALESTINE,' &c. &c.

ILLUSTRATED BY NUMEROUS ENGRAVINGS.

---

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

---

NEW YORK:  
MARK H. NEWMAN, 199 BROADWAY.  
CINCINNATI:  
WILLIAM H. MOORE & CO., 110 MAIN STREET.  
1846.

mere fact that Josephus makes Jerusalem the centre of the land seems to prove that the province did not extend so far to the south as the ancient kingdom of the same name. As the southern boundary of Judæa was also that of the whole country, the questions connected with it belong to the article PALESTINE; and it is only necessary to remark that Josephus places the southern boundary of the Judæa of the time of Christ at a village called Jardan, on the confines of Arabia Petraea. No place of this name has been found; and the indication is very indistinct, from the fact that all the country which lay beyond the Idumæa of those times was then called Arabia. In fixing this boundary, Josephus regards Idumæa as part of Judæa, for he immediately after reckons that as one of the eleven districts into which Judæa was divided. Most of these districts were denominated, like our counties, from the chief towns. They were, 1. Jerusalem; 2. Gophna; 3. Acrabutta; 4. Thumna; 5. Lydda; 6. Emmaus; 7. Pella; 8. Idumæa; 9. Engaddi; 10. Herodium; and 11. Jericho.

Judæa is, as the above intimations would suggest, a country full of hills and valleys. The hills are generally separated from one another by valleys and torrents, and are, for the most part, of moderate height, uneven, and seldom of any regular figure. The rock of which they are composed is easily converted into soil, which being arrested by the terraces when washed down by the rains, renders the hills cultivable in a series of long, narrow gardens, formed by these terraces from the base upwards. In this manner the hills were in ancient times cultivated most industriously, and enriched and beautified with the fig-tree, the olive-tree, and the vine; and it is thus that the scanty cultivation which still subsists is now carried on. But when the inhabitants were rooted out, and the culture neglected, the terraces fell to decay, and the soil which had been collected in them was washed down into the valleys, leaving only the arid rock, naked and desolate. This is the general character of the scenery; but in some parts the hills are beautifully wooded, and in others the application of the ancient mode of cultivation still suggests to the traveller how rich the country once was and might be again, and how beautiful the prospects which it offered. As, however, much of this was the result of cultivation, the country was probably anciently, as at present, *naturally* less fertile than either Samaria or Galilee. The present difference is very pointedly remarked by different travellers; and Lord Lindsay plainly declares that 'all Judæa, except the hills of Hebron and the vales immediately about Jerusalem, is barren and desolate. But the prospect brightens as soon as you quit it, and Samaria and Galilee still smile like the land of promise.' But there is a season—after the spring-rains, and before the summer heat has absorbed all the moisture left by them—when even the desert is clothed with verdure; and at that season the valleys of Judæa present a refreshingly green appearance. This vernal season, however, is of short duration, and by the beginning of May the grass upon the mountains, and every vestige of vegetation upon the lower grounds, have in general completely disappeared (see *Pictorial History of Palestine; Introduct.* pp. 39, 40, 119,

120; Nau, p. 439; Roger, p. 182; Mariti, ii. 363; Lindsay, ii. 70; Stephens, ii. 249; Elliot, p. 408, 409; Olin, ii. 323).

JUDAH (יְהוּדָה), celebrated; Sept. *Ἰούδας*, fourth son of Jacob and Leah (s.c. 1735). The narrative in Genesis brings this patriarch more before the reader, and makes known more of his history and character, than it does in the case of any other of the twelve sons of Jacob, with the single exception of Joseph. It is indeed chiefly in connection with Joseph that the facts respecting Judah transpire; and as they have already been given in the articles JACOB and JOSEPH, it is only necessary to indicate them shortly in this place. It was Judah's advice that the brethren followed when they sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites, instead of taking his life. By the light of his subsequent actions we can see that his conduct on this occasion arose from a generous impulse, although the form of the question he put to them has been sometimes held to suggest an interested motive:—'What profit is it if we slay our brother and conceal his blood? Come, let us sell him,' &c. (*Gen.* xxxvii. 26, 27).

Not long after this Judah withdrew from the paternal tents, and went to reside at Adullam, in the country which afterwards bore his name. Here he married a woman of Canaan, called Shuah, and had by her three sons, Er, Onan, and Shelah. When the eldest of these sons became of fit age, he was married to a woman named Tamar, but soon after died. As he died childless, the patriarchal law, afterwards adopted into the Mosaic code (*Deut.* xxv. 6), required him to bestow upon the widow his second son. This he did: but as Onan also soon died childless, Judah became reluctant to bestow his only surviving son upon this woman, and put her off with the excuse that he was not yet of sufficient age. Tamar accordingly remained in her father's house at Adullam. She had the usual passion of Eastern women for offspring, and could not endure the stigma of having been twice married without bearing children, while the law precluded her from contracting any alliance but that which Judah withheld her from completing.

Meanwhile Judah's wife died, and after the time of mourning had expired, he went, accompanied by his friend Hirah, to attend the shearing of his sheep at Timnath in the same neighbourhood. These circumstances suggested to Tamar the strange thought of connecting herself with Judah himself, under the guise of a loose woman. Having waylaid him on the road to Timnath, she succeeded in her object, and when the consequences began to be manifest in the person of Tamar, Judah was highly enraged at her crime, and, exercising the powers which belonged to him as the head of the family she had dishonoured, he commanded her to be brought forth, and committed to the flames as an adulteress. But when she appeared, she produced the ring, the bracelet, and the staff, which he had left in pledge with her; and put him to confusion by declaring that they belonged to the father of her coming offspring. Judah acknowledged them to be his, and confessed that he had been wrong in withholding Shelah from her. The result of this painful affair was the birth of two sons, Zerah and Pharez, from whom, with Shelah, the tribe of

Judah descended. Pharez was the ancestor of the line from which David, the kings of Judah, and Jesus came (Gen. xxxviii.; xlv. 12; 1 Chron. ii. 3-5; Matt. i. 3; Luke iii. 33).

These circumstances seem to have disgusted Judah with his residence in towns; for we find him ever afterwards at his father's tents. His experience of life, and the strength of his character, appear to have given him much influence with Jacob; and it was chiefly from confidence in him that the aged father at length consented to allow Benjamin to go down to Egypt. That this confidence was not misplaced has already been shown [JOSEPH]; and there is not in the whole range of literature a finer piece of true natural eloquence than that in which Judah offers himself to remain as a bond-slave in the place of Benjamin, for whose safe return he had made himself responsible to his father. The strong emotions which it raised in Joseph disabled him from keeping up longer the disguise he had hitherto maintained, and there are few who have read it without being, like him, moved even to tears.

We hear nothing more of Judah till he received, along with his brothers, the final blessing of his father, which was conveyed in lofty language, glancing far into futurity, and strongly indicative of the high destinies which awaited the tribe that was to descend from him.

2. JUDAH, TRIBE OF. This tribe sprang from Judah, the son of Jacob. When the Israelites quitted Egypt, it already exhibited the elements of its future distinction in a larger population than any of the other tribes possessed. It numbered 74,000 adult males, being nearly 12,000 more than Dan, the next in point of numbers, and 34,100 more than Ephraim, which in the end contested with it the superiority among the tribes. During the sojourn in the wilderness, Judah neither gained, like some tribes, nor lost like others. Its numbers had increased to 76,500, being 12,100 more than Issachar, which had become next to it in population (Num. i. 25). In the first distribution of lands, the tribe of Judah received the southernmost part of Palestine, to the extent of fully one-third of the whole country to be distributed among the nine and a half tribes for which provision was to be made. This oversight was discovered and rectified at the time of the second distribution, which was founded on an actual survey of the country, when Simeon and Dan received allotments out of the territory which had before been wholly assigned to Judah (Josh. xix. 9). That which remained was still very large, and more proportioned to the future greatness than the actual wants of the tribe. We now also know, through the researches of recent travellers, that the extent of good land belonging to this tribe, southward, was much greater than had usually been supposed, much of that which had been laid down in maps as mere desert, being actually composed of excellent pasture land, and in part of arable soil, still exhibiting some traces of ancient cultivation. When Judah became a kingdom, the original extent of territory assigned to the tribe was more than restored or compensated, for it must have included the domains of Simeon, and we know that Benjamin was included in it.

The history of the Judges contains fewer facts respecting this important tribe than might be ex-

pected. It seems however to have been usually considered that the birthright which Reuben forfeited had passed to Judah under the blessing of Jacob; and a sanction was given to this impression when, after the death of Joshua, the divine oracle nominated Judah to take precedence of the other tribes in the war against the Canaanites (Judg. i. 2). It does not appear that any tribe was disposed to dispute the superior claim of Judah on its own account, except Ephraim, although in doing this Ephraim had the support of other tribes. Ephraim appears to have rested its claims to the leadership of the tribes upon the ground that the house of Joseph, whose interest it represented, had received the birthright, or double portion of the eldest, by the adoption of the two sons of Joseph, who became the founders of two tribes in Israel. The existence of the sacerdotal establishment at Shiloh, in Ephraim, was doubtless also alleged by the tribe as a ground of superiority over Judah. When, therefore, Judah assumed the sceptre in the person of David, and when the sacerdotal establishment was removed to Jerusalem, Ephraim could not brook the eclipse it had sustained, and took the first opportunity of erecting a separate throne, and forming separate establishments for worship and sacrifice. Perhaps the separation of the kingdoms may thus be traced to the rivalry of Judah and Ephraim. After that separation the rivalry was between the two kingdoms; but it was still popularly considered as representing the ancient rivalry of these great tribes; for the prophet, in foretelling the repose of a coming time, describes it by saying, 'The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim' (Isa. xiii. 12).

3. JUDAH, KINGDOM OF. When the territory of all the rest of Israel, except Judah and Benjamin, was lost to the kingdom of Rehoboam, a special single name was needed to denote that which remained to him; and almost of necessity the word *Judah* received an extended meaning, according to which it comprised not Benjamin only, but the priests and Levites, who were ejected in great numbers from Israel, and rallied round the house of David. At a still later time, when the nationality of the ten tribes had been dissolved, and every practical distinction between the ten and the two had vanished during the captivity, the scattered body had no visible head, except in Jerusalem, which had been re-occupied by a portion of *Judah's* exiles. In consequence the name Judah (or *Jew*) attached itself to the entire nation from about the epoch of the restoration. But in this article Judah is understood of the people over which David's successors reigned, from Rehoboam to Zedekiah. Under the article ISRAEL the chronology of the two kingdoms has been discussed, which, however, was not carried below the capture of Samaria. In the lower part of the list we lose the check which the double line of kings afforded; but for the same reason the problem is simpler. The only difficulty encountered here rises out of the *ages* assigned to some of the kings of Judah. For this reason, in the following list, all their ages are inserted, so far as they are recorded. It has been thought sufficient to add Wiener's chronology to the dates as given above in the article ISRAEL.

Accession of	Years of Reign.	Age.	B. C.	Father's Age at Son's Birth.
Rehoboam . . .	17	41	975	—
Abijah . . .	3	—	957	*22
Asa . . .	41	—	955	*22
Jehoshaphat . . .	25	35	914	*22
[Jehoram installed]	8	32	—	—
Jehoram alone . . .	—	(35)	889	25
Ahaziah . . .	1	22	885	17
[Queen Athaliah]	—	—	884	—
Jehoshaphat . . .	39†	7	878	22
Amaziah . . .	29	25	838	22
Uzziah . . .	53†	16	809	38
Jotham . . .	16	25	757	43
Ahaz . . .	16	20	741	22
Hezekiah . . .	29	25	726	10
Manasseh . . .	55	12	696	42
Amon . . .	2	22	641	45
Josiah . . .	31	8	639	16
Jehoiakim . . .	†	23	609	15
Jehoiakim, his brother . . .	11	25†	609	13†
Jehoiachin . . .	†	18	598	18
Zedekiah, his father's brother . . .	11	21	598	28
Zedekiah is deposed . . .	—	—	588	—

The ages of Abijah and Asa at their accession not being given, the three first numbers in the last column are averages only, Rehoboam having been born 66 or 67 years before Jehoshaphat. It is clearly impossible that Ahaz should have been only 10 years older than his son Hezekiah. To lessen the absurdity, Mr. Clinton follows the reading of the Sept. in 2 Chron. xxviii. 1, which makes Ahaz 25 years of age at his accession. But in 2 Kings xvii. 2, the Sept. has 20, so that no weight can be laid on its reading in the other passage. Besides, this is inadequate to untie the knot; for it still remains that Jotham was a grandfather by the male line at the age of 31 (indeed, a year earlier in Mr. Clinton's scheme, who places the accession of Jotham in B.C. 756); nor is it probable that three kings in succession ascended the throne at the age of 25 years. If arbitrary change must be used, the most effectual would be to lower the age of Hezekiah at his accession by 10 years; but no certainty on these matters can be effected. A similar difficulty occurs with Jehoiakim, whose father Josiah is made to have been but 13 years older than he. Since, however, it is probable that Jehoiakim was older than Jehoiakim, perhaps the number 25, which expresses Jehoiakim's age at his accession, is corrupt.

From Rehoboam to Jehoiachin are 16 generations and 400 years; between the births of the first and last; which gives an average of 25 years to a generation. This is rather short for the direct line of descent, especially when we consider that, where polygamy is practised, the *eldest* son is by no means so certain, when alive, to succeed to the throne as with us. In fact, from the ages of their fathers we may probably infer that Amon, Manasseh, Jotham, and Uzziah, were younger sons, as Ahaziah is said to have been (2 Chron. xxii. 1). The three last generations of the series together occupy but  $16 + 13 + 18 = 47$  years; so that Amon, had

he lived, would have been a great-grandfather (in the male line) at the age of 47; a thing so unparalleled as to lead to the suspicion that the later chronology, where we lose the double series of kings, is less to be depended on. There is an apparent difficulty also as to Ahaziah, found in 2 Chron. xxii. 1, 2. That he was '42 years old' at his accession is an obvious error for 22 (2 Kings viii. 26): that he should have been the youngest of many sons, and yet only 17 years younger than his father, is to be explained by his father *already* having many wives; but still it is remarkable.

Where polygamy prevails, the extermination of a royal house by the enmity of brothers is notoriously to be dreaded, in spite of the number of posterity which single monarchs can sometimes count. That the house of David encountered *this* danger is not expressly mentioned in the Kings. Two massacres are therein found; one of 'the brethren of Ahaziah,' 'forty-two men,' the sons of Jehoram, by the hypocritical zeal of Jehu; and, almost simultaneously, 'all the seed-royal' (the sons of Ahaziah) by Queen Athaliah (2 Kings x. 13, 14; xi. 1). Only an infant son of Ahaziah (*all* in fact must have been of tender age) was saved from this slaughter, who, 44 years afterwards, was assassinated by his own people (2 Kings xii. 20), as was his son Amaziah (xiv. 19), and at a later period Amon (xxi. 23); but no massacre of the royal family accompanied either of these murders. In the Chronicles (2 Chron. xxi. 4) we read that Jehoram slew all his brethren, the sons of Jehoshaphat, from jealousy of the power with which their father had invested them; and Jehoram's own sons are said to have been all slain, but one, by the Philistines and Arabians; so that Ahaziah had no *brethren* left for Jehu to slay; but 'brethren' must be taken with some latitude to mean 'brothers' sons' (2 Chron. xxi. 4, 17; xxii. 1, 8). It must, however, be confessed that this is irreconcilable with the chronology; for at this time the age of Jehoram, their supposed grandfather (had he been alive), would have been 38 years; so that the eldest of these 'forty-two men' could barely have been 6 years old. Some error, therefore, must be admitted in the narrative of the Chronicler concerning Jehoram and his son; and, in fact, this is not the only point in which it is inconsistent with that in the Kings. Jehoram is said to have received a letter from Elijah the prophet (2 Chron. xxi. 12) at a time when he had already ascended into heaven, according to the Kings; also, in 2 Kings viii. 24, he is stated to have been buried 'with his fathers,' which is directly contradicted by 2 Chron. xxi. 20. To finish the subject of chronology it may be observed: (1.) It is remarkable that Jehoshabeath, the daughter of Ahaziah, should have been wife of Jehoiada the priest (2 Chron. xxii. 11). For as Jehoiada lived to the age of 130 (xxiv. 15), and died many years before Jehoshaphat, the priest must have been some 70 years older than his wife. (2.) The date '36 years,' in 2 Chron. xvi. 1, is certainly wrong, since Baasha died in the twenty-sixth year of Asa. The number 16 instead of 36 would agree sufficiently well with the history; but we cannot with propriety so correct the text, because of the date 35 in the last verse of the preceding chapter; not to mention that the narrative in the Chronicles represents the

declaration of the pious Asa as being only towards the end of his reign (xv. 17). Clinton overlooks this, and wishes ('with many commentators') to interpret 'the thirty-sixth year of the reign of Asa' to mean 'the thirty-sixth year of the divided monarchy'; but this is not interpretation at all.

When the kingdom of Solomon became rent with intestine war, it might have been foreseen that the Edomites, Moabites, and other surrounding nations would at once refuse their accustomed tribute, and become again practically independent; and some irregular invasion of these tribes might have been dreaded. It was a mark of conscious weakness, and not a result of strength, that Rehoboam fortified 15 cities (2 Chron. xi. 5-11), in which his people might find defence against the irregular armies of his roving neighbours. But a more formidable enemy came in, Shishak king of Egypt, against whom the fortresses were of no avail (xii. 4), and to whom Jerusalem was forced to open its gates; and, from the despoiling of his treasures, Rehoboam probably sustained a still greater shock in its moral effect on the Moabites and Edomites, than in the direct loss: nor is it easy to conceive that he any longer retained the commerce of the Red Sea, or any very lucrative trade. Judged of by the number of soldiers recounted in the Chronicles, the strength of the early kings of Judah must have been not only great, but rapidly increasing. The following are the armies there given:—

Rehoboam gathered 180,000 chosen men (2 Chron. xi. 1). (Shishak attacked him with 60,000 horse, 1200 chariots, besides infantry.) Abijah set in array 400,000 valiant men (xiii. 3, 17), and slew 500,000 of Jeroboam's 800,000 in one battle. Asa had 300,000 heavy armed, and 280,000 light armed men (xiv. 8). (Zerah invaded him with 1,000,000 men and 300 chariots.) Jehoshaphat kept up:—

- 300,000 under Aunah,
- 280,000 under Jehonah,
- 200,000 under Amasiah.
- 200,000 (light armed) under Eliadah,
- 180,000 under Jehozabad (xvii. 14-19).

Total . 1,160,000 for field service.  
'These waited on the king;' besides the garrisons 'in the fenced cities.'

After Jehoshaphat followed the calamitous affinity with the house of Ahab, and the massacres of both families. Under Jehoiada the priest, and Jehoash his pupil, no martial efforts were made; but Amaziah son of Jehoash, after hiring 100,000 Israelites to no purpose, made war on the Edomites, slew 10,000, and threw 10,000 more down from the top of their rock (xxv. 5, 6, 11, 12). His own force in Judah, from 20 years old and upwards, was numbered at only 300,000 choice men, able to handle spear and shield. His son Uzziah had 2600 military officers, and 307,500 men of war (xxvii. 12, 13). Ahaz lost, in a single battle with Pekah, 120,000 valiant men (xxviii. 6), after the severe slaughter he had received from Rezin king of Syria; after which no further military strength is ascribed to the kings of Judah. As to all these numbers the Vatican Sept. agrees with the received Hebrew text.

These figures have caused no small perplexity, and have suggested to some the need of conjec-

tural emendation. But if they have been corrupted, it is by system, and on purpose; for there is far too great uniformity in them to be the result of accident. It perhaps deserves remark, that in the book of Kings no numbers of such startling magnitude are found. The army ascribed to Rehoboam (1 Kings xii. 21) is, indeed, as in Chronicles, 180,000 men; but if we explain it of those able to fight, the number, though certainly large, may be dealt with historically. See the article on POPULATION.

As the most important external relations of Israel were with Damascus, so were those of Judah with Edom and Egypt. Some revolution in the state of Egypt appears to have followed the reign of Shishak. Apparently the country must have fallen under the power of an Ethiopian dynasty; for the name of the *Lubim*, who accompanied Zerah in his attack on Asa, is generally regarded as proving that Zerah was from Sennaar, the ancient Meroë. But as this invasion was signally repulsed, the attempt was not repeated; and Judah enjoyed entire tranquillity from that quarter until the invasion of Pharaoh-necho. In fact it may seem that this success assisted the reaction, favourable to the power of Judah, which was already begun, in consequence of a change in the policy of Damascus. Whether Abijah had been in league with the father of Benhadad I. (as is generally inferred from 1 Kings xv. 19) may be doubted; for the address cannot be rendered, 'Let there be a league between me and thee, as there was between my father and thine;' and it possibly is only a hyperbolical phrase of friendship for, 'Let us be in close alliance; let us count our fathers to have been allies.' However this may be, Asa bought, by a costly sacrifice, the serviceable aid of the Damascene king. Israel was soon distressed, and Judah became once more formidable to her southern neighbours. Jehoshaphat appears to have reasserted the Jewish authority over the Edomites without war, and to have set his own viceroy over them (1 Kings xxii. 47). Intending to resume the distant commerce which had been so profitable to Solomon, he built ships suitable for long voyages ('ships of Tarshish' as they are rightly called in 1 Kings xxii. 48—a phrase which the Chronicler has misunderstood, and translated into 'ships to go to Tarshish,' 2 Chron. xx. 36); but not having the advantage of Tyrian sailors, as Solomon had, he lost the vessels by violent weather before they had sailed. Upon this, Ahaziah, king of Judah, offered the service of his own mariners, probably from the tribe of Asher and others accustomed to the Mediterranean; but Jehoshaphat was too discouraged to accept his offer, and the experiment was never renewed by any Hebrew king. The Edomites, who paid only a forced allegiance, soon after revolted from Jehoram, and elected their own king (2 Kings viii. 20, 22). At a later time they were severely defeated by Amaziah (2 Kings xiv. 7), whose son, Uzziah, fortified the town of Elath, intending, probably, to resume maritime enterprise; but it remained a barren possession, and was finally taken from them by Rezin, in the reign of Ahaz (2 Kings xvi. 6). The Philistines, in these times, seem to have fallen from their former greatness, their league having been so long dissolved. The most remarkable event in which they are concerned is the assault on J

rusalem, in the reign of Jehoram (2 Chron. xxi. 16, 17).

It is strikingly indicative of the stormy scenes through which the line of David passed, that the treasures of the king and of the Temple were so often plundered or bargained away. First, under Rehoboam, all the hoards of Solomon, consecrated and common alike, were carried off by Shishak (1 Kings xiv. 26). Two generations later, Ass emptied out to Benhadad all that had since accumulated 'in the house of Jehovah or in the king's house.' A third time, when Hazael had taken Gath, and was preparing to march on Jerusalem, Jehoash, king of Judah, turned him away by sending to him all 'that Jehoshaphat, Jehoram, Ahaziah and Jehoash himself had dedicated, and all the gold that was found in the treasures of the house of Jehovah and in the king's house' (2 Kings xii. 18). In the very next reign Jehoash, king of Israel, defeated and captured Amaziah, took Jerusalem, broke down the walls, carried off hostages, and plundered the gold and silver deposited in the temple and in the royal palace (2 Kings xiv. 11-14). A fifth sacrifice of the sacred and of the royal treasure was made by Ahaz to Tiglath-pileser (2 Kings xvi. 8). The act was repeated by his son Hezekiah to Sennacherib, who had demanded '300 talents of silver and 30 talents of gold.' It is added, 'Hezekiah cut off the gold which he had overlaid, from the doors of the temple and from the pillars' (2 Kings xviii. 14-16). In the days of Josiah, as in those of Jehoash, the temple appears to have been greatly out of repair (xii. and xxii.); and when Pharaoh-necho, having slain Josiah, had reduced Judah to submission, the utmost tribute that could be exacted was 100 talents of silver and one talent of gold. Even this sum was obtained by direct taxation, and no allusion is made to any treasure at all, either in the temple or in the king's house. It is the more extraordinary to find expressions used when Nebuchadnezzar took the city, which at first sight imply that Solomon's far-famed stores were still untouched. 'Nebuchadnezzar carried out all the treasures of the house of Jehovah and of the king's house, and cut in pieces all the vessels of gold which Solomon had made in the temple of Jehovah' (2 Kings xxiv. 13). They must evidently have been few in number, for in 1 Kings xiv. 26, 'all' most, at least, mean 'nearly all.' 'Shishak took away the treasures of the house of Jehovah, and of the king's house; he even took away all.' Yet the vessels of gold and silver taken away by Nebuchadnezzar and restored by Cyrus are reckoned 5400 in number (Ezra i. 11).

The severest shock which the house of David received was the double massacre which it endured from Jehu and from Athaliah. After a long minority, a youthful king, the sole surviving male descendant of his great-grandfather, and reared under the paternal rule of the priest Jehoiada, to whom he was indebted not only for his throne but even for his recognition as a son of Ahaziah, was put in a situation to uphold the royal authority. That Jehoash conceived the priests to have abused the power which they had gained, sufficiently appears in 2 Kings xii., where he complains that they had for twenty-three years appropriated the money, which they ought to have spent on the repairs of the temple. Jehoiada gave way; but we see here the beginning of a feud (hitherto un-

known in the house of David) between the crown and the priestly order; which, after Jehoiada's death, led to the murder of his son Zachariah. The massacre of the priests of Beal, and of Athaliah, grand-daughter of a king of Sidon, must also have destroyed cordiality between the Phœnicians and the kingdom of Judah; and when the victorious Hazael had subjugated all Israel and showed himself near Jerusalem, Jehoash could look for no help from without, and had neither the faith of Hezekiah nor a prophet like Isaiah to support him. The assassination of Jehoash in his bed by 'his own servants' is described in the Chronicles as a revenge taken upon him by the priestly party for his murder of 'the sons of Jehoiada; and the same fate, from the same influence, fell upon his son Amaziah, if we may so interpret the words in 2 Chron. xxv. 27: 'From the time that Amaziah turned away from following Jehovah they made a conspiracy against him,' &c. Thus the house of David appeared to be committing itself, like that of Saul, to permanent enmity with the priests. The wisdom of Uzziah, during a long reign, averted this collision, though a symptom of it returned towards its close. No further mischief from this cause followed, until the reign of his grandson, the weak and unfortunate Ahaz: after which the power of the kingdom rapidly mouldered away. On the whole it would appear that, from Jehoiada downward, the authority of the priests was growing stronger, and that of the crown weaker; for the king could not rule successfully, except by submitting to (what we might call) 'the constitutional check' of the priests; and although it is reasonable to believe that the priests became less simple-minded, more worldly, and less religious, as their order advanced in authority (whence the keen rebukes of them by the prophets), it is not the less certain that it was desirable for Judah, both in a temporal and a spiritual sense, to have the despotic power of the king subjected to a strong priestly pressure.

The struggle of the crown against this control was perhaps the most immediate cause of the ruin of Judah. Ahaz was probably less guided by policy than by superstition, or by architectural taste, in erecting his Damascene altar (2 Kings xvi. 10-18). But the far more outrageous proceedings of Manasseh seem to have been a systematic attempt to extirpate the national religion because of its supporting the priestly power; and the 'innocent blood very much,' which he is stigmatized for shedding (2 Kings xxi. 16), was undoubtedly a sanguinary attack on the party opposed to his impious and despotic innovations. The storm which he had raised did not burst in his lifetime; but, two years after, it fell on the head of his son Amon; and the disorganization of the kingdom which his madness had wrought is commemorated as the cause of the Babylonian captivity (2 Kings xxiii. 26; xxiv. 3, 4). It is also credible that the long-continued despotism had greatly lessened patriotic spirit; and that the Jewish people of the declining kingdom were less brave against foreign invaders than against kindred and neighbour tribes or civil opponents. Faction had become very fierce within Jerusalem itself (Ezek. xxii.), and civil bloodshed was common. Wealth, where it existed, was generally a source of corruption, by introducing foreign luxury, tastes, manners, superstitions, immo-

nality, or idolatry; and when consecrated to pious purposes, as by Hezekiah and Josiah, produced little more than a formal and exterior religion.

Thoroughly to understand the political working of the monarchy, we ought to know, 1. What control the king exercised over ecclesiastical appointments; 2. How the Levites were supported when ejected from Israel; 3. What proportion of them acted as judges, lawyers, and scribes, and how far they were independent of the king. The nature of the case and the precedent of David may satisfy us that the king appointed the high-priest at his own pleasure out of the Aaronites; but (as Henry II. of England and hundreds of monarchs besides have found) ecclesiastics once in office often disappoint the hopes of their patron, and to eject them again is a most dangerous exertion of the prerogative. The Jewish king would naturally avoid following the law of descent, in order to preserve his right of election unimpaired; and it may be suspected that the line of Zadok was rather kept in the background by royal jealousy. Hilkiab belonged to that line; and if any inference can be drawn from his genealogy, as given in 1 Chron. vi. 8-15, it is, that none of his ancestors between the reigns of Solomon and Josiah held the high-priesthood. Even Azariah, who is named in 2 Chron. xxxi. 10 as of the line of Zadok, is not found among Hilkiab's progenitors. Jehoiada, the celebrated priest, and Urijah, who was so complainant to the innovating Ahaz (2 Kings xvi.), were of a different family. It would seem that too many high-priests gained a reputation for subservience (for it often happens in history that the ecclesiastical heads are more subservient to royalty than the mass of their order); so that, after Hilkiab, the race of Zadok became celebrated for uprightness, in invidious contrast to the rest of the priests; and even the Levites were regarded as more zealous than the generality of the Aaronites (2 Chron. xxix. 34). Hence in Esekial and other late writers the phrase 'the priests the sons of Zadok, or even 'the priests the Levites,' is a more honourable title than 'the priests the sons of Aaron.' Hilkiab's name seems to mark the era at which (by a reaction after the atrocities of Manasseh and Amon) the purer priestly sentiment obtained its triumph over the crown. But the victory came too late. Society was corrupt and convulsed within, and the two great powers of Egypt and Babylon menaced it from without. True lovers of their God and of their country, like Jeremiah, saw that it was a time rather for weeping than for action; and that the faithful must resign themselves to the bitter lot which the sins of their nation had earned.—F. W. N.

JUDAS is merely the Greek form of the Hebrew name JUDAH. The Septuagint, however, represents Judah by *Ἰουδᾶ*, *Juda*, which we find also in Luke iii. 26, 30, as the name of two of the ancestors of Christ not otherwise known. The persons named Judas were the following:—

1. JUDAS MACCABÆUS. [MACCABEES.]

2. JUDAS ISCARIOT. The object of this article is not to elucidate all the circumstances recorded respecting this person, but simply to investigate his motives in delivering up Jesus to the chief-priests. The evangelists relate his proceedings, but give no opinion. The subject is

consequently open to inquiry. Our conclusions must be guided by the facts of the case, and the known feelings and principles of human nature. Some hypothesis is necessarily formed by every reader. That one of our Lord's immediate followers and delegates, the treasurer of his household, who was admitted to his most secret counsels, and to the observation of his most private character, should at that particular juncture wait upon the Jewish rulers, and engage, for a pecuniary recompense, to lead their officers to his retiring-place, and, after time for reflection, should actually fulfil his engagement, and thus become the means of bringing his Master to the cross, is a fact too nearly connected with the honour of Christianity to allow us to remain unconcerned as to his motives. Even the credibility of this part of the narrative depends upon our being able to form a rational conception of them. There is no reason to doubt his sanity. We can neither ascribe his conduct to the mere love of evil, nor can we entertain the idea that it resulted from an arbitrary decree or impulse of the Almighty. His conduct might have been foreseen (Acts i. 16), but surely it was not commanded. Even supposing him to have been perfectly obdurate, and judicially abandoned to fall by his own wickedness, we must still seek the proximate cause of his ruin in his own intelligible motives. But his well known confession and remorse clearly prove that he was not wholly obdurate. Had he been so, he would have persisted in his conduct, or have attempted to calumniate Jesus and his disciples; or, perhaps, under the auspices of the chief-priests, have headed a most powerful opposition to Christianity. The only conceivable motives for the conduct of Judas are, a sense of duty in bringing his Master to justice, resentment, avarice, dissatisfaction with the procedure of Jesus, and a consequent scheme for the accomplishment of his own views. With regard to the first of these motives, if Judas had been actuated by a sense of duty in bringing his Master to justice for anything conceivable in his intentions, words, or actions, he would certainly have alleged some charge against him in his first interview with the chief-priests, and they would have brought him forward as a witness against Jesus, especially when they were at so great a loss for evidence; or they would have reminded him of his accusations when he appealed to them after our Lord's condemnation, saying, 'I have sinned in that I have betrayed innocent blood'—a confession which amounts to an avowal that he had never seen anything to blame in his Master, but everything to approve. Moreover, the knowledge of the slightest fault in Jesus would have served, at least for the present, to tranquillize his own feelings, and prevent his immediate despair. The chief-priests would also most certainly have alleged any charge he had made against Jesus, as a justification of their conduct, when they afterwards endeavoured to prevent his apostles from preaching in his name (Acts iv. 15-23; v. 27, 28-40). The second motive supposed, namely, that of resentment, is rather more plausible. Jesus had certainly rebuked him for blaming the woman who had anointed him in the house of Simon the leper, at Bethany (comp. Matt. xxvi. 8-17; John xii. 4, 5); and Matthew's narrative seems to connect his going to the