# H

## Ha-ammonai[[@Headword:Ha-ammonai]]

             SEE CHEPHAR-HAAMMIONIAT.

## Ha-araloth[[@Headword:Ha-araloth]]

             SEE GIBEAH-HAARALOTIT

## Haab, Philip Heinrich[[@Headword:Haab, Philip Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Stuttgart, Oct. 9, 1758, and died pastor at Schweigern, Wurtemberg, in 1833. He is the author of, Hebraische Griechische Grammatik zum Gebrauch fur das Neue Testament (Tubingen, 1815): — Religionsunterricht durch Bibelgeschichte (1818, 2 parts): — Betrachtungen uber die Leidensgeschichte Jesu Christi nach dem Bericht der Evangelien (Heilbronn, 1830). See Winer Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:126; 2:254, 403; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:482. (B.P.)

## Haag (Hague) Apologetical Society[[@Headword:Haag (Hague) Apologetical Society]]

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

## Haag, Georg Friedrich[[@Headword:Haag, Georg Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran minister of Germany, who died March 19, 1875; is the author of, Christliches Lehrbuchlein oder evangqel. Katechuwnenen Unterricht (Heidelberg, 1842): — Christliches Hausbuchlein (3d ed, 1861): — Biblische Geschichten (1855): — Evangelisches Handbuch (eod.): — Zeugnisse aus der lutherischen Kirche (1861). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:482. (B.P.)

## Haak, Theodore[[@Headword:Haak, Theodore]]

             an English divine and natural philosopher, was born in 1605 at Neuhausen, near Worms, in Germany, and was educated partly in his native country, and finally at Oxford and Cambridge. He then visited some of the Continental universities, and returned to Oxford in 1629, but without taking a degree was ordained, in 1632, deacon to bishop Hall of Exeter. He gave himself up to literary pursuits, and was devoted to the interests of parliament during the rebellion. He died in London, May 9,1690. He published the Dutch Annotations on the Bible (1657, 2 volumes, fol.); was employed by the Westminster Assembly, and translated into Dutch several theological works. He seems to have been the first to propose the Royal Society. Some of his letters appeared in the Philosophical Collections (May 1682).

## Haan, Carolus de[[@Headword:Haan, Carolus de]]

             was born at Arnheim Aug. 16, 1530. Becoming acquainted with the Reformation, he resolved to leave the Roman Catholic Church and his legal studies, and repaired to Geneva, where he studied theology under Calvin and Beza. In 1560 he became a minister of the Reformed Church at Deventer. Driven from thence by persecution, he was invited to Ham by William, duke of Cleves, and exercised his ministry there for sixteen years, until persecution again compelled him to depart. Count Jan of Nassau, stadtholder of Guelderland, and his son, Lodewijk Willem, stadtholder of Friesland, then secured his services to effect a reformation of the Church in their respective provinces. He afterwards returned to Deventer, but was again compelled to leave it in 1587, when it fell into the hands of the Spaniards. He repaired the same year to Leyden, where he was temporarily appointed professor extraordinary of theology. This position he held for four years. He was then called to Oldenbroek, where he exercised his ministry till he had passed the age of eighty. He died at Leyden Jan. 28, 1616. He wrote an exposition of the Revelation of St. John in Latin, and a work in Dutch against the Anabaptists. See Glasius, Godgeleerd Nederland, 1. (J. P. W.)

## Haar[[@Headword:Haar]]

             in Norse mythology, was a dwarf, made of and living in stones,

## Haas, Carl[[@Headword:Haas, Carl]]

             a German convert to the Church of Rome, was born October 18, 1804. He studied theology at Tubingen, and became a Protestant minister. In 1843 he was dismissed from the ministry, having the year before published Die Glaubensgegensatze des Protestantismus und Katholicismus. He joined the Church of Rome at Augsburg, in 1844, and published on that occasion Offenes Sendschreiben an seine liebe Genmeinde, etc., and Protestantismus und Katholicismus. He now set himself to write in the interest of the Church of Rome, and published Josephs und Konrads Feierstunden (Augsburg, 1845): — Populare Kirchengeschichte, mit besonderer Berucksichtigung der Reformationsgeschichte (2d ed. 1846): — Beleuchtung girosser Vorurtheile gegen die Katholische Kirche (1857): — Geschichte der Papste (1860): — Die zwei Hauptfeinde des Christenthums- (1866): — Natur und Gnade (1867). After the Vatican council, daas renounced again the Church of Rome, without returning to the Evangelical Church, and to justify himself, he published Nach Ronm und von Rom zuruck nach Wittenberg (Barmen, 1882). In 1881 he published Der ungefalschte Luther nach den Urdrucken der konigl. offentl, Bibliothek in Stuttgart hergestellt. Haas died December 21, 1883. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:484. (B.P.)

## Haas, Carl Franz Lubert[[@Headword:Haas, Carl Franz Lubert]]

             a Reformed theologian of Germany, was born August 12, 1722, at Cassel. He studied at Marburg, commenced his academical career there in 1748, was professor in 1754, and died October 29, 1789. He wrote, Diss. Historica de Meritis Philippi Magnanimi in Reformationem (Marburg, 1742): — De Eutichianismo et Variis Ejus Sectis (ibid. 1746): — Versuch einer Hessischen Kirchengeschichte (ibid. 1782). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen-Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:793. (B.P.)

## Haas, Gerardus de D.D[[@Headword:Haas, Gerardus de D.D]]

             was born in 1736. After completing his theological studies at Utrecht, and receiving the doctorate in theology in 1761, he was settled successively at Amersfoort, Middelburg, and Amsterdam. His works are chiefly exegetical and dogmatic. The most important of them are, Amerkinge over het sevende Boek der Godspraaken van Jesaia (Utr. 1773): — Het viifde en drie volgende hoofdstukken uit Pauuls brief aan de Roreinen verklaard (Amst. 1789-93, 3 parts): — Verhandeling over de toekonende wereld (Amst. 1798): — Over de Openbaring van Johannes (Amst. 1807. 3 parts). He also completed the commentary of Prof. Nahnis on the Epistle to the Philippians. It was published at Amsterdam in 1783 in 3 vols. See Glasius Godgeleerd Nederland, 1. (J.P.W.)

## Haas, Nikolaus[[@Headword:Haas, Nikolaus]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born November 25, 1665. He studied at Altdorf and Leipsic, was pastor in 1686, and died July 26, 1715, leaving, De Principiorum Moralium Existentia, Definitione et Divisione (1683): — De Astrologia Judiciaria (1685): — Heilige Unterredungen mit Gott (1689): — Enchiridion Catechismi Lutheri contra Papistas (1703), besides a number of ascetical works. See Doring, Die gelehrten  Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:166; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Habadim[[@Headword:Habadim]]

             (or rather Chabadim), a subdivision of the Jewish sect of Chasidim, founded by rabbi Solomon, in the government of Mohilef, in the 18th century. The name is composed of the initial letters of the three Hebrew words, דעת, בינה, חכמה, "wisdom, intelligence, and knowledge." They may not improperly be termed the "Jewish Quietists," as their peculiarity consists in the rejection of external forms and the complete abandonment of the mind to abstraction and contemplation. Instead of the baptisms customary among the Jews, they go through the signs without the use of the element, and consider it their duty to disengage themselves as much as possible from matter, because of its tendency to clog the mind in its ascent to the supreme source of intelligence. In prayer they make no use of words, but simply place themselves in the attitude of supplication, and exercise themselves in mental ejaculations.

## Habaiah[[@Headword:Habaiah]]

             (Heb. Chabayah', חֲבִיָּהor חֲבָיָה, protected by Jehovah; Sept. Ο᾿βα‹α and Ε᾿βαια, a priest whose descendants returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel, but were degraded from the priestly office on account of not being able to trace their genealogy (Ezr 2:6; Neh 7:63). B.C. ante 459.

## Habakkuk[[@Headword:Habakkuk]]

             [many Habak'kuk] (Heb. Chabakkuk', חֲבִקּוּק, embrace; Sept. Α᾿μβακούμ, Vulg. Habacuc; Jerome, Praef. in Habakkuk translates περίληψις, and Suidas πατὴρ ἐγέρσεως; other Graecized and Latinized forms are Α᾿ββακούμ, Α᾿μβακούκ, Ambacnum, Abacuc, etc.), the eighth in order of the twelve minor prophets (q.v.) of the Old Testament.

1. As to the name, besides the above forms, the Greeks, not only the Sept. translators, but the fathers of the Church, probably to make it more sonorous, corrupt it into Α᾿ραβακούκ, Α᾿ραβακούρω, or, as Jerome writes, Α᾿βακούρω, and only one Greek copy, found in the library of Alcala, in Spain, has Α᾿ββακούκ, which seems to be a recent correction made to suit the Hebrew text. The Heb. word may denote, as observed by Jerome, as well a “favorite” as a “struggler.” Abarbanel thinks that in the  latter sense it has allusion to the patriotic zeal of the prophet fervently contending for the welfare of his country: but other prophets did the same; and in the former and less distant signification, the name would be one like Theophilus, “a friend of God,” which his parents may have given him for a good omen. Luther took the name in the active sense, and applied it to the labors and writings of the man, thus: “Habakkuk had a proper name for his office; for it signifies a man of heart, one who is hearty towards another and takes him into his arms. This is what he does in his prophecy; he comforts his people and lifts them up, as one would do with a weeping child or man, bidding him be quiet and content, because, please God, it would yet be better with him.” But all this is speculation. See Keil and Delitzsch, Comment. ad cap. 1, 1.

2. Of the facts of this prophet's birth-place, parentage, and life we have only apocryphal and conflicting accounts (see Delitzsch, De Habacuci vita et cetate, Lips. 1842, 1844). The Rabbinical tradition that Habakkuk was the son of the Shunammite woman whom Elisha restored to life is repeated by Abarbanel in his commentary, and has no other foundation than a fanciful etymology of the prophet's name, based on the expression in 2Ki 4:16. Equally unfounded is the tradition that he was the sentinel set by Isaiah to watch for the destruction of Babylon (comp. Isa 21:16 with Hab 2:1). In the title of the history of Bel and the Dragon, as found in the Sept. version in Origen's Tetrapla, the author is called “Habakkuk, the son of Joshua, of the tribe of Levi.” Some have supposed this apocryphal writer to be identical with the prophet (Jerome, Promen. in Dan.). The psalm in ch. 3 and its title are thought to favor the opinion that Habakkuk w-as a Levite (Delitzsch, Habakkuk, p. 3). Pseudo-Epiphanius (2, 240, De Vitis Prophetamum) and Dorotheus (Chronicles Pasch. p. 150) say that he was of Βηθζοκήρ or Βηθιτουχάρ (v.r. Βηδζοκήρ, Βιδζεχάρ) (Bethacat, Isid. Hispal. c. 47), of the tribe of Simeon. This may have been the same as Bethzacharias, where Judas Maccabaus was defeated by Antiochus Eupator (1Ma 6:32-33). The same authors relate that when Jerusalem was sacked by Nebuchadnezzar, Habakkuk fled to Ostracine, and remained there till after the Chaldeans had left the city, when he returned to his own country, and died at his farm two years before the return from Babylon, B.C. 538. It was (during his residence in Judea that he is said to have carried food to Daniel in the den of lions at Babylon. This legend is given in the history of Bel and the Dragon, and is repeated by Eusebins, Bar Hebraeus, and Eutychius. It is quoted from Joseph ben-  Gorion (B. J. 11, 3) by Abarbanel (Comm. on Hab.), and seriously refuted by him on chronological grounds. The scene of the event was shown to mediaeval travelers on the road from Jerusalem to Bethlehem (Early Travels in Palestine, p. 29). Habakkuk is said to have been buried at Ceila, in the tribe of Judah, eight miles east of Eleutheropolis (Eusebius, Onomasficon, s.v.); where, in the days of Zebenus, bishop of Eleutheropolis, according to Nicephorus (H. k. 12, 48) and Sozomen (H. E. 7, 28), the remains of the prophets Habakkuk and Micah were both discovered. SEE KEILAH. Iabbinical tradition, however, places his tomb at Chukkok, of the tribe of Naphthali, now called Jakuk. SEE HUKKOK.

## Habakkuk (2)[[@Headword:Habakkuk (2)]]

             the Hebrew prophet, is commemorated in the old Roman martyrologies on January 15.

## Habakkuk, Book Of[[@Headword:Habakkuk, Book Of]]

             — A full and trustworthy account of the life of this prophet would explain his imagery, and many of the events to which he alludes; but since we have no information on which we can depend, nothing remains but to determine from the book itself its historical basis and its age.

1. The Rabbinical traditions agree in placing Habakkuk with Joel and Nahum in the reign of Manasseh (comp. Seder Olam Rabba and Zuta, and Tsemach David). This date is adopted by Kimchi and Abarbanel among the Rabbis, and by Witsius and others among modern writers. The general corruption and lawlessness which prevailed in the reign of Manasseh are supposed to be referred to in Hab 1:2-4. Kalinsky conjectures that Habakkuk may have been one of the prophets mentioned in 2Ki 21:10. Carpzov (Introd. ad libr. canon. V. T.p. 79, 410) and Jahn (introd. in libros sacros V. T. 2, § 120) refer our prophet to the reign of Manasseh, thus placing him thirty odd years earlier; but at that time the Chaldaeans had not as yet given just ground for apprehension, and it would have been injudicious in Habakkuk prematurely to fill the minds of the people with fear of them. Some additional support to our statement of the age of this book is derived from the tradition, reported in the apocryphal appendix to Daniel and by the Pseudo-Epiphanius, that Habakkuk lived to see the Babylonian exile. Syncellus (Chronographia, p. 214, 230, 240) makes him contemporary with Ezekiel, and extends the period of his prophecy from the time of Manasseh to that of Daniel and Joshua, the son of Josedech. The Chronicon Paschale places him later, first mentioning him in the beginning of the reign of Josiah (Olymp. 32), as contemporary with Zephaniah and Nahum; and again in the beginning of the reign of Cyrus (Olymp. 42), as contemporary with Daniel and Ezekiel in Persia,  with Haggai and Zechariah in Judea, and with Baruch in Egypt. Davidson (Horne's Introd. 2, 968), following Keil, decides in favor of the early part of the reign of Josiah. Calmet, Jager, Ewald, Rosenmüller, Maurer, and Hitzig agree in assigning the commencement of Habakkuk's prophecy to the reign of Jehoiakim, though they are divided as to the exact period to which it is to be referred. Ranitz (Introductio in Habakkuk Vatic. p. 24, 59), Stirkel (Prolog. ad interpr. tertii cap. Habakkuk p. 22, 27), and De Wette (Lehrbuch der Historischkritischen Eileit. Berlin, 1840, p. 338) justly place the age of Habakkuk before the invasion of Judaea by the Chaldeans. Knobel (Der Prophetisn. de Hebr.) and Meier (Gesch. d. poet, nat. Liter. d. Hebr.) are in favor of the commencement of the Chaldean era, after the battle of Carchemish (B.C. 606), when Judaea was first threatened by the victors. Some interpreters are of opinion that ch. 2 was written in the reign of Jehoiachin, the son of Jehoiakim (2Ki 24:6), after Jerusalem had been besieged and conquered by Nebuchadnezzar, the king made a prisoner, and, with many thousands of his subjects, carried away to Babylon; none remaining in Jerusalem save the poorest class of the people (2Ki 24:14). But of all this nothing is said of the book of Habakkuk, nor even so much as hinted at; and what is stated of the violence and injustice of the Chaldaeans does not imply that the Jews had already experienced it. It is also a supposition equally gratuitous, according to which some interpreters refer ch. 3 to the period of the last siege of Jerusalem, when Zedekiah was taken, his sons slain, his eyes put out, the walls of the city broken down, and the Temple burned (2Ki 25:11). There is not the slightest allusion to any of these incidents in the third chapter of Habakkuk.

But the question of the date of Habakkuk's prophecy has been discussed in the most exhaustive manner by Delitzsch (Derd Prophet Habakkuk, Eill. § 3), and, though his arguments are rather ingenious than convincing, they are well deserving of consideration as based upon internal evidence. The conclusion at which he arrives is that Habakkuk delivered his prophecy about the twelfth or thirteenth year of Josiah (B.C. 630 or 629), for reasons of which the following is a summary. In Hab 1:5 the expression “in your days” shows that the fulfillment of the prophecy would take place in the lifetime of those to whom it was addressed. The same phrase in Jer 16:9 embraces a period of at most twenty years, while in Eze 12:25 it denotes about six years, and therefore, reckoning backwards from the Chaldean invasion, the date above assigned  would involve no violation of probability, though the argument does not amount to a proof. From the similarity of Hab 2:10 and Zep 1:7, Delitzsch infers that the latter is an imitation, the former being the original. He supports this conclusion by many collateral arguments. Now Zephaniah, according to the superscription of his prophecy, lived in the time of Josiah, and from Hab 3:5 he is supposed to have prophesied after the worship of Jehovah was restored, that is, after the twelfth year of that king's reign. It is thought that he wrote about B.C. 624. Between this period, therefore, and the twelfth year of Josiah (B.C. 630), Delitzsch places Habakkuk. But Jeremiah began to prophesy in he thirteenth year of Josiah, and many passages are borrowed by him from Habakkuk (compare Hab 2:13 with Jer 51:58, etc.). The latter, therefore, must have written about B.C. 630 or 629. This view receives some confirmation from the position of his prophecy in the O.T. Canon.

On the other hand, while it is evident, from the constant use of the future tense in speaking of the Chaldean desolations (Hab 1:5-6; Hab 1:12), that the prophet must have written before the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar, which rendered Jehoiakim tributary to the king of Babylon (2Ki 24:1), B.C. 606, yet it is equally clear from ch. 2, 3 that the prophecy did not long precede the fulfillment; and as there seem to be no references to the reigns of Josiah or Jehoahaz (B.C. 609), and as the notices of the corruption of the period agree with the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim, we cannot be far astray in assigning B.C. 608 as the approximate date of this book.

2. Instead of looking upon the prophecy as an organic whole, Rosenmüller divided it into three parts corresponding to the chapters, and assigned the first chapter to the reign of Jehoiakim, the second to that of Jeheiachin, and the third to that of Zedekiah, when Jerusalem was besieged for the third time by Nebuchadnezzar. Kalinsky (Vatic. Chabac. et Nah.) makes four divisions, and refers the prophecy not to Nebuchadnezzar, but to Esarhaddon. But in such an arbitrary arrangement the true character of the composition as a perfectly developed poem is entirely lost sight of.

The prophet commences by announcing his office and important mission (i, I). He bewails the corruption and social disorganization by which he is surrounded, and cries to Jehovah for help (Hab 1:2-4). Next follows the reply of the Deity, threatening swift vengeance (Hab 1:5-11). The prophet, transferring himself to the near future foreshadowed in the divine threatenings, sees the rapacity and boastful impiety of the Chaldean hosts, but, confident that God has only employed them as the instruments of correction, assumes (Hab 2:1) an attitude of hopeful expectancy, and waits to see the issue. He receives the divine command to write in an enduring form the vision of God's retributive justice as revealed to his prophetic eye (Hab 2:2-3). The doom of the Chaldaeans is first foretold in general terms (Hab 2:4-6), and the announcement is followed by a series of denunciations pronounced upon them by the nations who had suffered from their oppression (Hab 2:6-20). The strophical arrangement of these “woes” is a remarkable feature of the prophecy. They are distributed in strophes of three verses each, characterized by a certain regularity of structure. The first four commence with a “Woe!” and close with a verse beginning with כַּי (for). The first verse of each of these contains the character of the sin, the second the development of the woe, while the third is confirmatory of the woe denounced. The fifth strophe differs from the others in form in having a verse introductory to the woe. The prominent vices of the Chaldaeans' character, as delineated in Hab 1:5-11, are made the subjects of separate denunciations: their insatiable ambition (Hab 2:6-8), their covetousness (Hab 2:9-11), cruelty Hab 2:12-14), drunkenness (Hab 2:15-17), and idolatry (Hab 2:18-20). The whole concludes with the magnificent psalm in chap. 3:” Habakkuk's Pindaric ode” (Ewald), a composition unrivalled for boldness of conception, sublimity of thought, and majesty of diction. This constitutes, in Delitzsch's opinion, “the second grand division of the entire prophecy, as the subjective reflex of the two subdivisions of the first, and the lyrical recapitulation of the whole.” It is the echo of the feelings aroused in the prophet's mind by the divine answers to his appeals; fear in anticipation of the threatened judgments, and thankfulness and joy at the promised retribution. But, though intimately connected with the former part of the prophecy, it is in itself a perfect whole, as is sufficiently evident from its lyrical character, and the musical arrangement by which it was adapted for use in the Temple service.

3. The style of this prophet has always been much admired. Lowth (De Poesi Hebraeor. p. 287) says: “Poeticus est Habaccuci stylus; sed maxime in eda, quae inter absolutissimas in eo genere merito numerari potest.” Eichhorn, De Wette, and Rosenmüller are loud in their praise of  Habakkuk's style; the first giving a detailed and animated analysis of the construction of his prophecies (Einleitung. in das A. Test. 3:333). He equals the most eminent prophets of the Old Testament — Joel, Amos, Nahum, Isaiah; and the ode in ch. 3 may be placed in competition, with Psalms 18, 68 for originality and sublimity. His figures are all great, happily chosen, and properly drawn out. His denunciations are terrible, his derision bitter, his consolation cheering. Instances occur of borrowed ideas (Hab 3:19; comp. Psa 18:34 : Hab 2:6; comp. Isa 14:7 : Hab 2:14; comp. Isa 11:9); but he makes them his own in drawing them out in his peculiar manner. With all the boldness and fervor of his imagination, his language is pure and his verse melodious. Eichhorn, indeed, gives a considerable number of words which he considers to be peculiar to this prophet, and supposes him to have formed new words or altered existing ones, to sound more energetic or feeble, as the sentiments to be expressed might require; but his list needs sifting, as De Wette observes (Einleitung, p. 339); and קַיקָלוֹן, Hab 2:16, is the only unexceptionable instance.

4. The ancient catalogues of canonical books of the Old Testament do not, indeed, mention Habakkuk by name; but they must have counted him in the twelve minor prophets, whose numbers would otherwise not be full. In the New Testament some expressions of his are introduced, but. his name is not added (Rom 1:17; Gal 3:11; Heb 10:38; comp. Hab 2:4; Acts 12:40, 41; comp. Hab 1:5).

5. Express commentaries on the whole of this book separately are the following, of which the most important are designated by an asterisk L\*] prefixed: Theophylact, Commentarius (in Opp. 4); Bede, Expositio (in Works, 9, 404) Tanchum of Jerusalem, Commentaire (ed. Munk, Paris, 1843. 8vo): Abarbanel, Commentarius (ed. Sprecher, Traj. 1722. Helmst. 1790, 8vo): Luther, Auslegung (Vitemb. 1526, 4to; Erf. cod. 8vo; in Latin, Argent. 1528, 8vo); Capito, Enarrationes (Argent. 1526, 8vo); Chytraus, Lectiones (in Opp. p. 364); Grynseus, Hypomeamata (Basil. 1582, 8vo); De Guevara, Commentarius [Rom. Cath.] (Madrid, 1585, 4to; 1593. fol.; Aug. Vind. 1603; Antw. 1609, 4to); Agellius, Commentarius (Antw. 1597. 8vo); Tossan, Periphrasis (Francf. 1599, 8vo); Garthius, Commentarius (Vitemb..1605, 8vc): Tarnovius, Commentarius (Rost. 1623, 8vo); Cocceius, Antlysis (in Opp. 11:657); Marbury, Commentaire (Lond. 1650; 4to), \*De Padilla, Commentaria [Rom. Cath.] (Madrid, 1657, 2 vols. 4to; Sulzb. 1674, 4to, Iome, 1702, fol.); Hafenreffer, Commentarius [including  Nahuml (Stuttg. 1663, 8vo); \*Van Til, Commentarius (L. B. 1700, 4to); Biermann, De Prophesie van H. (Utr. 1713, 4to); Esch, Erklarung (Wesel, 1714, 4to); Abicht, Annotationes (Vitemb. 1732, 4to); Jansen, Analecta (in Pentateuch, etc.); \*Scheltinga, Commentarius (L. B. 1747, 4to); \*Kalinskv, Illustratio [including Nahum] (Vratislav, 1748, 4to); Chrysander, Anmerk. (Rint. and Lpz. 1752, 4to); Monrad, Anmerk. (from the Danish, Göttingen, 1759, 8vo); Anon. Traduction (Paris, 1775, 12mo); Perschke Versio, etc. (Francf. et. Lips. 1777, 8vo): Ludwig, Erläuterung (Frkft. 1779, 8vo); Faber, Commentatio (Onold. 1779, 2 vols. 4to) Wahl, Amerkung. etc. (Hanover. 1790, 8vo), Kofod, Commentarius (Hafn. 1792, 8vo); Tingstad, Anmadversiones (Upsal. 1795, 8vo); Hadnlein, Interpretatio (Erlang. 1795, 8vo) Bather, Application (in Sermons, i, 188); Plum, Observationes [including Obad.] (Götting. 1796, 8x o); Conz, Erläuterung. (in Staudlen's Beitrade); Horst, Amerkungen (Gotha, 1798, 8vo); Dahl, Observationes (Neustr. 1798, 8vo); Wolfssohn, Amerk. (Bresl. 18.06, 8vo); Euchel, E1aut: (Copenh. i815, 8vo); Justi, Erlaut. (Lpz. 1820, 8vo); Wolff, Commentar (Darmst. 1822, 8vo); Schroder, Amerk. [including Joel. Nahum, etc.] (Hildesh. 1827, 8vo); Deutsch, תִּרְגּוּם, etc. (Bresl. 1837, 8vo) , \*Baumlein, Commentarius (Heilbronn, 1840, 8vo); \*Delitzsch, Auslegung (Lpz. 1843, 8vo); Von Gumpach, Erklarung (Munch. 1860, 8vo); Robinson, Homilies (Lond. 1865, 8vo). SEE PROPHETS, MINOR.

The following are on chap. 3 exclusively Barhr (, De equitatione Dei [Hab 1:15] (Lips. 1749, 4to); Feder, Canticum Hab. (Wirzb. 1774, 8vo); Perschke, Commentarius (Franef. 1777, 4to); Busing, De fulgoribus Dei[Hab 1:3, 41 (Bremen, 1778, 4to); Nachtigal, Erkldr. (in Henke's Magazine, 4:180-190); Schroder, Dissertutio (Groningen, 1781,4to); Schnurrer, Dissertatio (Tübing. 1786, 4to); Morner, Hymnus Habakkuk (Ups. 1794, 4to); Heidenheim, תִּרְגּוּם, etc. (Rodelh. 1800,1826, 8vo); Anton, Expositio (Gorl. 1810, 4to); Steiger, Amerkungen (in Schwarz, Jahrb. 1824, p. 136); Stickel, Prolusio (Neust. 1827, 8vo); Reissmann, De Song of Solomon Habakkuk (Krauth. 1831, 8vo); Strong, Prayer of Habakkuk (in the Meth. Quar. Rev. Jan. 1861, p. 73). SEE COMMENTARY.

## Habaziniah[[@Headword:Habaziniah]]

             (Hebrew Chabatstsinyah', חֲבִצַּנְיָה, perh. lamp of Jehovah; according to Furst, collection of Jehovah; Sept. Χαβασίν), the father of one Jeremiah  and grandfather of the chief Rechabite Jaazaniah, which last the prophet Jeremiah tested with the offer of wine in the Temple (Jer 35:3). B.C. considerably ante 539.

## Habbacuc[[@Headword:Habbacuc]]

             (Α᾿μβακούμ; Vulg. Habacuc), the form in which the name of the prophet HABAKKUK SEE HABAKKUK (q.v.) is given in the Apocrypha (Bel, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39).

## Habdalah[[@Headword:Habdalah]]

             (הִבְדָלָה, distinction), a ceremony by which the Jewish Sabbath is divided or separated from the other days of the week. It is performed after the concluding service in the synagogue, by reciting passages of Scripture and prayers, and the use of wine and spices. On Sabbath evening four benedictions are said, one over the wine, a second over the spice the third over the light, "Blessed art thou Lord our God, king of the world, who hast created a shining light," and the last is, "Blessed art thou, Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast made a distinction (הִמִּבְדַּיל) between the holy and the common, between light and darkness, between Israel and the other nations, between the seventh day and the other six days of work; blessed be thou, O God, who hast made a distinction between the-holy and the common." If for any reason a Jew is prevented from performing this ceremony, either at 'home or abroad, he is at liberty to substitute the following short benediction: "Blessed is he who has made a distinction  between things sacred and profane." See Buxtorf, Lex. Chald. Tal. s.v. (B.P.)

## Habergeon[[@Headword:Habergeon]]

             an old English word for breastplate, appears in the Auth.Vers. as the rendering of two Heb. terms: שַׁרְיָה, shir.yah'(Job 41:26, where it is named by zeugma with offensive weapons), or שַׁרְיוֹן, shiryon'(2Ch 26:14; Neh 4:16), a coat of mail (as rendered in 1Sa 17:5; 1Sa 17:38); and תִּחֲרָא, tachara' (Exo 28:32; Exo 39:23), a military garment, properly of linen strongly and thickly woven, and furnished around the neck and breast with a mailed covering (see Herod. 2, 182; 3:47; and comp. the λινοθώρηξ of Homer, II. 2, 529, 830). (See Smith's Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v. Lorica.) SEE ARMOR.

## Haberkorn, Peter[[@Headword:Haberkorn, Peter]]

             a German divine, born at Butzbach in 1604. After filling various other posts, he was made professor of theology at Giessen, and died there, April, 1676. He was distinguished as a polemic, especially against the Romanists and Syncretists (q.v.). He wrote (1) Vindicatio Luth.fidei: — (2) Heptas disputationum Anti-Wallemburgicarum (1650, 1652, 2 vols. 8vo). — Tholuck, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. v, 438,439.

## Haberlin, Georg Heinrich[[@Headword:Haberlin, Georg Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Stuttgart, September 30, 1644. He studied at Tubingen, became deacon in 1668, doctor and professor of theology in 1681, member of consistory and preacher in 1692, and died August 20, 1699, leaving, Specimen Theologicae Practicae: — Conspectus Locorum Theologicorum: — Theologia Corinthiaca in Forma Systematis Proposita: — De Principio Fidei: — De Unione Fidelium cum Christo: — De Justificatione Hominis Coram Deo: — De Satisfactione Christi: — De Chiliasmo Hodierno, Fidei Christiane Rulina et Infidelitatis Judaicae Firmamento, etc. See Fischlin, Memoria Theologorum Wartembergensium; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Habert, Isaac[[@Headword:Habert, Isaac]]

             doctor of the Sorbonne, the first Parisian theologian who wrote against Jansenius. He was a native of Paris, studied at the Sorbonne, was appointed canon of the cathedral of Paris, and in 1645 bishop of Vabres. He filled this post for twenty-three years, was reputed a very pious man, and died at Pont de Salars, near Rodez, in 1668. In 1641 he accused Jansenius of holding heretical doctrines on forty points, and thereby  provoked Antoine Arnauld to answer him in his Apologie, in which he sought to prove the identity of the doctrines of Jansenius and St. Augustine. Habert nevertheless remained a declared enemy of Jansenius, and to him is ascribed the authorship of the letter sent to pope Innocent X in 1651, and signed by eighty-five bishops, praying him to decide the question finally. The most noteworthy of his works are: De gratia ex partibus graecis (1646): — De consensu hierarchice et monarchice (Paris, 1640): — De cathedra seu primatu S. Petri (Paris, 1645). He translated also into Latin the ceremonial of the Eastern Church, under the title Liber pontficalis, Greece et Latine c. not. (Paris, 1643, fol.). — Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, 5, 439; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 13.

## Habert, Louis[[@Headword:Habert, Louis]]

             a French theologian and doctor of the Sorbonne, was born at Blois in 1638, and died at Paris, April 17, 1718. He is the author of, Pratique du Sacrement de Pezitence (Paris, 1714, 1729), better known as the Pratique de Verdun. He also wrote Theologia Dogmatica et Moralis ad Usum Seminarii Catalaunensis (Lyons, 1709-12, 7 volumes), which was attacked and condemned by Fednlon. Being opposed to the bull Unigenitus, Habert was exiled in 1714, and only returned to Paris after the death of Louis XIV. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Agricola, Bibl. Eccles. 3:212; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v. (B.P.)

## Habesh[[@Headword:Habesh]]

             SEE ABYSSINIAN CHURCH.

## Habibus[[@Headword:Habibus]]

             SEE ABIBAS.

## Habichhorst, Andreas Daniel[[@Headword:Habichhorst, Andreas Daniel]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died at Greifswalde, August 30, 1704, professor of theology, is the author of, Tractatus de Melchisedeci Historia et Figura: — Dissertationes Exegeticae in Illustriora Iesaiem Loca: — Breviarium Formulae Concordiae et Controversiarum Syncretistico Pietisticarum: — Dissertationes de Altari Gideonis: — De Ephod Gideonis: — De Magistratus et Suppliciorum Cupitalium  Constitutione Divina: — De Sanctorum cum Christo Redivivorum Resurrectione: — De Abrahamo Sola Fide Justificato: — De Iesaia Trinitatis Praecone. See Pipping, Memoriae Theologorum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Habington, William[[@Headword:Habington, William]]

             an English poet, was born Cat Hindlip, Worcestershire, November 5, 1605. He was educated at St. Omer's Jesuit College, and afterwards at Paris; spent his life in literary and rural leisure, and died on his native estate, November 13, 1645. Besides some historical works, he published occasional poems of a serious vein, which were collected in a volume entitled Castara (1635, 1640). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Habit[[@Headword:Habit]]

             See DRESS. Habit, “a power and ability of doing anything, acquired by frequent repetition of the same action. ‘Man,' says Dr. Paley, ‘is a bundle of habits. There are habits of industry, attention, vigilance, advertency; of a prompt obedience to the judgment occurring, or of yielding to the first impulse of passion; of extending our views to the future, or of resting upon the present; of apprehending, methodizing, reasoning; of indolence and dilatoriness; of vanity, self-conceit, melancholy, partiality; of fretfulness, suspicion, captiousness, censoriousness; of pride, ambition, covetousness; of overreaching, intriguing, projecting; in a word, there is not a quality or function, either of body or mind, which does not feel the influence of this great law of animated nature. “If the term attachment seems too good to be applied to habits, let us, if you please, call them ties. Habits, in fact, are ties, chains. We contract them unawares, often without feeling any pleasure in them; but we cannot break them without pain. It costs us something to cease to be what we have always been, to cease doing what we have always done. Life itself, in its least attractive form, the life least deserving of the name, is dear to us from the mere habit of living. The most intimate attachments, and, still more, the most incontestable, duties, have often given way before the power of habit. To have the loins girt about, then, is not merely to distrust our attachments; it is to prevent our habits from striking their roots too deep within. Nothing, therefore, which is habitual should be regarded as trivial. The most invisible ties are not the weakest,  and, at all events, their number renders them indestructible. We must remember that a cable is composed of threads. It is impossible to dispense with habits; a life without habits is a life without a rule. But in regard to these, as in regard to everything else; it is necessary to say with the apostle, ‘All things are lawful unto me, but I will not be brought under the power of any”‘(Vinet, Gospel Studies, p. 310). See Fellowes, Body of Theology, 1, 58; Paley, Moral Philosophy, 1, 48; Kames, Elen. of Criticism, ch. 15; Jortin, Sermons, vol. 3; Reid, Active Powers of Man; Muller, On the Christian Doctrine of Sin (see Index).

## Habitacle[[@Headword:Habitacle]]

             (Lat. habitaculum) (1) a residence; (2) a niche.

## Habitation[[@Headword:Habitation]]

             (represented by several Heb. and Gr. words). God is metaphorically called the habitation of his people (Psa 71:3), in him they find the most delightful rest, safety, and comfort (Psa 91:9). Justice and judgment are the habitation of God's throne (Psa 89:14), all his acts being founded on justice and judgment (Psa 117:2). The land of Canaan, the city of Jerusalem, the tabernacle and Temple, are spoken of as the habitation of God; there he does or did signally show himself present (Psa 132:5; Psa 132:13; Eph 2:22). Eternity is represented as his habitation (Isa 57:15). He “inhabited the praises of Israel,” a told metaphor, implying that Jehovah is the object of, and kindly accepts the praises of his people (Psa 22:3). SEE DWELLING.

## Habits[[@Headword:Habits]]

             SEE VESTIMENTS.

## Habor[[@Headword:Habor]]

             (Heb. Chabor', חָבוֹר, if of Shemitic origin, from חָבִר, to join, meaning the united stream; if of Persic derivation, from khubpadr= εὔκρημνος, with beautiful banks [Furst, Lex. s.v.]; Sept. Α᾿βώρ and ᾿Χαβώρ), a river, and apparently also a district of Assyria, to which considerable interest is attached in connection, with the first captivity. We read in 1 Chronicles 5, 26, that Tilgathpilneser carried away “the Reubenites, and the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, and brought them unto Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and to the river Gozan.” About seventeen years later, Shalmaneser, the successor of the former monarch, “took Samaia, and cared Israel away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah, and in fabor, the river of Gozan” (A.V., “by the river Gozan,” 2Ki 17:6; 2Ki 18:11). There are two rivers  still bearing this name, and geographers are not agreed as to which Is here referred to. SEE CAPTIVITY.

1. A river called Khabur rises in the central highlands of Kurdistan. flows in a south-westerly direction, and falls into the Tigris about seventy miles above Mosul (Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, p. 56; Schultens, Index Geogr. in vitain Saladizi, s.v.). Many suppose this to be the Habor of Scripture for the following reasons:

1. It is within Assyria proper, which Ptolemy says was bounded on the west-by the Tigris (6, 1).

2. It is affirmed that the Assyrian monarch would place his captives in a central part of his kingdom, such as this is, and not in the outskirts (Keil on 2Ki 17:4-6).

3. Habor is termed “a river of Gozan” (חָבוֹר נְהִר גּוֹזָן); and Gozan is supposed to signify “pasture,” and to be identical with the word Zozan, now applied by the Nestorians to the pasture-lands in the highlands of Assyria, where the Khabur takes its rise (Grant, The Nestorian Christians, p. 124).

4. Ptolemy mentions a mountain called Chabor (Χαβώρας) which divides Assyria from Media (6, 1); and Bochart says the river Chabor has its source in that mountain (Opera, 1, 194, 242, 362). Some have supposed that the modern Nestorians are the descendants of the captive Jews (Grant, 1. c.). SEE GOZAN.

2. The other and much more celebrated river, Khabur, is that famous affluent of the Euphrates, which is called Aborrhas (Α᾿βόῤῥας) by Strabo (16, 1, 27) and Procopius (Bell. Pers. 2, 5); Aburas (Α᾿βούρας) by Isidore of Charax (p. 4); Abora (Α᾿βώρα) by Zosimus (3, 12); and Chaboras by Ptolemy (Χάβώρας, 5, 18) and Pliny (Fl. N. 30, 3). “It rises about lat. 363 40', long 40' flows only a little south of east to its junction near Kaukab with the Jerujer or river of Nisibis, which comes down from Mons Masius. Both of these branches are formed by the union of a number of streams. Neither of them is fordable for some distance above their junction; and below it they constitute a river of such magnitude as to be navigable for a considerable distance by steamers. The course of the Khabur below Kaukab is tortuous [through rich meads covered with flowers, having a general direction about S.S.W. to its junction with the Euphrates at  Karkesia, the ancient Circesium]. The entire length of the stream is not less than 200 miles” (Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, 1, 236; see Ainsworth, Travels in the Track of the Ten Thousand, p. 79; Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, p. 304). Ritter (Erdkünde, 10, 248), Gesenius (Thesaurus), Layard, Rawlinson, and others, maintain that this is the ancient Habor. There can be no doubt that Assyria proper was confined to the country lying along the banks of the Upper Tigris, and stretching eastward to Media. But its territory gradually expanded so as to include Babylonia (Heroaotus, 3, 92), Mesopotamia (Pliny, H. N. 6, 26), and even the country westward to the confines of Iilicia and Phoenicia (Strabo, 16). At the time of the captivity the power of Assyria was at its height. The Jewish captives were as secure on the banks of the western as of the eastern Habor. The ruins of Assyrian towns are scattered over the whole of northern Mesopotamia. “On the banks of the lower Khabur are the remains of a royal palace, besides many other traces of the tract through which it runs having been permanently occupied by the Assyrian people. Even near Seruj, in the country between Haran and the Euphrates, some evidence has been found not only of conquest, but of occupation” (Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, 1, 247; see Chesney, Euphrates Expedition, i, 114; Layard, Ain. and Bab. p. 275, 279-300, 312). There can be no doubt that the Khabur was in Assyria, and near the center of the kingdom, at the time of the captivity. Further, Ptolemy mentions a province in Mesopotamia called Gauzanitis (5, 18). It lay around the Khabur, and was doubtless identical with Gozan, hence the phrase “Habor, the river of Gozan” (2Ki 17:6), Chalcitis, which appears to be identical with Ialah, mentioned in the same passage, adjoined Gauzanitis. It is a remarkable fact that down as late as the 12th century there were large Jewish communities on the banks of the Khabfir (Benjamin of Tudela, in Early Travels in Pal. p. 92 sq.). The district along the banks probably took its name from the river, as would seem from a comparison with 1Ch 5:26. , Ptolemy mentions a town called Chabor (5. 18). The Khablr occurs under that name in an Assyrian inscription of the 9th century before our era (Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 354) SEE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS.

It seems doubtful whether Habor was identical with the river Chebar (כַּבָר), on which Ezekiel saw his visions. The latter was perhaps farther south in Babylnia (Eze 1:3, etc.). SEE CHEBAR.

## Haccerem[[@Headword:Haccerem]]

             SEE BETH-HAC-CEREM.

## Hachaliah[[@Headword:Hachaliah]]

             (Heb. Chakalyah', חֲכִלְיָה; according to Gesenius, whose eyes Jehovah enlivens; according to Fürst, ornament of Jehovah; Sept. Α᾿χαλία v.r. Χελκία), the father of Nehemiah, the governor after the captivity (Neh 1:1; Neh 10:2). B.C. ante 447.

## Hachilah[[@Headword:Hachilah]]

             (Heb. Chakilah', חֲכילָה. according to Gesenius, darksome; according to Fürst, drought; Sept. Ε᾿χελά v.r. Χελμάθ), the descriptive name of a well Wooded hill (גַּבְעָה) near (“on the south of,” “before,” “by the way of”) the wilderness (“Jeshimon”) of Ziph, where David lay hid, and where Saul pitched his tent at the information of the Ziphites (1Sa 23:19; 1Sa 26:1; 1Sa 26:3). This is doubtless the Tell Zif reported by Dr. Robinson (Researches, 2, 190, 191) as “a round eminence situated in the plain, a hundred feet or more in height,” with a level plot on the top, apparently once enclosed by a wall, and containing several cisterns; lying a short distance west of the site of the town of Ziph. SEE ZIPH. The identification proposed by Schwarz (Palest. p. 113) with “the village Beth-Chachal, 21 miles west of Hebron,” is unsupported and out of place.

## Hachilah, Hill Of[[@Headword:Hachilah, Hill Of]]

             Lieut. Conder suggests for this spot (Quar. Statement of the "Palest. Explor. Fund,"'January 1875, page 47) "the high hill bounded by deep valleys north and south on which the ruin of Yekin now stands," and Tristram (Bible Lands, page 63) coincides in this identification; but if this be the site of the ancient city Cain (q.v.), it can hardly be also that of Hachilah; and, in fact, the latter is not a proper name at all, as it invariably has the article (תִחֲכַילָת, as being a mere appendage of Ziph). Later, Lieut. Conder proposes another site (Tent Work, 2:91): "This [hill] I would propose to recognise in the long ridge called El-Kolah, running out of the Ziph plateau towards the Dead Sea desert or Jeshimon, a district which, properly speaking, terminates about this line, melting into the Beersheba plains, On the north side of the hill are the 'Caves of the Dreamers,' perhaps the actual scene of David's descent on Saul's sleeping guards." As to the "wood (choresh) of Ziph," he remarks (page 89): "A moment's reflection will convince any traveller that as the dry, porous formation of the plateau must be unchanged since David's time, no wood of trees could then have flourished over this unwatered and sun-scorched region. The true explanation seems to be that the word choresh is a proper name with a different signification; and such is, the view of the Greek version and of Josephus. We were able considerably to strengthen this theory by the discovery of the ruin of Khoreisa and the valley of Hiresh (the same word under another form), close to Ziph, the first of which may well be thought to represent the Hebrew Choresh-Ziph." But the latter term likewise is a mere denominative, for it takes the article (תִחֹרְשָׁת, 1Sa 23:15; 1Sa 23:18), and is elsewhere used plainly with reference to trees (Isa 17:9; Eze 31:3).

## Hachmoni[[@Headword:Hachmoni]]

             (Heb. Chakmoni', חִכְמֹנַי, wise; Sept. Α᾿χαμανί v.r. Α᾿χαμί,Vulg. Hachamioni), a man only known as the father (or ancestor; comp. 1Ch 27:2) of Jashobeam, the chief of David's warriors (1Ch 11:11, where son of Hachmoni is rendered “HACHMONITE,” for which the parallel passage, 2Sa 23:8, has “TACHIONITE”); and also of Jehiel, the companion of the princes in the royal household (1Ch 27:32). B.C. considerably ante 1046. Hachmon or Hachmoni was no doubt the founder of a family to which these men belonged: the actual father of Jashobeam was Zabdiel (1Ch 27:2), and he is also said to have belonged to the Korhites (1Ch 12:6); possibly the Levites descended from Korah. But the name Hachmon nowhere appears in the genealogies of the Levites. See Kennicott, Diss. p. 72, 82, who calls attention to the fact that names given in Chronicles with Ben are  in Samuel given without the Ben, but with the definite article. A less probable view is that which makes this term a title of office, q. d. counselor. SEE JASHOBEAM.

## Hachmonite[[@Headword:Hachmonite]]

             (1Ch 11:16). SEE HACHMONI.

## Hacke, Nicholas P., D.D[[@Headword:Hacke, Nicholas P., D.D]]

             a German Reformed minister, was born in Baltimore, Maryland, September 20, 1800. At the age of six years he was sent to a relative in Bremen, Germany, to acquire a thorough knowledge of the German language. He returned to America in 1816, and studied theology privately until 1819, when he accepted an invitation to preach to some congregations in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania, returning to his studies the same year. He was licensed and ordained in 1819, and became pastor of the Greensburg charge, which he served fifty-eight years, and died there, August 25, 1878. During the greater part of his ministry he preached exclusively in the German language. He was a student all his life, and used the English language with ease and grace. He was fully consecrated to his work, remarkable for his social powers, caring not for worldly honors, a model Christian gentleman, and faithful minister of the gospel. See Harbaugh, Fathers of the Germ. Ref. Church, 5:300.

## Hacker, Joachim Bernhard Nikolaus[[@Headword:Hacker, Joachim Bernhard Nikolaus]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born November 11, 1760, at Dresden. He studied at Wittenberg, and died at Zscheyla, in Saxony, October 4, 1817, leaving some ascetical works, for which see Doring, Deutsche Kanzelredner; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:356, 386. (B.P.)

## Hacker, Johann Georg August[[@Headword:Hacker, Johann Georg August]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Dresden, January 24, 1762. He studied at Wittenberg, was in 1784 preacher at Torgau, in 1790 garrison-preacher at Dresden, in 1796 court-preacher there, and died Feb. 21, 1823, leaving Diss. Inauguralis de Descensu Christi ad Inferos (Wittenberg, 1802), and several volumes of sermons. See Doring, Deutsche Kanzelredner; Winer, candbuch der theol. Lit. 1:436; 2:82, 91. 127, 161, 172, 173, 183, 366, 389. (B.P.)

## Hacket, John[[@Headword:Hacket, John]]

             an English prelate, distinguished for his talents in controversy, was born at London in 1592. He studied at Westminster School, and entered Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1608. He took orders in 1618, and soon after became chaplain of the bishop of Lincoln. At the beginning of the Civil War he was one of the divines chosen to prepare a report on Church reforms, to be presented by a committee of the House of Lords. This plan failed from the opposition of the bishops. Hacket was a zealous partisan of Charles, and his house became the headquarters of the Royalists in his neighborhood. This brought him into trouble, and he was even imprisoned for a short time. After the Restoration he was made bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, and he caused the cathedral of Lichfield, which had been much injured during the war, to be repaired, mostly at his own expense. He died at Lichfield in 1670. Hacket was a Calvinist; yet his writings abound, says Coleridge, “in fantastic rags and lappets of Popish monkery.” He wrote also A Sermon preached before the King March 22, 1660: — A Century of Sermons upon several remarkable Subjects (published by Thos. Plume, with a life of the author, 1675, fol.): — The Life of Archbishop Williams (1693, fol.). See Biogr. Britannica; Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, vol. 2; Gentleman's Magazine, vol. 66; Hook, Eccles. Biography, 5, 471; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 752; Coleridge, Works (New York edition), 5, 123. Hacket, William, an English enthusiast and fanatic of the 16th century. He was at first the servant of a gentleman named Hussey, but married a rich widow, whose fortune he soon spent in dissipation. He next appears at York and in Lincolnshire giving himself out as a prophet, and announcing the downfall of the papacy; that England would suffer from famine, pestilence, and war unless the consistorial discipline were established. He was whipped and driven out of the county, but continued his prophecies elsewhere. According to Bayle, he was a very ready and grandiloquent speaker, so that many among the people thought he had received a special gift of the Holy Ghost. He affected to place great  reliance on his prayers, and asserted that if all England were to pray for rain there should fall none if he prayed for dry weather. Edmund Coppinger and Henry Arthington became associated with him, the former under the name of Prophet of Mercy, the latter Prophet of Judgment. They proclaimed Hacket the true king of the world, and next in power to Jesus Christ. On Jan. 16, 1591, he sent his disciples through the streets of London crying that Jesus had arrived, was stopping at a certain hotel in the town, and that this time none should undertake anything against him. They ended with the cry, Repent, England, repent! They were finally arrested and put in prison. Coppinger let himself die of starvation; Arthington published a recantation and was forgiven. As for Hacket, he persisted to the last, and was condemned to death as guilty of impiety and rebellion, and hung in London in July 1591. Even on the scaffold he prayed God for a miracle to confound his enemies. See Henry Fitz-Simon, Britannomachia Ministrorum, lib. 2, cap. 6, p. 202, 206; Camden, Annales, an. 1591, pars 4:p. 618623; Bayle, Dict. hist. et Crit.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 31.

## Hackett, Horatio Balch, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Hackett, Horatio Balch, D.D., LL.D]]

             an eminent Baptist scholar, was born at Salisbury, Massachusetts, December 27, 1808. In 1823 he entered Phillips Academy, Andover, and in 1827 Amherst College; became a hopeful Christian in 1828, and was valedictorian in 1830. He graduated from the theological seminary at  Andover in 1834, spending one year meanwhile as tutor in Amherst College. The next year he occupied a position as teacher of classics in Mount Hope College, Baltimore, and became a member of the First Baptist Church in that city. He was adjunct professor of Latin and Greek in Brown University for four years (1835-39). In 1839 he was elected professor of Biblical Literature and Interpretation in Newton Theological Institution, and the same year was ordained to the Christian ministry. Two years of earnest devotion to the cultivation of the classes which came under his instruction were followed by a year spent abroad, six months of the time in earnest study in Halle, Germany, attending the lectures of Tholuck, Gesenius, Rediger, and other eminent scholars, and four months in Berlin, enjoying the instructions, especially, of Neander and Hengstenberg. After his return to America, in 1842, he prepared an annotated edition of Plutarch's treatise on the Delay of the Deity in the Punishment of the Wicked, devoting also much time to the study of French, Chaldee, and Syriac, modern Greek, and Sanscrit. Two years afterwards he published a translation of Winer's Grammar of the Chaldee Language.

The first number of the second volume of the Bibliotheca Sacra, January 1845, contains his critique on the Life of Jesus, by Strauss. In the number of the same quarterly for January 1846, is an able article on the Synoptical Study of the Gospels, and Recent Literature Pertaining to it. The next year (1847) appeared his Exercises in Hebrew Grammar, and Selections from the Greek Scriptures to be Translated into Hebrew, etc. The result of some of his studies in connection with the preparation of this volume may be found in the January (1847) number of the Bibiothecan Sacra, in the form of two articles from his pen, The Structure of the Hebrew Sentence, and The Greek Version of the Pentateuch, by Thiersch. 'Then came his great work, the Commentary on Acts, the first edition of which appeared in 1852. He then made a second visit to Europe, his journey being extended to Palestine, and on his return spending several weeks in Germany. In 1855 he published his Illustrations of Scripture; Suggested by a Tour through the Holy Land. Soon after, he set out upon his third foreign tour, spending six months in Athens, for the purpose of devoting himself to the study of modern Greek, and thence making excursions in different directions in Greece. In 1860 the Bible Union published his Notes on the Greek. Text of the Epistle of Paul to Philemon, as the basis of a revision of the common English version; and a Revised Version, with Notes. In 1864 appeared his Christian Memorials of the War. During the same period he wrote thirty articles for the original edition of Dr. William Smith's Dictionary. In 1861  he wrote an introduction to the American edition of Westcott's Study of the Gospels; in the winter of 1865 he began to edit an American edition of Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, aided by Dr. Ezra Abbot.

He was also engaged by Dr. Schaff to translate Van Oosterzee's Commentary on Philemon, for his edition of Lange's Commentaries, and Braune's Commentary on Philippians, for the same series. He published in 1867 a second revised edition of Plutarchus de Sera Numinis Veri Dicta, with notes prepared by himself and professor W.S. Tyler, of Amherst College. Professor Hackett's connection with the Newton Theological Institution closed with its anniversary, June 24, 1868. Two years were next spent in laborious study in his favorite department, translating and revising the books of Ruth and of Judges for the Bible Union, upon the American edition of Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, and upon translations which he engaged to make for Dr. Schaff; also, in 1870, spending several months, once more in the Old World. Having been appointed to the chair of Biblical Literature and New Testament Exegesis, in the Rochester Theological Seminary, he entered upon the duties of his office in the fall of 1870. The same zeal and enthusiasm which characterized his instructions at Newton marked his teachings at Rochester. Five years of work were followed by another of those vacations in which he took so much delight, a vacation passed amid the scenes of the Old World. He returned, apparently greatly refreshed and strengthened, to enter anew, upon his work, when the summons suddenly came, telling him that his work was done. He died almost instantly, November 2, 1875, at his own home in Rochester, N.Y. See Memorials of H.B. Hackett, edited by G.H. Whittemore (Rochester, 1876). (J.C.S.)

## Hackett, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Hackett, Thomas, D.D]]

             an Irish prelate, was bishop of Down and Connor in 1672. He was deprived for simony in 1694. He published some Sermons (1672). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Hackley, Charles W. D.D[[@Headword:Hackley, Charles W. D.D]]

             a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and late professor of mathematics and astronomy in Columbia College, New York, was born March. 9, 1808, in Herkimer County, N. York, and died in the city of New York Jan. 10, 1861. Prof. Hackley graduated at the Military Academy, West Point, in 1829, and was assistant professor of mathematics there until 1832, when he engaged in the study of law, but subsequently abandoned it for theology, and was ordained in 1835. He was professor of mathematics in the University of New York until 1838, then became president of Jefferson College, Mississippi, and subsequently rector of St. Peter's Protestant Episcopal Church, Auburn, N.Y. He was elected professor in Columbia College in 1843, and continued in that post until his death. He was the author of several excellent mathematical works, and a contributor to scientific periodicals and weekly and daily journals. — American Annual Cyclopedia, 1861, p. 362; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 753. (J.W. M.)

## Hackluit[[@Headword:Hackluit]]

             SEE HAKLUYT.

## Hackspan, Theodor[[@Headword:Hackspan, Theodor]]

             an eminent Lutheran theologian and Orientalist, was born in 1607 at Weimar, and died at Altorf Jan. 19,1659. He was educated at Jena, where he studied philosophy, and then went to Altorf; to profit by the instructions  of the able Orientalist Schwenter and thence to Helmstadt, where he studied theology under the famous Calixtus. In 1636 he returned to Altorf, and for many years filled the chair of Hebrew in its university, where he was the first to publicly teach the Oriental languages. In 1654 he was appointed professor of theology in that institution, retaining at the same time the chair of Oriental languages. His close application to study and to the duties of his professorships so impaired his health that he died in the fifty-second year of his age. Hackspan is said to have been the best scholar of his day in Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic. The liberality of Jodocus Schmidmaier, an advocate of Nuremberg, who established in his own house a press, with supplies of types in the different languages, enabled him to publish most of his learned works. Among these we name Tractatus de usu Iibrorum Rabbisicorum: — Sylloge Disputationun theologicarum et philololgicarum: — Interpres Errabundus: — Disputationes de locutionibus sacris (Altorf, 1648): — Observationes Arabico-Syriacae in quaedam loca Veteris et Novi Testamenti (ibid. 1639): — De Angelorum daemonumque noninibus (ibid. 1641): — Fides et Leges Mohhammedis, etc. (ibid. 1646): — 1iscellaneorum Sacrorum Libri duo (ibid. 1660): — Exercitatio de Cabbala Judaica (ibid. 1660): — Note philolgico-theologicae. 1 varia et. difcilia Scripturce loca (ibid. 1664, 3 vols.).Rose, Nouv. Géneralé Biog. Dict.8, 169; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 23, 34. (J. W. M.)

## Hadad[[@Headword:Hadad]]

             a name which occurs with considerable confusion of form in the Heb. The proper orthography seems to be הֲדִד, Hadad' (according to Gesenius from an Arab. root signifying to break forth into shouts; but Furst makes it =שִׁדִּי, A Mighty), which appears in Gen 36:35-36; 1Ch 1:46-47; 1Ch 1:50-51 (in all which passages it is rendered by the Sept. Α᾿δάδ, and Vulg. Adad), and in 1Ki 11:14-25 (where the Sept. has Α᾿δάρ,Vulg. Adad). The other forms are חֲדִד, Chadad'(1Ch 1:30; Sept. ΧοδάδVulg. Hadad), הֲדִר, Hadar'(Genesis 26:39; Sept. Α᾿ράδ, Vulg. Adar, Engl. “Hadar”), חֲדִר, Chadar'(Gen 25:15; Sept Χοδάν, Vulg. and Engl. Hadar), and אֲדִד, Adad'(1Ki 11:17; Sept. Α᾿δάρ,Vulg. Adad). It was the name of a Syrian idol, and was thence transferred to the king, as the highest of earthly authorities, in the forms Hadad, Ben-hadad (“worshipper of Hadad”), and Hadad-ezer (“assisted by  Hadad,” Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 218). The title appears to have been an official one, like Pharaoh; and perhaps it ‘is so used by Nicolaus Damascenus, as quoted by Josephus (Ant. 7:5, 2), in reference to the Syrian king who aided Hadadezer (2Sa 8:5). Josephus appears to have used the name in the same sense, where he substitutes it for Benhadad (Ant. 9, 8, 7, compared with 2Ki 13:24). SEE HADAD-RIMMON.

1. ADAD SEE ADAD (q.v.) is the indigenous name of the chief deity of the Syrians, the sun, according to Macrobius (Saturnal. 1, 23). Moreover, Pliny (Hist. Nat. 37, 11, 71), speaking of remarkable stones named after parts of the body, mentions some called “Adadunephros, ejusdem oculus ac digitus dei;” and adds, “et hic colitur a Syris.” He is also called ῎Αδωδος βασιλεὺς θεῶν by Philo Byblius (in Eusebii Praepar. Evan. i, 10). The passage of Hesychius which Harduin adduces in his note to Pliny concerning the worship of this god by the Phrygians, Jablonski declares to be inadmissible (De Linzq. Lycaonica, p. 64).

This Syrian deity claims some notice here, because his name is most probably an element in the names of the Syrian kings Benhadad and Hadadezer. Moreover, several of the older commentators have endeavored to find this deity in Isa 66:17; either by altering the text there to suit the name given by Macrobius, or by adapting the name he gives to his interpretation and to the reading of the Hebrew, so as to male that extract bear testimony to a god Achad (q.v.). Michaelis has argued at some length against both these views; and the modern commentators, such as Gesenius, Hitzig, Bottcher (in Proben Altest. Schrifterkldr.), and Ewald, do not admit the name of any deity in that passage.

2. HADAIR SEE HADAIR (q.v.), one of the sons of Ishmael (Gen 25:15; 1Ch 1:30). His descendants probably occupied the western coast of the Persian Gulf, where the names Attaei (Ptol. 6:7, § 15), Attene, and Chateni (Plin. 6:32) bear affinity to the original name. SEE ARABIA.

3. HADAD, king of Edom, the son of Bedad, and successor of Husham: he established his court at Avith, and defeated the Midianites in the intervening territory of Moab (Gen 36:35; 1Ch 1:46). This is the only one of the ancient kings of Edom whose exploits are recorded by Moses. B.C. ante 1618. SEE AVITH.

4. HADAD, another king of Edom, successor of BaalHanon: he established his palace at Pal, and his wife's name was Mehetebel (1Ch 1:50). He is called HADAR in Gen 36:39. From the fact that with him the list of these Edomitish kings closes, it may be conjectured (Turner's Companion to Genesis, p. 326) that he lived about the time of the Exode, and in that case he may be the identical king of Edom who refused a passage to the Israelites (Num 20:14). B.C. prob. 1619; certainly ante 1093. SEE PA.

5. ADAD, a king of Syria, who reigned in Damascus at the time that David attacked end defeated Hadadezer, king of Zobah, whom he marched to assist, and in whose defeat he shared. B.C. cir..1040. This fact is recorded in 2Sa 8:5, but the name of the king is not given. It is supplied, however, by Josephus (Ant. 7, 5, 2), who reports, after Nicolas of Damascus, that he carried succors to Hadadezer as far as the Euphrates, where David defeated them both; and adds other particulars respecting his fame.

6. HADAD, a young prince of the royal race of Edom, who, when his country was conquered by David, contrived, in the heat of the massacre committed by Joab, to escape with some of his father's servants, or, rather, was carried off by them into the land of Midian. B.C. cir. 1040. Thence Hadad went into the desert of Paran (“Midian,” 2Sa 8:18), and eventually proceeded to Egypt (1Ki 11:14 sq.; in 1Ki 11:17 the name is given in the mutilated form אֲדִד). He was there most favorably received by the king, who assigned him an estate and establishment suited to his rank, and even gave him in marriage the sister of his own consort, by whom he had a son, who was brought up in the palace with the sons of Pharaoh. Hadad remained in Egypt till after the death of David and Joab, when, although dissuaded by Pharaoh, he returned to his own country in the hope of recovering his father's throne (1Ki 11:21-22). B.C. cir. 1012. The Scripture does not record the result of this attempt further than by mentioning him as one of the troublers of Solomon's reign, which implies some measure of success (see Kitto's Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.). After relating these facts the text goes on to mention another enemy of Solomon, named Rezin, and then adds (1Ki 11:25) that this was “besides the mischief that Hadad did; and he abhorred Israel, and reigned over Syria.”

Our version seems to make this apply to Rezin; but the Sept. refers it to Hadad, reading אדום, Ediom, instead of ארם, Aram or Syria, and the sense  would certainly be improved by this reading, inasmuch as it supplies an apparent omission; for without it we only know that Hadad left Egypt for Edom, and not how he succeeded there, or how he was able to trouble Solomon. The history of Hadad is certainly very obscure. Adopting the Sept. reading, some conclude that Pharaoh used his interest with Solomon to allow Hadad to reign as a tributary prince, and that he ultimately asserted his independence. Josephus, however, seems to have read the Hebrew as our version does, “Syria,” not “Edom.” He says (Ant. 8:7, 6) that Hadad, on his arrival in Edom, found the territory too strongly garrisoned by Solomon's troops to afford any hope of success. He therefore proceeded with a party of adherents to Syria, where he was well received by Rezin, then at the head of a band of robbers, and with his assistance seized upon a part of Syria and reigned there. If this be correct, it must have been a different part of Syria from that in which Rezin himself reigned, for it is certain, from 1Ki 11:24, that he (Rezin) did reign in Damascus. Carrieres supposes that Hadad reigned in Syria after the death of Rezin; and it might reconcile apparent discrepancies to suppose that two kingdoms were established (there were more previously), both of which, after the death of Rezin, were consolidated under Hadad. That Hadad was really king of Syria seems to be rather corroborated by the fact that every subsequent king of Syria is, in the Scripture, called Ben-Hadad; “son of Hadad,” and in Josephus simply Hadad, which seems to denote that the founder of the dynasty was called by this name., We may observe that, whether we read Aram or Edom, it must be understood as applying to Hadad, not to Rezin (Pictorial Bible, on 2Ki 11:14). — Kitto. The identity of name suggests a common origin between the Edomitish and Syrian dynasties. Josephus, in the outset of his account, appears to call this Hadad by the name of Ader. In any case, however, the preceding must be regarded as distinct persons from each other (see Hengstenberg, Pentateuch, 2, 288), the last probably being the son, or, rather, grandson of No. 5. SEE SYRIA.

## Hadad-ezer[[@Headword:Hadad-ezer]]

             (Heb. id., הַדִדנְעֶזֶר, Adad is his help [ SEE HADAD, No. 1]; Sept. Αδραέζερ in 2 Samuel 8, but Α᾿δαρέζερ v.r. Α᾿δαδέζερ in 1Ki 11:23; Vulg. Adarezer in both passages), less correctly HADAREZER (Heb. idt., הְרְעֶזֶר. ln. [ see under HDADA; yet some MSS. have Hadadezer throughout]; 2Sa 10:16; 2Sa 10:19, 1Ch 18:3-10; 1Ch 19:16; 1Ch 19:19; Sept. Α᾿δραζάρ v.r. Α᾿δρααζάρ, Vulg. still Adarezer), king of the Aramitish state Zobah, a powerful opponent of David. He was defeated by the Israelites in his first campaign, while on his way to “establish his dominion” (B.C. cir. 1035) in the neighborhood of the Euphrates, with a great loss of men, war chariots, and horses, and was despoiled of many of his towns (2Sa 8:3; 1Ch 18:3), and driven with the remnant of his force to the other side of the river (19:16). The golden weapons (שֶׂלֶט, A.V. “shields of gold”) captured on this occasion, a thousand in number, were taken by David to Jerusalem (18:7), and dedicated to Jehovah. The foreign arms were preserved in the Temple, and were long known as king David's (1Ch 23:9; Son 4:4). A diversion highly serviceable to him was made by a king of Damascene Syria [ SEE HADAD, 5], who compelled David to turn his arms against him (2Sa 10:6-14; 1Ch 19:6-14). The breathing-time thus afforded Hadadezer was turned by him to such good account that he was able to accept the subsidies of Hanun, king of the Ammonites, and to take a leading part in the confederacy formed by that monarch against David. B.C. cir. 1034. The first army brought into the field was beaten and put to flight by Abishai and Joab; but Hadadezer, not yet discouraged, went into the countries east of the Euphrates, and got together, the forces of all his allies and tributaries, which he placed under the command of Shobach, his general. The army was a large one, as is evident from the numbers of the slain; and it was especially strong in horse- soldiers (1Ch 19:18). They crossed the Euphrates, joined the other Syrians, and encamped at a place called Helam (q.v.). To confront so formidable an array, David took the field in person, and in one great victory so completely broke the power of Hadadezer, that all the small tributary princes seized the opportunity of throwing off his yoke, of abandoning the Ammonites to their fate, and of submitting quietly to David, whose power was thus extended to the Euphrates (2Sa 10:15-19; 2 Chronicles 19:15-19).

But one of Hadarezer's more immediate retainers, REZON ben-Eliadah, made his escape from the army, and, gathering round him some fugitives like himself, formed them into one of those marauding, ravaging “bands” (גְּדוּר) which found a congenial refuge in the thinly peopled districts between the Jordan and the Euphrates (2Ki 5:2, 1Ch 5:18-22). Making their way to Damascus, they possessed themselves of the city. B.C. cir. 980. Rezon became king, and at once began to avenge the  loss of his countrymen by the course of” mischief” to Israel which he pursued down to the end of Solomon's reign, and which is summed up in the emphatic words, “He was an adversary (a ‘Satan') to Israel”… “he abhorred Israel” (1Ki 11:23-25).

## Hadad-rimmon[[@Headword:Hadad-rimmon]]

             (Heb. Hadad'-Rimmon', רַמּוֹן הֲדִדthe names of two Syrian idols; Sept. κοπετάς ροὼνος,Vulg. Adadremmon), the name of a place in the valley of Megiddo, alluded to in Zec 12:11 as a type of the future penitence of the Jews; probably by a proverbial expression from the lamentation for Josiah, who was mortally wounded not far from this spot (2Ch 35:22-25). (There is a treatise by Wichmanshausen. De planctu Hadadr. in the Nov. Thes. Theol. — phil. 1, 1101; exegetical remarks on the same text have also been written in Dutch by Vermast [ Gonda, 1792, 1794], in German by Mauritii [Rost. 1764. 1772], and in Latin by Froriep [Erf. 1776].) According to Jerome (Comment. on Zechariah 1. c. and Hosea 1), it was afterwards called Maximliunoopolis (see Reland. Palcest. p. 891), which, according to the Jerus. Itin., lay 17 Rom. miles from AEesatea, and 10 from Esdraelon; being situated, according to Dr. Robinson (new ed. of Researches, 3, 118), a little south of Megiddo (now Lejjun) (see Bibliotheca Sacra, 1844, p. 220). The name has been thought to be derived from the worship of the idol Hadad-rimmon (Hitzig on Isaiah 17, 9; Movers, Phin. p. 297); but, according to the Targum of Jonathan (followed by Jarchi), it is an ellipsis for Hadad, son of Tab-rimmon, the alleged opponent of Ahab at Ramoth-Gilead. As it contains the names of two principal Syrian deities, it may have been an old Syrian stronghold, and hence Josiah may here have made his last stand in defense of the plain of Esdraeloa. ‘Such a site, therefore, does not ill agree with the position of the modern Runlaneh, a village “at the foot of the Megiddo hills, in a notch or valley about 1 hour S. of tell Metzellim” (Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 333; comp. Narrative, 1, 355; De Saulcy, Dead Sea, 2, 311). Schwarz's attempt (Palest. p. 159) to identify Hadad-Rimmon with Gath-Rimmon of Jos 21:25, as the Kefar Uthni of the Talmud (Götting, fol. 76, a), and a present Kafer Guth, said by him to be located about 24 miles from Lejjun, beyond Sepphoris, is without foundation.

## Hadar[[@Headword:Hadar]]

             a various reading of two Heb. names. SEE ETS-HADAR.

1. CHADAR'(חֲדִר, perhaps chamber; Sept. Χοδδάν; Vulg. Hadar), a son of Ishmael (Gen 25:15); written in 1Ch 1:30, Chadad'(חֲדִד, Χονδάν, Hadad); but Gesenius supposes the former to be the true reading of the name. It has not been identified, in a satisfactory way, with the appellation of any tribe or place in Arabia, or on the Syrian frontier; but names identical with, or very closely resembling it, are not uncommon in those parts, and may contain traces of the Ishmaelitish tribe sprung from Hadar. The mountain Hadad, belonging to Teyma, SEE TEMA. on the borders of the Syrian desert, north of el-Medineh, is perhaps the most likely to be correctly identified with the ancient dwellings of this tribe; it stands among a group of names of the sons of Ishmael, containing Dumah, Kedar, and Temna. SEE HADAD, 2.

2. HADAR'(הֲדִר, perh. ornament; Sept. Α᾿ράδ v.r. Α᾿ράθ; Vulg. Adua), one of the Edomitish kings, successor of Baal-Hanan ben-Achbor (Gen 36:39); and, if we may so understand the statement of Gen 36:31, about contemporary with Saul. The name of his city, and the name and genealogy of his wife, are given. In the parallel list in 1 Chronicles 1, he appears as HADAD. We know from another source (1Ki 11:14, etc.) that ‘Hadad was one of the names of the royal family of Edom. Indeed, it occurs in this very list (Gen 36:35). SEE HADAD, 4.

## Hadarezer[[@Headword:Hadarezer]]

             the form of the name of the town mentioned in the account of David's Syrian campaign, as given in 2 Samuel 10, and in all its occurrences in the Heb. text (as well as in both MSS. of the Sept. and in Josephus), except 2Sa 8:3-12.; 1Ki 11:23, where it is more correctly called HADADEZER SEE HADADEZER (q.v.).

## Hadarniel[[@Headword:Hadarniel]]

             in the Talmud, is an angel of the heaven of fixed stars, and commander of fire; therefore more than twelve thousand flashes of lightning come from  his mouth at every word he utters.. He would. not allow Moses to wander through the air, when the latter came, at the command of God, to receive the law. God chided him, therefore he offered his services, to go before Moses, and announce his words.

## Hadas[[@Headword:Hadas]]

             SEE MYRTLE.

## Hadashah[[@Headword:Hadashah]]

             (Heb. Chadashah', חֲדָשָׁה, new; Sept. Α᾿δασά v.r. Α᾿δασάν), a city in the valley of Judah, mentioned in the second group between Zenan and Migdal-gad (Jos 15:37). It has generally been thought (Winer, Realw. s.v.) to be the same with the Adasa (‘Accaas) of Josephus (Ant. 12, 10, 5) and the Apocrypha ‘(1 Macc. 8:40, 45), and likewise of the  Onomasticon (s.v.), which, however, must have lain rather in the mountains of Ephraim, apparently near the modern village Surda. SEE ADASA. Schwarz (Phys. Descript. of Pal. p. 103) inclines to identify it with a little village el-Chadas, stated by him to lie between Migdal and Ashkelon, the el-Jora of Van de Velde's Map. According to the Mishna (Erub. 5, 6), it anciently contained 50 houses only (Reland, Palaest. p. 701). SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF.

## Hadassah[[@Headword:Hadassah]]

             (Heb. Hadassah', הֲדִסָּה, myrtle; comp. the Gr. names A Myrto, etc.; Sept. omits, Vulg. Edissa), the earlier Jewish name of ESTHER (Est 2:7). Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 366) suggests that it is identical with ςΑτοσσα, the name of the daughter of Cyrus (Herod. 3. 133,134).

## Hadassi, Jehuda[[@Headword:Hadassi, Jehuda]]

             a learned Karaite Jew, was born towards the end of the 11th century, at Jerusalem, and died between 1150 and 1160. He is the author of a great work, bearing upon the literature of the Karaite Jews, entitled, אֶשְׁכֹּל הִכֹּפֶר, also סֵפֶר הִפֶּלֶס, first published at Koslov, 1836. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:353; Geschichte der Karaer, 2:211 sq.; De' Rossi, Dizionaro Storico (Germ. transl.), page 120. (B.P.)

## Hadattah[[@Headword:Hadattah]]

             (Heb. Chadattah', חֲדִתָּה. a Chaldaizing form=nova; Sept. omits, Vulg. nova), according to the A.T. one of the towns of Judah in the extreme south “Hazor, Hadattah, and Kerioth, and Hezron,” etc. (Jos 15:25); but the Masoretic accents of the Hebrew connect the word with that preceding it, as if it were Hazor-chadattah, i.e. New Hazor, in distinction from the place of the same name in Jos 15:23. This reading is expressly sanctioned by Eusebius and Jerome, who speak (Onomast. s.v. Asor) of “New Hazor” as lying in their day to the east of and near Ascalon. (See also Reland, Palcest. p. 708.) But Ascalon, as Robinson has pointed out (Researches, new ed. 2, 34, note), is in the Shefelah, and not in the south, and would, if named in Joshua at all, be included in the second division of the list, beginning at Jos 15:33, instead of where it is, not far from Kedesh. Still the total (29) in Jos 15:32 requires as in much abbreviation in the enumerated list of cities in this group as possible. — SEE HAZOR- HADATTAH.

## Haddah[[@Headword:Haddah]]

             SEE EN-HADDAH.

## Haddock, Chas. B., D.D[[@Headword:Haddock, Chas. B., D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Salisbury, N. H., in the summer of 1796. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1816. Immediately after  graduating, he entered Andover Theological Seminary, where he remained two years. He was then compelled to desist from his studies, and made a journey to the South. He returned in 1819 invigorated in health, and was at once chosen the first professor of rhetoric in Dartmouth College, which position he held till 1838, when he was chosen professor of intellectual philosophy. In 1850 he received the appointment of charge d'affaires at the court of Portugal which he held till 1855. He spent the remainder of his life at West Lebanon. For about twelve years he preached at White River Village, Vt., and for several years he supplied the pulpit at the upper and lower churches of Norwich, Vt. For a year or two he preached at West Lebanon, and for the last two years and a half of his life he preached at Queechy village, Vt. He died at West Lebanon, N. H., Jan. 15, 1861. As a preacher he was always acceptable, and never more so than during the last year of his life. — Congregational Quarterly, 1861, p. 213.

## Hadelin (Lat. Hadalinus), Saint[[@Headword:Hadelin (Lat. Hadalinus), Saint]]

             priest and confessor, who died about 690, was one of the disciples of St. Remacle, and when that saint resigned his bishopric of Fougeres, that he might retire into the peaceful monastery of Stanislawow, lately founded by St. Sigebert, king of Austrasia, he took with him the pious Hadelin. Remacle sent Hadelin into Dinant, on the Meuse, in 669, and finding a quiet retreat at Celles, on the Lesse, he dwelt there in a cave, and built a little chapel, on the site of which afterwards rose a collegiate church. St. Hadelin is the patron of five churches in the diocese of Liege and Namur. His hermitage still exists, and has never been without a pious successor. The body of this saint was buried there, but was translated to Vise, in the diocese of Liege, in 1338. He is mentioned in the martyrologies of Ado, Wyon, Menardus, those of Liege, Cologne, etc. There are two ancient lives, one by Notker, bishop of Liege (971-1007). See Baring-Gould, Lives of the Saints (sub. February 3, his day), 2:49.

## Hadeloga (or Adaloga), Saint[[@Headword:Hadeloga (or Adaloga), Saint]]

             commemorated February 2, is said to have been the first abbess of the nunnery of Kissingen, and a daughter of Charles Martel, in the 8th century.

## Hades[[@Headword:Hades]]

             a Greek word (]σης, derived, according to the best established and most generally received etymology, from privative a and ἰδεῖν, hence often written ά‹δμς), means strictly what is out of sight, or possibly, if applied to a person, what puts out of sight. In earlier Greek this last was, if not its only, at least its prevailing application; in Homer it occurs only as the personal designation of Pluto, the lord of the invisible world, and who was probably so designated-not from being himself invisible, for that belonged to him in common with the heathen gods generally-but from his power to render mortals invisible-the invisible-making deity (see Crusius, Homeric Lexicon, s.v.). The Greeks, however, in process of time abandoned this use of hades, and when the Greek Scriptures were written the word was scarcely ever applied except to the place of the departed. In the classical writers, therefore, it is used to denote Orcus, or the infernal regions. In the Greek version of the Old Testament it is the common rendering for the Heb. שְׁאוֹל, sheol, though in the form there often appears a remnant of the original personified application; for example, in Gen 37:35, “I will go down to my son,” εἰς ]δου, i.e. into the abodes or house of hades δύμους or οϊvκον being understood). This elliptical form was common both in the classics and in Scripture, even after hades was never thought of but as a region or place of abode.

1. The appropriation of hades by the Greek interpreters as an equivalent for sheol may undoubtedly be taken as evidence that there was a close  agreement in the ideas conveyed by the two terms as currently understood by the Greeks and Hebrews respectively-a substantial, but not an entire agreement; for in this, as well as in other terms which related to subjects bearing on things spiritual and divine, the different religions of Jew and Gentile necessarily exercised a modifying influence; so that even when the same term was employed, and with reference generally to the same thing, shades of difference could not but exist in respect to the ideas understood to be indicated by them. Two or three points stand prominently out in the views entertained by the ancients respecting hades: first, that it was the common receptacle of departed spirits, of good as well as bad; second, that it was divided into two compartments, the one containing an Elysium of bliss for the good, the other a Tartarus of sorrow and punishment for the wicked; and, thirdly, that in respect to its locality, it lay under ground, in the mid-regions of the earth. So far as these points are concerned, there is no material difference between the Greek hades and the Hebrew sheol. This, too, was viewed as the common receptacle of the departed: patriarchs and righteous men spoke of going into it at their decease, and the most ungodly and worthless characters are represented as finding in it their proper home (Gen 42:38; Psa 139:8; Hos 13:14; Isa 14:9, etc.). A twofold division also in the state of the departed, corresponding to the different positions they occupied, and the courses they pursued on earth, is clearly implied in the revelations of Scripture on the subject, though with the Hebrews less prominently exhibited, and without any of the fantastic and puerile inventions of heathen mythology. Yet the fact of a real distinction in the state of the departed, corresponding to their spiritual conditions on earth, is in various passages not obscurely indicated.

Divide retribution is represented as pursuing the wicked after they have left this world-pursuing them even into the lowest realms of sheol (Deu 32:22; Amo 9:2); and the bitterest shame and humiliation are described as awaiting there the most prosperous of this world's inhabitants, if they have abused their prosperity to the dishonor of God and the injury of their fellow-men (Psa 49:14, Isaiah 14). On the other hand, the righteous had hope in his death, he could rest assured that, in the viewless regions of sheol, as well as amid the changing vicissitudes of earth, the right hand of God would sustain him; even there he would enter into peace, walking still, as it were, in his uprightness (Pro 14:32; Psa 139:8; Isa 57:2). That sheol, like hades, was  conceived of as a lower region in comparison with the present world, is so manifest from the whole language of Scripture on the subject, that it is unnecessary to point to particular examples; in respect to the good as well as the bad, the passage into sheol was contemplated as a descent; and the name was sometimes used as a synonym for the very lowest depths (Deu 32:22; Job 11:7-9). This is not, however, to be understood as affirming anything of the actual locality of disembodied spirits; for there can be no doubt that the language here, as in other cases, was derived from the mere appearances of things; and as the body at death was committed to the lower parts of the earth, so the soul was conceived of as also going downwards. But that this was not designed to mark the local boundaries of the region of departed spirits may certainly be inferred from other expressions used regarding them-as that God took them to himself; or that he would give them to see the path of life; that he would make them dwell in his house forever; or, more generally still, that the spirit of a man goeth upwards (Gen 5:24; Psa 16:11; Psa 23:6; Ecc 3:21; Ecc 12:7). During the old dispensations there was still no express revelation from heaven respecting the precise condition or external relationships of departed spirits; the time had not yet come for such specific intimations; and the language employed was consequently of a somewhat vague and vacillating nature, such as spontaneously arose from common feelings and impressions. For the same reason, the ideas entertained even by God's people upon the subject were predominantly somber and gloomy. Sheol wore no inviting aspect to their view, no more than hades to the superstitious heathen; the very men who believed that God would accompany them thither and keep them from evil, contemplated the state as one of darkness and silence, and shrunk from it with instinctive horror, or gave hearty thanks when they bound themselves for a time delivered from it (Psa 6:5; Psa 30:3; Psa 30:9; Job 3:13 sq.; Isa 38:18). The reason was that they had only general assurances, but no specific light on the subject; and their comfort rather lay in overleaping the gulf of sheol, and fixing their thoughts on the better resurrection some time to come, than in anything they could definitely promise themselves between death and the resurrection-morn.

In this lay one important point of difference between the Jewish and the heathen hades, Originated by the diverse spirit of the two religions, that to the believing Hebrew alone the sojourn in sheol appeared that only of a temporary and intermediate existence. The heathen had no prospect  beyond its shadowy realms; its bars for him were eternal; and the idea of a resurrection was utterly strange alike to his religion and his philosophy. But it was in connection with the prospect of a resurrection from the dead that all hope formed itself in the breasts of the true people of God. As this alone could effect the reversion of the evil brought in by sin, and really destroy the destroyer, so nothing less was announced in that first promise which gave assurance of the crushing of the tempter; and though as to its nature but dimly apprehended by the eve of faith, it still necessarily formed, as to the reality, the great object of desire and expectation. Hence it is said of the patriarchs that they looked for a better country, which is a heavenly one; and of those who in later times resisted unto blood for the truth of God, that they did it to obtain a better resurrection (Heb 11:16; Heb 11:35). Hence, too, the spirit of prophecy confidently proclaimed the arrival of a time when the dead should arise and sing, when sheol itself should be destroyed, and many of its inmates be brought forth to the possession of everlasting life (Isa 26:19; Hos 13:14; Dan 12:2). Yet again, in apostolic times, Paul represents this as emphatically the promise made by God to the fathers, to the realization of which his countrymen as with one heart were hoping to come (Act 26:7); and Josephus, in like manner, testifies of all but the small Sadduceean faction of them, that they believed in a resurrection to honor and blessing for those who had lived righteously in this life (Ant. 18, 1, 3). This hope necessarily cast a gleam of light across the darkness of hades for the Israelite, which was altogether unknown to the Greek. Closely connected with it was another difference also of considerable moment, viz., that the Hebrew sheol was not, like the Gentile hades, viewed as an altogether separate and independent region, withdrawn from the primal fountain of life, and subject to another dominion than the world of sense and time. Pluto was ever regarded by the heathen as the rival of the king of earth and heaven; the two domains were essentially antagonistic. But to the more enlightened Hebrew there was but one Lord of the living and the dead; the chambers of sheol were as much open to his eye and subject to his control as the bodies and habitations of men on earth; so that to go into the realms of the deceased was but to pass from one department to another of the same all-embracing sway of Jehovah. SEE SHEOL.

2. Such was the general state of belief and expectation regarding hades or sheol in Old-Testament times. With the introduction of the Gospel a new light breaks in, which shoots its rays also through the realms of the  departed, and relieves the gloom in which they had still appeared shrouded to the view of the faithful. The term hades, however, is of comparatively rare occurrence in New-Testament scripture; in our Lord's own discourses it is found only thrice, and on two of the occasions it. is used in a somewhat rhetorical manner, by way of contrast with the region of life and blessing. He said of Capernaum, that from being exalted unto heaven it should be brought down to hades (Mat 11:23) —that is, plainly, from the highest point of fancied or of real elevation to the lowest abasement. Of that spiritual kingdom, also, or church, which he was going to establish on earth, he affirmed that “the gates of hades should not prevail against it” (Mat 16:18), which is all one with saying that it should be perpetual. Hades is contemplated as a kind of realm or kingdom, accustomed, like earthly kingdoms in the East, to hold its council chamber at the gates; and whatever measures might there be taken, whatever plots devised, they should never succeed in overturning the foundations of Christ's kingdom, or effectually marring its interests. In both these passages hades is placed by our Lord in an antagonistic relation to his cause among men, although, from the manner in which the word is employed, no very definite conclusions could be drawn from them as to the nature and position of hades itself. But in another passage — the only one in which any indication is given by our Lord of the state of its inhabitants-it is most distinctly and closely associated with the doom and misery of the lost: “In hades,” it is said of the rich man in the parable, “he lifted up his eyes, being in torments” (Luk 16:23). The soul of Lazarus is, no doubt, also represented as being so far within the bounds of the same region that he could be descried and spoken with by the sufferer. Still, he was represented as sharing no common fate with the other, but as occupying a region shut off from all intercommunion with that assigned to the wicked, and, so far from being held in a sort of dungeon-confinement, as reposing in Abraham's bosom, in an abode where angels visit. With this also agrees what our Lord said of his own temporary sojourn among the dead, when on the eve of his departing thither — “Today,” said he, in his reply to the prayer of the penitent malefactor, “shalt thou be with me in paradise” (Luk 23:43) But paradise was the proper region of life and blessing, not of gloom and forgetfulness; originally it was the home and heritage of man as created in the image of God; and when Christ now named the place whither he was going with a redeemed sinner paradise it bespoke that already there was an undoing-of the evil of sin, that for all who are Christ's there is an actual recovery immediately after death, and as  regards the better part of their natures, of what was lost by the dis. obedience and ruin of the fall. SEE PARADISE.

But was not Christ himself in hades? Did not the apostle Peter on the day of Pentecost apply to him the words of David in Psalms 16, in which it was said, “Thou wilt not leave my soul in hades, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption,” and argue apparently that the soul of Christ must have indeed gone to hades, but only could not be allowed to continue there (Act 2:27-31)? Even so, however, it would but concern the application of a name; for if the language of the apostle must be understood as implying that our Lord's soul was in hades between death and the resurrection, it still was hades as having a paradise within its bosom; so that, knowing from his on lips what sort of a receptacle it afforded to the disembodied spirit of Jesus, we need care little about the mere name by which, in a general way, it might be designated. But the apostle Peter, it must be remembered, does not call it hades; he merely quotes an Old-Testament passage, in which hades is mentioned, as a passage that had its verification in Christ; and the language of course in this, as in other prophetical passages, was spoken from an Old-Testament point of view, and must be read in the light which the revelations of the Gospel have cast over the state and prospects of the soul. ‘We may even, however, go farther; for the Psalmist himself does not strictly affirm the soul of the Holy One to have gone to hades; his Words precisely-rendered are, “Thou wilt not leave (or abandon) my soul to hades -that is, give it up as a prey to the power or domain of the nether world. It is rather a negative than a positive assertion regarding our Lord's ‘connection with hades that is contained in the passage, and nothing can fairly be argued from it as to the local habitation or actual state of his disembodied spirit. SEE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

The only other passages in the New Testament in which mention is made of hades are in Rev 1:18, where the glorified Redeemer declares that he has the keys of death and of hades; Rev 6:8, where death is symbolized as a rider, smiting all around him — with weapons of destruction, and hades following to receive the souls of the slain; Rev 20:13-14, where death and hades are both represented as giving up the dead that were in them, and afterwards as being themselves cast into the lake of fire, which is the second death. In every one of these passages hades stands in a dark and-forbidding connection with death-very unlike that association with paradise and Abraham's bosom in which our  Lord exhibited the receptacle of his own and his people's souls to the eye of faith; and not only so, but in one of them it is expressly as an ally of death in the execution of judgment that hades is represented, while in another it appears as an accursed thing, consigned to the lake of fire. In short, it seems as if in the progress of God's dispensations a separation had come to be made between elements that originally were mingled together — as if, from the time that Christ brought life and immortality to light, the distinction in the next world as well as this was broadened between the saved and the lost; so that hades was henceforth appropriated, both in the name and in the reality, to those who were to be reserved in darkness and misery to the judgment of the great day, and other names, with other and brighter ideas, were employed to designate the intermediate resting-place of the redeemed. It was meet that it should be so; for by the personal work and mediation of Christ the whole Church of God rose to a higher condition; old things passed away, all things became new; and it is but reasonable to suppose that the change in some degree extended to the occupants of the intermediate state the saved becoming more enlarged in the possession of bliss and glory, the lost more sunk in anguish and despair. SEE DEATH.

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

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

(1.) Abyss (ἄβυσσος == ἄβυθος, without bottom). The Sept. uses this word to represent three different Hebrew words: 1. מְצוֹלָהa depth or deep place (Job 41:23); or צוּלָה, the deep, the sea (Isa 44:27). 2. אֵּהִבbreadth, a broad place (Job 36:16). 3. תַּהוֹם, a mass of waters, the sea (Gen 8:2, etc.), the chaotic mass of waters (Gen 1:2; Psa 104:6), the subterraneous waters, “the deep that lieth under” (Gen 49:25), “the deep that coucheth beneath” (Deu 33:13). In the N.T. it is used always with the article, to designate the abode of the dead, hades, especially that part of it which is also the abode of devils and the place of woe (Rom 10:7; Luk 8:31; Rev 9:1-2; Rev 9:11; Rev 11:7; Rev 17:8; Rev 20:1; Rev 20:3). In the Revelation the word is always translated in the A.Vers. “bottomless pit,” by Luther “Abgrund.” In 9:1, mention is made of “the key of the bottomless pit” (ἡ κλεὶς το῏υ φρέατος τῆς ἀβ., the key of the pit of the absss), where hades is represented as a boundless depth. which is entered by means of a shaft covered by a door, and secured by a lock (Alford, Stuart, Ewald, De Wette, Diisterdieck). In Rev 20:11 mention is made of “the angel of the abyss,” by whom some suppose is intended Satan or one of his angels. SEE ABYSS.

(2.) Abaddon (ἀβαδδών, from the Heb. אֲבִדּוֹן, destruction, the place of the dead, Job 26:6; Pro 21:1), the name given in Rev 9:11 to “the angel of the abyss,” and explained by the writer as equivalent to the Greek (ἀπολλύων, destroyer. The term may be understood either as a personification of the idea of destruction, or as denoting the being supposed to preside over the regions of the dead, the angel of death. The Rabbins frequently use this term to denote the lowest regions of sheol or hades (Erubin, fol. 19:1; Sohar Num. fol. 4; Sohar Chudash, fol. 22; comp.Eisenmenger, Entdecktes Jud. 2, 324 sq.); and the addition, “angel of the abyss,” seems to favor the supposition that the president or king of this place is alluded to here. But it may be doubted whether the angelologly of the Rabbins finds any sanction from the N.T., and it accords better with the general character of the passage to suppose a personification here of the idea of destruction, so that the symbol may find many realizations in the history of the Church: as there are many Antichrists, so doubtless are there many Apollyons. The identification of Abaddon with the Asmodseus of the Apocrypha and the Talmud rests upon no solid basis. SEE ABADDON.  5. A full view of the extensive literature of this subject more appropriately belongs to other heads; we here notice only a few treatises specially bearing upon the opposite states of the dead: Jour. Sac. Lit. October, 1852, p. 35 sq., April, 1853, p. 56 sq.; July, 1853, p. 413 sq.; Bickersteth, Hades and Heaven (Lond. 1865). SEE HEAVEN.

## Hadid[[@Headword:Hadid]]

             (Heb. Chadid', חַדיד, pointed, perh. from its situation on some craggy eminence, Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 446; Sept. Α᾿δώδ in Neh 11:31, elsewhere unites with preceding word, Λοδαδίδ; Vulgate Hadid), a place in the tribe of Benjamin, in the vicinity of Lod and Ono, whose inhabitants returned from the captivity to their old seat under Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:33, where some copies read חָרַיד, HARID; Neh 7:37; Neh 11:34). It is probably the same with one of the cities called ADIDA SEE ADIDA (q.v.) by Josephus (War, 4, 9, 1), but not that of the Apocrypha (1Ma 12:38; comp. Josephus, Ant. 13:15, 2). In the time of Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. Adithaim), a town called Aditha (Α᾿δαθά) existed to the east of Diospolis (Lydda). According to Schwarz (Phy. Description If Palestine, p. 134), it was identical with the present “village el-Chadida, situated 5 Eng. miles east of Lud, on the summit of a round mountain:” probably the same with that seen by Dr. Robinson, and called by him “el- Haditheh, a large village just at the mouth of a wady, as it issues from the hills east of Ludd into the plain” (new edit. of Researches, 3, 143, note). This district, although, within the territory of Dan, belonged to Benjamin. The same place is described by the old Jewish traveler ha-Parchi as being “on the summit of a round hill,” and identified by him, no doubt correctly, with Hadid (Zunz, in Asher's Benj. of Tudela, 2, 439).

## Hadid (2)[[@Headword:Hadid (2)]]

             The modern site, Hadithek, is laid down on the Ordnance Map as three miles east of Ludd, and is described in the accompanying Memoirs (2:297; comp. page 322) as "a moderate-sized village on a terraced tell at the  mouth of a valley at the foot of the hills, with a well to the east. There are remains of a considerable town round it; tombs and quarries exist; and the mound on which the village stands is covered with pottery."

## Hadith[[@Headword:Hadith]]

             a name given by Mohammedans to the sayings of Mohammed, which were handed down by oral tradition from one generation to another. There are said to be six authors of these traditions, among whom are Ayesha, the wile of the prophet; AbuHoreira, his intimate friend; and Ibn-Abbas, his cousin-german. The collection of these traditions made by Khuarezmi numbers 5266 savings, all of which the devout Mohammedan ought to commit to memory, or, where that cannot be done, to transcribe them.

## Hadj[[@Headword:Hadj]]

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

## Hadlai[[@Headword:Hadlai]]

             (Heb. Chadlay', הִדנְלִי, resting; Sept. Α᾿δδί v.r. Ε᾿λδα‹, Vulg. Adali), the father of Amasa, which latter was one of the Ephraimites who opposed the enslavement of the captives of Judah in the civil war between Pekah and Ahaz (2Ch 28:12). B.C. ante 738.

## Hadoram[[@Headword:Hadoram]]

             (Heb. Hadoramn', הֲדוֹרָם, “defectively” הֲדָֹרםin Chronicles'Furst suggests [Heb. Lex. s.v.]= הֲדוֹר רָם, Haudor [i.e. Ador, the fire-god; SEE HADRAMMELECH ] is exalted; the Samuel at Gen 10:27 has Adoram; Sept. in Gen 10:27, ῾Οδοῤῥἀ, Vulg. Aduram; in 1Ch 1:21, Κεδουράν; in 1Ch 18:10, Α᾿δουράμ.; in 2Ch 10:18, Α᾿δωράμ; Vulg. in all these last, Adoram), the name of three men…

1. ADORAM, the fifth son of Joktan, and progenitor of a tribe of the same name in Arabia Felix (Gen 10:27; 1Ch 1:21). B.C. post 2414. Bochart (Phaleg, 2, 20) compares the Dirmati or Drimnati on the Persian Gulf (Plin. 6:32), and the promontory Κορόδαμον (Ras el-Had) of Ptol. 6:7, 11. Michaelis (Spiciley. 2, 162) despairs of all identification of the tribe in question. Schulthess (Parad. p. 83) and Gesenius (Thes. Heb. s. 4.) think that the Adramitae are meant, whom Ptolemy (Α᾿δραμῖται, Geog. 6, 7) places on the southern shores of Arabia, between the Homeritae (Hamyarites) and the Sochalite, an account with which Pliny (“Atramitoe,” Hist. Nat. 6, 28, 32; 12:14,30) substantially agrees. Winer, 1, 453. Fresnel cites an Arab author who identifies Hadoram with Jurhum (41'Lettre, Journ. Asiatique, 3 serie, 6:220); but this is highly improbable; nor is the suggestion of Hadhira, by Caussin (Essai i, 30), more likely, the latter being one of the aboriginal tribes of Arabia, such as Ad, Thamûd, etc. SEE ARABIA.

2. HADORAM, son of Toi, king of Hamath, sent by his father (with valuable presents in the form of articles of antique manufacture [Josephus], in gold, silver, and brass) to congratulate David on his victory over their common enemy Hadarezer, king of Syria (1Ch 18:10). B.C. cir. 1034. In the parallel narrative of 2 Samuel 8, the name is given as JORAM; but this being a contraction of Jehoram, which contains the name of Jehovah, is peculiarly an Israelitish appellation. By Josephus (Ant. 7, 5,4) he is called Α᾿δώραμος.

3. ADONIRAM SEE ADONIRAM (q.v.), as he is elsewhere more fully called (1Ki 4:6; 1 Kings 5, 14; Josephus constantly Α᾿δώραμος) the son of Abda, the treasurer of taxes under Solomon, and who was stoned to death by the people of the northern tribes when sent by Rehoboam to exact the usual dues (2Ch 10:18).

## Hadrach[[@Headword:Hadrach]]

             (Heb. Chadrak', חִדנְרָךְ, signif. unknown, but possibly connected with Hudor-- SEE HADORAI; Sept. Σεδράχ,Vulg. Hadrach), apparently the name of a country, and (as we may gather from the parallel member of the sole and obscure passage where it occurs) near or identical with Damascus (Zec 9:1). The meaning seems to be, “The utterance of the word of Jehovah respecting the land of Hadrach; and Damascus is the place upon which it rests.” On the locality in question, great division of opinion exists. Adrichoinius says, “Adrach, or Hadrach, alias Adra is a city of Caelesyria, about twenty-five miles from Bostra, and from it the adjacent region takes the name of Land of Hadrach. This was the land which formed the subject of Zechariah's prophecy” (Theaterum Terrae Sanctae, p. 75). Rabbi Jose, a Damascene, according to Jarchi, declared he knew a place of this name east of Damascus; and Michaelis says (Suppleme. p. 677), “To this I may add what I learned, in the year 1768, from Joseph Abbassi, a noble Arab of the country beyond Jordan. I inquired whether he knew a city called Hadrakh He replied that there was a city of that name, which, though now small, had been the capital of a large region called the land of Hadrakh,” etc. The two names, however, are entirely different (הדר,ִ Hadrach; Arab. Edhr'a), and there is no historical evidence that Edhr'a ever was the capital of a large territory. SEE EDREI. Yet corroborative of the existence of the place in question are the explicit statements of Cyril and Theodoret in commenting on the above passage. But to these it is objected that no modern traveler has heard of such a place in this region; Gesenius  especially (Thesaur. Heb. p. 449) urges that the name could not have become extinct. Yet no other explanation of the word Hadrach hitherto offered is at all satisfactory (see Winer's Realw. s.v.). Movers suggests that Hadrach may be the name of one of the old deities (compare Adres, Justin, 36:2, and ATERGATIS) of Damascus (Die Phonizier, 1, 478); and Bleek conjectures that reference is made to a king of that city (Studien u. Kritiken, 1852, 2, 258). Henderson (Comment. ad loc.) supposes it to be only a corruption of חדד, the common names of the kings of Syria. SEE HADAR. Jarchi and Kimchi say, “Rabbi Juda interpreted it as an allegorical expression relating to the Messiah, Who is harsh (חד) to the heathen, and gentle (ר)ִ to Israel” Jerome's interpretation is somewhat similar: “Et est ordo verborum; assumptio verbi Domini, acuti in peccatores, mollis in justos. Adrach quippe hoc resonat ex duobus integris nomen compositum: AD (חד) acutun, RACH (ר)ִ molle, tenerumque significans” (Comment. in Zach. ad loc.). Hengstenberg (Christol. 3, 372) adopts the same etymology and meaning, but regards the word as a symbolical appellation of the Persian empire, whose overthrow by Alexander Zechariah here foretells. He says the prophet does not mention the real name, because, as he lived during the supremacy of Persia, such a reference would have exposed him to danger. SEE ZECHARIAH, BOOK OF.

Looking at the passage in what appears to be its plain and natural meaning, no scholar can deny that, according to the usual construction, the proper name following אֶרֶוֹis the name of the “land” itself, or of the nation inhabiting the land, and the analogy presented by all the other names in, the section is sufficient proof that this must be the case here (Hengstenberg, 3, 375). All the other names mentioned are well known-Damascus, Hamath, Tyre, Zidon, Gaza, etc.; it is natural to infer that Hadrach is also the name of a place known to the prophet. Its position is not accurately defined. The words of the passage do not connect it more closely with Damascus than with Hamath. It is remarkable that no such name is elsewhere found in ancient writers. The translators of the Sept. were ignorant of it. So was Jerome. No such place is now known. Yet this does not prove that there never was such a name. Many ancient names have disappeared, as it seems to be the case with this (see Alphens, Diss. de terra Chaderach, Tr. ad Rhen. 1723; also in Ugolino, 7). SEE DAMASCUS.

## Hadria[[@Headword:Hadria]]

             SEE ADRIA.

## Hadrian[[@Headword:Hadrian]]

             SEE ADRIAN.

## Hadrian, Pope[[@Headword:Hadrian, Pope]]

             SEE ADRIAN.

## Hadrianus, P. Aemilius[[@Headword:Hadrianus, P. Aemilius]]

             the 14th Roman emperor (from A.D. 117-138), was a relative and the ward of Trajan, and married Julia Sabina, the granddaughter of Marciana sister of that emperor. In regard to the place of his birth, the statement of Spartianus (De vita Hadricani, 1) that he was born at Rome Jan. 24, A.D. 76, is generally regarded as the more reliable, though others name Italica in Spain, where his ancestors had settled in the time of Scipio (see Eutropius, 8:6, and Eusebius, Chronicon, No. 2155, p. 166, ed. Scaliger). Aided by the preference of Trajan's wife, Plotina, and showing himself capable in the positions entrusted to him, he rose rapidly, and on the death of Trajan succeeded to the empire, having been either really adopted as his successor by that emperor, or palmed off as such by Plotina and her party. For a statement of the conflicting opinions on this point, see Spartianus (De vita Hadriani, 4) and Dion Cassius (69, 1). When Hadrian assumed the reins of government (A.D. 117), he found the quiet of the empire threatened at several points, but, adopting a general policy of peace, he succeeded in preventing outbreaks and invasions in nearly every instance. In furtherance of this peaceful policy, he withdrew the legions from the conquests of his predecessor beyond the Tigris and Euphrates, and would have also abandoned Dacia had not populous Roman colonies existed there.

Impelled by curiosity, or, more probably, by a desire to see for himself the condition of the empire, he journeyed extensively through it, leaving everywhere monuments of his munificence in temples, aqueducts, and other useful or ornamental works. He made many improvements in the laws, and the Edictumperpetuum Hadriani (a codification of praetorial edicts made by his orders) marked an era in the historical development of the Roman law. Hadrian, though a voluptuary in private life, was a patron of the arts and of learning; was fond of the society of artists, poets, scholars, philosophers, etc., and even aspired to rank among them; but his inferior taste, his jealousy, his overweening vanity, and his impatience of rivalry and contradiction led him often to acts of cruel injustice towards the leaned men he gathered about him.

His conduct towards the Christians was marked by a sense of justice. The proconsul of Asia Minor having complained to Hadrian that the people at  their festivals demanded the execution of Christians, he issued a rescript forbidding such executions, and requiring that all complaints against the Christians should be made in legal form. Though this edict failed to secure immunity to Christians from persecution, since the fourth persecution occurred during his reign, Hadrian was not classed by Melito, Tertullian, or Eusebius among their persecutors, and his reign is regarded as in general favorable to the progress of Christianity. Aelius Lampridius (Alexander Serverus, 43), indeed, mentions a report that Hadrian purposed to erect temples to Christ, as one of the gods, but was deterred by the priests, who declared that all would become Christians if he did so. This story is, however, generally regarded as unworthy of credit. The tolerant spirit or indifference of Hadrian towards religious opinions and practices disapproved of and even ridiculed by him is shown by his letter to Servianus, preserved in Vopiscus (Severus, 8), and by the fact that though a zealous worshipper of the Sacra of his native country, he also adopted the Egyptian Cultus.

The peace of his reign was broken by one serious war. Among the Jews a spirit of discontent had been kept alive ever since the capture of Jerusalem by Titus. Wishing to eradicate this spirit by the destruction of the Jewish nationality, Hadrian issued an edict forbidding the practice of circumcision, and determined to erect on the ruins of Jerusalem a new Roman city, to be called after himself, Aelia Capitolina. Consequently a furious revolt of the Jews broke out under the lead of Bar Cochba, a pretended messiah, and it was only after having suffered great losses, and having almost exterminated the Jewish nation (500,000 Jews were said to have perished), that the imperial armies succeeded in crushing the revolt, although the able general, Julius Serverus, had been called from the distant shores of Britian to lead them. Aelia Capitolina rose over the ruins of the Holy City, but the Jew was forbidden, on the pain of death, to enter it, and from that time the race was dispersed through the world. Antoninus Pius annulled the prohibition of circumcision. Hadrian died at Baiae July 10, 138; but his last days had been marked by such outrageous cruelties that Antoninus, his successor, with difficulty secured the customary honors to his memory. — Spartianus, de vita Hadriani (in Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Teubner's edit.); Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. 2, 319 sq.; Hoefer. Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 1, 301 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 5, 446; Sharpe, History of Egypt, 15, 14-31. (J.W.M.)

## Hadshi-Khalfa[[@Headword:Hadshi-Khalfa]]

             (originally MUSTAFA ben-Abdallah, also known by the name of Katib- Tshelebi), a most celebrated Turkish historian, geographer,. and biographer, was born at Constantinople about 1605. He was for some time secretary to the sultan, Murad IV, and died in 1658. His main production is a great biographical lexicon, Keshful-funun, written in Arabic, in which he gives the titles of more than 18,000 Arabic, Persian, and Turkish works, with short biographies of the authors. It is of the greatest value, since it enumerates a great many others which seem to have been lost. Hammer- Purgstall largely used this work for his Encyklopadische Uebersicht der Wissenschaften des Orients (Leipsic, 1806). A complete edition of Iadshi's text, with a Latin translation, was published by Flilgel, Lexicon Bibliographicum et Encyclopaedicum (Lond. 1835-58, 7 volumes): — Hadshi also published chronological tables, Takwum-al-tawarikh (translated into Latin by Reiske, Leipsic, 1766), and a geography, Dschihan-numa (Latin transl. by Norberg, Lund, 1818, 2 volumes). (B.P.)

## Hadwinus, Saint[[@Headword:Hadwinus, Saint]]

             SEE CHADORNUS.

## Haematerius[[@Headword:Haematerius]]

             SEE CHELIDONIUS.

## Haemorrhage[[@Headword:Haemorrhage]]

             SEE ISSUE.

## Haemorrhoids[[@Headword:Haemorrhoids]]

             ( טְחוֹרִיםtechorim', prob. tumores ani i.e. the piles, so called as protruded [the root is טָחר, to stretch] from the fundament, or from the straining or tenesmus with flow of blood, which the Masorites have everywhere inserted in the margin for the textual [but apparently more vulgar and less proper] word עַפָלִיםophalim', lit hills, spoken also in the Arab. of a “tumor in ano virorum vel in pudendis mulierum” [see Schroeder, Orig. Hebrews 4:54; Schultens, ad Medianii Prov. p. 23]; Sept. and Vulg. understand a sore in the secret parts), a painful disease with which the Philistines were afflicted by God as a punishment for detaining the sacred ark at Ashdod after they had captured it in battle (2Sa 5:6). The word also occurs among the physical curses denounced upon the Israelites by Moses in case of apostacy (Deu 28:27). Interpreters are not agreed on the exact signification of the original terms, nor on the nature of the disease, although most think that those painful tumors in the fundament are meant which sometimes turn into ulcers, i.e. the piles (Psa 78:66). Others regard it as the name of the fundament itself, podex (Bochart, Hieroz, 1, 382; see Fuller in Miscel. Sac. v, 3; Kanne, Die Goldene Aerse der Philist. Nurimb. 1820).

The Sept and Vulg. add to Psa 78:9 that the Philistines made seats of skins upon which to sit with more ease, by reason of their indisposition. Herodotus seems to have had some knowledge of this history, but has assigned another cause (1, 105). He says the Scythians, having plundered the temple of Venus at Askalon, a celebrated city of the Philistines, the goddess, who was worshipped there, afflicted them with a peculiar disease θήλεια νόσος. The Philistines, perhaps, thus related the story; but it evidently passed for truth that this disease was ancient, and had been sent among them by some avenging deity. To remedy this suffering, and to remove the ravages committed by rats, which wasted their country, the Philistines were advised by their priests and soothsayers to return the ark of God with the following offerings (1Sa 6:1-18): five figures of a golden emerod, that is the part afflicted, and five golden rats; hereby acknowledging that this plague was the effect of divine justice. This advice was followed; and Josephus (Ant. 6, 1, 1, δυσεντερία; Aquila, τὸ τῆς φαγεδαίνης ἕλκος and others  believed that the five cities of the Philistines made each a statue, which they consecrated to God as votive offerings for their deliverance. This, however, seems to have originated from the figures of the rats.

The heathen frequently offered to their gods figures representing those parts of the body which had been diseased (see Frey, De more simulacra membrorum consecrandi, Altd. 1746); and such kinds of ex votes are still frequent in Catholic countries, being consecrated in honor of some saint who is supposed to have wrought the cure: they are images of wax or of metal, exhibiting those parts of the body in which the disease was seated. The Scholiast on Aristophanes (Achara,231) mentions a similar plague (followed by a similar subsequent propitiation to that mentioned in Scripture), as sent upon the Athenians by Bacchus. The opinion mentioned by Winer (s.v. Philister), as advanced by Lichtenstein (in Eichhorn's Biblioth. 6, 405-467), that the plague of emerods and that of mice are one and the same, the former being caused by an insect (solpuga) as large as a field mouse, is hardly worth serious attention. Kitto thinks that they were rather talismans specially formed under astrological calculations for the purpose of obviating the effects of the disease (Daily Bible Illustr. ad loc.). The words of 1Sa 5:12, “The men that died not were smitten with emerods,” show that the disease was not necessarily fatal. It is clear from its parallelism with “botch” and other diseases in Deu 28:27 that עַפָלִים is a disease, not a part of the body (see Beyer, De haemorrhoidibus ex lege Mosaica, Lips. 1792). Now 1Sa 5:11 speaks of the images of the emerods after they were actually made and placed in the ark. It thus appears probable that the former word means the disease and the latter the part affected, which must necessarily have been included in the actually existing image, and have struck the eye as the essential thing represented, to which the disease was an incident. As some morbid swelling, then, seems the most probable nature of the disease, so no more probable conjecture has been advanced than that hemorrhoidal tumors or bleeding piles, known to the Romans as mariscae (Juv. 2, 13) are intended. These are very common in Syria at present, Oriental habits of want of exercise and improper food, producing derangement of the liver, constipation, etc., being such as to cause them. SEE DISEASE.

## Haemstede, Adrian van[[@Headword:Haemstede, Adrian van]]

             one of the first preachers of the Reformed faith in the Netherlands, was probably born about the year 1525 in Schouwen. The parents of Adriaan  seem to have been among the earliest in Zealand to embrace the Reformed faith. He understood several modern languages, and wrote in both Latin and Dutch. His Dutch style is remarkable for perspicuity and strength. Adriaan was in 1557 ministering to the Reformed church ill Antwerp, and his labors there were eminently successful. Deeply sympathizing with the persecuted Protestants in France, he wrote in Latin a letter to Henry the Second of France, in which he remonstrates with him and pleads with him to exercise clemency. This letter is dated. Dec. 1, 1557, and is thus in advance of the measures set on foot by Calvin and Beza in behalf of these persecuted followers of Christ. Van Haemstede in this letter suggests a conference such as was held at Poissv in 1562. Van der Heiden, sent at his request by the church at Emden to assist him at Antwerp, having arrived, he took occasion to leave for a time (Feb. 1558). During his absence dark clouds gathered, and soon after his return the storm burst. Van der Heiden, whose place of preaching had been betrayed by a woman, escaped. Van Haemstede remained, though a. price was set upon his head, and certain death awaited him if captured. His two faithful helpers, Gillis and Antoine Verdikt, were both burned at Brussels. He left Antwerp probably in March 1559, and sought refuge in Ost Friesland. Subsequently he labored for a short time at Groningen, and was thence sent to England to take charge of a Reformed church in London. He espoused the cause of the better class of Anabaptists, so far as to maintain that they should not be punished for their doctrinal error respecting the humanity of Christ, since they acknowledged his divinity, and depended on him for salvation. This view was in direct conflict with the views and practice of Cranmer and Ridley, who had in 1551 condemned to the flames Joris van Parre, a Netherlander of irreproachable morals, simply on account of his doctrinal belief. As the church which Haemstede served was at this time under the supervision of Edmund Grindal, bishop of London, he was called to account for his views, and, adhering to them, was banished from the kingdom. On his return to Holland he was deprived of all his property. Emden, too, refused to receive him. He bore his trials and privations in a truly Christian manner. At the earnest request of many of the London congregation, he finally went thither again. The bishop of London demanded a recantation. He refused. Again he was banished. With a heavy heart he returned to Friesland, where he soon after died. His death occurred in 1562. In his views of religious liberty he was far in advance of his age, and fell a victim to the reigning spirit of intolerance. He was the author of the first Book of Martyrs published in the Netherlands. It is conjectured that it was first published at  Antwerp during the persecution, and issued in sheets as it was prepared. The original edition, which is extremely rare, is in small quarto, bearing the author's name, but not the place of its publication. It met with great favor, and for two centuries it was the manual of thousands, having passed through many successive editions. See an able and interesting monograph of Rev. Joh. ab Utrecht Dresselhuis in the with vol. of Kist and Rayaard's Archief voor Kerkelijke Geschiedenis, inzonderheid van Nederland (Leyd. 1835); Glasius, Godgeleerd Nederland, D. 2. (J. P.W.)

## Haendel[[@Headword:Haendel]]

             SEE HANDEL.

## Haer, Franciscus Van Der[[@Headword:Haer, Franciscus Van Der]]

             a theologian and historian of Utrecht, who died at Louvain, January 12, 1632, is the author of, Catena Aurea in IV Evangelia: — Concordia Historice Sacrae et Profance (1614): — Jesus Nazarenus Messias Danielis-Biblia Sacra Vulgata: — Expositio iz Epistolas Pauli: — De Sacramentis. See Burmann, Trajectum Eruditum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Haeretici[[@Headword:Haeretici]]

             SEE HERETIC.

## Haeretico comburendo[[@Headword:Haeretico comburendo]]

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

## Haevernick[[@Headword:Haevernick]]

             SEE HAVERNICK.

## Hafedah[[@Headword:Hafedah]]

             an idol of the Adites, a tribe of Arabians who inhabited the country of Hadhramaut, in Yemen, or Arabia Felix. It was principally invoked for prosperity in travelling.

## Hafeli, Johann Caspar[[@Headword:Hafeli, Johann Caspar]]

             a Protestant theologian, was born May 1, 1754, in Switzerland. He studied at Zurich, was vicar in 1773, in 1784 chaplain to the prince of Dessan, in 1793 preacher at Bremen, in 1802 professor at the gymnasium there, in 1805 superintendent at Bernburg, and died April 4, 1811. He is the author of some ascetical works. See Doring, Deutsche Kanzelredner; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:47, 157, 168, 201, 204, 312. (B.P.)

## Hafen, Johann Baptist[[@Headword:Hafen, Johann Baptist]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, who died June 27, 1870, is the author of, Streongkirchlichkeit und Liberalismus in der Kathol. Kirche (Ulm, 1842): — Behandlung der Ehesachen im Bisthum Rottenbuig (1867): — Predigten (1865, 3 volumes). (B.P.)

## Hafenreffer, Matthias[[@Headword:Hafenreffer, Matthias]]

             (also Haffenreffer), a Lutheran theologian, was born June 24, 1561, at Lorch, in Wirtemberg, and died Oct. 22,1619. at Tübingen. He studied philosophy and theology at the last-named place, and in 1590 was made court-preacher and counselor of the Consistory at Stuttgart; in 1592 became professor of theology, and in 1617 chancellor and provost at Tübingen. To a profound and comprehensive learning, he united a sweet and peace-loving disposition, which led him to keep aloof for the most part from the theological strifes of his age, and to find his pleasures in directing and stimulating the studies of his pupils, to whose affectionate appreciation of him Val. Andreti and others bear testimony. His chief work, Loci theologici certa methodo ac ratione in tres libros tributi (Tübingen, 1600; an improved and enlarged ed; 1603), published at the request of Frederick, duke of Würtemberg, for the use of prince John Frederick was regarded as a model not only of Lutheran orthodoxy, but also of clearness and definiteness in conception, and expression and simplicity in style. It was the textbook of theology at Tübingen up to the end of the 17th century, supplanting Heerbrand's Cosfenditus, which had long been of almost symbolical authority there. By royal decree it was, in 1612, made the official textbook of dogmatics in the University of Upsala and other Swedish institutions of learning. Charles XII is said to have almost known it by heart. Hafelnreffer wrote also some controversial works against the Romanists and Calvinists, and a work entitled Templum Ezechielis (Tübingen, 1613, foi.). — Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 5, 469. (J. W. M.)

## Haferung, Johann Caspar[[@Headword:Haferung, Johann Caspar]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born February 14, 1669. He studied at Wittenberg, and died there May 17, 1744, doctor and professor of theology. He wrote, De Defectibus Afflictionum Christi a Paulo Supplendis: — De Bileamo Incantatore et Propheta Periodica: — De Causis cur Christus Morte Crucis Voluerit Mori: — De Sanguine Jesu Christi: — De Mysterio Trinitatis, in Libris Apocryphis Obvio, etc. See Moser, Lexicon jetztlebender Theologen; Freher, Theatrum Eruditorum; Neubauer, Nachricht von den jetztlebenden Gottesgelehrten; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Haffner, Isaac[[@Headword:Haffner, Isaac]]

             a French Protestant minister and distinguished humanist, was born at Strasburg in 1751. After studying at Paris and visiting several of the (German universities, he was ordained, and soon acquired great reputation as a preacher in Strasburg. He became subsequently dean of the theological faculty of that city, and died there May 27, 1831. He had been instrumental  in restoring in part the old university of Strashurg under the title of Protestant Theological Academy, which was afterwards changed to Protestant Seminary. At the inauguration he delivered an address printed under the title Des Secours que l'etude des langues, de histoire, de la philosophie et de la literature offer à la theologie (Strasb. 1803, 8vo); he wrote also De l'Education littiraire, off essui sur l' organisation d'un etablissement pour les hautes sciences (Strasb. 1792, 8vo). Discourses delivered on the anniversary of his 50th year in the ministry were published under the title Jubil. d'Haffner (French and German, Strasb. 1831, 8vo). See Oberlin, Amanach d'AIsace; M. Henrion,Amnales biographiques (1831,1854), vol 2; Hoefer, Nour. Biog. Géneralé 23, 80.

## Hafizi[[@Headword:Hafizi]]

             (keepers), a name given to Mohammedans who commit the entire Koran to memory, and are on that account regarded as holy men, intrusted with God's law.

## Haft[[@Headword:Haft]]

             (נַצָּב, nitstsab',firm), the handle of a weapon, e.g. of a dagger (Jdg 3:22). SEE KNIFE.

## Haftorah[[@Headword:Haftorah]]

             (also Haftaroth) is the name applied to fifty-four portions or sections of the Pentateuch selected by the Jews for Sabbath reading in the synagogue, under Antiochus Epiphanes, who forbid them reading the law. Previous to his time the Pentateuch was divided into sidras. In Palestine the number of sections required three years for the public reading of the whole Pentateuch, but in Babylonia, the reading, arranged as above referred to, was done in one year. — Furst, Kulturgeschichte, 1, 60; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebr. Lit. p. 201. SEE HAPHTARAT. (J.H.W.)

## Haftorang[[@Headword:Haftorang]]

             in Persian mythology, is the god and ruler of the planet Mars, the light- giver and health restorer. As he is the protector of the northern region and its stars, he may be the seventh constellation, because Hafti denotes seven. lagemann, Lorenz, a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Wolfenbiittel, August 10, 1692. He studied at Jena, was preacher in 1719 at Bodenburg, in 1722 at Nordhausen, in 1728 at Hanover, in 1748 general superintendent, and died in 1752. He wrote An Homerus Fuerit Philosophus Moralis? (Jena, 1712), besides, a number of ascetical works. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hagab[[@Headword:Hagab]]

             (Heb. Chagab', חָגָב, a locust; Sept. Α᾿γάβ), one of the Nethinim whose descendants returned from Babylon under Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:46). B.C. ante 536. SEE HAGABA.

## Hagaba[[@Headword:Hagaba]]

             (Heb. Chagaba', חֲגָבָא, a locust, a Chaldaizing form; Sept. Α᾿γαβά v.r. Α᾿γγαβά,Vulg. Flagaba, Neh 7:48) or HAGABAHE (Heb. Chagabah', חֲגָבָהid.; Sept. Α᾿γαβά,Vulg. Hagaba, Ezr 2:45), one of the Nethinim whose descendants returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel. B.C. ante 536. SEE AGABUS; SEE HAGAB.

## Hagahashteri[[@Headword:Hagahashteri]]

             (Heb. with the art. [which the A.V. has mistaken for part of the name] ha- Achashtari', הָאֲחִשְׁתָּרַי, i.e. the Achastarite, prob. of foreign [? Persian] origin; according to Furst, an adj. from the word achastar, i.e. courier [compare: אֲחָשַׁתַּרָנַים, “, camels,” Est 8:10; Est 8:14]; according to Gesenius, mule-driver; Sept. οΑ῾᾿σθηρά v.r. Α᾿ασθἠο, etc., Vulg. Ahasthari), the last mentioned of the four sons of Naarah, second of the two wives of Ashur, the founder of Tekoa, of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 4:6). B.C. post 1618.

## Hagany, John B. D.D[[@Headword:Hagany, John B. D.D]]

             an eminent minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the city of Wilmington, Delaware, August 26, 1808, of Methodist parentage, and entered the itinerant ministry in 1831. His ministry was from the first very successful. During his long career of thirty-four years he filled many of the most important stations of his Church in the Middle States, among them Pottsvllle, Pa.; St. George's, Ebenezer, and Trinity churches, Philadelphia; the Vestry Street, Mulberry Street, St. Paul's, and Bedford Street churches, New York City; Sands Street, Brooklyn, and Thirtieth Street, New York, where he closed his labors with his life, June 28, 1865.

Dr. Hagany was an eloquent preacher. He had a sweet-toned voice, a calm rather than a fervid temperament, a quick, tender sympathy, by which he was readily affected himself, and could readily affect others to tears. His memory was retentive, and enabled him to command instantly all his resources. In the early Methodist literature, and the English classics of the 17th century, he was unusually well read, and his citations from his favorite authors pleasantly spiced his conversation. Withal there was a vein of humor running through his speaking and writing which gave a flavor to both. His literary remains consist chiefly of essays contributed to religious and other periodicals. One of these, on John Wesley, furnished to Harper's Magazine, is one of the most striking characterizations of the great reformer extant. On the last Sunday of his life, June 25th, he preached to his congregation from the text, “Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his.” Not having finished his discourse, he announced that he would conclude it the next time he preached. On the evening of that day he was too unwell to go into the pulpit. On Wednesday afternoon he was sitting in his chair, reading from the sermons of Rev. Jonathan Seed, an old favorite of John Wesley. Meeting in Seed with a passage, which greatly pleased him, he called his wife, and began reading it aloud to her. While reading he was seized with a spasm of pain in the chest; the book was dropped, he leaned his head upon his hand, his arm upon the table before him, and in a few minutes it was all over. He had nearly completed his fifty-seventh year, and the thirty-fourth of his ministry. (G. R. C.)

## Hagar[[@Headword:Hagar]]

             (Heb. Hagar'הָגָי, flight, apparently from her abandonment of her mistress; but according to others, a stranger, from her foreign birth, SEE HAGARENE Sept. and N.T. ςΑγαρ), a native of Egypt, and servant of Abraham (Gen 21:9-10), perhaps one of the female slaves presented to Abraham by Pharaoh during his visit to Egypt (Gen 12:16), although she properly belonged to Sarah (Gen 16:1). The long continued sterility of Sarah suggested to her the idea (not uncommon in the East) of becoming a mother by proxy through her handmaid, whom, with that view, she gave to Abraham as a secondary wife (Genesis 15). B.C. 2078. SEE ABRAHAM; SEE ADOPTION; SEE CONCUBINE. This honor was too great and unexpected for the weak and ill-regulated mind of Hagar; and no sooner did she find herself likely to become the mother of her master's heir than she openly indulged in triumph over her less favored mistress. The feelings of Sarah were severely wounded, and she broke out to her husband in loud complaints of the servant's petulance. Abraham, whose meek and prudent behavior is strikingly contrasted with the violence of his wife, left her with unfettered power, as mistress of his household, to take what steps she pleased to obtain the required redress. (See Kitto's Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.) In all Oriental states where concubinage is legalized, the principal wife has authority over the rest; the secondary one, if a slave, retains her former condition unchanged, and society thus presents the strange anomaly of a woman being at once the menial of her master and the partner of his bed. This permission, however, was necessary in an Eastern household, but it is worthy of remark that it is now very rarely given; nor can we think, from the unchangeableness of Eastern customs, and the strongly-marked national character of those peoples, that it was usual anciently to allow a wife to deal hardly with a slave in Hagar's position. Left with this authority over her dotal maid-servant, Sarah was neither reluctant nor sparing in making the minion reap the fruits of her insolence; but whether she actually inflicted blows (Augustine, Epist. 48), or merely threw out menaces to that effect, cannot be determined from the verb עִָגָה (to “afflict”) there employed.

Sensible, at length, of the hopelessness of getting the better of her mistress, Hagar determined on flight; and having seemingly formed the purpose of returning to her relations in Egypt, she took the direction of that country, which led her to what was afterwards called Shur, through a long tract of sandy uninhabited country, lying on the west of Arabia Petrsea, to the extent of 150 miles  between Palestine and Egypt. Here she was sitting by a fountain to replenish her skin-bottle or recruit her wearied limbs, when the angel of the Lord appeared, and in the kindliest manner remonstrated with her on the course she was pursuing, and encouraged her to return by the promise that she would ere long have a son, whom Providence destined to become a great man, and whose wild and irregular features of character would be indelibly impressed on the mighty nation that should spring from him. — Obedient to the heavenly visitor, and having distinguished the place by the name of Beer-lahai-roi (q.v.), “the well of the visible God,” Hagar retraced her steps to the tent of Abraham, where in due time she had a son; and, having probably narrated this remarkable interview to Abraham, that patriarch, as directed by the angel, called the name of the child Ishmael “God hath heard” (Genesis 16). B.C. 2078. Fourteen years after the birth of Ishmael the appearance of the long-promised heir entirely changed the relations of the family, though nothing materially affecting Ishmael took place till the weaning of Isaac, which, as is generally thought, was at the end of his third year. B.C. 2061. Ishmael was then fully capable of understanding his altered relations to the inheritance; and when the newly- weaned child, clad, according to custom, with the sacred symbolic robe, which was the badge of the birthright, was formally installed heir of the tribe (see Biblioth. Bibl. vol. 1; Vicasi, Annot. p. 32; Bush on Gen 27:15), he inconsiderately gave vent to his disappointed feelings by an act of mockery (Gen 21:9 the Hebrew word צָחִק, though properly signifying “to laugh,” is frequently used to express strong derision, as in Gen 19:14; Neh 2:19; Neh 4:1; Eze 23:32; accompanied, as is probable on some of the occasions referred to in these passages, with violent gestures, which might very justly be interpreted as persecution, Gal 4:29). The procedure of Abraham in awarding the inheritance to Isaac was guided by the special command of God, and, moreover, was in harmony with the immemorial practice of the East, where the son of a slave or secondary wife is always supplanted by that of a free woman, even if born long after. This insulting conduct of Ishmael gave offence to Sarah, such that she insisted upon his expulsion from the family, together with his mother as conniving at it. So harsh a measure was extremely painful to Abraham; but his scruples were removed by the divine direction to follow Sarah's advice (see Kitto's Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.), “for,” adds the Targum of Jonathan, “she is a prophetess” (compare Gal 4:30). Accordingly, “Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took bread, and a bottle of water (and gave it unto Hagar, putting it on her shoulder), and  the child, and sent her away” (Gen 21:14). B.C. 2061. In spite of instructions, the two exiles missed their way. Overcome by fatigue and thirst, the strength of the young Ishmael first gave way, and his mother laid him down in complete exhaustion under one of the stunted shrubs of this arid region, in the hope of his obtaining some momentary relief from smelling the damp in the shade, while she withdrew to a little distance, unable to witness his lingering sufferings, and there “she lifted up her voice and wept.” In this distress, the angel of the Lord appeared with a comforting promise of her son's future greatness, and directed her to a fountain, which, concealed by the brushwood, had escaped her notice, and from which she now revived the almost lifeless Ishmael. This well, according to the tradition of the Arabs (who pay great honor to the memory of Hagar, and maintain that she was Abraham's lawful wife), is Zemzem, near Mecca. (See Weil's Bibl. Legends, p. 82.) Of the subsequent history of Hagar we have no account beyond what is involved in that of Ishmael, who established himself in the wilderness of Paran, in the neighborhood of Sinai, was married by his mother to a countrywoman of her own, and maintained both himself and his family by the produce of his bow (Gen 21:20-21). SEE ISHMAEL. In Gal 4:24, the apostle Paul, in an. allegory, makes Hagar (τό ςΑγαρ) represent the Jewish Church, which was in bondage to the ceremonial law, as Sarah represents the true Church of Christ which is free from this bondage. (See Bloomfield's Note, ad loc.) Some commentators, however, have discovered an alliteration in. the name here with the Arab word for stone (hajar). According to Mohammedan tradition, Hagar (Hfajir) was buried at Mecca! (D'Herbelot, Bib. Or. s.v. Hagiar). Mr. Rowlands, in traveling through the desert of Beersheba, discovered some wells and a stone mansion, which he declares the Arabs still designate as those of Hagar! (Williams, Holy City, 1, 465 sq.). SEE ABRAHAM.

## Hagarene or Hagarite[[@Headword:Hagarene or Hagarite]]

             [commonly Ha'arite] (Heb. Hagri', הִגְרַיfiugitive [compare Hagar, from the same root as the Arab. Hegirah, i.e. fight]; but, according to First, s.v., a patrial from some ancestor Hagar, otherwise unknown; 1Ch 11:38, Sept. Α᾿ταρα‹, Tulg. Agarai, A.V. “Haggeri;” 27:31, Α᾿γαρἰτης, Agariols, “Haggerite;” in the plur. Hagrim',הִגְרַים.,l Psa 83:6, Α᾿γαρηνοί, Agareni, “Hagarenes;” fully Hagriim', חִגְרַאַים, 1Ch 5:10; 1Ch 5:19-20, Sept. in 1Ch 5:10 πάροικοι, in 1Ch 5:19-20  Α᾿γαραῖοι,Vulg. Aagarei, A.V. “Hagarites;” Bar 3:23, υὶοί ςΑγαρ, Jilii Agar, “Agarenes”), occurs apparently as the national or local designation of two individuals, and also of a tribe or region, probably the same Arab people who appear at different periods of the sacred history as foreigners to the Hebrews. SEE ARABIA.

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

1. In 1Ch 11:38 of MIBHAR SEE MIBHAR (q.v.), one of David's mighty men, who is described as בֶןאּהִגרַי, υἱὸς Α᾿γαρι, filius Agarai, “the son of Haggeri, er, better (as the margin has it), “the Haggerite,” whose father's name is not given. This hero differs from some of his colleagues, “Zelek the Ammonite” (1Ch 11:39), for instance; or “Ithmah the Moabite” (1Ch 11:46), in that, while they were foreigners, he was only the son of a foreigner-a domiciled settler perhaps. SEE HAGGERI.

2. In 1Ch 27:31 of Aziz (q.v.), another of David's retainers, who was “over his flocks.” This man was himself a “Hagarite,” οΑ῾᾿γαρίτης, Agareus. A comparison of the next paragraph (II) will show how well qualified for his office this man was likely to be from his extraction from a pastoral race. (“A Hagarite had charge of David's flocks, and an Ishmaelite of his herds, because the animals were pastured in districts where these nomadic people were accustomed to ‘feed their cattle” [or, rather, because their experience made them skilful in such employments], Bertheai on Chronicles [Clarke's ed.], 2, 320.) One of the effects of the great victory over the Hagarites of Gilead and the East was probably that individuals of their nation entered the service of the victorious Israelites, either voluntarily or by coercion, as freemen or as slaves. Jaziz was-no doubt among the former, a man of eminence and intelligence among his countrymen, on which account he attracted the attention of his royal master, who seems to have liberally employed distinguished and meritorious foreigners in his service. SEE HAGGERITE.

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

1. Our first passage treats of a great war, which in the reign of king Saul was waged between the trans-Jordanic tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh on the one side, and their formidable neighbors, the Hagarites, aided by the kindred tribes of “Jetur, and Nephish, and Nodab,” on the  other. (Kindred tribes, we say, on the evidence of Gen 25:15. The. Arab tribes derived from Hagar and Ishmael, like the earlier stocks descended from Cush and Joktan, were at the same time generally known by the common patronymic of Ishmaelites or Hagarenes. Some regard the three specific names of Jetur, Nephish, and Nodab, not as distinct from, but in apposition with Hagarites; as if the Hagarites with whom the two tribes and a half successfully fought were the clans of Jetur, Nephish, and Nodab. See Forster's Geog. of Arabia, 1, 186-189.) The result of this war was extremely favorable to the eastern Israelites: many of the enemy were taken and many slain in the conflict (Gen 25:21-22); the victorious two tribes and a half took possession of the country, and retained it until the captivity (Gen 25:22). The booty captured on this occasion was enormous: “of camels 50.000, and of sheep 250,000, and of asses 2000” (Gen 25:21). Rosenmüller (Bibl. Geogr. [tr. by Morren], 3:140), following the Sept. and Luther, unnecessarily reduces the number of camels to 5000. When it is remembered that the wealth of a Bedouin chief, both in those and these times, consisted of cattle, the amount of the booty taken in the Hagarite war, though great, was not excessive. Job's stock is described as “7000 sheep, 3000 camels, 500 yoke of oxen, and 500 she-asses” (1, 3.). Mesha, king of Moab, paid to the king of Israel a tribute of 100,000 lambs and 100,000 rams (2Ki 3:4). In further illustration of this wealth of cattle, we may quote a passage from Stanley's Jewish Church, i, 215, 216: “Still the countless flocks and herds may be seen [in this very region conquered from the Hagarites], droves of cattle moving on like troops of soldiers, descending at sunset to drink of the springs-literally, in the language of the prophet, ‘rams and lambs, and goats and bullocks, all of them fatlings of Bashan.' “By this conquest, which was still more firmly ratified in the subsequent reign of David, the promise, which was given as early as Abraham's time (Gen 15:18) and renewed to Moses (Deu 1:7) and to Joshua (Jos 1:4), began to receive that accomplishment which was consummated by the glorious Solomon (1Ki 4:21). The large tract of country which this accrued to Israel stretched from the indefinite frontier of the pastoral tribes, to whom were formerly assigned the kingdoms of Sihon and Og, to the Euphrates. A comparison of 1Ch 5:9-20 with Gen 25:12-18, seems to show that this line of country, which (as the history informs us) extended eastward of Gilead and Bashan in the direction of the Euphrates, was substantially the same as that which Moses describes as peopled by the sons of Ishmael, whom Hagar bore to Abraham. “They dwelt,” says  Moses, “from Havilah Iuito Shur, that is before Egypt as thou goest towards Assyria” — in other words, across the country from the junction of the Euphrates with the Tigris to the Isthmus of Suez; and this is the spacious tract which we assign to the Hagarites or Hagarenes. The booty taken from the Hagarites and their allies proves that much of this territory was well adapted to pasturage, and therefore valuable to the nomadic habits of the conquerors (Num 32:1). The brilliancy of the conquest, moreover, exhibits the military prowess of these shepherds. Living amid races whose love of plunder is still illustrated in the predatory Bedouins of Eastern Palestine, they were obliged to erect fortresses for the protection of their pastures (Michaelis, Laws of Moses, art. 23), a precaution which seems to have been resorted to from the first. The sons of Ishmael are enumerated, Gen 25:16, “by their towns and by their castles;” and some such defensive. erections were no doubt meant by the children of Reuben and Gad in Num 32:16-17. SEE ISHMAELITES.

2. Though these eastern Israelites became lords paramount of this vast tract of country, it is not necessary to suppose that they exclusively occupied the entire region, nor that the Hagarites and their kindred, though subdued, were driven out; for it was probably in the same neighborhood that “the Hagarenes” of our second passage were living when they joined in the great confederacy against Israel with, among others, Edom, and Moab, and Ammon, and Analek (Psa 83:6 [Hebrews 7; Sept. 72:6]). When this combination took place is of little importance here; Mr. Thrupp (Psalms , 2, 60, 61) gives reasons for assigning it to the reigns of Jehoash and of his son Jeroboam 11. The psalm was probably written on the triumph of Jehoshaphat over the trans-Jordanic Bedouins (2 Chronicles 20). SEE PSALMS.

The nations, however, which constituted the confederacy with the Hagarenes, seem to confirm our opinion that these were still residing in the district, where in the reign of Saul they had been subjugated by their Israelitish neighbors. Rosenmüller (Bibl. Geogr. [trans.] 3:141) and Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 365) suggest that the Hagarenes when vanquished migrated to the south-east, because on the Persians Gulf there was the province of Hagar or Hagjar. This is the district which the Arabian geographers have carefully and prominently described (compare De Sacy's Chrestomathie Arube, 2, 123; Abllfeda [by Reinaud], 2, 1,137, who quotes Jakut's Moshtarek for some of his information; and Rommel's Commentary on Abulfeda, De Prov. Hagiar, site Bahh-rain, p. 87, 88, 89;  D'Herbelot, s.v. Hagr). We will not deny that this province probably derived its name and early inhabitants from Hagar and her son Ishmael (or, as Rabbi D. Kimchi would prefer, from Hagar, through some son by another father than Abraham): but we are not of opinion that these Hagarenes of the Persian Gulf, whose pursuits were so different, were identical with the Hagarenes of the Psalm before us, or with the Hagarites of 1 Chronicles, whom we have identified with them. Nothing pastoral is related of this maritime tribe; Rommel quotes from two Arabian geographers, Taifashi and Bakiu, who both describe these Hagarenes of the coast as much employed in pearl-fishing and such pursuits. Niebuhr (Travels in Arabia [Engl. tr.], 2, 151, 152) confirms their statement. Gesenius is also inexact in identifying these maritime Hagarenes with the Α᾿γραῖοι of Ptolemy, 5, 19, 2, and Eratosthenes, in Strabo, 16:767, and Pliny, 6:28. If the tribes indicated in these classical authors be the same (which is doubtful), they are much more correctly identified by an older writer, Dr. T. Jackson (Works [ed. Oxon.], 1, 220), who says: “The seat of such as the Scripture calls Hagares was in the desert Arabia, betwixt Gilead and Euphrates (1Ch 5:9-10). This people were called by the heathen Α᾿γραῖοι, Agraei, rightly placed by Ptolemy in the desert Arabia, and by Strabo in that very place which the Scripture makes the eastern bounds of Ishmael's posterity, to wit, next unto the inhabitants of ‘Havilal.” Amid the difficulty of identification, some modern geographers have distributed the classical Agraei in various localities. Thus, in Forster's maps of Arabia, they occupy both the district between Gilead and the Euphrates in the north, and also the western shores of the Persian Gulf.

The fact seems to be that many districts in Arabia were called by the generic appellation of Hagarite or Hagarene, no doubt after Hagar; as Keturah, another of Abraham's concubines, occasioned the rather vaguely- used name of Ketureans for other tribes of the Arabian peninsula (Forster, Geog. of Arabia, 2, 7). In the very section of Abulfeda which we have above quoted, that geographer (after the author of the Moshtarek) reminds us that the name Hajar (Hagar) is as extensive in meaning in Arabia as Shsam (Syria) and Irak elsewhere; in like manner Rommel, within a page or two, describes a Hagar in the remote province of Yemen; this, although an unquestionably different place (Reinaud, 2, 1-137, note), is yet confounded with the maritime Hajar. In proof of the uncertainty of the situation of places in Arabia of like name, we may mention that, while Abulfeda, Edrisi, Giauhari, and Golins distinguish between the Hagarenes of the north-east coast and those of the remote south-west district which  we have just mentioned, Nassir Edin, Olugbeig, and Büsching confound them as identical. Winer, Realw. s.v. Hagariter, mentions yet another Chhqjcr, which, though slightly different in form, might; be written much like our word in Hebrew חגרא, and is actually identical with it in the Syriac (Assemanni, Biblioth. Orient. 3, 2, 753). This place was in the province of Hejaz, on the Red Sea, on the main route between Damascus and Mecca. Such being the uncertainty connected with the sites of these Arab tribes, we the less hesitate to place the Hagarees of the Psalm in the neighborhood of Edom, Moab, and Ammon, in the situation which was in Saul's time occupied by the Hagarites, “near the main road which led” [or, more correctly, in the belt of country which stretched] “from the head of the Red Sea to the Euphrates” (Smith's Dict. of Geog. s.v. Agrei; see also Bochart, Phaleg [edit. Villemandy], 4:2, 225). The mention both of Ishmaelites and Ragarenes in this Psalm has led to the opinion that they are separate nations here meant. The verse, however, is in the midst of a poetic parallelism, in which the clauses are synonymous and not antithetic (comp. 1Ch 5:5-11), so that, if “Edom and the Ishmaelites” is not absolutely identical in geographical signification with “Moab and the Hagarenes,” there is at least a poetical identity between these two groups which forbids our separating them widely from each other in any sense (for the dispersed condition of the Hagarenes, see also Fuller, Misc. Sacr. 2, 12).

Combinations marked the relenting hostility of their neighbors towards the Jews to a very late period. One of these is mentioned in 1 Maccabees 5, as dispersed by Judas Maccabaus. “The children of Baean” (υἱοὶ Βαίαν) of 1Ma 5:4 have been by Hitzig conjectured to be the same as our Hagarenes; there is, however, no other ground for this opinion than their vicinity to Edom and Ammon, and the difficulty of making them fit in with any other tribe as conveniently as with that which is the subject of this article (see J. Olshausen, die Psalmen, p. 345).

3. In the passage from Bar 3:23 there are attributed to “the Agarenes” qualities of wisdom for which the Arabian nation has long been celebrated, skill in proverbial philosophy (comp. Freytag, Arob. Prov. tom. 3, praef.); in this accomplishment they have associated with them “the merchants of Meran and of Theman.” This is not the place to discuss the site of Meran, which some have placed on the Persian Gulf, and others on the Red Sea; it is enough to observe that their mercantile habits gave them a shrewdness in practical knowledge which rendered them worthy of comparison with “the merchants of Theman” or Edom. Forster makes these Themanese to be  inhabitants of the maritime Bahrain, and therefore Hagarenes (1, 303); but in this he is flagrantly inconsistent with. his own good canon (1, 291): “The n me of the son of Eliphaz and of his descendants [the Edomites] is uniformly written Teman in the original Hebrew, and that of the son of Ishmael and his family [the Hagarenes or Ishmaelites] as uniformly Tema [without the n].” The wisdom of these Themanese merchants is expressly mentioned in Jer 49:7, and Oba 1:8. The Hagarenes of this passage we would place among the inhabitants of the shores of the Persian Gulf, where (see 1) Gesenius and others placed “the Hagarites” after their conquest by the trans-Jordanic Israelites. The clause, “That seek wisdom on earth” [that is, “who acquire experience and intelligence from intercourse with mankind”] (οἱ ἐκζητοῦντες τὴν σύνεσιν οἱ ἐπἱ τῆς γῆς, is surely corrupt, because meaningless: by the help of the Vulgate and the Syriacit has been conjectured by some [by Havernick and Fritzsche, ad loc., for instance] that instead of οἱ ἐπι we should read τὴν ἐπὶ, q. d. “the wisdom [or common sense] which is cognizant of the earth its men and manners;” an attainment which mercantile persons acquire better than all else), seems to best fall in with the habits of a seafaring and mercantile race (see Fritzsche, das Buch. Baruch, p. 192; and Havernick, whose words he quotes: “Hagareni terram quasi perlustrantes dicuntur, quippe mercatores longe celeberrimi antiquissimis jamjam temporibus”).

## Hagemann, Johann Georg[[@Headword:Hagemann, Johann Georg]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died at Blankenburg in 1765, a superintendent, wrote Betrachtungen uber die funf Bucher Moses  (Bruhswick, 1732-44): — Von den vorwehmsten Uebersetzungen der heiligen Schrift (Quedlinburg, 1747). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hagen, Friedrich Caspar[[@Headword:Hagen, Friedrich Caspar]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died April 13, 1741, member of consistory, court-preacher, and superintendent at Bayreuth, is the author of, De Conventu Snobacenae (Bayreuth 1717): — De θηριομαχίᾷ Pauli (Wittenberg, 1703; also found in Thesaurus Novus Theol. Philol. 2:875 sq.): — Memoriae Philosophorum, Oratorum, Poetarum, Historicorum, etc. (Bayreuth, 1710): — Die Ausgabe einer deutschen Bibel Lutheri. See Baumgarten, Merkwurdige Bucher, 9:107; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:751; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hagenau, Conference of[[@Headword:Hagenau, Conference of]]

             a theological conference called by the German emperor in 1539 in order to bring about a reunion between Protestants and Roman Catholics. Having originally been convoked to Worms, it was transferred to Hagenau in consequence of an epidemic prevailing in the former city. It lasted from June 12 to July 16, 1540. As it was not deemed safe to send Luther without a special protection, and as Melancthon fell sick during the journey, the Protestants were represented by Brenz, Osiander, Capito, Cruciger, and Myconius; and the Roman Catholics by Eck, Faber, and Cochlaus. The conference led to no definite results. It was agreed that an equal number of representatives, chosen by the two parties, should meet at Worms, and resume the negotiations for a union. — Herzog, 19, 589. (A.J.S.)

## Hagenbach, Karl Rudolf[[@Headword:Hagenbach, Karl Rudolf]]

             a Swiss theologian, was born at Basle, March 4, 1801. Besides the university of his native place, he studied at Bonn and Berlin, and in these places received the instruction of Lucke, Schliermacher, and Neander. Having returned to Basle, he commenced his. academical career by presenting Observationes Historico-Hermeneuticae circa Origenis Methodum Interpretandae Scripturae Sacrae (1823), and six years later he was made professor ordinarius in the theological faculty. For fifty years he belonged to the Basle University, and exerted a wide influence, not only as a teacher, but also as a preacher. He died June 7, 1874. Hagenbach's first important work was Encyklopadie und Methodologie der theol. Wissenschaften (Leipsic, 1833; 11th ed. by Kauitzsch, 1884; Engl. transl. by Crooks and Hurst, as volume 3 of Library of Biblical and Theological Literature, N.Y. 1884): — Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte (1840; 4th ed. 1867; Engl. transl. by Beech, Edinburgh, revised and enlarged by Dr. H.B. Smith, N.Y. 1861, 2 volumes; new ed. with preface by Plumptre, Edinburgh, 1880, 3 volumes): — Grundzuge der Homiletik und Liturgik (1863). His largest work is the Kirchengeschichte von der altesten Zeit bis zum 19. Jahrhundert (Leipsic, 1869-72, 7 volumes; that part which treats of the 18th and 19th centuries has been translated into English by Dr. Hurst, N.Y. 1869, 2 volumes): — OEcolampad und Myconius (Elberfeld, 1859): — Predigten (9 volumes). Besides, he contributed to Herzog's Encyklopicdia and other theological reviews. See Eppler, Karl Rudolf Hagenbach (Guterslohe, 1875); PlittHerzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.;  Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:487 sq. (B.P.)

## Hager, E.W., D.D[[@Headword:Hager, E.W., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman of the diocese of central New York, was a chaplain of the U.S. Navy. At one time he was rector of All Saints' Church, Worcester, Massachusetts, and subsequently of St. George's Church, Utica, N.Y. He died in Chicago, Illinois, July 7, 1880. See Whittaker, Almanac and Directory, 1881.

## Hagerite[[@Headword:Hagerite]]

             [or Ha'gerite] (Heb. with the art. haFIagri', הִהִגְרַי, the Hagrite; Sept. οΑ῾᾿γαρίτης, Vulg. Agareus), a designation of Jaziz (q.v.), one of David's agricultural officers (1Ch 27:31). SEE HAGARITE.

## Haggadah[[@Headword:Haggadah]]

             (Heb. anecdote, legend), in the Talmud and with the Rabbis the name for traditional stories, legends, etc. used in the interpretation and elucidation of the law and the prophets. Many of the haggadoth in the Talmud are absurd and preposterous, and they are not held by the best Rabbins as authoritative. Maimonides says of them: “Beware that you take not these words of the hachimim (wise) literally, for this would be degrading to the sacred doctrine, and sometimes to contradict it. Seek rather the hidden sense; and if you cannot find the kernel, let the shell alone, and confess ‘I cannot understand this'“(Perush Hammishnayoth). — Furst, Kulturgeschichte d. Juden. 1, 74; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebr. Lit. p. 182; Jost, Gesch. d. Juden. 1, 178; 2, 313. The Haggadah frequently refers to the Halachah (rule, norm), the oral law of tradition, brief sentences established by the authority of the Sanhedrim, in which the law was interpreted and applied to individual cases, and which were designated as the “sentences of the elders.” SEE MIDRASH. (J. H. W.)

## Haggai[[@Headword:Haggai]]

             (Heb. Chaggay', חִגִּי, festive; Sept. and Joseph. Α᾿γγἃ ιος; Jerome and Vulg. Aggaeus or Hagaeus), the tenth in order of the twelve minor prophets, and the first of the three who, after the return of the Jews from the Babylonian exile, prophesied in Palestine. Of the place and year of his birth, his descent, and the leading incidents of his life, nothing is known which can be relied on (see Oehler, in Herzog's Encyk. 5, 471 sq.). The more fabulous traditions of Jewish writers, who pass him for all assessor of the Synagogea Magna, and enlarge on his literary avocations, have been collected by Carpzov (Introductio in V. T. 3,426). Some interpreters, indeed, taking in its literal sense the expression מִלְאִךְ יְהוָֹה(malak Yehovah) in 1:13, have imagined that he was an angel in human shape (Jerome, Comm. ad loc.). Some ancient writers assert that he was born in Babylon, and while yet a young mall came to Jerusalem, when Cyrus, in the year B.C. 536, allowed the Jews to return to their country (2Ch 34:23; Ezr 1:1); the new colony consisting chiefly of people belonging to the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi, with a few from other tribes. According to the same tradition, he was buried with honor near the sepulchers of the priests (Isidor. Hispal. c. 49; Pseudo Dorotheus, in Chronicles Pasch. 151, d). It has hence been conjectured that he was of priestly rank. Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, according to the Jewish writers, were the men who were with Daniel when he saw the vision related in Daniel 10, and were after the captivity members of the Great Synagogue, which consisted of 120 elders (Cozri, 3, 65). The Seder Olam Zuta places their death in the 52nd year of the Medes and Persians, while the extravagance of another tradition makes Haggai survive till the entry of Alexander the Great into Jerusalem, and even till the time of our Savior (Carpzov, Introd.). In the Roman martyrology Hosea and Haggai are joined in the catalogue of saints (Acta Sanctor. 4 Julii). SEE EZRA.

This much appears from Haggai's prophecies (Hag 1:1, etc.), that he flourished during the reign of the Persian monarch Darius Hystaspis, who ascended the throne B.C. 521. It is probable that he was one of the exiles who returned with Zerubbabel and Jeshua: and Elwald (die Proph. d. AIt. B.) is even tempted to infer from Hag 2:3, that he may have been one of the few survivors who had seen the first Temple in its splendor (Bleek, Einleit. p. 549). The rebuilding of the Temple, which was commenced in the reign of Cyrus (B.C. 535), was suspended during the reigns of his successors, Cambyses and Pseudo-Smerdis, in consequence of the determined hostility of the Samaritans. — On the accession of Darius Hystaspis (B.C. 521), the prophets Haggai and Zechariah urged the renewal of the undertaking, and obtained the permission and assistance of the king (Ezr 5:1; Ezr 6:14; Josephus, Ant. 11, 4). Animated by the high courage (magni spiritus, Jerome) of these devoted men, the people prosecuted the work with vigor, and the Temple was completed and dedicated in the sixth year of Darius (B.C. 516). SEE TEMPLE.

The names of Haggai and Zechariah are associated in the Sept. in the titles of Psalms 137, 145-148 in the Vulgate in those of Psalms 111, 145; and in the Peshito Syriac in those of Psalms 125, 126, 145, 140-1, 147, 148. It may be that tradition assigned to these prophets the arrangement of the above-mentioned psalms for use in the Temple service, just as Psa 64:1; in the Vulgate attributed to Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and the name of the former is inscribed at the head of Psalms 136 in the Sept. According to Pseudo-Epiphanius (De Vitis Proph.), Haggai was the first who chanted  the Hallelujah in the second Temple: ‘; wherefore,” he adds, “we say ‘Hallelujah, which is the hymn (of Haggai and Zechariah “Haggai is mentioned in the Apocrypha as AGGEUS, in 1Es 6:1; 1Es 7:3; 2 Esdr. 1, 40; and is alluded to in Sir 49:11 (comp. Hag 2:23), and Heb 12:26 (Hag 2:6). SEE ZECHARIAH.

## Haggai, Prophecy Of[[@Headword:Haggai, Prophecy Of]]

             These vaticinations are comprised in a book of two chapters, and consist of discourses so brief and summary as to have led some German theologians to suspect that they have not come down to us in their original complete form, but are only an epitome (Eichhorn, Einleitung in des A. T. 3:§ 598; Jahn, Introductio in libros sacros Vet. Fied. edit. 2,Viennse, 1814, § 156).

Their object generally is to urge the rebuilding of the Temple, which had, indeed, been commenced as early as B.C. 535 (Ezr 3:10), but was afterwards discontinued, the Samaritans having obtained an edict from the Persian king (Ezr 4:7) which forbade further procedure, and influential Jews pretending that the time for rebuilding the Temple had not arrived, since the seventy years predicted by Jeremiah applied to the Temple also (Zec 1:2). As on the death of Pseudo-Smerdis (the “ARTAXERXES” of Ezra 4 see Ezr 4:24), and the consequent termination of his interdict, the Jews still continued to wait for the end of the seventy years, and were only engaged in building splendid houses for themselves, Haggai began to prophesy in the second year of Darius, B.C. 520.

His first discourse (Haggai 1), delivered on the first day of the sixth month of the year mentioned, denounced the listlessness of the Jews, who dwelt in their “paneled houses,” while the temple of the Lord was roofless and desolate. The displeasure of God was manifest in the failure of all their efforts for their own gratification. The heavens were “stayed from dew,” and the earth was “stayed from her fruit.” They had neglected that which should have been their first care, and reaped the due wages of their selfishness (Hag 1:4-11). The words of the prophet sank deep into the hearts of the people and their leaders. They acknowledged the voice of God speaking by his servant, and obeyed the command. Their obedience was rewarded with the assurance of God's presence (Hag 1:13), and twenty-four days afterwards the building was resumed. The second discourse (Hag 2:1-9), delivered on the twenty-first day of the seventh month, shows that a month had scarcely elapsed when the work seems to have slackened, and the enthusiasm of the people abated. The  prophet, ever ready to rekindle their zeal encouraged the flagging spirits of the chiefs with the renewed assurance of God's presence, and the fresh promise that, stately and magnificent as was the Temple of their wisest king, the glory of the latter house should be greater than the glory of the former (Hag 2:3-9). The third discourse (Hag 2:10-19), delivered on the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month, refers to a period when building materials had been collected, and the workmen had begun to put them together. Yet the people were still comparatively inactive, and after two months we thus find him again censuring their sluggishness, which rendered worthless all their ceremonial observances. ‘But the rebuke was accompanied by a repetition of the promise (Hag 2:19). The fourth and last discourse (Hag 2:20-23), delivered also on the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month, is exclusively addressed to Zerubbabel, the political chief of the new Jewish colony, who, it appears, had asked for an explanation regarding the great political revolutions which Haggai had predicted in his second discourse: it comforts the governor by assuring him they would not take place very soon, and not in his lifetime. As Zerubbabel was prince of Judah, the representative of the royal family of David, and, as such the lineal ancestor of the Messiah, this closing prediction foreshadows the establishment of the Messianic kingdom (see Hengstenberg, Christology, 3, 243 sq.) upon the overthrow of the thrones of the nations (Hag 2:23).

The style of the discourses of Haggai is suitable to their contents: it is pathetic when he exhorts, it is vehement when he reproves, it is somewhat elevated when he treats of future events, and it is not altogether destitute of a poetical coloring, though a prophet of a higher order would have depicted the splendor of the second Temple in brighter hues. The language labors under a poverty of terms, as may be observed in the constant repetition of the same expressions, which Eichhorn (Einleitung, § 599) attributes to an attempt at ornament, rendering the writer disposed to recur frequently to a favorite expression.

The prophetical discourses of Haggai are referred to in the Old and New Testament (Ezr 5:1; Ezr 6:14; Heb 12:20; comp. Haggai 2:7, 8:22). In most of the ancient catalogues of the canonical books of the Old Testament Haggai is not, indeed, mentioned by name; but, as they specify the twelve minor prophets, he must have been included among them, as otherwise their number would not be full. Josephus, mentioning Haggai and Zechariah (Anf. 11, 4, 5), calls them δύο προφῆται. (See generally  Bertholdt, Einleitunq, 4, 169; Davidson, in Horne's Introduc. new ed. 2, 972 sq.; Hassc, Gesch. der A. B. p. 203 sq.; Smith, Scripture Testimony, 1, 283 sq.)

Special commentaries on the whole of this prophecy exclusively have been written by Rupertus Titiensis, In Aggaeum (in Opp. 1); Melancthon, Argumentum (in Opp. 2); Ecke, Commentarius (Saling. 1538, 8vo); Wicelius, Enarratio (Mog. 1541); Varenius, Exercitations (Rost. 1548, 1550, 4to); Draconis, Explicatio (Lub. 1549, fol.); Mercer, Scholia (Paris, 1557, 4to); Pilkington, Exposition (London, 1560, 8vo); Brocardus, Interpretatio [includ. some other books] (L. B. 1580, 8vo); Grynseus, Commentarius (Genesis 1581, 8vo; translated into English, Lond. 1586, 12mo); Reinbeck, Exercitationes (Brunsw. 1592, 4to); Balwin, Commentarius (including Zechariah and Malachi] (Vitemb. 1610, 8vo); Tarnovius, Commentarius (Rostock, 1624, 4to); Willius, Commenetatirs [including Zechariah and Malachi] (Brcm. 1638, 8vo); Raynolds, Interpretation (Lond. 1649, 4to); Pfeffinger, Notce (Argent. 1703, 4to); Woken, Adnotationes (Lips. 1719, 4to) Kall, Dissertationes (s. 1. 1771-3, 4to); Hessler, Illustratio (Lunid. 1799, 4to): Scheibel, Observationes (Vratisl. 1822, 4to); Moore, Notes, etc. [including Zechariah and Malachi] (N. Y. 1856, 8vo); Kohler, Erklarung (Erlangen, 1860, 8vo)'; Aben-Ezra's annotations on Haggai have been translated by Abicht (in his Selectae Rabb. Lips. 1705), Lund (Upsal. 1706), and Chytraeus (ib. eod.); Abarbanel's by Scherzer (Lpz. 1633, 1705) and Mundin (Jena, 1719),: Kimchi's by Nol (Par. 1557). Expositions of particular passages are those of Staudlin [on 2, 1-9] (Tüb. 1784), Benzel [on 2, 9] (in his Syntaom. Dissertt. 2, 116 sq.), Sartorius [on 2, 7 (Tüb. 1756), Vesschuir [on 2, 6-9] (in his Diss. Phil. No. 6), Essen [on 2, 23] (Vitemb. 1759). SEE PROPHETS, MINOR.

## Haggeri[[@Headword:Haggeri]]

             (Heb. Hagri', הִגְרַי., a Hagarite; Sept. Α᾿ταρα‹ v.r. Α᾿γρί, Vulg. Agatrai). “Mibhar, son of Haggeri,” was one of the mighty men of David's guard, according to the catalogue of 1Ch 11:38. The parallel passage 2Sa 23:36 -has “Bani the Gadite” (הִגָּדַי). This Kennicott thinks was the original, from which “Haggeri” has been corrupted (Dissert. p. 214). The Targum has Bar Gedt (בִּר גְּדָא). SEE HAGARENE.

## Haggerty, John[[@Headword:Haggerty, John]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Prince George County, Md., Feb. 18, 1747. He was converted under the ministry of John King about 1771. He began to preach among his neighbors the same year, and continued to labor diligently for the Church, under the direction of Strawbridge, Rankin, and King, till he entered the regular itinerancy in the “year 1779.” He preached both in English and German. He was instrumental in the conversion of not a few men of ability, who became ornaments of the ministry. He located, owing to the sickness of his wife, in 1792, and settled in Baltimore, where he continued to preach with great acceptance. He was one of the original elders of the Church, and died in the faith Sept. 4, 1823, aged seventy-six years. — Stevens, History of the M. E. Church, 2. 66, 496; 3:144,146.

## Haggi[[@Headword:Haggi]]

             (Heb. Chaggi', חִגַּי, ,festive; Sept. Α᾿γγυίς), the second of the seven sons of the patriarch Gad (Gen 46:16), and progenitor of the family of HAGGITES (Num 26:15; Sept. Α᾿γγί). B.C. prob. ante 1784.

## Haggiah[[@Headword:Haggiah]]

             (Heb. Chaggiyah', חִגַּיָּה,festival of Jehovah: Sept. Α᾿γγία), a Levite of the family of Merari, apparently the son of Shimea and father of Asaiah, which last seems to have been contemporary with David (1Ch 6:30 [Heb. 15]). B.C. ante 1043.

## Haggite[[@Headword:Haggite]]

             (Heb. only as a collect. with the art. haChaggi', הִחִגַּי[for הַחִגַּיַּי]; Sept. οΑ῾᾿γγί, Vulg. Agitce, A.V. “the Haggites”), the family title of the descendants of the son of Gad of the same [Heb.] name (Num 26:15). SEE HAGGI.

## Haggith[[@Headword:Haggith]]

             (Heb. Chaggith', חִגַּית; Sept. Α᾿γγίθ v.r. φεγγίθ, but Α᾿γγείθ in 1Ch 2:3; Josephus Α᾿γγίθη, Ant. 7:14,4), a. wife of David, only known as the mother of Adonijah (2Sa 3:4; 1 Kings 1, 5, 11; 1 Kings 2, 13; 1Ch 3:2); but apparently married to David after his  accession to the throne. B.C. 1053. SEE DAVID. “Her son was, like Absalom, renowned for his handsome presence. In the first and last of the above passages Haggith is fourth in order of mention among the wives, Adonijah being also fourth among the sons. His Mirth happened at Hebron (2Sa 3:2; 2Sa 3:5) shortly after that of Absalom (1Ki 1:6, where it will be observed that the words ‘his mother' are inserted by the translators)” (Smith, s.v.). The Heb. name is merely the fern. of the adj. that appears in the names, HAGGI, etc., and seems to be indicative of festivity in the religious sense SEE FESTIVAL; Fürst renders it “born at the Feast of Tabernacles” (Heb. Lex. s.v.), and Mr. Grove (in Smith, ut sup.) regards it as “a dancer,” from the primitive sense of the root חָגִג.

## Hagia[[@Headword:Hagia]]

             (Α᾿γία or Α᾿γιά, Vulg. Aggia), given in the Apocrypha (1 Esd. 5, 34) as the name of one of the “servants of Solomon” whose “sons” returned to Jerusalem after the exile; instead of HATTIL SEE HATTIL (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezr 2:57; Neh 7:59).

## Hagidgad[[@Headword:Hagidgad]]

             SEE HOR-HA-GIDGAD.

## Hagiographa[[@Headword:Hagiographa]]

              Α῾γιόγραφα (Holy Writings), a term first found in Epiphanius (Panariun, p. 58), who used it, as well as γραφἓ ια, to denote the third division of the Scriptures, called by the Jews כְּתוּבַים, or the Writings, consisting of five books, SEE MEGILLOTH, viz. the three poeins (אמת), Job, Proverbs, and the Psalms, and the two books of Chronicles.

These divisions are found in the Talmud (Baba Bathra, fol. 1, ed. Amsterdam), where the sacred books are classified under the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings (Ketubim). The last are thus enumerated (l. c.): Ruth, the book (sepher) of Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes (Koheleth), the Song of Songs, Lamentations, Daniel, and the books (megilloth) of Esther, Ezra, and Chronicles. The Jewish writers, however, do not uniformly follow this arrangement, as they sometimes place the Psalms or the book of Job first among the hagiographa. Jerome gives the arrangement followed by the Jews in his time. He observes that they  divided the Scriptures into five books of Moses, eight prophetical books (viz.

1. Joshua

2. Judges and Ruth

3. Samuel;

4. Kings;

5. Isaiah

6. Jeremiah

7. Ezekiel

8. The twelve prophets), and

9. Hagiographa, viz. 1. Job 2. David, five parts; 3. Solomon, three parts; 4. Koheleth; 5. Song of Solomon 6. Daniel , 7. Chronicles; 8. Esdras, two books [viz. Ezra and Nehemiah]; 9. Esther.

“Some however,” he adds, “place Ruth and Lamentations among the Hagiographa rather than among the prophetical books.' “We find a different arrangement in Josephus, who reckons thirteen prophetical books, and four containing hymns and moral precepts (Apiont, 1, 8), from which it would appear that after the time of Josephus the Jews comprised many books among the prophets which had previously belonged to the Hagiographa. It has however, been considered as more probable that Josephus had no authority from manuscripts for his classification.

The earliest notice which we find of these divisions is that contained in the prologue to the book of Ecclesiasticus, written B.C. cir. 140, the author of which refers to the Law, the Prophets, and the other books; by which last were most probably meant the Hagiographa. Philo also speaks of the Laws, the Prophets, the Hymns, and the other books, but without classifying them. In the New Testament we find three corresponding divisions mentioned, viz. the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms; which last book has been supposed to have given its name to the third division, from the  circumstance of its then being the first in the catalogue (Luk 24:44). Havernick, however (Handbuch, p. 78), supposes that Luke calls the Hagiographa by the name of Psalms, rather on account of the poetical character of several of its parts. The “book of the Prophets” is referred to in the New Testament as a distinct volume (Act 7:42, where the passage indicated is Amos 5, 25, 26). It is, well known that the second class was divided by the Jews into the early Prophets, viz. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings; and the later Prophets, viz. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel (called the major prophets), and the book of the twelve (minor) prophets.

When this division of books was first introduced it is now impossible to ascertain. Probably it commenced after the return from the exile, with the first formation of the canon. Still more difficult is it to ascertain the principle on which the classification was formed. The rabbinical writers maintain that the authors of the Ketubim enjoyed only the lowest degree of inspiration, as they received no immediate communication from the deity, like that made to Moses, to whom God spoke face to face; and that they did not receive their knowledge through the medium of visions and dreams, as was the case with the prophets or the writers of the second class; but still that they felt the Divine Spirit resting on them and inspiring them with suggestions. This is the view maintained by Abarbanel (Praef in Proph. priores, fol. 20, 1), Kimchi (Praef. in Psalm.), Maimonides (More Nebochim, 2, 45, p. 317), and Elias Levita (Tisbi); which last writer defines the word כתום to mean a work written by divine inspiration. The placing of Ruth among the Hagiographa, and especially the separation of Lamentations from Jeremiah, seems, however, to be irreconcilable with this hypothesis; nor is it easy to assign a satisfactory reason why the historical: books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings should be placed among the Prophets, and the book of Chronicles among the Biographa. The reasons generally assigned for this, as well as for placing in the third class the books of Psalms, Daniel, and Job, are so fanciful and unsatisfactory as to have led Christian writers to form other and more definite classifications. It will suffice to mention the reason assigned by Rabbi Kinchi for excluding Daniel from the book of Prophets, viz. that he has not equaled the other prophets in his visions and dreams. Others assign the late date of the book of Daniel as the reason for the insertion of it, as well as of some historical books, in the Hagiographa, inasmuch as the collection of the prophets was closed at the date of the composition of this book (De Wette, §:255). Bertholdt, who is of this opinion (Einleitung, 1,70 sq.), thinks that the  word Ketubim means “books newly introduced into the canon” (p. 81). Hengstenberg (Authentie des Daniel, etc., p, 25 sq.) follows the ancient opinions of the Rabbins, and maintains that the book of Daniel was placed in the Hagiographa in consequence of the lower degree of inspiration attached to it; — but herein he is opposed by Havernick (Handbuch, p. 62). De Wette (§ 13) supposes that the first two divisions (the Law and the Prophets) were closed a little after the time of Nehemiah (compare 2Ma 2:13-14), and that perhaps at the end of the Persian period the Jews commenced the formation of the Hagiographa, which long remained “changeable and open.” The collection of the Psalms was not yet completed when the two first parts were formed. SEE KETHUBIM.

It has been concluded from Mat 23:35, and Luk 11:51, compared with Luk 24:14, that as the Psalms were the first, so were Chronicles the last book in the Hagiographa (Carpzov, Introd. 4, 25). If, when Jesus spoke of the righteous blood shed from the blood of Abel (Gen 4:8) to that of Zechariah, he referred, as most commentators suppose, to Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada (2Ch 24:20-21), there appears a peculiar appositeness in the appeal to the first and the last books in the canon. The book of Chronicles still holds the last place in the Hebrew Bibles, which are all arranged according to the threefold division. The late date of Chronicles may in some measure account for its separation from the book of Kings; and this ground holds good whether we fix the era of the chronicler, with Zunz, at about B.C. 260, or, with Movers, we conceive him to have been a younger contemporary of Nehemiah, and to have written about B.C. 400 (Kritische Untersuchung über de Biblische Chronik, Bonn, 1834). The circumstance of the existence of a few acknowledged later additions, such as 1Ch 3:19-24, does not militate against this hypothesis, as these may have been supplied by the last editor. SEE CHRONICLES, BOOKS OF. De Wette conceives that the genealogy in this passage comes down only to the third generation after Nehemiah. SEE CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

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

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

## Hagiolatry[[@Headword:Hagiolatry]]

             SEE SAINTS, WORSHIP OF.

## Hagioscope[[@Headword:Hagioscope]]

             a word used by English ecclesiastical writers to describe openings made through different parts of the interior walls of the church, generally on either side of the chancel arch, so as to afford a view of the altar to those worshipping in the aisles.

## Hagiosideron[[@Headword:Hagiosideron]]

             (ἁγιοσίδηρον, holy iron), one of the substitutes for bells still used in the East (also called τὸ σιδηροῦν, κροῦσμα). SEE SEMANTRON. It usually consists of an iron plate, curved like the tire of a wheel, which is struck with a hammer, and produces a sound not unlike that of a gong. They are occasionally made of brass. See Neale, Eastern Church, Int. pages 217, 225; Daniel, Codex Lit. 4:199.

## Hagnoaldus, Saint[[@Headword:Hagnoaldus, Saint]]

             SEE CAGNOALDUS.

## Hague, WILLIAM, D.D[[@Headword:Hague, WILLIAM, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Pelham, N.Y., January 4, 1808. Graduating from Hamilton College in 1826, and from Newton Theological Institute in 1829, he entered the ministry of his Church, serving as pastor until 1869, when he became professor of homiletics at the Chicago Baptist Theological Seminary. He died August 1, 1887. He was the author of The Authority and Perpetuity of the Christian Sabbath, and other volumes. See Appletons' Cyclop. of Amer. Biography.

## Hahiroth[[@Headword:Hahiroth]]

             SEE PI-HA-HIROTH.

## Hahn, August[[@Headword:Hahn, August]]

             a distinguished German Protestant theologian, Orientalist, and opponent of rationalism, was born at Grossosterhausen, near Querfurt, in Prussian Saxony, March 27, 1792. His father died before he was nine years old, but his pastor, Stossen, generously instructed the orphan with his own son, and secured his admission to the gymnasium at Eisleben. In 1810 Hahn entered the University of Leipsic, where, he tells us (Preface to Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens, 2nd ed.), he lost his early faith and peace, the fruits of a pious mother's teachings, and became imbued with the prevailing rationalism. After a three-years' course, in which, besides adding to his stock of classic and theological learning, he had studied Oriental languages and literature, especially Syriac and Arabic, he engaged in teaching. In  1817 he entered the newly established theological school at Wittenberg, where, under happier religious influences and inspirations, he regained his lost faith and peace, and was henceforth active in seeking to impart them to other minds and hearts. In 1819 he was appointed professor extraordinary, and in 1821 ordinary professor of theology in the University of Konigsberg, and during his occupancy of that post published Bardesanes, Gnosticus, Syrorum primsus hymnologus (Leipsic, 1819), a work which earned for him thedoctorate of theology. This was followed by several other publications in patristic literature, viz. De gnosi Marcionis (1820): — A Antitheses Marcionis, etc. (1823): Das Evangelium Marcions, etc. (1823): — De Canone Marcionis (1824): — Chrestonathia Syriaca, s. S. Ephrcemi, etc. (in conjunction with Seiffert) (1825); besides treatises in several periodicals. Being called in 1826 to the professorship of theology in the University of Leipsic, Hahn was thrown into the midst of theological controversy, and gave expression to his antagonism to the Rationalists in his treatise — De Rationalismi, qui dicitur, Vera Indole et qua cum Naturalismo contineatur ratione (Leipsic, 1827), in which he asserts the necessity of supernatural revelation, and the inability of man by nature to attain “certain and complete knowledge of religious truths,” and aims to show historically that rationalism had always been regarded by the Church as hostile to Christianity, and that it was the offspring of naturalism and deism. He developed this antagonism still further in his Ogine Erkaldrung an die Evangelische Kirche zunichst in Sachsen und Preussen (1827), wherein he maintains that Rationalists cannot be considered as Christian teachers, and ought in conscience to withdraw from the evangelical Church. His efforts in favor of evangelical orthodoxy were continued in his Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens (1828; 2nd ed. 1857), and Sendschreiben an Bretschneider über die Lage des Christenthums in uitserer Zeit und das Verhaltniss christlicher Theologie zur Wissenschalf überhault (1832). The last work especially led to his call to Breslau in 1833 as professor, and his appointment as consistorial counselor, a position of great importance in the direction of ecclesiastical affairs. In 1844 he was made general superintendent for Silesia, which post he filled until his death, May 13, 1863, and in which he was able to exert considerable influence in behalf of the evangelical party among the clergy. The most important of his writings not already mentioned are, Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der apostol. — catholischen Kirche (1842): — Theologisch- Lirchliche Annalen (Breslau, 1842-44):Das Bekenntniss der evangelischen Kirche und die ordinatorische Verpflichtung ihrer Diener  (1847): — Das Bekenntniss der evangelischen Kirche in seinem Terhialtnise zu den der romischen und griechischen (1853): — Predigten und Reden unter den Bewegungen in Kirche und Staat seit dem J. 1830 (1852). See obituary notice of Hahn in the Allgemeine Kirchen-Zeitung for 1863, No. 75-77, and an autobiographical sketch of his life up to 1830 in Dietzsch's Homilet. Journal, 1830, vol. 2, pt. 1; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 19, 593 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 164; New Amer. Cyclop. 8, 634. (J.W. M.)

## Hahn, Christoph Ulrich[[@Headword:Hahn, Christoph Ulrich]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born in 1805 at Wurtemberg. In 1833 he was deacon, in 1859 pastor at Haslach, and died January 5, 1881, at Stuttgart, doctor of theology and philosophy. He organized the Evangelical Society at Stuttgart, and took a great interest in the work of missions. He published, Der symbolischen Bucher der evangelischprotestantischen Kirche-Bedeutung und Schicksale (Stuttgart, 1833): — Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Ketzer, besonders im 11, 12, u. 13 Jahrhundert ( 1846-50, 3 volumes): — Handbuchlein fur  Kirchenalteste (1851). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:490; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:335. (B.P.)

## Hahn, Heinrich August[[@Headword:Hahn, Heinrich August]]

             eldest son of August Hahn, was born at Konigsberg June 19, 1821, and died Dec. 1, 1861, at Greifswald. After having studied at Breslau and Berlin, he devoted himself to Old-Testament exegesis and theology. He was tutor (privatdocent) at Breslau in 1845, went thence in 1846 to Konigsberg as professor ad interim on the death of Havernick, and in 1851 became professor extraordinary, and in 1860 ordinary professor at Greifswald, succeeding Kosegarten. He edited Havernick's Vorlesungen fiber die Theologie des A. Testamnents (1848). His chief works are, a dissertation De Spe immzorttalitatis sub Vet. Testam. etc.; Veteris testcam. sententia de Natura hominis (1846): — Commentar über das Buch Hiob (1850): — Ubersetzung und Erklarung des Hohen Liedes (1852): — Erklarung von Jesaia Kapiel 40-46 (forming vol. 3 of Drechsler's commentary on Isaiah, 1857): — Commentar über das Predigerbuch Slomno's (1860). His works evince the care and fidelity which characterized the man, but his criticisms are sometimes marked by great boldness. He was a man of mild temper and great purity of character. See Allgemeine Kirchen-Zeitung for 1862, No. 26; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 19, 597. (J.W. M.)

## Hahn, Hermann Joachim[[@Headword:Hahn, Hermann Joachim]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1679 at Grabow, in Mecklenburg. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1706 deacon at Dresden, and finally preacher there. He was stabbed by a fanatical Roman Catholic, May 21, 1726. He wrote De iis, quae circa Receptam de Sabbatho Doctrinam, a non Neomine Nuper in Dubium Vocata sunt (Leipsic, 1703), besides a number of ascetical works. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hahn, Johann Bernhard[[@Headword:Hahn, Johann Bernhard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Konigsberg in 1685, and died there, July 8, 1755, doctor and professor of theology. He wrote, De Appellatione Linguae Hebraeae quae dicitur Sancta (Konigsberg, 1715): — De Cornubus Altaris Extremis: — De Festo Ebraeorum Purin: — Introductio ad Jesaiam (1735): — Introductio ad Jeremiam (1736): — De Anno Ebraeorum Jubileo (1746): — De שלוים ad Num 11:31. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon. s.v. (B.P.)

## Hahn, Johann Friedrich[[@Headword:Hahn, Johann Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born August 15, 1710, at Bayreuth. He studied at Jena and Halle, was preacher at Klosterbergen in 1743, and military chaplain at Berlin in 1746. In 1749 he was general superintendent, in 1762 member of consistory, and died at Aurich, in East Frisia, June 4, 1789. He published sermons and other ascetical writings. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hahn, Johann Zacharias Herman[[@Headword:Hahn, Johann Zacharias Herman]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born August 12, 1768, at Schneeberg, in Saxony. In 1800 he was deacon at his native place, in 1804 general superintendent and member of consistory at Gera. He died November 22, 1826, doctor of theology, leaving, Politik, Moral, und Religion in Verbindung (Leipsic, 1797-1800, 2 vols.): — Geraisches Gesangbuch nebst Gebeten (Gera, 1822). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:168, 172, 177, 291, 296. (B.P.)

## Hahn, Michael[[@Headword:Hahn, Michael]]

             a German theosophist, was born Feb. 2, 1758, at Altdorf, near Böblingen, Würtemberg. The son of a peasant, he was from early youth under the influence of profound religious convictions, and devoted himself, in retirement, to the study of the Bible, and of the works of prominent theosophists, as Behmen and Oetinger. He claimed to receive from God special revelations, and wrote down their contents. As a speaker in the meetings of the Pietists he attracted large crowds, was several times summoned before the consistory to defend himself against the charge of  heresy, but was finally allowed to spend the last twenty-four years of his life without further annoyance upon an estate of the duchess Francisca of Würtemberg. There he died in great peace in 1819. The followers of Hahn, called the Michelians, constitute an organized communion which has never separated from the State Church, but the members of which annually meet for consultation, and, in particular, for making provision for the poor. The celebrated colony of Kornthal (q.v.), near Stuttgart, was organized under the direct influence of Hahn. The works of Hahn, which contain a complete speculative theosophy, have been published at Tübingen in 12 vols. (1819 sq.). Several of his hymns were received by Albert Knapp into the hymn- book which he prepared for the use of the State Church. Like many of the Würtemberg Pietists, Hahn believed in the final restoration of all things. — Haug, Die Sekte der Michelisner, in Studien der evang. Geistlichkeit Würtemberg, vol. 11; Illgen, Hist. theolog. Zeitschrift, 1841; Römer, Kirchl. Geschichte Würtemberg; Herzog, Real-Encykl. 5,472. (A. J. S.)

## Hahn, Philipp Matthaus[[@Headword:Hahn, Philipp Matthaus]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born November 25, 1739, at Scharuhausen, in Wurtemberg. He studied at Tubingen, and died at Echterdingen, near Stuttgart, May 2, 1790. He was famous alike as a mechanic and theologian. A pupil of Oetinger and Bengel, he developed their theosophic system in his commentaries on different parts of the New Test., and his other writings. He published, Betrachtungen und Predigten uber die Evangelien (Stuttgart, 1774; 5th ed. revised according to his manuscripts, 1847): — Erbaungsstunden uber den Brief an die Epheser (published by his grandson, 1845): — Erbauungsstunden uber den Brief an die Kolosser (1845): — Die Lehre Jesu und seiner Gesandten (1856): — Die Erklarung der Bergpredigt Jesu Christi (eod.): — Auslegung des Briefes an die Hebraer (ed. by Flattiol, 1859). See Plitt-Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Paulus, Philipp Matthaus Hahn (Stuttgart, 1858); Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:492. (B.P.)

## Hai[[@Headword:Hai]]

             (Gen 12:8; Gen 13:3). SEE AI.

## Hai (or Haja) bar-Sherira[[@Headword:Hai (or Haja) bar-Sherira]]

             a Jewish rabbi, was born in 969 and died in 1035. He was the last gaon of Pumbaditha (q.v.), and was distinguished both for his personal virtues, and for an erudition which rendered him the most accomplished Jewish scholar of his time. He was a voluminous writer, and his works may be classified under the following heads: a. Talmudical; b. Exegetical; c. Poetical; d. Cabalistic; and e. Miscellaneous. Passing over his Talmudical works, we mention his פֵּרוּשׁ עִל תנ,ָ or commentary on the Scriptures, not extant, but cited by some of the later commentators, as Ibn-Ezra, David Kimchi, and others. Sefer ham-measeph, ס המאס, originally called el Chdvi, i.e., "the gathering," arranged alphabetically after the manner of many Arabic dictionaries, where the order is regulated by the last adical letter (e.g. רעד under daleth). In this dictionary, written in Arabic, which extended to the Biblical Chaldee also, the language of the Mishna, as well as a comparison of the Arabic, and sometimes even of the old Persian, was applied to the explanation of Hebrew words, as may be seen from the quotations of Ibn-Balaam (in his commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy, preserved in Oxford, and where the dictionary of Haja is expressly called el-Chavi, as in Tanchium on Jdg 8:16), Ibn-Ezra (Deu 32:39; Isa 46:8; Amos 1:27; Psa 58:10;  Job 4:15; Job 6:10; Job 13:27; Job 21:32), David Kimchi (in his Book of Roots, also in his commentary on Isa 5:5; 35:14; Jer 12:6; Eze 19:10), Rashi (on Jdg 4:19; Hos 3:4), and others. This dictionary, as well as several other treatises, is not extant. Of his poetical works, we mention Musar haskel, השכל מוסר, also שערי מוסר, an exposition of the Pentateuch in Arabic verse (Constantinople, 1511; Latin transl. by Mercier, Paris, 1561; and Seidel, Leipsic, 1638); Shema Koli (שמע קולי), i.e., "Hear my voice," in the Spanish Ritual. See Rapaport, Biography of Hai, in Bikkura hattim, 10:79-95; 11:90-92; Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, page 78, 125; and Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodl. (1026-30); Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:355-358; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), page 120 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 6:6-13; Geiger, Jud. Zeitschrift (1862), page 206-217, 312-314; Nascher, Hai Gaon (Breslau, 1867). (B.P.).

## Haictites[[@Headword:Haictites]]

             a Mohammedan sect, who profess to believe in Christ as well as in Mohammed. They hold many of the doctrines pertaining to Christ in common with orthodox Christians. They also believe that he will come again to judge the world in the same body which he had on earth; that he will destroy Antichrist, and reign forty years, at the close of which the world will be destroyed.

## Haifa[[@Headword:Haifa]]

             a town in Palestine, just under the northern brow of Carmel, on the shore near the mouth of the Kishon, seems to be alluded to as (near) the western terminus of Zebulon (Gen 49:13, חוֹת, choph, "haven;" see Deu 1:7, “aide;" Jos 9:1, "coasts;" in both which passages the associated geographical terms are likewise technically used as proper names). In fact the present Arabic name (properly Chaypha) is but the Aramaean form (חֵיפָא, the cove) of the Heb. word (used in the above passages only). In the Talmud the old name reappears (חיפה, Cheyphah, the modern form; Graecized ῾Ηφά: see Reland, Palaest. page 718). By the Greek and Roman writers, a place called Sycaminum (Συκαμίνον, Hebraized שקמונה, Sekamunah, doubtless as a mart for figs) is mentioned as situated in Phoenicia, near the foot of Carmel (see Reland, page 1024). In the Middle Ages the place was called Pouphyreon by a strange mistake,  the real town of that name being north of Sidon. It was also known as Cayphas, and the derivations given are very curious, either from Cephas or Caiaphas. Haifa is now a small but growing town of about two thousand inhabitants, built close upon the sandy beach, and surrounded by a shattered wall. The interior has a dreary look, which is not improved by the broken wall, and two or three rusty cannon lying about, half covered by rubbish. The only tolerable houses appear to be those of the consular agents, who abound here, as it is a frequent stopping-place, especially in foul weather, for the Levant steamers.

There is a flourishing German colony in the neighborhood. The bay spreads out in front, its sandy beach sweeping gracefully along the plain to the low point on which the battlements of Acre are seen in the distance. In Haifa the Christians outnumber the Mohammedans;, and there is a small community of Jews. Few remains of antiquity are visible except some tombs in the rocks; but the magnificence of former buildings is attested by the fragments of marble, granite, porphyry, and greenstone lying in the shingle on the beach. Two miles farther south-west are the remains of another large town, at the place called Tell es-Semak. There can scarcely be a doubt that this is the ancient Sycamilon, often confused with Haifa, but a place distinct and named from its sycamine fig-trees-a stunted specimen of which still stands near, with its little figs growing out of the stem. See Murray, Handbook for Syria, page 362; Badeker, Palestine, page 348; Conder, Tent Work, 1:180; 2:306. SEE CARMEL; SEE KISHON.

## Haight, Benjamin I., S.T.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Haight, Benjamin I., S.T.D., LL.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born in the city of New York, October 16, 1809. He graduated at Columbia College in 1828, and at the General Theological Seminary in the same city in 1831; was ordained that year, and became rector of St. Peter's Church in his native city; in 1834 of St. Paul's, Cincinnati; in 1837 of All-Saints', New York, and the same year likewise professor of pastoral theology in the General Theological Seminary, retaining the latter position until 1855, when he was associated with Trinity parish in the same city. He died there February 21, 1879.

## Hail[[@Headword:Hail]]

             SEE BEN-HAIL.

## Hail (2)[[@Headword:Hail (2)]]

             (בָּרָד, barard', χάλαζα), or congealed rain, is the symbol of the divine vengeance upon kingdoms and nations, the enemies of God and of his people. As a hailstorm is generally accompanied by lightning, and seems to be produced by a certain electrical state of the atmosphere, so we find in Scripture hail and fire, i.e. lightning, mentioned together (Exo 9:23; compare Job 38:22-23; Psa 105:32; Psa 78:48; Psa 148:8; Psa 18:13). SEE PLAGUES OF EGYPT. That hail, though uncommon, is not absolutely  unknown in Egypt, we have the testimony of Mansleben and Manconys, who had heard it thunder during their stay at Alexandria, the former on the 1st of January, and the latter on the 17th and 18th of the same month; on the same day it also hailed there. Perry also remarks that it hails, though seldom, in January and February at Cairo. Pococke even saw hail mingled with rain fall at Fium in February (compare Exo 9:34). Korte also saw hail fall. Jomard says, “I have several times seen even hail at Alexandria.” Volney mentions a hail-storm which he saw crossing over Mount Sinai into that country, some of whose frozen stones he gathered; “and so,” he says, “I drank iced water in Egypt.” Hail was also the means made use of by God for defeating an army of the kings of Canaan (Jos 10:11).

In this passage it is said, “The Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them” i.e. hailstones of an extraordinary size, and capable of doing dreadful execution in their fall from heaven. Some commentators are of opinion that the miracle consisted of real stones, from the circumstance that stones only are mentioned in the preceding clause; but this is evidently erroneous, for there are many instances on record of hail-stones of enormous size and weight falling in different countries, so as to do immense injury, and to destroy the lives of animals and men. In Palestine and the neighboring regions, hailstones are frequent and severe in the mountainous districts and along the coasts; but in the plains and deserts hail scarcely ever falls. In the elevated region of Northern Persia the hailstones are frequently so violent as to destroy the cattle in the fields; and in Comm. Porter's Letters from Constantinople and its Environs (1, 44) there is an interesting account of a terrific hailstorm that occurred on the Bosphorus in the summer of 1831, which fully bears out the above and other Scripture representations. Many of the lumps picked up after the storm weighed three quarters of a pound. In Isa 28:2, which, denounces the approaching destruction by Shalmaneser, the same images are employed. Hail is mentioned as a divine judgment by the prophet Haggai (Hag 2:17). The destruction of the Assyrian army is pointed out in Isa 30:30. Eze 13:11 represents the wall daubed with untempered mortar as being destroyed by great hailstones. Also in his prophecy against Gog (Eze 38:22) he employs the same symbol (compare Rev 20:9). The hail and fire mingled with blood, mentioned in Rev 8:7, are supposed to denote the commotions of nations. — The great hail, in Rev 11:19, denotes great and heavy judgments on the enemies of true religion; and the grievous storm, in 16:21, represents something similar, and far more severe. So Horace  (Odes, 1. 2); comp. Virgil (En. 4:120, 161; 9:669) and Livy (2, 62, and 26, 11).

## Hail![[@Headword:Hail!]]

             (χἃ ιρε, rejoice, as often rendered; “farewell” also), a salutation, importing a wish for the welfare of the person addressed (Luk 1:28; in ‘mockery, Mat 27:29, etc.). It is now seldom used among us, but was customary among our Saxon ancestors, and imported as much as “Joy to you,” or “Health to you;” including in the term health all kinds of prosperity. — Calmet, s.v. SEE GREETING.

## Hail, Mary![[@Headword:Hail, Mary!]]

             SEE AVE MARIA.

## Hail-Stone[[@Headword:Hail-Stone]]

             (אֶבֶן בָרָד, e'ben barad', a stone of hail). See above.

## Haime, John[[@Headword:Haime, John]]

             a soldier in the English army, and one of Mr. Wesley's preachers. He was born at Shaftesbury, Dorsetshire, in 1710, and was bred a gardener, and afterwards a button-maker. From early life he lived in great wickedness, and in constant agony of conviction. In 1739 he enlisted in a regiment of dragoons, and some time after he was converted; but, being very ignorant, he alternately lost and regained his hope, but constantly forced to save others. At last he heard and converse with Mr. Wesley, much to his comfort. The regiment was sent to Flanders in 1743, from which time till Feb. 1745, he was in despair and great agony. At that time, while marching into Germany, his evidence of pardon returned, and encouraged by Mr. Wesley's letters, he began to preach in the army. At the battle of Dettingen he showed great gallantly. In May 1744, the army went to Brussels, and here his labors were the means of a great and remarkable revival in the army and city. Part of the time Haime had six preachers under him, although the regular chaplains opposed him. But the duke of Cumberland and general Ponsonby were his friends and patrons, and his piety of life, and the valor of his “Methodists” in every battle, commanded universal admiration and respect. On the 6th of April, 1746, he fell into despair, and from that date he lived for twenty years “in agony of soul;” yet all the time, in Germany, England, Ireland, he ceased not with all the energy of despair to labor, preaching often 20 or 30 times a week, and seeing thousands of souls converted under his efforts, while his own soul was filled with anguish and darkness. At the end of this time he once mere obtained the evidence of acceptance with God. He died Aug. 18, 1784, at Whitchurch, in Hampshire. — Jackson, Lives of Early Methodist Preachers, 1, 147, Stevens, History of Methodism, vol. 2.

## Haimo[[@Headword:Haimo]]

             SEE HAYMO.

## Hainau (or Hena), Solomon[[@Headword:Hainau (or Hena), Solomon]]

             a Jewish writer of the 18th century, is the author of, ס8 בנין שלמה, a large Hebrew grammar (Frankfort, 1708): — הנקיד ס8 יסוד, another grammatical work (Amsterdam, 1730): — צהר התבה, also a Hebrew grammar (Berlin, 1733, and often): — ס שערי תורה, a compendium of Hebrew grammar (Hamburg, 1718): — שערי זמרה, a treatise on the Hebrew accents (1718, 1762): — שערי תפלה מחברת, a grammatical commentary on the daily prayers (1725). His works were opposed by different Jewish writers, against whom he wrote עכביש קורי and קורות ארזים(Furth, 1744). He left a number of philological works in MS. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:379 sq.; Steinschneider, Bibl. Handbuch, s.v.; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), page 122. (B.P.)

## Hainbalites[[@Headword:Hainbalites]]

             one of the four orthodox sects of the Mohammedans, which derived its name from Ahmed Ibn-Hanbal, a devout follower of the prophet. He maintained the eternity of the Koran, and thus brought upon himself the vengeance of the caliph al-Motasem, who held that the Koran was created. Hanbal was imprisoned and scourged; but he continued to propagate his opinions until his death, which occurred about the middle of the 8th  century. The Hanbalites prevail principally in the wilder districts of Arabia, their austere habits being well suited to the simple manners of the Bedouin.

## Hair[[@Headword:Hair]]

             (properly שֵׂעָר, sedr', θρίξ) is frequently mentioned in Scripture, chiefly with reference to the head. In scarcely anything has the caprice of fashion been more strikingly displayed than in the various forms which the taste of  different countries and ages has prescribed for disposing of this natural covering of the head. SEE HEAD.

1. Of the more ancient nations, the Egyptians appear to have been the most uniform in their habits regarding it, and, in some respects also, the most peculiar. We learn from Herodotus (2, 36, 3:12) that they let the hair of their head and beard grow only when they were in mourning, and that they shaved it at other times. Even in the case of young children they were wont to shave the head, leaving only a few locks on the front, sides, and back, as an emblem, of youth. In the case of royal children, those on the sides were covered and enclosed in a bag, which hung down conspicuously as a badge of princely rank (Wilkinson, 2, 327, 328). “So particular were they,” says Wilkinson, “on this point, that to have neglected it was a subject of reproach and ridicule; and whenever they intended to convey the idea of a man of low condition, or a slovenly person, the artists represented him with a beard” (Ancient Egyptians, 3, 957). Slaves also, when brought from foreign countries, having beards on them at their arrival, “were obliged to conform to the cleanly habits of their masters; their beards and heads were shaved, and they adopted a close cap.” This universal practice among the Egyptians explains the incidental notice in the life of Joseph, that before going in to Pharaoh he shaved himself (Gen 41:14); in most other places he would have combed his hair and trimmed his beard, but on no account have shaved it. The practice was carried there to such a length probably from the tendency of the climate to generate the fleas and other vermin which nestle in the hair; and hence also the priests, who were to be the highest embodiments of cleanliness, were wont to shave their whole bodies every third day (Herod. 2, 37).

It is singular, however and seems to indicate that notions of cleanliness did not alone regulate the practice, that the women still wore their natural hair, long and plaited, often reaching down in the form of strings to the bottom of the shoulder-blades. Many of the female mummies have been found with their hair thus plaited, and in good preservation. The modern ladies of Egypt come but little behind their sisters of olden time in this respect (see Lane's Modern Egyptians, 1, 60). Yet what was remarkable in the inhabitants of a hot climate, while they removed their natural hair, they  were accustomed to wear wigs, which were so constructed that ‘they far surpassed.” says Wilkinson, “the comfort and coolness of the modern turban, the reticulated texture of the ground-work on which the hair was fastened allowing the heat of the head to escape, while the hair effectually protected it from the sun” (Anc. Egypt. 3, 354). Josephus (Life, § 11) notices an instance of false hair (περιθετὴ κόμη) being used for the purpose of disguise. Among the Medes the wig was worn by the upper classes (Xenoph. Cyrop 1, 3, 2). SEE HAIR-DRESS.

2. The precisely opposite practice, as regards men, would seem to have prevailed among the ancient Assyrians, and, indeed, among the Asiatics generally. In the Assyrian sculptures the hair always appears long, combed closely down upon the head, and shedding itself in a mass of curls on the shoulders. “The beard also was allowed to grow to its full length, and, descending low on the breast, was divided into two or three rows of curls. The mustache was also carefully trimmed and curled at the ends” (Layard's Nineveh, 2, 327). Herodotus likewise testifies that the Babylonians wore their hair long (i, 195). The very long hair, however, that appears in the figures on the monuments is supposed to have been ‘partly false,' a sort of head-dress to add to the effect of the natural hair. The excessive pains bestowed by the ancient nations in arranging the hair and beard appears almost foppish in contrast with their stern, martial character (Layard's Nineveh, 2, 254). SEE BEARD. The practice of the modern Arabs in regard to the length of their hair varies generally the men allow it to grow its natural length, the tresses hanging down to the breast, and sometimes to the waist, affording substantial protection to the head and neck against the violence of the sun's rays (Burckhardt's Notes, 1, 49; Wellsted's Travels, 1, 33, 53, 73).

3. Among the ancient Greeks, the general admiration of long hair, whether in men or women, is evidenced by the expression καρηκομόωντες Α᾿χαιοί (“well-combed Greeks”), so often occurring in Homer; and by the saying, which passed current among the people, that hair was the cheapest of ornaments; and in the representations of their divinities, especially Bacchus and Apollo, whose long locks were a symbol of perpetual youth. But the practice varied. While the Spartans in earlier times wore the hair  long, and men as well as women were wont to have it tied in a knot over the crown of the head, at a later period they were accustomed to wear it short. Among the Athenians, also, it is understood the later practice varied somewhat from the earlier, though the information is less specific. The Romans passed through similar changes: in more ancient times the hair of the head and beard was allowed to grow; but about three centuries before the Christian era barbers began to be introduced, and men usually wore the hair short. Shaving was also customary, and a long beard was regarded as a mark of slovenliness. An instance even occurs of a man, M. Livius, who had been banished for a time, being ordered by the censors to have his beard shaved before he entered the senate (Livy, 27, 34). SEE DIADEL.

This later practice must have been quite general in the Gospel age, so far as the head is concerned, among the countries which witnessed the labors of the apostle Paul, since, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, he refers to it as an acknowledged and nearly universal fact. “Doth not even nature itself teach you,” he asked, “that if a man have long hair, it is a shame to him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her; for her hair is given her for a covering” (1Co 11:14-15). The only person among the more ancient Israelites who is expressly mentioned as having done in ordinary life what is here designated a shame, is Absalom; but the manner in which the sacred historian notices the extravagant regard he paid to the cultivation of his hair not obscurely intimates that it was esteemed a piece of foppish effeminacy (2Sa 14:26). To the Corinthians the letter of Paul was intended to administer a timely reproof for allowing themselves to fall in with a style of manners which, by confounding the distinctions of the sexes, threatened a baneful influence on good morals; and that not only the Christian converts in that city, but the primitive Church generally, were led by this admonition to adopt simpler habits, is evident from the remarkable fact that a criminal, who came to trial under the assumed character of a Christian, was proved to the satisfaction of the judge to be an impostor by the luxuriant and frizzled appearance of his hair (Tertullian, Apol.; Fleury, Les Maeurs des Chretiennes). SEE SHAVING.

With regard to women, the possession of long and luxuriant hair is allowed by Paul to be an essential attribute of the sex — a graceful and modest covering provided by nature; and yet the same apostle elsewhere (1Ti 2:9) concurs with Peter (1Pe 3:9) in launching severe invectives against the ladies of his day for the pride and passionate fondness they displayed in the elaborate decorations of their head-dress. SEE PLAITING THE HAIR.

As the hair  was pre-eminently the “instrument of their pride” (Eze 16:39, margin), all the resources of ingenuity and art were exhausted to set it off to advantage and load it with the most dazzling finery; and many, when they died, caused their longest locks to be cut off, and placed separately in an urn, to be deposited in their tomb as the most precious and valued relics. In the daily use of cosmetics, they bestowed the most astonishing pains in arranging their long hair, sometimes twisting it round on the crown of the head, where, and at the temples, by the aid of gum, which they knew as well as the modern belles, they wrought it into a variety of elegant and fanciful devices figures of coronets, harps, wreaths, diadems, emblems of public temples and conquered cities, being formed by the mimic skill 6f the ancient friseur; or else plaiting it into an incredible number of tresses, which hung down the back, and which, when necessary, were lengthened by ribbons so as to reach to the ground, and were kept at full stretch by the weight of various wreaths of pearls and gold fastened at intervals down to the extremity. From some Syrian coins in his possession Hartmann (Die Hebrderinn am Putztische) has given this description of the style of the Hebrew coiffure; and many ancient busts and portraits which have been discovered exhibit so close a resemblance to those of Eastern ladies in the present day as to show that the same elaborate and gorgeous disposition of their hair has been the pride of Oriental females in every age. (See below.) From the great value attached to a profuse head of hair arose a variety of superstitious and emblematic observances, such as shaving parts of the head, or cropping it in a particular form; parents dedicating the hair of infants (Tertullian, De Animta) to the gods; young women theirs at their marriage warriors after a successful campaign; sailors after deliverance from a storm; hanging it up on consecrated trees, or depositing it in temples; burying it in the tomb of friends, as Achilles did at the funeral of Patroclus; besides shaving, cutting off, or plucking it out, as some people did; or allowing it to grow in sordid negligence, as was the practice with others, according as the calamity that befell them was common or extraordinary, and their grief was mild or violent. SEE CUTTINGS IN THE FLESH.

4. The Hebrews were fully alive to the importance of the hair as an element of personal beauty, whether as seen in the “curled locks, black as a raven,” of youth (Son 5:11), or in the “crown of glory” that encircled the head of old age (Pro 16:31). Yet, awhile they: encouraged the growth of hair, they observed the natural distinction  between the sexes by allowing the women to wear it long (Luk 7:38; Joh 11:2; 1Co 11:6 sq.), while the men restrained theirs by frequent clippings to a moderate length. This difference between the Hebrews and the surrounding nations, especially the Egyptians, arose, no doubt, partly from natural taste, but partly also from legal enactments, and to some extent from certain national usages of wide extent.

(a.) Clipping the hair in a certain manner, and offering the locks, was in early times connected with religious worship: many of the Arabians practiced a peculiar tonsure in honor of their god Orotal (Herod. 3:8), and hence the Hebrews were forbidden to “round the corners” (פֵּאָה, lit the extremity) of their heads? (Lev 19:27), meaning the locks along the forehead and temples, and behind the ears. (See Alteneck, Coma Hebraeorum, Viteb. 1695.) This tonsure is described in the Sept. by a peculiar expression, σισόη (the classical σκάφιον), probably derived from the Hebrew צַיצַית(comp. Bochart, Canaan, 1, 6, p. 379). That the practice of the Arabians was well known to the Hebrews appears from the expression קְצוּצֵי פֵאָה, rounded as to the locks, by which they are described (Jer 9:26; Jer 25:23; Jer 49:32; see marginal translation of the A.V.). The prohibition against cutting off the hair on the death of a relative (Deu 14:1) was probably grounded on a similar reason. SEE CORNER.

(b.) In addition to these regulations, the Hebrews dreaded baldness, as it was frequently the result of leprosy (Lev 13:40 sq.), and hence formed one of the disqualifications for the priesthood (Lev 21:20, Sept.). SEE BALDNESS. The rule imposed upon the priests, and probably followed by the rest of the community, was that the hair should be polled (כָּסִם, Eze 44:20), neither being shaved, nor allowed to grow too long (Lev 21:5; Ezekiel 50). What was the precise length usually worn we have no means of ascertaining; but from various expressions, such as פָּרִע רֹאשׁ, lit. to let loose the head or the hair (solvere crines, Virgil. En. 3:65; 11:35; demissos lugentis more capillos, Ovid, Ep. 10, 137) by unbinding the head-band and letting it go disheveled (Lev 10:6, A.V. uncover your heads”), which was done in mourning (compare Eze 24:17); and again גָּלָה אֹזֶן, to uncover the ear previous to making any communication of importance (1Sa 20:2; 1Sa 20:12; 1Sa 22:8; A.V., margin),.as though the hair fell over the ear, we may conclude that men wore their hair somewhat longer than is usual with us. The word פֶּרִע, used as =hair (Num 6:5; Eze 44:20), is especially indicative of its free growth (see Knobel, Comm. on Lev 21:10). In 2Ki 1:8, “a hairy man;” literally, “a lord of hair,” seems rather to refer to the flowing locks of Elijah (q.v.). This might be doubtful, even with the support of the Sept. and Josephus--ᾷΟπωΤροᾷ Σαᾷᾷᾷ--and of the Targum Jonathan — סַעֲרָן גְּבִר— the same word used for Esau in Gen 27:11. But its application to the hair of the head is corroborated by the word used by the children of Bethel when mocking Elisha (q.v.). “Bald-head” is a peculiar term (קֵרֵח), applied only to want of hair at the back of the head; and the taunt was called forth by the difference between the bare shoulders of the new prophet and the shaggy locks of the old one. Long hair was admired in the case of young mea; it is especially noticed in the description of Absalom's person (2Sa 14:26), the inconceivable weight of whose hair, as given in the text (200 shekels), has led to a variety of explanations (comp. Harmer's Observations, 4, 321), the more probable being that the numeral כ (20) has been turned into ר (200): Josephus (Ant. 7, 8, 5) adds that it was cut every eighth day. The hair was also worn long by the bodyguard of Solomon, according to the same authority (Ant. 8, 7, 3, μηκίστας καθειμένοι χαίτας). The care requisite to keep the hair, in order in such cases must have been very great, and hence the practice of wearing long hair was unusual, and only resorted to as an act of religious observance, in which case it was a “sign of humiliation and self-denial, and of a certain religious slovenliness” (Lightfoot, Exercit. on 1Co 11:14), and was practiced by the Nazarites (Num 6:5; Jdg 13:5; Jdg 16:17; 1Sa 1:11), and occasionally by others in token of special mercies (Act 18:18); it was not unusual among the Egyptians when on a journey (Diod. 1, 18). SEE NAZARITE.

(c.) In times of affliction the hair was altogether cut off (Isa 3:17; Isa 3:24; Isa 15:2; Isa 22:12; Jer 7:29; Jer 48:37; Amo 8:10; Josephus, War, 2, 15, 1), the practice of the Hebrews being in this respect the reverse of that of the Egyptians, who let their hair grow long in time of mourning (Herod. 2, 36), shaving their heads when the term was over (Gen 41:14); but resembling that of the Greeks, as frequently noticed by classical writers (e.g. Soph. Aj. 1174; Eurip. Electr. 143, 241). Tearing the hair (Ezr 9:3), and letting it go disheveled, as already noticed, were similar tokens of grief. Job is even represented as having shaved his head, to make himself bald, in the day of his calamity (1:20); probably more, however, as a  symbol of desolation than as an ordinary badge of mourning; for it is in that respect that baldness is commonly spoken of in Scripture (Isa 3:24; Isa 15:2, etc.). The call in Jer 7:29 to cut off the hair — “Cut off thine hair, O Jerusalem, and cast it away; and take up a lamentation on high places” is addressed to Jerusalem under the symbol of a woman, and indicates nothing as to the usual practice of men in times of trouble and distress. In their case, we may rather suppose, the custom would be to let the hair grow in the season of mourning, and to neglect the person. But the practice would naturally differ with the occasion and with the feelings of the individual. SEE MOURNING.

The usual and favorite color of the hair was black (Son 5:11), as is indicated in the comparisons to a “flock of goats” and the “tents of Kedar” (Son 4:1; Son 1:5): a similar hue is probably intended by the purple of Son 7:5, the term being broadly used (as the Greek πορφύρεος in a similar application =μέλας, Anacreon, 28). A fictitious hue was occasionally obtained by sprinkling gold dust on the hair (Josephus, Ant. 8:7 3). It does not appear that dyes were ordinarily used; the “carmel” of Son 7:5 has been understood as = כִּרְמַיל (A.V. “crimson,” margin) without good reason, though the similarity of the words may have suggested the subsequent reference to purple. Herod is said to have dyed his gray hair for the purpose of concealing his age (Ant. 16:8, 1); but the practice may have been borrowed from the Greeks or Romans, among whom it was common (Aristoph. Eccles. 736; Martial, Ep. 3, 43; Propert. 2, 18, 24,26): from Mat 5:36, we may infer that it was not usual among the Hebrews. The approach of age was marked by a sprinkling (זָרִק, Hos 7:9; comp. a similar use of sparyqere, Propert. 3:4, 24) of gray hairs, which soon overspread the whole head (Gen 42:38; Gen 44:29; 1Ki 2:6; 1Ki 2:9; Pro 16:31; Pro 20:29). The reference to the almond in Ecc 12:5, has been explained of the white blossoms of that tree, as emblematic of old age: it may be observed, however, that the color of the flower is pink rather than white, and that the verb in that passage, according to high authorities (Gesen. and Hitzig), does not bear the sense of blossoming at all. SEE ALMOND. Pure white hair was deemed characteristic of the divine majesty (Dan 7:9; Rev 1:14). SEE GRAY.

The chief beauty of the hair consisted in curls, whether of a natural or artificial character. The Hebrew terms are highly expressive: to omit the  word צִמָּח— rendered “locks” in Son 4:1; Son 4:3; Son 6:7; and Isa 47:2; but more probably meaning a veil — we have תִּלְתִּלַּים (Son 5:11), properly pendulous flexible boughs (according to the Sept., ἐλάται, the shoots of the palm tree) which supplied an image of the coman pendlau; צַיצַת. (Eze 8:3), a similar image borrowed from the curve of a blossom; עֲנָק (Son 4:9), a lock falling over the shoulders like a chain of ear-pendant (in uno crine colli tui, Vulgate better, perhaps, than the A.V., “with one chain of thy neck”); רְהָטַים (Son 7:5, A.V. “galleries”), properly the channels by which water was brought to the flocks, which supplied an image either of the comafluens, or of the regularity in which the locks were arranged; דִּלָּה(Son 7:5), again an expression for coma pendula, borrowed from the threads hanging down from an unfinished woof; and, lastly, מִעֲשֶׂה מַקְשֶׁה (Isa 3:24, A.V. “well set hair”), properly plaited work, i.e. gracefully curved locks. With regard to the mode of dressing the hair we have no very precise information; the terms used are of a general character, as of Jezebel (2Ki 9:30), תֶּיטֵב, i.e. she adorned her head; of Judith (10, 3), (διέταξε, i.e. arranged (the A.V. has “braided,” and the Vulg. discriminavit, here used in a technical sense in the reference to the discriminale or hair-pin); of Herod (Joseph. Ant. 14, 9, 4), κικοσμημένος τῇ συνθέσει τῆς κύμης, and of those who adopted feminine fashions (War, 4, 9, 10), κόμας συνθετιζόμενοι. The terms used in the N. Test. (πλέγμασιν, 1Ti 2:9; ἐμπλοκῆς τπιχῶν, 1Pe 3:3) are also of a general character; Schleusner (Lex. s.v.) understands them of curling rather than plaiting. The arrangement of Samson's hair into seven locks, or more properly braids ( מִחְלָפוֹתfrom הָלִ, to interchange; Sept. σειραί; Jdg 16:13; Jdg 16:19), involves the practice of plaiting, which was also familiar to the Egyptians (Wilkinson, 2, 335) and Greeks (Homer, II. 14, 176). The locks were probably kept in their place by a fillet, as in Egypt (Wilkinson, 1. c.).

Ornaments were worked into the hair, as practiced by the modern Egyptians, who “add to each braid three black silk cords with little ornaments of gold” (Lane, 1, 71): the Sept. understands the term שְׁבַיסַים (Isa 3:18, A.V. “cauls”) as applying to such ornaments (ἐμπλόκια);  Schrider (Vest. Mul. Heb. cap. 2) approves of this, and conjectures that they were sun-shaped, i.e. circular, as distinct from the “round tires like, the moon,” i.e. the crescent-shaped ornaments used for necklaces. The Arabian women attach small bells to the tresses of their hair (Niebuhr, Trav. 1, 133). Other terms, sometimes understood as applying to the hair, are of doubtful signification, e.g. הֲרַיטים (Isa 3:22; acus; “crisping- pins”), more probably purses, as in 2Ki 5:23; קַשֻׁרַים (Isa 3:20, “head-bands”), bridal girdles, according to Schroder and other authorities; פְּאֵרַרם (Isa 3:20, Vulg. discriminalia, i.e. pins used for keeping the hair parted; comp. Jerome in Rufin. 3, capult.), more probably turbans. Combs and hair-pins are mentioned in the Talmud; the Egyptian combs were made of wood and double, one side having large, and the other small teeth (Wilkinson, 2, 343); from the ornamental devices worked on them we may infer that they were worn in the hair. See each of the above terms in its place. In the Talmud frequent references are made to women who were professional hair-dressers for their own sex, and the name applied to whom was גידלת (probably from גדל, to twine or plait), “femina gnara alere crines” (Maimon. in Tr. Shabbath, 10, 6; comp. also Wagenseil, Sota, p. 137; Jahn, Archceöl. pt. 1, vol. 2, p. 114).

The Hebrews, like other nations of antiquity, anointed the hair profusely with ointments, which were generally compounded of various aromatic ingredients (Rth 3:3; 2Sa 14:2; Psa 23:5; Psa 45:7; Psa 92:10; Ecc 9:8; Isa 3:24); more especially on occasion of festivities or hospitality (Mat 6:17; Mat 26:7; Luk 7:46; comp. Joseph. Ant. 19, 4, 1, χρισάμενος μύροις τὴν κεφαλήν, ώς ἀπὸ συνουσίας). It is, perhaps, in reference to the glossy appearance so imparted to it that the hair is described as purple (Son 7:5). SEE OINTMENT.

It appears to have been the custom of the Jews in our Savior's time to swear by the hair (Mat 5:36), much as the Egyptian women still swear by the sidelock, and the men by their beards (Lane, 1, 52,71, notes). SEE OATH.

Hair was employed by the Hebrews as an image of what was least valuable in man's person (1Sa 14:45; 2Sa 14:11; 1Ki 1:52.; Mat 10:30; Luk 12:7; Luk 21:18; Act 27:34); as well as of what was innumerable (Psa 40:12; Psa 69:4), or particularly fine  (Jdg 20:16). In Isa 7:20, it represents the various productions of the field, trees, crops, etc.; like ὅπος κεκομημένον ὔλῃ of Callim. Dian. 41, or the humus comans of Stat. Theb. 5, 502. White hair, or the hoary head, is the-symbol of the respect due to age (Lev 19:22; Pro 16:31). Hence we find in Dan 7:9, God takes upon him the title of “Ancient of Days” (comp. Rev 1:14), the gray locks there represented being the symbol of authority and honor. The shaving of the head, on the contrary, signifies affliction, poverty, and disgrace. Thus “cutting off the hair” is a figure used to denote the entire destruction of a people by the righteous retributions of Providence (Isa 7:20). “‘Gray hairs here and there on Ephraim” portended the decline and fall of the kingdom of Israel (Hos 7:9). “Hair like women's” forms part of the description of the Apocalyptic locusts (Rev 9:8) and is added to complete the idea of fierceness of the anti-Christian troop of cavalry, bristling with shaggy hair (comp “rough caterpillars,” i.e. hairy locusts, Jer 51:27); long and undressed hair in later times being regarded as an image of barbaric rudeness (Hengstenberg, ad loc. Rev.).

## Hair, Christian Modes Of Wearing[[@Headword:Hair, Christian Modes Of Wearing]]

             In the early Church the clergy sometimes wore long hair, but the custom of cutting it short, in. distinction from pagans, soon became general, and at length shaving it altogether, even to a bare spot upon the crown, was introduced as a monkish habit. SEE TONSURE. Penitents cut their hair short as a sign of humiliation. Laymen usually wore long hair, but ringlets were regarded as a mark of effeminacy. Women were enjoined to wear long hair, but modestly arrayed. False hair was strongly denounced.

## Hair-cloth[[@Headword:Hair-cloth]]

             has often been worn by ascetics as a means of mortifying the flesh, especially hairshirts. In the early church penitents were sometimes clothed with it, and candidates for baptism were often examined standing upon a piece of haircloth. The dying and the dead were also covered with it.

## Hairetites[[@Headword:Hairetites]]

             a skeptical Mohammedan sect, who profess to doubt everything, and to hold their minds in constant equipoise, maintaining that it is impossible to distinguish truth from falsehood. Their usual reply in discussion is, "God knows, we do not." They are, however, scrupulous in their observance of Mohammedan laws and ceremonies, both civil and religious.

## Haitz, Fidelis[[@Headword:Haitz, Fidelis]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, was born in 1801 at Waldshut, Baden. In 1826 he was made a priest, in 1845 canon at Freiburg, and died June 9, 1873. He wrote Die Katholische Abendmahlslehre (Mayence, 1872). (B.P.)

## Hajar El-Aswad[[@Headword:Hajar El-Aswad]]

             the name of the sacred black stone in the great temple of Mecca. It is supposed to have been originally an aerolite or Baetylia. SEE KAABA.

## Haji[[@Headword:Haji]]

             SEE HADJ.

## Hakemites[[@Headword:Hakemites]]

             SEE DRUSES; SEE HAKIM.

## Hakewill, George[[@Headword:Hakewill, George]]

             an English theologian and philosopher, was born at Exeter in 1579. He studied at Exeter and at Alban Hall, Oxford, where he graduated, and entered the Church in 1611. He became successively chaplain of prince Charles (afterwards Charles I) and archdeacon of Surrey. His opposition to the prince's, plan of marriage with the Infanta of Spain caused him to lose his chaplaincy. During the Civil War he kept aloof from parties, and in 1648 he was one of the first in accepting the rule requiring all members of the University of Oxford to sign a promise of obedience to Parliament. He died in 1649. Besides a large number of sermons and occasional pamphlets, he wrote An Apology, or Declaration of the Power and Providence of God in the Government of the World (in four books, 1627, fol.; augmented edit. 1635), a work written with great strength and clearness, if not always in good taste. See Wood, Athenae Ox nienses, vol. 2; Prince, Worthies of Devon; Gorton, General Biogr. Dict.; Rose, New Genesis Biogr. Dict.; Hoefer— Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 23, 123; Allibone, Dict. Of Authors, s.v.

## Hakim Ben-Allah or Ben-Hashem[[@Headword:Hakim Ben-Allah or Ben-Hashem]]

             surnamed MOKANNA (the veiled) and SAGENDE NAH (moon-maker), the founder of an Arabian sect, flourished in the latter half of the 8th  century. He began his career as a common soldier, rose to a captaincy, but subsequently became the leaver of a band of his own. Having lost one of his eyes by the shot of an arrow, he constantly wore a veil to conceal his ugliness, as unbelievers assert, but, according to the belief of his disciples, to prevent the dazzling brightness of his divinely illuminated countenance from overpowering the beholder. Hakim is said to have been an adept in legerdemain and natural magic, so as to be able to produce grand and startling effects of light and color, in virtue of Which he laid claim to miraculous powers, and asserted that he was a god in human form, having been incarnated in the bodies of Adam, Noah, and other celebrated men, and, last of all, in that of Abu Moslem, prince of Khorassan. On one occasion, to the “delight and bewilderment of his soldiers,” he is said for a whole week to have caused to issue from a deep well a moon or moons of such surpassing brilliancy as to obscure the real moon. Many flocked to his standard, and he seized several strong places near Nekshib and Kish. The sultan Mahadi marched against him, and finally captured his last stronghold; but Hakim, “having first poisoned his soldiers with the wine of a banquet,” had destroyed his body by means of a burning acid, so that only a few hairs remained, in order that his disciples might believe that he had “ascended to heaven alive.” Remnants of the sect still exist on the shores of the Oxus, having for outward badge a white garb in memory of that worn by their founder, and in contrast to the black color adopted by the caliphs of the house of Abbas. The life of Hakim has been the subject of many romances, of which “the best known and most brilliant” is the story of “The Veiled Prophet of Khorassan” in Moore's Lalla Rook. — Chambers, Cyclopaedia, s.v. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 1, 82; D'Herbelot, Biblioth. Orientale, s.v. Mocanna. (J. W. M.)

## Hakka Version[[@Headword:Hakka Version]]

             SEE CHINESE VERSIONS.

## Hakkatan, or rather Katan[[@Headword:Hakkatan, or rather Katan]]

             (Heb. Katan', קָטָן, with the article הִקָּטָן, the little or junior; Sept. Α᾿κκατάν, Vulg. Eccetan), a descendant (or native) of Azgaad and father of Johanan, which last returned with 110 male retainers from Babylon with Ezra (Ezr 8:12) B.C. ante 459.

## Hakkore[[@Headword:Hakkore]]

             SEE EN-HAK-KORE.

## Hakkoz[[@Headword:Hakkoz]]

             (1Ch 24:10). See Koz. Haku'pha (Chakupha', חֲקוּפָא, crooked; but, according to Farst, incitement, a Chaldaizing form; Sept. Α᾿κουφά and Α᾿χιφά), one of the Nethinim whose descendants returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:51; Neh 7:53). B.C. ante 536.

## Hakluyt, Richard[[@Headword:Hakluyt, Richard]]

             an eminent English clergyman and historian, was born in London in 1553, and educated at Christ Church, Oxford. He died in 1616. He published Divers Voyages touching the Discovery of America, and the Islands Adjacent unto the Same, (1582). He was prebendary of Westminster in 1605, and rector of Witheringset, in Suffolk. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Halacha[[@Headword:Halacha]]

             SEE HAGGADAH; SEE MIDRASH.

## Halah[[@Headword:Halah]]

             (Hebrew Chalach', חֲלִח., signif. unknown; Sept. Ε᾿λαέ and Α᾿λαέ, Vulg. Hala; but in 1Ch 5:26; Sept. ΞαΞαδ, Vulg. Lahela), a city or district of Media, upon the river Gozan, to which, among other places, the captives of Israel were transplanted by the Assyrian kings (2Ki 17:6; 2Ki 18:11; 1Ch 5:26). Many, after Bochart (Geog. Sacra, 3:14, p. 220), have conceived this Halah or Chalach to be the same with the CALAH or Kelach of Genesis 10, 11, the Calacine (Καλακινή) which Ptolemy places to the north of Assyria (6, 1), the Calachene (Καλαχηνή) of Strabo (11, 530), in the plain of the Tigris around Nineveh. But this is probably a different place, the modern Kalah-Shergat. Major Rennell, identifying the Gozan with the Kizzil-Ozan, indicates as lying along its banks a district of some extent, and of great beauty and fertility, called Chalchal, having within it a remarkably strong position of the same name, situated on one of the hills adjoining to the mountains which separate it from the province of Ghilan (Geog. of Herod. p. 396). The Talmud understands Cholwan, five days journey from Bagdad (Furst, Lex. s.v.). Ptolemy, however, mentions (5. 18) another province in Mesopotamia of a similar name, namely, Chalcitis (Χαλκῖτις), which he places between Anthemusia (compare Strabo, 16:1, § 27) and Gau'zonitis (Gozan); and this appears to be the true Halah of the Bible. It lay along the banks of the Upper Khabûr, extending from its source at Ras el-Ain to its junimtiorp with the Jerujer, as the name is thought to remain in the modern Cla, a large mound on this river, above its junction with the Jerujer (Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 312, note). Halah, Habor, and Gozan were situated close together on the left bank of the Euphrates (Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, 1, 246).

## Halak[[@Headword:Halak]]

             (Heb. Chalak'p, חָלָקsmooth; Sept. Α᾿αλάκ and Χελχά), the name (or, rather, epithet) of a hill (הָהָי הִחָלָק, both with the art.=-the bare mount) near the territory of Seir, at the southern extremity of Canaan, among the conquests of Joshua (Jos 11:17; Jos 12:7); so called, doubtless, from its bald appearance, making it a landmark in that direction. Hence it is used by Joshua, as Beersheba was used by later writers, to mark the southern limit of the country” So Joshua took all that land… from the Mount Halak, that goeth up to Seir, even unto Baal-gad, in the valley of Lebanon, under Mount Hermon.” The situation of the mountain is thus pretty definitely indicated. It adjoins Edom, and lay on the southern border of Palestine; it must, consequently, have been in, or very near, the great valley of the Arabah. The expression, “that goeth up to Seir” (הָעֹלֶה שֵׂעַיר), is worthy of note. Seir is the mountainous province of Edom, SEE SEIR; and Mount Halak would seem to have been connected with it, as if running up towards it, or joining it to a lower district. About ten miles south of the Dead Sea a line of naked white cliffs, varying in height from 50 to 150 feet, runs completely across the Arabah. As seen from the north, the cliffs resemble a ridge of hills (and in this aspect the word הִרmight. perhaps be applied to them), shutting in the deep valley, and connecting the mountain chain on the west with the mountains of Seir on the east. It is possibly this ridge which is referred to in Num 24:3-4, and Jos 15:2-3, under the name “Ascent of Akrabbim,” and as marking the south-eastern border of Judah; and it might well be called the bald mountain, which ascends to Seir. It was also a natural landmark for the southern boundary for Palestine, as it is near Kedesh-barnea on the one side, and the northern ridge of Edom on the other. To this ridge, bounding the land in the valley on the south, is appropriately opposed on the north, “Baal-gad, in the valley of Lebanon” (Keil on Jos 11:17). The cliffs, and the scenery of the surrounding region, are minutely described by Robinson (Bib. Res. 2, 113, 116 120). Still, the peculiar term, “the bald mountain,” seems to require some more distinctive eminence, perhaps in this general range. Schwarz thinks it may be identified with Jebel Madura, on the south frontier of Judah, between the south end of the Dead Sea and wady Gaian (Palestine, p. 29); marked on Robinson's map a little south of the famous pass Nukb es-Safah.

## Halak, Mount[[@Headword:Halak, Mount]]

             Jebell Maderah, with which we may probably identify this mountain, lies on the south side of a wady of the same name, five miles south-west of the pass of Sufah, and is a round, isolated hill, with numerous blocks of stone on the base and summit, which Arab tradition ascribes to a destructive shower, as a punishment for inhospitality on the part of the ancient inhabitants (Palmer, Desert of the Exodus, page 351).

## Halal[[@Headword:Halal]]

             what is permitted and sanctioned by the Mohammedan law.

## Halcyon[[@Headword:Halcyon]]

             a mythological term equivalent to rest or quiet, especially applied to any season of repose; a figure drawn from the so-called "halcyon days," which are a fortnight, one half before and the other after the winter solstice, during which the bird halcyon, or kingfisher, was fabled by the Greeks to brood, the sea remaining calm during the time of incubation. The myth originated in the classical story of Halcyone or Alcyone (Αλκυόκη), a daughter of AEolus and Enarete, or AEgiale, who married Ceyx, and lived  so happily with him that the two compared themselves to Jupiter and Juno, and were punished for their presumption by being changed into birds. A more literal version of the story is that Ceyx having perished by shipwreck, Alcyone threw herself into the sea, and was metamorphosed into a kingfisher.

## Halcyon Church[[@Headword:Halcyon Church]]

             a denomination of Christians which is said to have arisen in the interior of the United States in 1802, who reject all creeds and confessions. They hold that there is but one person in the Godhead, and that the Father reveals himself in the personality of the Anointed. They deny eternal punishment, and believe in the annihilation of the wicked. They baptize only adults, and that in a peculiar manner. The persons to be baptized walk down into the water in procession, attended by the congregation, and accompanied with vocal and instrumental music. The ordinance is then administered in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. They devote their children to God, not by baptism, but by dedicating them in prayer, and placing them under the guardianship of the church members.

## Haldane, James Alexander[[@Headword:Haldane, James Alexander]]

             brother of the following, was born at Dundee July 1 1768. Having imbibed the family passion for the sea, he was appointed captain of the Melville Castle in 1793. The vessel, however, did not sail for four months, and during that interval a great change took place in captain Haldane's character. He became serious and thoughtful on the subject of religion, and, having determined to follow the example of his brother, who had already relinquished the seafaring life, he disposed of his command for £9000, and his share in the property of the ship and stores for £6000 more. With this fortune of £15,000 he retired with his wife to Scotland in 1794, and gave himself up to those religious inquiries which now engrossed his chief concern. Several years elapsed before his views were established; but at length he attained to a knowledge of the truth as well as peace hi believing. Mr. James Haldane, having plenty of time at command, occupied himself with many plans of Christian usefulness; among which the opening of Sabbath-schools, and itinerant preaching, at first in the villages around Edinburgh, and afterwards in the other large towns of Scotland, were the chief. His principal coadjutor in these labors of love was John Campbell, the African traveler. In company with that zealous Christian, Mr. Haldane made successive tours throughout all Scotland as far as Orkney, and those who were awakened by their preaching were, through the liberality of Mr. Robert Haldane, accommodated with suitable places of worship. Mr. James eventually accepted the office of stated pastor in the Tabernacle, Leith Walk, Edinburgh, and in that capacity he exercised, without any emolument, all the public and private duties of a minister with unbroken fidelity and zeal for a period of fifty years. Although he vacillated on some points of Church government, he and his brother remained steadfast in their adherence to the general principles of the Scotch Baptists. He died in Edinburgh Feb. 8, 1851. Besides a number of controversial tracts, he published A View of the social Worship of the first Christians (Edinb. 1805, 12mo): — Man's Responsibility and the Extent of the Atonement (Edinb. 1842, 12mo): — Exposition of Galatians (Edinb. 1848, 12mo): — Inspiration of the Scriptures (Edinb. 1845, 12mo). — Jamieson, Religious Biography, p. 242; Rich, Biog. Dict. s.v. Haldane; Lives of the Brothers Haldane (1852, 8vo); Belcher, Memoir of Robert and James Alexander Haldane, etc. (Amer. Tract Soc.); New Englander, April 1861, p. 269. SEE INDEPENDENTS, III.

## Haldane, Robert[[@Headword:Haldane, Robert]]

             an eminent Christian philanthropist, was born in London (of Scotch parents) Feb. 28, 1764, and inherited a large property. His early manhood was spent in the navy; he was afterwards an enthusiastic Democrat in politics, and welcomed the French Revolution. After this excitement subsided he was converted, and resolved on dedicating his life to missionary labors. India was the chosen field, and, having secured the promised co-operation of Messrs. Innes, Ewing, and Bogue, of Gosport, to whom he guaranteed adequate stipends, he applied to the Indian government to sanction his enterprise. The East India Company directors, after much deliberation, resolved that the superstitions of. Hindostan should not be disturbed. Mr. Haldane now determined to employ his resources in spreading the Gospel at home, and, in conjunction with Rowland Hill and other eminent evangelists, he was instrumental in awakening an extensive revival of religion throughout Scotland. The General Assembly (1800) forbade field preaching, and discouraged the revival. Mr. Haldane therefore seceded from the Established Church, and at his own expense erected places of worship, under the name of Tabernacle in. all the large towns of Scotland; and educated 300 young men under Dr. Bogue at Gosport, Mr. Ewing at Glasgow, and Mr. limes at Dundee. He also organized a theological school at Paris. His attention was subsequently directed to the evangelization of Africa. To commence this undertaking, the procured thirty young children from Sierra Leone to receive a Christian education at his expense, and gave a bond for £7000 for their board arid education, which, however, the friends of emancipation in London undertook to defray. This is only one specimen of his munificence. His personal labors. in awakening a religious spirit in the south of France were successful beyond his own most sanguine expectations; and both at Geneva and Montauban he sowed the seeds of truth, which are bearing good fruit to this day in the Protestant churches of France. Mr. Haldane took a prominent part in the management of the Continental Society and the Bible Society of Edinburgh; and in the painful controversy relative to the circulation of the Apocrypha by the British and Foreign Bible Society, which led to the establishment of the latter. He was the author. of The Evidence and Authority of divine Revelation (3rd ed. 1839, 2 vols. 12mo): — An Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans (Lond. 1839, 2 vols. 12mo): — Verbal Inspiration (6th ed. 1853, 12mo); and various controversial pamphlets. He died Dec. 12, 1842. — Jamieson, Religious Biography, p.  240; Rich, Biogr. Dictionary; Darling, Lives of the Brothers Haldane (Lond. 1852, 8vo); Belcher, Memoir of Robert and James Alexander Haldane (Amer. Tract. Soc.).

## Halde, Du[[@Headword:Halde, Du]]

             SEE DU HALDE.

## Hale, Benjamin, D.D[[@Headword:Hale, Benjamin, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Old Newbury, Massachusetts, in 1797. He graduated with honor from Bowdoin College in 1818, and immediately became principal of the Saco Academy. In 1819 he entered the Andover Theological Seminary, and became a minister of the Congregational Church in 1822. The four years thereafter he spent as a tutor in Bowdoin. In 1827 he was called to Dartmouth College, N.H., as a professor, and held the office until 1835, when his professorship was abolished by the trustees of the college. He was ordained deacon in the; Protestant Episcopal Church in 1828, and presbyter in 1831. After his return from a visit to the West Indies, whither he went for recuperation in the summer of 1836, he was elected to the presidency of Hobart College, in Geneva, N.Y. In 1852 he made a brief visit to Europe, and in 1856 resigned the presidency of the college, which he had held for twenty years, and afterwards lived in retirement in his native place. He died at Newburyport, Massachusetts, July 15, 1863. Dr. Hale was the author of several scientific and professional works; but his reputation rests largely upon his work as an instructor. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. October 1863, page 507.

## Hale, Bernard, D.D[[@Headword:Hale, Bernard, D.D]]

             master of Peterhouse, in Cambridge University, was born of religious parents, and received his early education in the public school of Hartford. Afterwards he removed to Westminster, thence to Peterhouse, of which he became a fellow. After three or four years spent in his fellowship, his father's death transmitted to him a fair estate, and he resigned his office, and thereafter lived in retirement, chiefly in. Norfolk, occupied with acts of devotion and beneficence. At the Restoration he was moved by a father of the Church to enter the priesthood. Immediately several preferments were offered him, some of which he accepted, but with the understanding that whatever emoluments he reaped therefrom should be dedicated to the service of God. He largely endowed the College of St. Peter. He died about 1663. See The (Lond.) Christian Remembrancer, April 1822, page 208.

## Hale, Enoch[[@Headword:Hale, Enoch]]

             a Congregational minister, brother of Nathan Hale, the Revolutionary martyr, and father of Hon. Nathan Hale, of the Boston Daily Advertiser, was born at Coventry, Connecticut, in 1754; graduated from Yale College in 1773; was ordained pastor of the Church in Westhampton, Massachusetts, in 1779, and died January 14, 1837. He was secretary of the Massachusetts General (Congregational) Association from 1804 to 1824. See Cong. Quarterly, 1859, page 39; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2:572.

## Hale, John[[@Headword:Hale, John]]

             a Congregational minister, was born June 3, 1636, in Charlestown, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1657, and was ordained first pastor of the newly formed Church at Beverley, Sept. 20,1667, where he remained until his death, May 15, 1700. He published an Election Sermon (1684), and A modest Inquiry into the Nature of Witchcraft, and how Persons guilty of that Crime may be convicted, and the Means used for their Discovery discussed, both negatively and affirmatively, according to Scripture and Experience (18mo, 1697). — Sprague, Annals, 1, 168.

## Hale, Sir Matthew[[@Headword:Hale, Sir Matthew]]

             was born at Alderley, Gloucestershire, Nov. 1, 1609, admitted at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, in 1626, and at Lincoln's Inn in 1629. In 1653 (under the Commonwealth) he was made one of the judges of the Common Bench, and in 1671 he was elected to be chief justice of the King's Bench. He died Dec. 25, 1676. He was a learned lawyer, an upright judge, a pious Christian. The only spot upon his memory as a criminal judge is the notorious fact of his having condemned two wretched women for witchcraft, at the assizes at Bury St. Edmund's, in the year 1665. Hale in the course of the trial, avowed himself a believer in witchcraft, and the jury found the prisoners guilty, notwithstanding many impartial by-standers declared that they disbelieved the charge. No reprieve was granted, and the prisoners were executed. Hale was a voluminous writer. Of his legal publications we make no mention here; besides them he wrote An Abstract of the Christian Religion: — A Discourse of Religion: — Contemplations, Moral and Divine: — The Knowledge of Christ crucified (new ed. Glasg. 1828, 12mo). These and other minor pieces are gathered in his Works, Moral and Religious, edited by the Rev. T. Thirlwall, M.A. (London, 1805, 2 vols. 8vo). See Burnet, Life of Sir M. Hale (London, 1682, 12mo; also prefixed to his Works, above named); Baxter, Notes on the Life and Death of Sir M. Hale (Lond. 1682, 12mo; reprinted, with Hale's Thoughts  on Religion, Lond. 1805, 12mo); Campbell, Lives of the Chief Justices; English Cyclopaedia; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, s.v.

## Halenius, Engelbertus[[@Headword:Halenius, Engelbertus]]

             a Swedish prelate, son of Lars, was born October 8, 1700, became bishop of Skara in 1753, held lively discussions with Swedenborg, and died February 14, 1767, leaving some sermons, and a translation of Maimonides. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Hales, Alexander[[@Headword:Hales, Alexander]]

             SEE ALEXANDER ALESIUS.

## Hales, John[[@Headword:Hales, John]]

             of Eton, usually called the “ever memorable,” an eminent English scholar and divine, was born in Bath, 1584, and educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. In 1606 he was elected fellow of Merton College, and was employed by Sir H. Savile in the preparation of his fine edition of Chrysostom, published in 1613. His attainments in Greek gained him the professorship of that language at Oxford in 1612, and in 1613 he was ordained and become fellow of Eton. In 1618 he accompanied Sir D. Carleton to the Hague as his chaplain, and attended him to the Synod of Dort (q.v.). He went to that celebrated body a Calvinist, and left it an Arminian, as is shown by a letter of Farindol (q.v.), prefixed to Hales's Golden Remains, in which he says “At the well-pressingof Joh 3:16 by Episcopius there, I bid John Calvin good-night, as he has often told me” (see Jackson, Life of Farindon, p. 49). In 1636 he wrote for Chillingworth a tract on Schism, in which he rebuked the claims of high Episcopacy. Laud sought to gain over the great Greek scholar, and offered him any preferment he pleased. In 1639 he was made canon of Windsor, but was deprived in 1642. Refusing to subscribe to the covenant, he was compelled to wander from place to place, and at last he had to sell his library for bread. He died May 19,1656. No man of his time had greater reputation for scholarship and piety. Bishop Pearson speaks of him as a “man of as great a sharpness, quickness, and subtlety of wit as ever this or perhaps any nation bred… a man of vast and unlimited knowledge, of a severe and profound judgment.” He wrote unwillingly, and published but a few tracts in his lifetime; but after his death a number of his sermons and miscellaneous pieces were collected under the title of Golden Remains of the Ever-memorable John Hales (London, 1659, 8vo; best ed. 1673, 4to); his Letters concerning the Synod of Dort are published in the edition of 1673. An edition of his Whole Works (with the language modernized) was published by lord Hailes in 1765 (3 vols. 12mo). See Des Maizeaux, Life of Hales (Lond. 1719, 8vo).; General Biog. Dictionary; Jackson, Life of Farindon (prefixed to Farindon's Sermons, vol. 1); Wood, Athenae Oxoniensis, 2, 124; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 5, 476-7; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, s.v.

## Hales, Stephen, D.D., F.R.S[[@Headword:Hales, Stephen, D.D., F.R.S]]

             a Church of England divine, was born September 7, 1677. He entered Corpus Christi College in 1696, graduated A.B. in 1701, A.M. in 1703,  and B.D. in 1711, greatly distinguishing himself meanwhile as a botanist, anatomist, and astronomer. In 1710 he was presented to the perpetual curacy of Teddington, Middlesex, and afterwards accepted the living of Porlock, Somersetshire, which he exchanged for the living of Farringdon, Hampshire. On March 13, 1717, or 1718, he was elected a member of the Royal Society. In 1725 he published a valuable work on Vegetable Statistics, and in 1733 a sequel to it, entitled Statistical Essays. He published a very popular work on Temperance; and in 1739 an 8vo volume entitled, Philosophical Experiments on Sea-water, Corn, Flesh, and other Substances. Dr. Hales also published several sermons and many papers in the Phil. Trans., etc. He died at Teddington, January 4, 1761. See Masters, Hist. of E.C.C.C.; Annual Register, 1764, page 42; Gentleman's Magazine, volume 69; Butler, Life of Hildesley, page 362; Lysons, Environs; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Hales, Wiliam, D.D[[@Headword:Hales, Wiliam, D.D]]

             an Irish divine, was born at Cork, April 8, 1747, and educated at Trinity College, Dublin, of which he became a fellow in 1769. Afterwards he served as a college tutor, and was very popular. In due time he was ordained deacon and priest; and in 1788 was appointed to the rectory of Killesandra, in Cavan, which he held till his death, January 30, 1831. Dr. Hales was eminently faithful in all the duties pertaining to the ministerial office. He was amiable and unselfish, catholic in spirit, and blameless in life. His works are, Sonorum Doctrina (1778): — De Mortibus Planetarum (1782): — Analysis Equationum (1784): — Observations on the Political Influence of the Doctrine of the Pope's Supremacy (1787-88): — The Rights of Citizens (1793): — The Scripture Doctrine of Political Government and Liberty (1794): — Methodism Inspected (1803-5): — Dissertations on the Prophecies Expressing the Divine and Human Character of our Lord (1808): — Analysis of Chronology (1809-14, his most important publication): — Origin and Purity of the Primitive Church in the British Isles (1818). See The Church of England Magazine, March, 1842, pages 147, 164; Memoir of Dr. Hales in the early numbers of the British Magazine; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Half-communion[[@Headword:Half-communion]]

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

## Half-way Covenant[[@Headword:Half-way Covenant]]

             a scheme adopted by the Congregational churches of New England in order to extend the privileges of church membership and infant baptism beyond the pale of actual communicants at the Lord's table. Stoddard, of Northampton, vindicated it, and Jonathan Edwards opposed it. This struggle caused Edwards's removal from Northampton. It is now abandoned by the orthodox Congregationalists. — Hurst, Rationalism, p. 538; Upham, Ratio Disciplinae, 21. SEE CONGREGATIONALISTS; SEE EDWARDS, JONATHAN.

## Halhul[[@Headword:Halhul]]

             (Heb. Chalchul', חִלַחוּל, etymol. doubtful, but, according to Fürst, full of hollows; Sept. Α᾿λοὐλ. r. Αἰλουά), a town in the highlands of Judah, mentioned in the fourth group of six north of Hebron (Keil, Joshua p.  387), among them Beth-zur and Gedor (Jos 15:58). Jerome (Onomast. s.v. Elul) says it existed in his time near Hebron as a small village (“vilula”) by the name of Alta. Dr. Robinson found it in the modern Hulhul, a short distance north of Hebron, consisting of a ruined mosque (called Neby Yunas or “Prophet Jonah”) upon a long hill, surrounded by the remains of ancient walls and foundations (Researches, 1, 319). During his last visit to Palestine he visited it again, and describes it as situated high on the eastern brow of the ridge, the head town of the district, inhabited by an uncivil people; the environs are thrifty and well cultivated. The old mosque is a poor structure, but has a minaret (new ed. of Researches, 3, 281). Schwarz also identifies it with this village on a mount, 5 Eng. miles north-east of Hebron” (Palestine, p. 107). So likewise De Saulcy (Dead Sea, i, 451). The hill is quite a Conspicuous one, half a mile to the left of the road from Jerusalem to Hebron, the village somewhat at its eastern foot, while opposite it, on the other side of the road, is Best-stir, the modern representative of Beth-zur, and a little further to the north is Jedfir, the ancient Gedor. In Jewish tradition quoted by Hottinger (Cippi Hebraicae p. 38), and reported by an old Hebrew traveler (Jo. Chel, 1334; see Carmody, Itin. Hebrew, p. 242), it is said to be the burial-place of (ad, David's seer (2Sa 24:11). Hence it was for a time a place of Jewish pilgrimage (Wilson, Lands of Bible, 1, 384). See also the citations of Zunz in Asher's Betj. of Tudela (2, 437, note). SEE CHELLUS.

## Halhul (2)[[@Headword:Halhul (2)]]

             The modern representative of this place, Halhul, is described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (3:305) as "a large stone  village on a hill-top, with two springs and a well; also a fine spring below ('Hin ed-Dhirweh). On the west is the mosque of Neby Yunis, now in a partly ruinous condition, with a minaret. There are rock-cut tombs south of the village. The hills on the north have vineyards on them, and there are other tombs here also." These last are elsewhere more fully detailed (3:329).

## Hali[[@Headword:Hali]]

             (Heb. Chali'. חֵלי, necklace; Sept. Α᾿λί v.r. Α῾λέφ and Ο᾿ολει). a town on the border of the tribe of Asher, mentioned between Helkath and Beten (Jos 19:25). Schwarz thinks it may be the Chalon (Cyamoion) of Jdt 7:3, opposite Esdraelon, and therefore near the range of Carmel (Palest. p. 191); but the reading of that passage is doubtful (see Arnald, Comment. ad loc.), and such an identification would place Hali far remote from the associated localities, which seem to indicate a position on the eastern boundary, at some distance from its northern extremity. Accordingly Van de Velde suggests (Memoir, p. 318) that “perhaps the site of this city may be recognized in that of Al a, a place where the rock- hewn foundations of a large city are seen, on the south-east side of the village of M'alia, rather more than five hours north-east of Akka; the tell of M'alia would seem to have formed the acropolis of the ancient city.”

## Hali (2)[[@Headword:Hali (2)]]

             For this locality Lieut. Conder accepts (Tent Work, 2:377) the suggestion of the modern 'Alia, which is laid down on the Ordnance Map at nine and three quarter miles south-east of Es-Zib (Ecdippa on the coast), and described in the accompanying Memoirs (1:170) as "a small square building of well-dressed stone, without draft, probably of the crusades; a large number of cisterns and traces of ruins." Among the latter are added, from Guerin, a description of several sepulchral chambers containing sarcophagi. The village of Malia, which lies half a mile north-west, is thought to represent the Meltoth of Josephus (Wars, 3:3, 7), and the Mahalia or Chateau du Roi of the Teutonic knights (ibid. page 149, 155).

## Haliburton[[@Headword:Haliburton]]

             SEE HALYBURTON.

## Haliburton, George (1)[[@Headword:Haliburton, George (1)]]

             a Scotch prelate, minister of Perth, was made bishop of Dunkeld by letters royal, January 18, 1602, and died in 1664. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 98.

## Haliburton, George (2)[[@Headword:Haliburton, George (2)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was born in 1628, consecrated bishop of Brechin in 1678, and was translated to the see of Aberdeen in 1682, where he sat until the Revolution, in 1688. He died at his house of Deihead, in the parish of Coupar, in Angus, September 29, 1715. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 134, 168.

## Halicarnassus[[@Headword:Halicarnassus]]

             ( Α῾λικάρνασσος), in Caria of Asia Minor, a city of great renown, as being the birthplace of Herodotus and of the later historian Dionysius, and as embellished by the mausoleum erected by Artemisia, but of no Biblical interest except as the residence of a Jewish population in the periods between the Old and New Testament histories. In 1Ma 15:23, this city is specified as containing such a population. The decree in Josephus (Ant. 14, 10, 23), where the Romans direct that the Jews of Halicarnassus shall be allowed their national usage of proseuchoe, or prayer-chapels by the sea-side (τὰς ποσευχὰς ποιεῖσφαι τῇ φαλάσσῃ κατὰ τὸ πάτριον ἔφος); is interesting when compared with Act 16:13. This city was celebrated for its harbor and for the strength of its fortifications; but. having made a vigorous and protracted defense against Alexander the Great, he was so much enraged that upon gaining at length possession of it, he destroyed it by fire-a calamity from which it never recovered. A plan of the site is given in Ross, Reisen auf den Griech. Ilseln, 1, 30 (copied in Smith's Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.). The sculptures of the. mausoleum are the subject of a paper by Mr. Newton in the Classical Museum, and many of them are now in the British Museum (see also his full work, Discoveries at Halicarniassus, etc., Lond. 1862-3). The modern name of the place is Budrum.

## Halidome[[@Headword:Halidome]]

             (or Hallydome), an old term for the Last Day-the general judgment.

## Hall[[@Headword:Hall]]

             occurs in the A.V. of the N.T. three times; twice (Mat 27:27; Mar 15:16) in reference to the πραίτωριον, praetorium, or residence of the Roman governor at Jerusalem, which was either the palace built by the elder Herod, or the tower of Antonia; his usual abode was at Csesarea (Act 23:23). Mark adds to the word αὐλή, as he is wont in other cases, an explanatory phrase, ὅ ἐστι πραιτώριον (Vulg. atrium praetorii). In Luk 22:55, αύλή) means the open court or quadrangle belonging to the high priest's house, such as was common to Oriental dwellings. It has the same meaning in Mat 26:69, and Mar 14:66, and in both passages is incorrectly rendered “palace” in the A.V., as the adverbs ἔξω and κάτω plainly distinguish the αύλή from the οῖκος to which it was attached (Luk 22:54). So in Luk 11:21. In Joh 10:1; Joh 10:16, it means a “sheep-fold,” and in Rev 11:2, the outer “court” of the Temple. The αὐλή was entered from the street by a προαύλιον or vestibule (Mar 14:68), through a πυλών or portal (Mat 26:71), in which was a θύρα or wicket (Joh 18:16; Act 12:13). — Kitto. s.v. Αὐλή is the equivalent for חָצֵר, an enclosed or fortified space (Gesenius, Tesaur. p. 512), in many places in the O.T. where the Vulg. and A. Vers. have respectively villa or viculus, “village,” or atritum,” court,” chiefly of the tabernacle or Temple. See Coar. The hall or court of a house or palace would probably be an enclosed but uncovered space, implucium , on a lower level than the apartments of the lowest floor which looked into it. SEE HOUSE.

## Hall, Baynard Rush, D.D[[@Headword:Hall, Baynard Rush, D.D]]

             a Reformed (Dutch) minister, was born in Philadelphia in 1798. At the age of four he was left an orphan, and heir to a large estate, which through  mismanagement never came into his possession. In Union College, where he graduated in 1820, his reputation for ability and scholarship was of the first rank. He was educated with. a view to the law, but Providence turned his steps to the ministry. He graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1823, with bright promise of success, yet most of his life was spent in teaching. He was professor in Indiana University the same year, and taught in after-years in Trenton, Poughkeepsie, Newburgh, and Brooklyn. In 1846 he left the Presbyterian Church and joined the Reformed Church in America, but remained without charge. He died in Brooklyn, L.I, January 23, 1863. Dr. Hall published in early life a valuable Latin Grammar. His volume entitled The News Purchase, or Seven Years' in the West, enjoyed great popularity. Later in life he published a work of acknowledged merit, entitled, Teaching, a Science. He contributed freely to the religious periodicals. See Corwin, Manual of the Ref. Church in America, s.v.; Christian Intelligencer, 1863. (W.J.R.T.)

## Hall, Charles, D.D[[@Headword:Hall, Charles, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Williamsport, Pa., June 23, 1799, and graduated at Hamilton College in 1824 with great distinction. He passed his theological studies at Princeton, was licensed in 1827 and appointed soon after assistant secretary to the Home Missionary Society. In 1852 he went to Europe for his health, visited most of that continent, and returned after a short absence to his accustomed duties. He died Oct. 31, 1853. He edited for several years The Home Missionary; and published A Tract on Plans and Motives for the Extension of Sabbath Schools (1828): — The Daily Verse Expositor (1832) — A Plan for systematic Benevolence; and A Sermon on the World's Conversion. (1841). — Sprague, Annals. 4, 730.

## Hall, Charles, D.D (2)[[@Headword:Hall, Charles, D.D (2)]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born at Williamsport, Pennsylvania, June 23, 1799. He graduated from Hamilton College in 1824; studied two years in Princeton Theological Seminary; was ordained evangelist. March 25,1832; became secretary of the American Home: Missionary Society in 1827; and so continued until his death at Newark, N.J., October 31, 1853. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 49; Nevin, Presb. Cyclop. s.v.

## Hall, David, D.D[[@Headword:Hall, David, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Yarmouth. Massachusetts, August 5, 1704. He graduated from Harvard College in 1724; in November, 1728, supplied the pulpit in Sutton, and was ordained pastor October 15, 1729. His church shared in the great revival of 1740. He died at Sutton, May 8, 1789. Dr. Hall was an able and faithful minister. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:357.

## Hall, Edwin, D.D[[@Headword:Hall, Edwin, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born at Granville, N.Y., January 11, 1802. He graduated from Middlebury College in 1826; studied theology privately; taught in Middlebury for some two years; was ordained at Hebron, August 27, 1830; was successively pastor at Glenn's Falls and Sandy Hill for one  year thereafter; at Bloomfield, N.J., the next year; over the First Congregational Church at Norwalk, Connecticut, for twenty-two years, and in 1854 became professor of Christian theology in Auburn Theological Seminary, a position which he retained until his death, September 8, 1877. He published several works on baptism, and other ecclesiastical subjects. See Genesis Cat. of Auburn Theol. Sem. 1883, page 266.

## Hall, George[[@Headword:Hall, George]]

             an English prelate, was born in 1612, and educated at Exeter College, Oxford. He was the son of the bishop of Norwich, became prebendary of Exeter in 1639, archdeacon of Cornwall in 1641, bishop of Chester in 1662, and died August 23, 1668. He published Sermons (1655-66). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Hall, Gordon[[@Headword:Hall, Gordon]]

             a Congregational minister and missionary to India. He was born in Granville (now Tollaind), Mass., April 8, 1781, and graduated from Williams College in 1808 with the first honors of his class. At college he had formed the acquaintance of Samuel J. Mills and James Richards, afterwards missionaries. He commenced the study of theology under Ebenezer Porter, afterwards president of Andover Theological Seminary, was licensed to preach in 1809, and supplied for a time a church at Wooodbury. But from the time of his acquaintance with Mills it seems he had purposed to become a missionary. In 1810 he went to Andover, was ordained at Salem Feb. 6, 1812 and sailed on the 18th from Philadelphia with Nott and Rice, arriving in Calcutta on the 17th of June. The East India Company refused them the privilege of laboring or remaining in its territory, and Messrs. Hall and Nott embarked for Bombay, where they arrived Feb. 11, 1813. Orders from the governor general followed, commanding them to be sent to England; but by the courage and wisdom of Mr. Hall's memorials, the governor was influenced to repeal his order,  and Mr. Hall remained. He labored zealously and with great success until March 20,1826, when he was suddenly cut off by cholera. Mr. Hall possessed fine abilities, ardent piety, great courage. and self-sacrifice. His indomitable spirit, and the ability of his appeals to the governor general, did much to open the way for the success of Christianity in India. — American Missionary Memorial, p. 41. (G. L. T.)

## Hall, Gordon, Jr., D.D[[@Headword:Hall, Gordon, Jr., D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Bombay, India, November 4, 1823. After preparatory study at Ellington, Conn., he graduated from Yale College in 1843, and from Yale Divinity School in 1847. After a term of service as tutor in the college, he was ordained pastor of the Church in Wilton, October 25, 1848, and June 2, 1852, became pastor of Edwards Church, Northampton, Massachusetts, and so continued until his death at Binghamton, N.Y., November 5, 1879. From 1870 he was a corporate member of the American Commissioners for Foreign Missions; was a trustee of Williston Seminary; and from 1878 was visitor of Andover Theological Seminary. See Cong. Year-book, 1880, page 20; Obituary Record of Yale College, 1880.

## Hall, Henry[[@Headword:Hall, Henry]]

             a learned English divine, was born in London in 1716, and was educated at King's College, Cambridge, where he became a fellow in 1738. In 1750 he was collated to the rectory of Harbledown, and soon after to the vicarage of Herne. He was presented to the vicarage of East Peckham in 1756, and was at the same time librarian of Lambeth. He died at Harbledown, November 2, 1763. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Hall, James[[@Headword:Hall, James]]

             a veteran Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Rutland, Vermont, March 4, 1790. He entered the Genesee Conference in 1813, in which he labored faithfully until his superannuation in 1852. He died at Mayville, N.Y., October 6, 1882. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1883, page 224.

## Hall, James, D.D[[@Headword:Hall, James, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, August 22, 1744. When he was eight years old the family moved to North Carolina,  and settled in Rowan County. He was blessed with pious parents, who taught him the truths of the gospel. and thus early he was brought into the Church. He graduated at Princeton in 1774; was licensed by the Presbytery of Orange in 1775; in 1778 became pastor at Bethany, and there labored faithfully and successfully until his death, July 25, 1826. Dr. Hall was active in the scenes of the Revolutionary war. He published a few Sermons which he preached on national occasions. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3:381.

## Hall, Jeremiah, D.D[[@Headword:Hall, Jeremiah, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister was born at Swanson, N.H., May 21, 1805. He pursued his classical studies in the Brattleborough Academy, Vermont, and his theological studies at the Newton Seminary, where he graduated in 1830. He was ordained February 3, 1831, and had charge, successively, of churches in Fairfax, Westford, and Bennington; afterwards became one of the pioneer laborers of his denomination in what was then the territory of Michigan, and assisted in the organization of the Church at Kalamazoo, of which he was the pastor eight years (1835-43), and subsequently at Akron, Ohio. (1843-45). For some time he was principal of the Norwalk Institute; then pastor in Granville (1851-53); president of Denison University (185363); and being a pastor for a time at Shell Rock, Iowa, returned to Michigan, where he labored as occasion offered until his death, May 30, 1881. See Genesis Cat. of Newton Sem. page 9. (J.C.S.).

## Hall, Joseph, D.D[[@Headword:Hall, Joseph, D.D]]

             bishop of Norwich, was born at Ashby-de-la-Zouch July 1, 1574, and educated at Emanuel College, Cambridge. While rector of Halstead, in Suffolk, he composed his “Contemplations,” which procured him the patronage of prince Henry and the rectory of Waltham. In 1616 he went to Paris as chaplain to the English ambassador. On his return he was appointed by king James to the deanery of Worcester (1617), and in the following year he accompanied his royal master into Scotland, when that monarch made a progress into the northern part of his kingdom to prosecute his imprudent scheme of erecting Episcopacy on the ruins of Presbyterianism. None of the unpopularity, however, of that measure fell upon Hall, whose character and principles secured him the esteem and respect of the most eminent Scotchmen of the day. He was commanded to go over into Holland to attend the Synod of Dort in 1618; but the protracted meetings go that convocation made sad inroads on his health, and after two months he returned with an impaired constitution to England. In 1627 he was raised to the see of Exeter, and afterwards, without any solicitation, to that of Norwich in 1641. Amid all the ecclesiastical tyranny of Laud, bishop Hall preserved his moderation; the bishop, however, had his season of trial. When the popular outcry “No bishops” was raised, and an armed mob marched against the House of Lords, Hall, with eleven of the lords spiritual, joined in protesting against the measures which were passed in their absence; and this document having been made a ground of impeachment, he, with his protesting brethren, were consigned to the Tower. He was released in June following on giving bail for 5000. He continued for a year to exercise his episcopal functions in Norwich; but the popular tide again set in, his house was attacked, his property sequestrated, himself insulted, and in meek resignation he retired into a small place called Higham, in Norfolk, where he spent the remainder of his days in acts of piety and charity, and at length died Sept. 8, 1656, in the eighty-second year of ‘his age. Bishop Hall was a “man of very devotional habits, to fortify which he made a most rigid distribution of his time, having set hours  for prayer, for reading divinity, for general literature and composition; and so intense was his ardor In the pursuit of intellectual and spiritual improvement, that for a time he observed the strictest abstemiousness, taking for a while only one meal a day.” For his depth of thought and elegance of language he has been called “the Christian Seneca.” His writings consist, besides the “Contemplations,” of sermons, polemical and practical theology, and correspondence; the best edition is Works, with some account of his life and writings (edited by Peter Hall, Oxford, 1837,12 vols. 8vo). Many editions of the Contemplations have appeared. See Hughes, Life of Bishop Hall; Hook, Eccles. Biography, 5, 514; Rich, Cyclop. of Biography, s.v.; Jamieson, Religious Biography, p. 245; Wordsworth, Eccles. Biogoraphy, 4, 255.

## Hall, Peter[[@Headword:Hall, Peter]]

             an English divine and theological writer was born in 1803. He studied first at Winchester College, and entered Brazenose College, Oxford, in 1820. He was ordained in 1828, and became successively curate of St. Edmund's Salisbury; rector of Millston, Wilts, in 1834; minister of Tavistock chapel, Drunr Lane, London, in 1836; and of Long Acre chapel in 1841. In 1843 he removed to Bath, and became minister of St. Thomas's chapel, Walcot. He died in 1849. Hall wrote Reliquie liturgicae: Documents connected with the Liturgy of the Church of England (Bath, 1847, 5 vols. 18mo): Fragmenta liturgica: Documents illustrative of the Liturgy of the Church of England (Bath, 1848,7 vols. 18mo); and a number of Sermons. Mr. Hall published a new English edition of that valuable work, The Harmony of the Protestant Confessions (1841,8vo), the two previous English editions of which (Camb. 1586, 12mo; London, 1643, 4to) had become very scarce. He also edited the best edition of the words of his ancestor, bishop Hall (Oxford, 1837, 12 vols.); and wrote Congregations l Reform four Sermons with notes (Loidon, 1835, 12mo). Darlint, Cyclopaedia Bibliog. 1, 1373; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 761; Gentleman's Magazine, November. 1849.

## Hall, Richard[[@Headword:Hall, Richard]]

             an English Romanist writer, was born about 1540. He studied at first at Christ College, Cambridge, but was obliged to leave it in 1572 on account of being a Roman Catholic. He then went to Douay, and afterwards to Italy. Having returned to Douay, he became professor of theology in the  English college of that city. He became successively canon of St. Gery of Cambray, then of the cathedral of St. Omer, and finally official of the diocese. He died in 1604. He published several works of controversy, such as De prismariis Catists Tumulltuim Belglicorim (Douay, 1581): — De quinque partita Conscientia (Douay, 1598, 4to). But he is especially known for his Life of Bishop Fisher, the original MSS. of which was kept by the English Benedictines in their convent of Deeuward in Lorraine. A copy of it fell into the hands of Thomas Bailey, son of Bailey or Baily, bishop of Bangor, who sold it to a publisher: the work appeared under the name of Bailey (London, 1655, 8rv; Lend. 1739. 12mo). See Chalmers, General Biog. Did.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 149.

## Hall, Robert[[@Headword:Hall, Robert]]

             one of the most eloquent of modern preachers, was born at Arnsby, Leicestershire, May 2, 1764. His father, who was also a Baptist minister of good repute, early remarked his talent, and gave him every opportunity for its development. It is said that “Edwards On the Will and Butler's Analogy were the chosen companions of his childhood, being perused and reperused with intense interest before he was nine years old. At eleven his master, Mr. Simmons, declared himself unable any longer to keep pace with his pupil!” In 1773 he was placed under the instruction of the learned and pious John Ryland, of Northampton. At fifteen he became a student in the Baptist College at Bristol, and at eighteen he entered King's College, Aberdeen, where he took the degree of M.A. Here he “enjoyed the instruction of Drs. Gerard, Ogilvie, Beattie, and Campbell, and also formed that intimate friendship with Sir James Mackintosh which continued through life. Mr. Hall was the first scholar in his class through his collegiate course.” In 1785 he was chosen as colleague with Dr. Caleb Evans in the ministry at Broadmead Chapel, Bristol, and adjunct professor in the Baptist Academy there. Here he attained great popularity. His father died in 1791; and the same year a difference with Dr. Evans led to his removing from Bristol, and accepting an invitation to become pastor of the Baptist congregation at Cambridge on the departure of the Rev. Robert Robinson, who had adopted Unitarian views, to be successor to Dr. Priestley at Birmingham. Hall had already acquired considerable celebrity as a preacher, but it was not till now that he appeared as an author; and the impulse that sent him to the press was rather political than theological. His first publication (unless we are to reckon some anonymous contributions to a Bristol newspaper in 1786-87) was a pamphlet entitled Christianity  consistent with a Love of Freedom, being an Answer to a Sermon by the Rev. John Clayton (8vo, 1791).

Like most of the ardent and generous maids of that day, he was strongly excited and carried away by the hopes and promises of the French Revolution. In 1793 he published another liberal pamphlet, entitled An Apology for the Freedom of the Press, and for general Liberty, which brought him much reputation. The impression that had been made upon him, however, by the irreligious character of the French revolutionary movement was indicated in his next publication, Moderne Infidelity considered with respect to its Influence on Society, a Sermon (8vo, 1800). It was the publication of this able and eloquent sermon which first brought Hall into general notice. From this time whatever he produced attracted immediate attention. “In 1802 appeared his Reflections on War. The threatened invasion of Bonaparte in 1803 brought him again before the public in the discourse entitled Sentiments suitable to the present Crisis which raised Mr. Hall's reputation for large views and powerful eloquence to the highest pitch. In November, 1804, owing chiefly to a disease of the sprie, attended by want of sufficient exercise and rest, the exquisitely toned mind of Mr. Hall lost its balance, and he who had so long been the theme of universal admiration became the subject of as extensive a sympathy. He was placed tinder the care of Dr. Arnold, of Leicester, where, by the divine blessing, his health was restored in about two months. But similar causes produced a relapse about twelve months afterwards, from which he was soon restored, though it was deemed essential to the permanent establishment of his health that he should resign his pastoral charge and remove from Cambridge. Two shocks of so humiliating a calamity within the compass of a year deeply impressed Mr. Hall's mind. His own decided persuasion was that lie never before experienced a thorough transformation of character; and there can be no question that from this period his spirit was habitually more humble, dependent, and truly devotional.

It became his custom to renew every birthday, by a solemn act, the dedication of himself to God, on evangelical principles, and in the most earnest sincerity of heart. In 1807 he became pastor of the Baptist church in Leicester, where he soon after married; and where he labored most successfully for nearly twenty years. At no period was he more happy, active, and useful. The church, when he left it, was larger than the whole congregation when he took the charge of it. But his influence was not confined to the limits of his parish. He took an active part in all the noble charities of the age, and by his sermons, speeches, and writings exerted a wide influence on society, not only in England, but on  the continent of Europe, in America, and in India. His review of Zeal without Innovation, his tracts on the Terms of Communion, and his sermons on the Advantages of Knowledge to the lower Classes, on the Discouragements and Supports of the Christian Ministry, on the Character of a Christian Missionary, on the Death of the Princess Charlotte and of Rev. Dr. Ryland, with several others, were given to the public while residing here. Here also, in 1823, he delivered his admirable course of lectures on the Socinian Controversy, partially preserved in his Works. At last, in 1826, he removed to the pastoral care of his old congregation at Broadmead, Bristol, and here he remained till his death, which took place at Bristol on the 21st of Feb. 1831. Besides occasional contributions to Various dissenting periodical publications, Hall published various tracts and sermons in the last twenty years of his life, which, along with those already mentioned, have since his death been collected under the title of The Works of Robert Hall, M.A., with a brief Memoir of his Life by Dr. Gregory, and Observations on his Character as a Preacher by John Foster, published under the superintendence of Olinthus Gregory, LL.D., professor of mathematics in the Royal Military Academy (London, 1831- 32, 6 vols. 8vo; lith ed. 1853). It was intended that the Life should have been written by Sir James Mackintosh, but he died (in May, 1832) before beginning it. Dr. (Gregory's Memoir, from which we have abstracted the materials of this article, was afterwards published in a separate form. SEE GREGORY, OLINTHUS.

The first volume of Hall's Works contains sermons, charges, and circular letters (or addresses in the name of the governing body of the Baptist Church); the second, a tract entitled On Terns of Communion (1815, in 2 parts), and another entitled The essential Difference between Christian Baptism and the Baptism of John (a defense of what is called the practice of free communion, which produced a powerful effect in liberalizing the practice of the Baptist community) (1816 and 1818, in 2 parts); the third, political and miscellaneous tracts extending from 1791, to 1826, and also the Bristol newspaper contributions of 1786- 87; the fourth, reviews and miscellaneous pieces; the fifth, notes of sermons and letters. The sixth, besides Dr. Gregory's memoir, contains Mr. Foster's observations, and notes taken down by friends of twenty-one sermons. The American reprint (New York, Harper and Brothers, 4 vols. 8vo) contains, besides what is given in the English edition, a number of additional sermons, with anecdotes, etc., by Rev. Joseph Belcher.  Robert Hall was one of the greatest preachers of his age. His excellence did not so much consist in the predominance of one of his powers as in the exquisite proportion and harmony of them all. The richness, variety, and extent of his knowledge were not so remarkable as his absolute mastery over it. There is not the least appearance of straining after greatness in his most magnificent excursions, but he rises to the loftiest heights with the most childlike ease. His style as a writer is one of the clearest and simplest- the least encumbered with its own beauty-of any which ever has been written. — His noblest passages do but make truth visible in the form of beauty, and ‘clothe upon' abstract ideas till they become palpable in exquisite shapes. Whoever ‘wishes to see the English language in its perfection,' says Dugald Stewart, ‘must read the writings of Rev. Robert Hall. He combines the beauties of Johnson. Addison, and Burke, without their imperfections.' He is distinguished, however, rather for expression and exposition than for invention; he was an orator rather than a great thinker. But as an orator he will rank in literature with Bossuet and Massillon. For critical estimates of him by Mackintosh and other eminent. men, see Life of Hall, by Gregory, prefixed to his Works; also Eclectic Magazine, 2, North British Review, 4, 454; North American Review, 54, 384; Methodist Quarterly Review, 4, 516; Quarterly Review (Lond.), 47, 100; English Cyclopedia; Jamieson, Religious Biography, p. 246.

## Hall, Samuel Read, LL.D[[@Headword:Hall, Samuel Read, LL.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Conydon, N.H., October 27, 1795. He was educated at Kimball Union Academy, and was for some years a teacher; studied theology with Reverend Walter Chapin of Woodstock, Vt.; was ordained at Concord, March 5, 1823, and remained pastor there until 1830. During this time he established and taught the first normal school in the country; afterwards became principal of the Teacher's Seminary at Andover, Massachusetts, for six years; then took charge of Plymouth Academy, N.H. (1836-39); was pastor at Craftsbury, Vermont, fourteen years; at Browington twelve years, and thereafter, with the exception of two years, when he was acting pastor in Granby, remained without charge until his death, June 24, 1877. He was moderator of the General Convention of Vermont in 1859. He published, The Child's Assistant to a Knowledge of the Geography and History of Vermont  (1827; revised ed. 1868): — Lectures on School Keeping (1829): — Lectures to Female School Teachers. (1832): — The Child's Instructor (eod.): — The Arithmetical Manual (eod.): — Practical Lectures on Parental Responsibility, and the Religious Education of Children (1833): — A School History of the United States (eod.): — The Alphabet of Geology (1868). He assisted president Hitchcock in the geological survey of Vermont, and a part of section 7 in the published Report on Northern Vermont was prepared by him. (W.P.S.)

## Hall, Thomas[[@Headword:Hall, Thomas]]

             a learned English Nonconformist divine, was born at Worcester, July 22, 1610, and educated at Balliol College; was master of the free school at King's-Norton, and curate of the place; and died April 13, 1665. Among his works are many controversial tracts, and commentaries on some parts of the Scriptures. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Hall, Timothy[[@Headword:Hall, Timothy]]

             an English prelate, who was consecrated bishop of Oxford in 1688, and died April 10, 1690, published some Sermons (1684, 1689). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Hall, Wesley[[@Headword:Hall, Wesley]]

             a minister of the Church of England, was one of the Oxford Methodists. Of his origin and early life nothing is known. He became one of Wesley's pupils at Lincoln College, Oxford, and joined the Methodists some time prior to October 25, 1732. The date of his ordination must have been as early as 1734, as he then refused a living. He was at that time deemed a young malt of extraordinary piety, and love to souls. He married Wesley's sister, Martha, whom he afterwards abandoned, but after a very irregular and dissolute life, partly in the ministry, but chiefly as an open Deist, he became penitent, and died at Bristol, January 3, 1776. See Tyerman, The Oxford Methodists, page 386.

## Hallahan, Margaret Mary[[@Headword:Hallahan, Margaret Mary]]

             foundress of the congregation of St. Catherine of Sienna, was born in London, January 23, 1803. From her ninth to her thirtieth year she lived at service, part of the time in Belgium. In 1834 she received her habit as a member of the Dominican order. In April 1842, she returned to England,  and began teaching at Coventry. On December 8, 1845, she laid the foundation at Coventry of the first English convent of Dominican nuns, which had a hard struggle there; although at Langton (1851), Stone (1853), Stoke-upon-Tirent (1857), Rhyl (1864-66), and Torquay (1864) the establishments were successful. In October 1858, mother Margaret, accompanied by Reverend Dr. Northcote, went to Rome, in order to obtain a definite settlement as to the future government of the increasing communities. It was deemed best that they should be united in a congregation under one superioress, with one novitiate, the whole to be under the government of the order of St; Dominic. She was appointed prioress-provincial of the newly formed congregation, which afterwards received the name of St. Catherine of Sienna. Her last work was the establishment of a house at Bow, London. She died at Stone, May 11, 1868. See Cath. Almanac (N.Y.), 1880, page 85.

## Hallam, Robert Alexander, D.D[[@Headword:Hallam, Robert Alexander, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at New London, Connecticut, September 30, 1807. After some time spent in teaching, he graduated from the General Theological Seminary of New York city in 1832; in August of the same year was ordained deacon in Hartford, Connecticut, and went to Meriden as rector of St. Andrew's Church, where he was ordained presbyter, August 2, 1833. He returned to New London in January 1835, as rector of St. James's Church, a position which he held until his death, January 4, 1877. In 1836 he published a volume of Lectures on the Morning Prayer, and a volume of Sermons; also, in 1871, a course of Lectures on Moses, and in 1873 a History of his Parish Church. See Obituary Record of Yale College, 1877.

## Hallbauer, Friedrich Andreas[[@Headword:Hallbauer, Friedrich Andreas]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born in Thuringia, September 13, 1692. He studied at Halle and Jena, was adjunctus of the philosophical faculty at Jena in 1721, professor of elocution in 1731, professor of theology in 1738, and died March 1, 1750. He wrote, De Luthero (Jena, 1717): — De Ecclesia Lutherana (ibid. 1717): — Commentationes Philologicae im Quaedam Loca Vet. Test. (ibid. 1721): — Disp. in Qucedam Loca Novi Test. (ibid. eod.): — Vindiciae Trium Dictornu N. Test. Luk 23:34, Rev 14:13, Rom 9:5 (ibid. 1736): — Messias ex Virgine Exoriturus (ibid. 1740): — Comment. Theol. in Rev 2:2 (ibid.  1741): — Filus Dei Mundi Creator et Pater Hominum (ibid. 1746): — De Jesu sine Patre et Matre (ibid. 1748): — Christus Pulcherrimus Hominum Psa 45:2 (ibid. 1749). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen- Deutschlands; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:4, 736; 2:58; Jocher, Allgemeines. Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hallel[[@Headword:Hallel]]

             (הִלֵּל, Gr. ὕμνος), the designation of a particular part of the hymnal service, chanted in the Temple and in the family on certain festivals.

1. Origins of the name, contents of the service, etc. The name hallel', הִלֵּל, which signifies praise, is κατ᾿ ἐξοχόν, given to this distinct portion of the hymnal service because it consists of Psalms 113-118, which are Psalms of praise, and because this group of Psalms begins with Hallelujah, הֲלְלוּיָהּ.. It is also called הִלֵּל הִמַּצְרַי, the Egyptian Hallel, because it was chanted in the Temple with the Passover lambs, which were first enjoined in Egypt, were being slain. There is another Hallel called הִלֵּל הִגָּדוֹלּ, the Great Hallel (so called because of the reiterated response after every verse, “For thy mercy endureth forever,” in Psalms 136; which is part of this Hollel), which, according to R. Jehudah (Pesachim, 118) and Maimonides, comprises Psalms 118-136 (Jod Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Chanmez. Maza, 8:10). Others, however, though agreeing that this Hallel  ends with Psalms 136, maintain that it begins with Psalms 120 or Psa 135:4 (Pesachin, 118).

2. Time and manner in which it was chanted. — This hymnal service, or Egyptian Hallel, was chanted at the sacrifice of the first and second Pesach, after the daily sacrifice on the first day of Passover (Mishna, Pesachim, 5, 7), after the morning sacrifice on the Feast of Pentecost, the eight days of the Feast of Tabernacles (Mishna, Succa, 4, 8), and the eight days of the Feast of Dedication (Mishna; Taanith, 5, 5), making in all twenty days in the year. “On twelve days out of the twenty, viz., at the sacrifice of the first and second Pesach, of the first day of Pesach, of the Feast of Pentecost, and of the eight days of the Feast of Tabernacles, the flute was played before the altar when the Hallel was chanted” (Mishna, Pesachim, 2, 3), whilst after the morning sacrifice during the eight days of the Feast of Dedication the Hallel was chanted without this accompaniment of the flute. The manner in which “these hymns of praise were offered must have been very imposing and impressive. The Levites who could be spared from assisting at the slaying of the sacrifices took their stand before the altar, and chanted the Hallel verse by verse; the people responsively repeated every verse, or burst forth in solemn and intoned Hallelujahs at every pause, whilst the slaves of the priests, the Levites, and the respectable lay people assisted in playing the flute (comp. Pesachim, 64, a; Erachim, 10, a, b; and Tosipha on Cap. 1; Sota, 27, b; Taanith, 28, a, b). No representatives of the people (אנשׁי מעמד) were required to-be present at the Temple at the morning sacrifices on the days when the Hallel was chanted (Mishna, Taanith, 4, 4). SEE SACRIFICE.

The Egyptian Hallel was also chanted in private families at the celebration of the Passover on the first evening of this feast. On this occasion the Hallel was divided into two parts; the part comprising Psalms 113, 114 was chanted during the partaking of the second cup, whilst the second part, comprising Psalms 115, 116, was chanted over the fourth and finishing cup (רניעי גומר עליו את ההלל, Mishna, Pesachim, 10, 7); and it is generally supposed that the singing of the hymn by our Savior and his disciples at the conclusion of the Passover supper (Mat 26:30; Mar 14:26) refers to the last part of this Hallel. (Dean Alford [Greek Testament, ad loc. ] strangely confounds this Hallei with the Great Hallel.) In Babylon there was an ancient custom, which can be traced as far back as the 2nd century of the Christian sera, to recite this Hallel on every festival  of the new moon (Taanith, 28, a), omitting, however, Psa 115:1-11; Psa 116:1-11.

The great Hallel (הלל הגדול) was recited on the first evening at the Passover supper by those who wished to have a fifth cup, i.e.one above the enjoined number (Maimonides, Jod Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Chawmez t. Maza, 8, 10). It was also recited on occasions of great joy, as an expression of thanksgiving to'God for special mercies (Mishna, Taanith, 3, 9).

3. Present use of the Hymnal Service. — The Jews to the present day recite the Egyptian Hallel at the morning prayer immediately after the Eighteen Benedictions ‘(שׁמונה עשׁרה) on all the festivals of the year except New Year and the Day of Atonement, omitting Psa 115:1-11; Psa 116:1-11, on the last six days of the Feast of Passover, and on the new moon. Before the Hallel is recited they pronounce the following benediction: “Blessed art thou, Lord our God, King of the world, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and enjoined upon us to recite the Hallel!” At the Passover supper, on the first two evenings of the festival, both the Egyptian Hallel and the Great Hallel are now recited; the former is still divided in the same manner as it was in the days of our Savior.

4. Institution of this Hymnal Service. — It is now impossible to ascertain precisely when this service was first instituted. Some of the Talmudists affirm that it was instituted by Moses, others say that Joshua introduced it, others derive it from Deborah, David, Hezekiah, or Hanaaiah, Mishael and Azariah (Pesachim, 117, a). From 2Ch 35:15, we see that the practice of the Levites chanting the Hallel while the Paschal lambs were in the act of being slain was already in vogue in the days of Josiah, and it is not at all improbable that it was customary to do so at a much earlier period.

5. Literature. — Mamonides, Jod Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Chamez u. Mlaza, sections 7 and 8, vol. i, p. 263-265; Buxtorf, Lexicon Chaldaicum Talmudicum et Rabbinicum, s.v. הלל, col. 613-616; and Bartoloccii, Bibliotheca Moagna Rabbinica, 2, 227-243, have important treatises upon this subject, but their information is most uncritically put together, and no distinction is made between earlier and later practices. A thoroughly masterly and critical investigation is that of Krochmal, More Neboche Ha- Seman (Leopoli, 1851), p. 135 sq.; comp. also Edelmanm's edition of the  Siddur with Landshuth's Critical Annotations (Königsberg, 1845), p. 423 sq.; Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel (Nordhausen, 1857), 2, 169 sq.

## Hallelujah[[@Headword:Hallelujah]]

             (Heb. hallelu'-yah', הִלְלוּאּיָהּ, Praise ye Jah, i.e. Jehovah!) or (in its Greek form) ALLELU'IAH (Α᾿λληλούϊα), a word which stands at the beginning of many of the Psalms. See Muller, De notione Hallelujah (Cygn. 1690); Wernsdorf, De formula Hallelujah (Viteb. 1763). From its frequent occurrence in this position it grew into a formula of praise, and was chanted as such on solemn days of rejoicing. (See Critica Biblica, 2, 448.) This is intimated by the apocryphal book of Tobit (13, 18) when speaking of the rebuilding of Jerusalem, “And all her (Jerusalem's) streets shall sing Alleluia” (comp. Rev 19:1; Rev 19:3-4; Rev 19:6). This expression of joy and praise was transferred from the synagogue to the church, and is still occasionally heard in devotional psalmody. — Kitto. The Hebrew terms are frequently rendered “Praise ye the Lord;” and so in the margin of Psa 104:35; Psa 105:45; Psalms 106; Psa 111:1; Psa 112:1; Psa 113:1 (comp. Psa 113:9; Psa 115:18; Psa 116:19; Psa 117:2). The Psalms from 113 to 118 were called by the Jews the Hallel, and were sung on the first of the month, at the Feast of Dedication, and the Feast of Tabernacles, the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of the Passover. SEE HOSANNA.

On the last occasion Psalms 113, 114, according to the school of Hillel (the former only according to the school of Shammai), were sung before the feast, and the remainder at its termination, after drinking the last cup. The hymn (Mat 26:30) sung by Christ and his disciples after the last supper is supposed to have been a part of this Hallel, which seems to have varied according to the feast. SEE HALLEL. The literal meaning of “hallelujah” sufficiently indicates the character of the Psalms in which it occurs, as hymns of praise and thanksgiving. They are all found in the last book of the collection, and bear marks of being intended for use in the Temple service, the words “praise ye Jehovah” being taken up by the full chorus of Levites. SEE PSALMS.

In the great hymn of triumph in heaven over the destruction of Babylon, the apostle in vision heard the multitude in chorus like the voice of mighty thunderings burst forth “Alleluia, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth,” responding to the voice which came out of the throne, saying, “Praise our God all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great” (Rev 19:1-6). In this, as in the offering of incense (Revelation 8), there is evident allusion to the service of the Temple, as the apostle had often witnessed it in its fading grandeur. SEE REVELATION, BOOK OF.

## Hallelujah (2)[[@Headword:Hallelujah (2)]]

              a doxology used frequently in the ancient Church, and derived from the Old Testament. The singing Hallelujah sometimes means the repetition of the word, in imitation of the heavenly host (see Revelation 19); at other times it has reference to one of the psalms beginning with Hallelujah. In the early Christian Church the more common acceptation of ‘hallelujah' is for the singing of the word itself in special parts of divine service, as-a sort of mutual call to each other to praise the Lord.” In some churches the Hallelujah was sung only on Easter day and the fifty days of Pentecost; in others it was used more generally. Augustine says it was not used in time of Lent (Augustine, Epist. 119, 178). In the fourth Council of Toledo it is mentioned under the name Laudes, and appointed to be smug after the reading of the Gospel (Concil. Tolet. 4, can. 10,11). It was occasionally sung at funerals: St. Jerome speaks of it as being smug at the funeral of Fabiola, and says the people made the golden roof of the church shake with echoing forth the Hallelujah (Contra Vigilant. cap. 1, and Epist. 30, cap. 4). The ancient Church retained the Hebrew word, as also did the Church of England in its first Liturgy; though now it is translated “Praise ye the Lord,” to which the people reply, “The Lord's name be praised.” See Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. 14, ch. 2, § 4; Procter.

On Common Prayer, p. 212; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, ch. 15:§ 9.

## Haller, Albrecht von[[@Headword:Haller, Albrecht von]]

             one of the greatest of modern physiologists, was born in Berne Oct. 16, 1708, and displayed, even in childhood, the most extraordinary talents. He studied medicine first at Tübingen, and afterwards at Leyden, under Boerhaave. After extensive travels he became professor of anatomy, surgery, and botany at Göttingen in 1736, and remained there until 1753, when he returned to Berne. There he resided, honored by his fellow- citizens, for nearly a quarter of a century; continued to benefit science by his literary labors; filled several important offices in the state, and adorned the Gospel by his life. He died in October 1777. A great part of the modern science of physiology is due to the labors and genius of Haller. But his place in our pages is due to his steady religious life, to his constant recognition, in his works, of the great truths of Christianity, and especially to his religious writings, viz. Brief über die wichtigsten Wahrheiten der Ogffnbaroug (Berne, 1772); Briefe zur Vertheidigung der Ofenbartrtg  (Berne, 1775-77, 3 parts), consisting of letters to his daughter on the truth and excellence of Christianity. See Zimmermann, Leben Flallers (Zirich, 1755, 8vo); Biographie de Haller (Paris, 1846, 2nd edit.).

## Haller, Berthold[[@Headword:Haller, Berthold]]

             one of the Reformers of Berne, was born at Aldingen, Würtemberg, in 1492. At Pforzheim he had Melancthon for a fellow-student, and graduated bachelor at Cologne in 1512. After teaching some time at Rottwell he went to Berne, invited by Rubellus in 1513 (1518?). He became assistant to Dr. Wyttenbach in St.Vincent's church, and in his society, his knowledge of the Scriptures and his religious character were greatly cultivated. About 1520 he made the acquaintance of Zwingle, who was always afterwards his faithful friend and counselor. Shortly after he succeeded Wyttenbach as cathedral preacher, and soon began to expound Matthew, instead of following the usual Church lessons only. His eloquence and zeal made him extremely popular. When the strife began in 1522 Haller was a member of the commission, and distinguished himself in the conference by his opposition to the bishop of Lausanne. His hold upon the popular mind was so great that in the subsequent years of strife he held his place as preacher in spite of all opposition, and contributed greatly, not so much by his learning as by his personal force of character, to the establishment of the Reformation in Berne. Even with the Anabaptists, on their appearance in Berne, he obtained great influence. In. 1525 he courageously abandoned the Mass. In the Grand Council he defended himself so vigorously that he was still kept in office as preacher, though he lost his canonship. In 1527 a number of Reformers were elected to the “Grand Council.” The venerable Francis Kolb, full of fire and energy, was now in Berne, ready to aid and stimulate the more prudent Haller. The “Mandates” of 1523 and 1526, the former for, the latter against the Reformation, were submitted to the people, and they decided for the first. In the “Conference” of 1528, at Berne, Haller took the leading part, aided by Zwingle, (Ecolampadius, and Bucer. It was finally decreed by the Conference that the Mass should be abolished. In 1529 he married. His labors for the Reformation extended to Solothurn, and to other parts of Switzerland; but his chief activity lay in Berne, where he held his pre-eminence as preacher and Reformer until his death, Feb. 25, 1536. He left no writings. See Kirchhofer, Haller oder die Reform. v. Bern (Zurich, 1828); Kuhn, Die Reformatoren Berns (Berne, 1828); D'Aubigne, History of Reformation, 2, 349; 3:336; 4:296, 308; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 5, 479.

## Haller, Karl Ludwig von[[@Headword:Haller, Karl Ludwig von]]

             was born at Berne Aug. 1, 1768. In 1795 he became secretary of the city council, and in 1800 immigrated to Germany. In 1806 he returned, and became professor of history and statistics at Berne. In 1814 he became member of the city council, and in 1818 made a journey through Italy and to Rome. Having secretly become a member of the Romish Church in 1820, he joined it openly in 1821, and was discharged from his office. He then went to Paris in 1824, and was employed in the ministry of foreign affairs. Having lost that situation in consequence of the Revolution of July 1830, he finally went to Solothurn, where he was in 1834 appointed member of the lesser council. Here he was at the head of the Ultramontane party, and died May 20, 1854. Haller was an ultra-conservative in politics, and was drawn into the Church of Rome by his fanatical hatred of all liberal reforms. His chief work, entitled Restauration der Staatswissenschaften (Winterthur, 1816-1834,6 vols.), was written with the design to annihilate all revolutionary principles in politics. Even many Roman Catholic writers expressed a decided dissent from the anti-liberal doctrines of this work. The most important among his other works are, Lettre a sa famille pour lui declarer son retour a Iglise catholique (Par. 1821; in German by Paulus, Stuttgart, 1821; by Studer, Berne, 1821): — Theorie der geistl. Staaten u. Gesellschaften (Winterthur, 1822):Die Freimaurerei u. ihr Einfluss aufd. Schlweiz (Schaffhausen, 1840): — Gesch. dir kirchl. Revolut. des Cantons Bern (Lucerne, 1839,4th ed.). See Tzschirner, der Uebertritt des Herrn von H. z. kathotischen Kirche (Lpz. 1821); Krig, Apologie der protestantischen Kirche (Lpz. 1821); Escher, Ueber die Philosophie des Staatsrechts mit bes. Bezieh. auf d. Haller'sche Restauration (Zurich, 1825); Scherer (ultramontane), Die Restauration der Staatswissensch. (Lucerne, 1845).

## Hallet, Joseph[[@Headword:Hallet, Joseph]]

             an English Nonconformist, was born at Exeter in 1692, ordained in 1713, and succeeded his father as co-pastor with Mr. Pierce over the Independent congregation at Exeter in 1722. Here he discharged his pastoral duties faithfully until his death in 1744. As a writer, he was marked by industry, learning, and critical sagacity. He wrote a number of controversial tracts on the Evidences of Christianity in reply to Tindal and Chubb, and on the Trinity. Besides these, he published A free and impartial Study of the Holy Scriptures recommended, being notes on peculiar texts of Scripture (Lond.  1729-36. 3 vols. 8vo): — A Paraphrase and Notes on the three last Chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews (London, 1733, 4to). In theology he was a semi-Arian. See Bogue and Bennett, History of Dissenters, 2, 179, 222; Jones, Christian Biography.

## Halley, Ebenezer, D.D[[@Headword:Halley, Ebenezer, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Scotland, August 1, 1801. He graduated from Edinburgh University, pursued his studies in theology under Dick and Chalmers; was ordained pastor at Leith, where he labored for ten years, and then removed to America. His first settlement was in Salem, Washington County, N.Y., as pastor of the United Presbyterian Church. After serving this Church ten years, he was called to the pastorate of the Second Street Presbyterian Church, Troy, where he remained seven years, and then became pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church, Albany. After two years he retired in 1875, as its pastor emeritus. From 1878 he was chaplain of the State Senate. He died October 31, 1881. Dr. Halley was unusually well read in classical and English literature, but his leading, trait was his passion for preaching.. For a great part of his ministry he followed the Scottish method of writing and memorizing; he was at then same time ready, as few are, to respond to a sudden demand for a speech or a sermon. See New York Observer, November 10, 1881. (W.P.S.)

## Halley, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Halley, Robert, D.D]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born at Blackheath, near Londons, August 13, 1796. He joined the Church at an early age, entered Homerton College in 1816, and five years later began his ministry at St. Neot's, Huntingdonshire: On the opening of Highbury College, in 1826, Mr. Halley was chosen resident and classical tutor, which post he occupied for thirteen years. In 1834 he published a reply to Reverend James Yates's letter, which letter defended Mr. Well-beloved's Improved Version of the Scriptures, entitling his reply, The Improved Version truly Designated a Creed. This pamphlet soon attracted special attention by its vigor, keenless of criticism, depth of scholarship, and its able handling of the Greek text. It soon found its way across the Atlantic. In 1839 he accepted a call to the pastorate of Mozley Street Chapel, Manchester, and in 1857 received an appointment to the principalship of New College, from which he retired in 1872. He spent some months at Spring Hill College, supplying a vacantn chair. He  was an indefatigable preacher, travelling over the whole country. He died at Betworth Park, near Arundel, August 18, 1876. Dr. Halley wrote a History of Puritanism and Nonconformity in Lancashire: — Lectures on the Sacraments in The Lord's Supper. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1877, page 367; Allibone, Dict.. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Halliday, David Moffat, D.D[[@Headword:Halliday, David Moffat, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Morristown, N.J., February 9, 1807. He graduated from the College of New Jersey in 1829, studied (1835-36) in the Princeton Theological Seminary, was licensed to preach in 1837, became pastor at Danville, Virginia, in 1838, Peekskill, N.Y., in 1843, without charge after 1867, residing during his latter years at Princeton, N.J. He died at Brooklyn, N.Y., December 8, 1884. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1885, page 34.

## Hallier, Francois[[@Headword:Hallier, Francois]]

             a French prelate, was born at Chartres in 1595. He was doctor and professor of the Sorbonne, and syndic of the theological faculty at Paris. While at Rome in 1652 he was the main instrument of having the five propositions of Jansenius condemned. In 1656 he was made bishop of Cavaillon, and died in 1659. He wrote, Defensio Ecclesiasticae Hierarchiae (Paris, 1632): — Monita ad Ordinandos et Ordinatos (1634): — De Sacris Electionibus et Ordinationibius ex Antiquo et Novo Ecclesiae Usu (1636, 3 volumes fol.). See Winer; Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:461; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hallifax, Samuel[[@Headword:Hallifax, Samuel]]

             bishop of St. Asaph, was born at Mansfield, Derbyshire, in 1733. He studied at Jesus College, Cambridge, and at Trinity Hall, and became successively rector of Chaddington, Buckinghamshire, in 1765; professor of Arabic at Cambridge in 1768; professor of jurisprudence in 1770; chaplain of George III in 1774; master of Doctors Commonis in 1775; rector of Warsop, Nottinghamshire, in 1778, and bishop of Gloucester in 1781. He was transferred to the see of St. Asaph in 1787, and died in 17c0. He wrote An Analysis of the Roman Civil Law compared with the Laws of England (1774, 8vo): — Twelve Sermons on the Prophecies concerning the Christian Religion, and in particular concerning the Church of Papal Rome, preached in Lincoln's Inn Chapel at Bishop Warburton's Lecture (1776, 8vo): — An Analysis of Butler's Analogy: — Discourses on Justification (Camb. 1762, 8vo). See Rose, New General Biog. Dict.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale,. 23, 197; British Critic, vol. 27.

## Hallock, William Allen, D.D[[@Headword:Hallock, William Allen, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, son of Reverend Moses Hallock, was born at Plainfield, Massachusetts, June 2, 1794. He graduated in 1819 from Williams College, and in 1822 from Andover Theological Seminary; the next three years was agent for the New England Tract Society, and in 1825 was, corresponding secretary of the American Tract Society, which he was largely instrumental in founding. He was ordained in Middlefield, Mass., October 5, 1836, and became honorary secretary of the Tract Society in 1870, and so continued until the close of his life in New York city, October 2, 1880. He was for several years editor of the American Messenger, and besides several tracts, wrote and published the following: — The Life of Harlan Page: — The Venerable Mayhews: — Life of Reverend Moses Hallock: — Life of Reverend Dr. Justin Edwards. See Cong. Year-book, 1881, page 24.

## Hallohesh[[@Headword:Hallohesh]]

             or, rather, LOCHESH (Heb. Lochesh'לוֹחֵשׁ, with the article הֲלּוֹחֵשׁ, hal- lochesh', the whisperer; Sept. Α᾿λλωῆς and Α᾿λωῆς, Vulg. Alohes), the father of Shallum, which latter assisted Nehemiah in repairing the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 3:12, where the name is Anglicized “Halohesh”). He was one of the popular chiefs that subscribed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:24). B.C. cir. 410.

## Halloix, Pierre[[@Headword:Halloix, Pierre]]

             a Jesuit of Liege, was born there in 1572, and died July 30, 1856. He is the author of Illustrium. Eccl. Orient. Scriptorum Vitae et Documenta (Douay, 1633, 2 volumes fol.): — Vita et Documenta S. Justini (1622): — Origenes Defensus, S. Origenis Vita, Virtutes et Documenta Libris IV  (Liege, 1648). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:854, 897, 899; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hallow[[@Headword:Hallow]]

             (קָדִשׁ, in Piel; ἀγνιάζω, to render sacred, set apart, consecrate (Exo 28:38; Exo 39:1; Lev 22:2; Num 5:10). The English word is from the Saxon, and is properly to make holy; hence hallowed persons, things, places, rites, etc.; hence also the name, power, dignity of God is hallowed, that is, reverenced as holy (Mat 6:9). SEE HOLY.

## Halloween[[@Headword:Halloween]]

             the Scotch term for the eve of the feast of All-Saints (q.v.).

## Hallowmas[[@Headword:Hallowmas]]

             SEE ALL-SAINTS DAY.

## Hallum (or Halom), Robert De[[@Headword:Hallum (or Halom), Robert De]]

             an English prelate of the first part of the 15th century, was, of the blood royal of England, says Pits (De Scriptoribus Britaninicis, an. 1410), but in what way is not said. He was educated in Oxford, became chancellor of that university in 1403, afterwards archdeacon of Canterbury, bishop of Salisbury, and June 6, 1411, was made cardinal. He was one of the three prelates sent to represent the English clergy in the Councils of Pisa and Constance, in which last service he died at Gotleby Castle, in 1417. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed, Nuttall), 3:323.

## Hallymote[[@Headword:Hallymote]]

             (1) a sacred or holy court, presided over by an ecclesiastic;

(2) a visitation by a bishop of some particular parish or church.

## Halohesh[[@Headword:Halohesh]]

             (Neh 3:12). SEE HALLOHESH.

## Halsey, Abram Oothout, D.D.[[@Headword:Halsey, Abram Oothout, D.D.]]

             a Reformed (Dutch) minister, was born in New York, November 3, 1798. He graduated from Union College in 1822, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1827; became pastor at North and South Hampton in 1829, a position which he retained until a few months before his death at Sweedsborough, N.J., August 23, 1867. He was a man of childlike, catholic spirit, and possessed a peculiar unction in prayer. He was eminent as a preacher. His theology was that of moderate Calvinism, and he held it with genuine charity towards all who differed from him. He was also a decided premillenarian, and was thoroughly versed in the literature of that question. See Corwin, Manual of the Ref. Church in America, s.v. (W.J.R.T.) .

## Halsey, Job Foster, D.D[[@Headword:Halsey, Job Foster, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Schenectady, N.Y., July 12, 1800. He received his preparatory education at Newburgh Academy; graduated from Union College in 1819; taught with his father at Newburgh; studied theology with his brother, and was licensed by the Presbytery of North River, May 1, 1823; spent from 1823 to 1826 at Princeton Seminary; was ordained by the Presbytery of New Brunswick at Freehold, N.J., June 14, 1826, and on the same day installed pastor of the Old Tennant Church in that place, where he labored until May 5, 1828; was agent in New Jersey for the American Bible Society in 1828 and 1829; in Albany, N.Y., in 1829 and 1830, for the American Tract Society, and in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in 1830 and 1831, in the Sunday-school cause. He went to Allegheny City, and was installed pastor of the First Church of that city, July 1, 1831, and labored there until released, April 23, 1836. He was a professor in the Marion Manual Labor College in Missouri, in 1835 and 1836; principal of Raritan Seminary for Young Ladies, at Perth Amboy, N.J., from 1836 to 1848; was installed pastor at West Bloomfield, now Montclair, January 8, 1852, where he remained until 1856; was installed pastor of the First Church of Norristown. Pennsylvania, May 11, 1856, where he labored twenty-four years. Here he died, March 24, 1882. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1882, page 12.

## Halsey, Luther, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Halsey, Luther, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Schenectady, N.Y., January 1, 1794. After receiving a preparatory education, he graduated from Union College in 1812; then entered upon the study of medicine, but soon relinquished it for theology, and in 1816 was ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Blooming Grove, Orange County, N.Y., where his labors were blessed in the ingathering of many souls. In 1829 he was appointed professor of theology in the Allegheny Theological Seminary, and in 1837 professor of ecclesiastical history and Church polity in the Auburn Theological Seminary. In 1844 he again took charge of the Blooming Grove Church, and in 1847 accepted the chair of Church history in the Union Theological Seminary. For several of the last years of his life he occupied a retired relation. He died in New York, October 29, 1880. See New York Observer, November 11, 1880; Genesis Cat. of Auburn Theol. Sem. 1883, page 279. (W.P.S.)

## Halt[[@Headword:Halt]]

             (צֶלִע, χωλός), lame on the feet or legs (Gen 32:31; Psa 38:17; Jer 20:10; Mic 4:6; Mic 7:1; Zep 3:19). Many persons who were halt were cured by our Lord. SEE LAME.To halt between two opinions (כָּסִח 1Ki 18:21), should, perhaps, be to stagger from one to the other repeatedly; but some say it is an allusion to birds, who hop from spray to spray, forwards and backwards, as the contrary influence of supposed convictions vibrated the mind in alternate affirmation and doubtfulness.

## Halyburton, Thomas[[@Headword:Halyburton, Thomas]]

             professor of divinity in the University of St. Andrew's, was born at Duplin, near Perth, Dec. 25, 1674. He was in early youth the subject of frequent but ineffectual religious convictions. In 1689 he began to be perplexed respecting the evidences of revealed religion, till, after having experienced some relief from Robert Bruce's Fulfilling of the Scriptures, he received further aid from Mr. Donaldson, an excellent old minister who came to preach at Perth, and paid a visit to his mother. He inquired of his young friend if he sought a blessing from God on his learning, remarking at the same time, with an austere look, “Sirrah, unsanctified learning has done much mischief to the Kirk of God.” This led him to seek divine direction in extraordinary difficulties; but this exercise, he acknowledges, left him still afar off from God. He studied at St. Andrew's, and became domestic chaplain in a nobleman's family in 1696. His mind, long disquieted about the evidences of Christianity, was finally settled, and he wrote an Inquiry into the Principles of modern Deists, which is still valued. In 1698 he was thoroughly converted; in 1700 he became minister of Ceres parlisi. In 1711 he was made professor of divinity at St. Andrew's. He died Sept. 23, 1712. He was an excellent scholar, and a very pious man. A sketch of his life is given in his Wars, edited by Robert Burns, D.D. (London, 1835, 8vo), which volume contains the following, among other writings, viz. The great Concern of Salvation: — Natural Religion insufficient: — Essay on the Nature of Faith: — Inquiry on Justification, and Sermons. Halyburton's  Memoirs, with an introductory Essay by the Rev. Dr. Young (Glasg. 1824, 12mo), has been often reprinted, both in Great Britain and America.

## Ham  [[@Headword:Ham  ]]

             (Heb. Chanz, חָס, hot [see below]; Sept. Χάμ. [Josephus Χάμας, Ant. i, 4, 1], Vulg. Chamn), the name of a man and also of two regions.

1. The youngest son of Noah (Genesis 5, 32; comp. 9:24). B.C. post 2618. Having provoked the wrath of his father by an act of indecency towards him, the latter cursed him and his descendants to be slaves to his brothers and their descendants (Gen 9:25). B.C. cir. 2514. To judge, however, from the narrative, Noah directed his curse only against Canaan (the fourth son of Ham) and his race, thus excluding from it the descendants of Ham's three other sons, Cush, Mizraim, and Phut (Gen 10:6). How that curse was accomplished is taught by the history of the Jews, by whom the Canaanites were subsequently exterminated. The general opinion is that all the southern nations derive their origin from Ham (to which the Hebrew root חָמִם, to be hot, not unlike the Greek Αἰφίοπες, lends some force). This meaning seems to be confirmed by that of the Egyptian word KEM (Egypt), which is believed to be the Egyptian equivalent of Ham, and which, as an adjective, signifies “black,” probably implying warmth as well as blackness. SEE EGYPT.

If the Hebrew and Egyptian words be the same, Ham must mean the swarthy or sun-burnt like Αἰφίοψ, which has been derived from the Coptic name of Ethiopia, ethops, but which we should be inclined to trace to thops, “a boundary;” unless the Sahidic esops may be derived from Kish (Cush). It is observable that the names of Noah and his sons appear to have had prophetic significations. This is stated in the case of Noah (Gen 5:29), and implied in that of Japheth (Gen 9:27), and it can scarcely be doubted that the same must be concluded as to Shem. Ham may therefore have been so named as progenitor of the sunburnt Egyptians and Cushites. Cush is supposed to have been the progenitor of the nations of East and South Asia, more especially of South Arabia, and also of Ethiopia; Mizrainm, of the African nations, including the Philistines and some other tribes which Greek fable and tradition connect with Egypt; Phut, likewise of some African nations; and Cancan, of the inhabitants of Palestine and Phoenicia. On the Arabian traditions concerning Ham, see D'Herbelot (Bibl. Orient. s.v.). SEE NOAH.

A. Ham's Place in his Family. Idolatry connected with his Name. — Like his brothers, he was married at the time of the Deluge, and with his wife was saved from the general destruction in the ark which his father had prepared at God's command. He was thus, with his family, a connecting link between the antediluvian population and those who survived the Flood. The salient fact of his impiety and dishonor to his father had also caused him to be regarded as the transmitter and representative in the renovated world of the worst features of idolatry and profaneness, which had growls to so fatal a consummation among the antediluvians. Lactantius mentions this ancient tradition of Ham's idolatrous degeneracy: “Ille [Cham] profugus in ejus terra parte consedit, quae nunc Arabia nominatur; eaque terra de nomine suo Chanaan dicta est, et poster ejus Chanianeei. Haec fuit prima gens quae Deum ignoravi, quoniam princeps ejus [Chami] et conditor cultum Deia a patre non accepit, maledictus ab eo; itfaue ignoraootiam divinitatis minoribus suis reliquit” (De, orig. errorts, 2, 13; De falssa Relig. 23). See other authors quoted in Beyer's Addit. ad Seldeni Syntag. de Diis Sytris (Ugolino, Thes. 23, 288). This tradition was rife also among the Jews. R. Manasse says, “Moreover Ham, the son of Noah, was the first to invent idols,” etc. The Tyrian idols called חמנים, Chamanim, are supposed by Kircher to have their designation from the degenerate son of Noah (see Spencer, De legg. Heb'. [ed. Pfaff.] p. 470482). The old commentators, full of classical associations, saw in Noah and his sons the counterpart of Κρόνος, or Saturn, and his three divine sons, of whom they identified Jupiter or Ζεύς with Ham, especially, as the name suggested, the African Jupiter Ammon (Α᾿μμοῦν [or, more correctly, Α᾿μοῦν, so Gaisford and Bahr] γάρ Αἰγύπτιοι καλέουσι τὸν Δία, Herod. Eute7p. 42, Plutach explains Α᾿μοῦν by the better known form Α᾿μμων, Is. et Osir. 9. In Jer 46:25, “the multitude of No” is אָמוֹן מַנֹּא, Amon of No; so in Nah 3:8, “Populous No” is No-Amon, נאֹ אָמוֹן. For the identification of Jupiter Ammon with Ham, see J. Conr, Dannhauer's Politica Biblica, 2, 1; Is.Vossius, De Idol. lib. 2, cap. 7). This identification is, however, extremely doubtful; eminent critics of modern times reject it; among them Ewald (Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 1, 375 [note]), who says, “Mit dem aegyptischen Gotte Amonl oder Hammdn ihn zusammenzubringen hat man keinen Grund,” u. s. w.). One of the reasons which leads Bochart (Phaleg, 1, 1, ed.Villemand, p. 7) to identify Ham with Jupiter or Zeus is derived from the meaning of the names. חָם(from the root חָמִם., — to be hot) combines the ideas hot and swarthy (comp.  Αἰθίοψ); accordingly, St. Jerome, who renders our word by calidus, and Simon (Onomast. p. 103) by niger, are not incompatible. In like maneier Ζεύς is derived ‘afernendo, according to the author of the tynmol. Magn., παρὰ τὴν ζέσιν, θερμότατος γὰρ ὁ ἄήρ, ἤ παρὰ τὸ ζέω, to seethe, or boil fervere. Cyril of Alexandria uses θερμασίαν as synonymous (I 2, Glaphy.r. in Genes.). Another reason of identification, according to Bochart, is the fanciful one of comparative age. Zeus was the youngest of three brothers, and so was Ham in the opinion of this author. He is not alone in this view of the subject. Josephus (Ant. 1, 6, 3) expressly calls Ham the youngest of Noah's sons, ὸ νεώτατος τῶν παίθων. Gesenius (Thes. p. 489) calls him “filius natu tertius et. minimus;” similarly Furst (Hebr. Wörterbuch 1, 408), Knobel (die Genesis erkl. p. 101), Delitzsch (Comment. über die Gen. p. 280), and Kalisch (Genesis p. 229), which last lays down the rule in explanation of the בְּנוֹ הִקָּטָןapplied to Ham in Gen 9:24, “If there are more than two sons, בן גדולis the eldest, בן קטוןthe youngest son,” and he aptly compares 1Sa 17:13-14. The Sept., it is true, like the A.V., renders by the comparative--ὁ νεώτερος, “his younger son.'' But, throughout, Shem is the term of comparison, the central point of blessing from whom all else diverge. Hence not only is Ham הקָּטָן, ὁ νεώτερος, in comparison with Shem, but Japhet is relatively to the same הִגָּדוֹל, ὁ μείζων (see Gen 10:21). That this is the proper meaning of this latter passage, which treats of the age of Japhet, the eldest son of Noah, we are convinced by the consideration just adduced, and our conviction ‘is supported by the Sept. translators, Symmachus, Rashi (who says, “From the words of the text I do not clearly know whether the elder applies to Shem or to Japhet. But, as we are afterwards informed that Shem was 100 years old, and begat Arphaxad two years after the Deluge [11, 10], it follows that Japhet was the elder, for Noah was 500 years old when he began to have children, and the Deluge took place in his 600th year. His eldest son must consequently have been 100 years old at the time of the Flood, whereas we are expressly informed that Shem did not arrive at that, age until two years after the Deluge”), Aben-Ezra, Luther, Junius, and Tremellius, Piscator. Mercerus, Arius, Montanus; Clericus, Dathius, J. D. Michaelis, and Mendelssohn (who gives a powerful reason for his opinion: The tonic accents make it clear that the word הגדול, the elder, applies to Yapheth; wherever the words of the text are obscure and equivocal, great respect and attention must be paid to the tonic accents, as their author understood the true  meaning of the text better than we do.” De Sola, Lindenthal, and Raphall's Trans. of Geneses, p. 43). In consistency with this seniority of Japheth, his name and genealogy are first given in the Toledoth Beni Noah of Genesis 10. Shem's name stands first when the three brothers are mentioned together, probably because the special blessing (afterwards to be more fully developed in his great descendant Abraham) was bestowed on him by God. But this prerogative by no means affords any proof that Shem was the eldest of Noah's sons. The obvious instances of Seth, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, Joseph, Ephraim, Moses, David, and Solomon (besides this of Shem), give sufficient ground for observing that primogeniture was far from always securing the privileges of birthright and blessing, and other distinctions (comp. Gen 25:23; Gen 48:14; Gen 48:18-19, and 1Sa 16:6-12).

B. Descendants of Ham, and their locality. — The loose distribution which assigns ancient Asia to Shem, and ancient Africa to Ham, requires much modification; for although the Shemites had but little connection with Africa, the descendants of Ham had, on the contrary wide settlements in Asia, not only on the shores of Syria, the Mediterranean, and in the Arabian peninsula, but (as we learn from linguistic discoveries, which minutely corroborate the letter of the Mosaic statements, and refute the assertions of modern Rationalism) in the plains of Mesopotamia. One of the most prominent facts alleged in Genesis 10 is the foundation of the earliest monarchy by the grandson of Ham in Babylonia. “Cush [the eldest son of Ham] begat Nimrod the beginning of whose kingdom was Babel [Babylon], and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar” (vers. 6, 8, 10). Here we have a primitive Babylonian empire distinctly declared to have been Hamitic through Cush. For the complete vindication of this statement of Genesis from the opposite statements of Bunsen, Niebuhr, Heeren, and others, we must refer the reader to Rawlisson's Five great Monarchies, vol. 1, chap. 3, compared with his Historical Evidences, etc. (Bampton Lectures), p. 18, 68, 355-357. The idea of an “Asiatic Cush” was declared by Bunsen to be “an imagination of interpreters, the child of despair” (Phil. of Univ. History, 1, 191). But in 1858, Sir H. Rawlinson, having obtained a number of Babylonian documents more ancient than any previously discovered, was able to declare authoritatively that the early inhabitants of South Babylonia were of a cognate race with the primitive colonists both of Arabia and of the African Ethiopia (Rawlinson's Herodotus, 1, 442). He found their vocabulary to be undoubtedly Cushite  or Ethiopian, belonging to that stock of tongues which in the sequel were everywhere more or less mixed up with the Shemitic languages, but of which we have the purest modern specimens in the Mahra of southern Arabia and the Galla of Abyssinia (ibid., note 9). He found, also, that the traditions both of Babylon and Assyria pointed to a connection in very early times between Ethiopia, Southern Arabia, and the cities on the lower Euphrates. We have here evidence both of the widely spread settlements of the children of Ham in Asia as well as Africa, and (what is now especially valuable) of the truth of the 10th chapter of Genesis as all ethnographical document of the highest importance. Some writers push the settlements of Ham still more towards the east; Feldhoff (Die Volkertafel der Genesis, p. 69), speaking generally of them, makes them spread, not simply to the south and south-west of the plains of Shinar, but east and south-east also: he accordingly locates some of the family of Cush in the neighborhood of the Paropamisus chain [the Hindu Kûsh], which he goes so far as to call the center whence the Cushites emanated, and he peoples the greater part of Hindfistan, Birmah, and China with the posterity of the children of Cush (see under their names in this art.). Dr. Prichard (Analysis of the Egyptian Mythology) compares the philosophy and the superstitions of the ancient Egyptians with those of the Hindus, and finds “so many phenomena of striking congruity” between these nations that he is induced to conclude that they were descended from a common origin. Nor ought we here to omit that the Arminian historian Abulfaragius among the countries assigned to the sons of Ham expressly includes both Scindia and India, by which he means such parts of Hindfistan as lie west and east of the river Indus (Greg. Abul-Pharagii, Hist. Dynast. [ed. Pocock, Oxon. 1673], Dyn. 1, p. 17).

The sons of Ham are stated to have been “Cush,” and Mizraim, and Phut,- and Caanan” (Gen 10:6; comp. 1Ch 1:8). It is remarkable that a dual form (Mizraim) should occur in the first generation, indicating a country, and not a person or a tribe, and we are therefore inclined to suppose that the gentile noun in the plural מַצְרַים, differing alone ill the pointing from מַצְרִיַםoriginally stood here, which would be quite consistent with the plural forms of the names of the Mizraite tribes which follow, and analogous to the singular forms of the names of the Canaanite tribes, except the Sidonians, who are mentioned, not as a nation, but under the name of their forefather Sidon.  The name of Ham alone, of the three sons of Noah, if our identification be correct, is known to have been given to a country. Egypt is recognized as the “land of Ham” in the Bible (Psa 78:51; Psa 105:23; Psa 106:22), and this, though it does not prove the identity of the Egyptian name with that of the patriarch, certainly favors it, and establishes the historical fact that Egypt, settled by the descendants of Ham, was peculiarly his territory. The name Mizraim we believe to confirm this. The restriction of Ham to Egypt, unlike the case, if we may reason inferentially, of his brethren, may be accounted for by the very early civilization of this part of the Hamitic territory, while much of the rest w-as comparatively barbarous. Egypt may also have been the first settlement of the Hamites whence colonies went forth, as we know was the case with the Philistines. SEE CAPHTOR.

I. Cush (Josephus Χοῦσος) “reigned over the Ethiopians” [African Cushites]; Jerome (in Quaest. Hebr. in Genes.), “Both the Arabian Ethiopia, which was the parent country and the African, its colony” [Abyssinia = Cush in the Vulg. and Syr.]; but these gradations (confining Cush first to the western shore of the Red Sea, and then extending the nation to the Arabian Peninsula) require further extension; modern discoveries tally with this most ancient ethnographical record in placing Cush on the Euphrates and the Persian Gulf. When Rosenmüller (Scholia in Ges. ad loc.) claims Josephus for an Asiatic Cush as well as an African one, he exceeds the testimony of the historian, who says no more than that “the Ethiopians of his day called themselves Cushites, and not only they, but all the Asiatics also, gave them that name” (Ant. 1, 6, 2). But Josephus does not specify what Ethiopians he means: the form of his statement leads to the opposite conclusion rather, that the Ethiopians were Africans terely, excluded from all the Asiatics [ὑπὸ ἑαυτῶν τε καὶ ἐν τῇ Α᾿σίᾷ πάντῶν], the ἑαυτῶν referring to the Αἰθίοπες just mentioned. ‘(For a better interpretation of Josephus here, see Volney, Systeme Geogr. des Hebreux, in Zieuvres, 5, 224.) The earliest empire, that of Nimrod, was Cushite, literally and properly, not per catachresin, as Heeren, Bunsen, and others would have it.

Sir W. Jones (On the Origin and Families of Nations, in Works, 3, 202) shows an appreciation of the wide extent of the Cushite race in primaeval times, which is much more consistent with the discoveries of recent times than the speculations of the neocritical school prove to be: “The children of Ham,” he says, “founded in Iran (the country of the lower Euphrates) the monarchy of the first Chaldeans, invented letters, etc.” (compare Rosenmüller, as above quoted). According to  Volnev. the term Ethiopian, coextensive with Cush, included even the Hintdis; he seems, however, to mean the southern Arabians, who were, it is certain, sometimes called Indians (in Menologio Greco, part 2, p. 197. “Felix Arabia Tindtl vocatur ubi jelix vocatur India Arabica, ut ali Ethiopica et Gangetica distinguatur,” Assemani, Bibl. Orient. 3, 2, 569), especially the Yemenese; Jones, indeed, on the ground of Sanscrit affinities (“Cus or Cush being among the sons of Brahma, i.e. among the progenitors of the Hindus, and at the head of an ancient pedigree preserved in the Ractmyan”), goes so far as to say, “We can hardly doubt that the Cush of Moses and Valmic was an ancestor of the Indian race.” Jones, however, might have relied too strongly on the forged Purana of Wilford (Asiatic Researches, 3, 432); still, it is certain that Oriental tradition largely (though in its usual exaggerated tone) confirms the Mosaic statements about the sons of Noah and their settlements. “In the Rozit ul-SuoTah it is written that God bestowed on Ham nine sons,” the two which are mentioned at the head of the list (Hind, Sicnd, with which comp. Abulfaragius as quoted in one of our notices above), expressly connected the Hindus with Ham, although not through Cush, Who occurs as the sixth among the Hamite brethren. See the entire extract from the Khelassut- Akhibar of Khondemir in Rosenmüller (Bibl. Geogr. Append. to ch. 3, vol. 1, p. 109 [Bib. Cab.]). Bohlen (Genesis, ad loc.), who has a long but indistinct notice of Cush, with his Sanscrit predilections, is for extending Cush “as far as the dark India,” claiming for his view the sanction of Rosenm., Winer, and Schumann. When Job (Job 28:19) speaks of “the topaz of Ethiopia” (פַּטְרִתאּכּוּשׁ), Bohlen finds a Sanscrit word in פטדת, and consequently a link between Indict and Cush (כּוּשׁ, Ethiopia). He refers to the Syriac, Chaldeean, and Saadias versions as having India for Cush, and (after Braun, De Vest. Scaerd. 1, 115) assigns Rabbinical authority for it. Assemani, who is by Bohlen referred to in a futile hope of extracting evidence for the identification of Cush and India (of the Hindus), has an admirable dissertation on the people of Arabia (Bibl. Or. 3:2, 552 sq.); one element of the Arab population he derives from Cush (see below).

We thus conclude that the children of Ham, in the line of Cush, had very extensive settlements in Asia, as far as the Euphrates and Persian Gulf at least, and probably including the district of the Indus; while in Africa they both spread widely in Abyssinia, and had settlements apparently among their kinsmen, the Egyptians: this we feel warranted in assuming on the testimony of the Arabian geographers; e.g. Abulfeda (in his section on Egypt, tables, p. 110 in the original, p. 151 trans. by Reinand) mentions a  Cush; or rather Kus, as the most important city in Egypt after the capital Fosthaht: its port on the Red Sea was Cosseyr, and it was a place of great resort by the Mohammedans of the west on pilgrimage. “The sons of Cush, where they once got possession, were never totally ejected. If they were at any time driven away, they returned after a time and recovered their ground, for which reason I make no doubt but many of them in process of time returned to Chaldea, and mixed with those of their family who resided there. Hence arose the tradition that the Babylonians not only conquered Egypt, but that the learning of the Egyptians came originally from Chaldea; and the like account from the Egyptians, that people from their country had conquered Babylon, and that the wisdom of the Chaldaeans was derived from them” (Bryant, On Ancient Egypt, in Works, 6, 250). SEE CUSH.

1. Seba (Josephus Σἀβας) is “universally admitted by critics to be the ancient name for the Egyptian [Nubian] Meroe” (Bohlen). This is too large a statement; Bochart denies that it could be Meroe, on the assumption that this city did not exist before Cambyses, relying on the statement of Diodorus and Lucius Ampelius. Josephus (Ant. 2, 10), however, more accurately says that Saba “was a royal city of Ethiopia [Nubia], which Cambyses afterwards named Meroe, after the name of his sister.” Bochart would have Seba to be Saba-eMal reb in Arabia, confounding our Seba (סְבָא) with Sheba (שׁבָא). Meroe, with the district around it, was no doubt settled by our Seba. (See Gesen. s.v., who quotes Burckhardt, Rtippell, and Hoskins; so Corn. a Lap., Rosenm., and Kalisch; Patrick agrees with Bochart; Volney [who differs from Bochart] yet identifies Seba with the modern Arabian Sabbea; Heeren throws his authority into the scale for the Ethiopian Meroi; so Knobel.) It supports this opinion that Seba is mentioned in conjunction with the other Nile lands (Ethiopia and Egypt) in Isa 43:3; Isa 45:14. (The Sheba of Arabia, and our ‘Ethiopian Seba, as representing opposite shores of the Red Sea, are contrasted in Psa 72:10.) See Feldhoff (Volkertafel, p. 71), who, however, discovers manly Sebas both in Africa (even to the southwest coast of that continent) and in Asia (on the Persian Gulf), a circumstance from which he derives the idea that, in this grandson of their patriarch, the Hamites displayed the energy of their race by widely-extended settlements. SEE SEBA.

2. Havilah (Josephus Εὐϊvλας), not to be confounded (as he is by Rosenm., and apparently by Patrick, after Bochart) with the son of Joktan, who is mentioned in v. 29. Joseph and Jerome, as quoted by Corn. a Lap., were. not far wrong in making the Gaetulians (the people in the central part of  North Africa, between the modern Niger and the Red Sea) to be descended from the Cushite Havilah. Kiepert (Bibel-Atas, fol. I) rightly puts our Havilah in East Abyssinia, by the Straits of Baib el-Mindeb. Gesen., who takes this view, refers to Pliny, 6, 28, and Ptolemy, 4, 7, for the Avalitce, now Zeilah, and adds that Saadias repeatedly renders חוילה by Zeilah. Bohlen at first identifies the two Havilahs, but afterwards so far corrects himself as to admit, very properly, that there was probably on the west coast of the Red Sea a Havilah as well as on the east of it just in the same way as there was one Seba on the coast of Arabia, and another opposite to it in Ethiopia.” There is no such difficulty as Kalisch (Genesis, Pref. p. 93) supposes in believing that occasionally kindred people should have like namoles. It is not more incredible that there should be a Havilah both in the family of Ham and in that of Shem (Gen 10:7, comp. with Gen 10:29) than that there were Enochs and Lamechs among the posterities of both Cain and Seth (compare Gen 4:17-18, with Gen 4:18; Gen 4:25). Kalisch's cumbrous theory of a vast extent of country from the Persian Gulf running to the south-west and crossing the Red Sea, of the general name of Havilah (possessed at one end by the son of Joktan, and at the other by the son of Cush), removes no difficulty, and, indeed, is unnecessary. There is no “apparent discrepancy” (of which he speaks, p. 249) in the Mosaic statement of two Havilahs of distinct races, nor any violation- of consistency when fairly judged by the nature of the case. Michaelis and Feldhoff strangely flounder about in their opposite conjectures: the former supposes our Havilah to be the land of the Chvalisci, on the Caspian, the latter places it in China Proper, about Pekin (!). SEE HAVLAH.

3. Sabtlah (Joseph. Σαβάθα, Σαβάθας) is by Josephus, with great probability, located immediately north of the preceding, in the district east of Meroe, between the Astabaras (Tacazze), a tributary of the Nile, and the Red Sea, the country of the Astabari, as the Greeks called them (Σαβαθηνοὶ ὀνομάζονται δὲ Α᾿στάβαροι παρ ῞Ελλησιν, Ant. 1, 6, 2). Kalisch quite agrees in this opinion, and Gesenius substantially, when he places Sabtah on the south-west coast of the Red Sea, where was the Ethiopian city Σαβάτ. (See Strabo, 16, p. 770 ed. Casaub.], and Ptolemy, 4:10.) Rosenm., Bohlen, and Knobel, with less propriety, place it in Arabia, with whom agree Delitsch and Keil, while Feldhoff, with his usual extravagance, identifies it with Thilet. SEE SABTAH.

4. Raamah (Josephus ῾Ρέγμα, ῾Ρέγμος) and his two sons Sheba (Σαβᾶς) and Dedan (Ιουδάδας) are separated by Josephus and Jerome, who place  the last-mentioned in West Ethiopia (Αἰδιοπικὸν ἔθνος τῶν Ε᾿σπερἰων, which Jerome translates Gens AEthiopice in occidentali plaga). Ezekiel, however, in 27:20, 22, mentions these three names together in connection with Arabia. According to Niebuhr, who, in his map of Yemen, has a province called Sabid, and the town of Sabbea (in long. 43° 30', lat. 18°), the country south of Sabid abounds with traces of the name and family of Cush. Without doubt, we have here veritable Cushite settlers in Arabia (Assemani, Bibl. Oriental. 3, 2, 554). All the commentators whom we have named (with the exception of Feldhoff) agree in the Arabian locality of these grandsons and son of Cush. A belt of country ‘stretching from the Red Sea, opposite the Ethiopian Havilah, to the south of the Persian Gulf, across Arabia, comprises the settlements of Raamah and his two sons. The city called ῾Ρέγμα, or ῾Ρῆγμα, by Ptolemy (6, 7), within this tract, closely resembles Raamah, as it is written in the original (רִעְמָה); so does the island Daden, in the Persian Gulf, resemble the name of one of the sons, Dedan. SEE DEDAN.

5. Sabtechah (Joseph. Σαβακαθά, Σαβακάθας) is by Kalisch thought to have settled in Ethiopia, and the former of the word favors the opinion, the other compounds of Sab being apparently of Ethiopic or Cushite origin. “Its obvious resemblance to the Ethiopian name Subatok, discovered on Egyptian monuments (comp. the king סוא, in 2Ki 17:4, and the Sebechus of Manetho), renders its position in Arabia, or at the Persian Gulf, improbable; but Samydace, in Gedrosia (as Bochart supposes), or Tabochosta, in Persia (as Bohlen suggests), or Satakos, are out of the question. The Targum of Jonathan renders it here זנגאי(Zinti), which is the Arabic name for the African district Zanguebar, and which is not inappropriate here” (EK;lisch). SEE SABTECHAH.

6. Nimrod (Joseph. Νεβρώδης), the mighty founder of the earliest imperial power, is the grandest name, not only among the children of Ham, but in primeval history. He seems to have been deified under the title of Bilu- Nipru, or Bel-Nimrod, which may be translated “the god of the chase,” or “the great hunter.” (The Greek forms Νεβρώδ and Νεβρώθ serve to connect Nipru with נַמְרֹדThe native root is thought to be napar, “to pursue,” or “cause to flee,” Rawlinson, p. 196.) He is noticed here in his place, in passing, because around his name and exploits has gathered a mass of Eastern tradition from all sources, which entirely corroborates the statement of Moses, that the primitive empire of the Chaldaeans was  Cushite, and that its people were closely connected with Egypt, and Canaan, and Ethiopia. Rawlinson (Fire Great Mot1., chap. 3) has collated much of this tradition, and shown that the hints of Herodotus as to the existence of an Asiatic Ethiopia as well as an African one (3, 94; 7:70), and that the traditional belief which Moses of Chorene, the Armenian historian, has, for instance, that Nimrod is in fact Belus, and grandson of Cush by Mizraim (a statement substantially agreeing with that of the Bible), have been too strongly confirmed by all recent researches (among the cuneiform inscriptions) it comparative philology to be set aside by criticism based on the mere conjectures of ingenious men. It would appear that Nimrod not only built cities, and conquered extensive territories, “subduing or expelling the various tribes by which the country was previously occupied” (Rawlinson, p. 195; comp. Gen 10:10-12 [marginal version]), but established a dynasty of some eleven or twelve monarchs. By-and-by (about 1500 B.C.; see Rawlinson, p. 223) the ancient Chaldaeans, the stock of Gush and people of Nimrod, sank into obscurity, crushed by a foreign Shemitic stock, destined after some seven or eight. centuries of submission to revive to a second tenure of imperial power, which culminated in grandeur under the magnificent Nebuchadnezzar. SEE NIMROD.

II. MIZRAIM (Joseph. Μεσραϊvν, Μεστραϊvμος), that is, the father of Egypt, is the second son of Cush. Of this dual form of a man's name we have other instances in Ephraim and Shaharaim (1Ch 8:8). We simply call the reader's attention to the fact, vouched for in this genealogy of the Hamites, of the nearness of kindred between Nimrod and Mizraim. This point is of great value in the study of ancient Eastern history, and will reconcile many difficulties which would otherwise be insoluble. “For the last 3000 years it is to the Shemitic and Indo-European races that the world has been mainly indebted for its advancement; but it was otherwise in the first ages. Egypt and Babylon, Mizraim and Nimrod, both descendants of Ham, led the way and acted as the pioneers of mankind in the various untrodden fields of art, literature, and science. Alphabetic writing, astronomy, history, chronology, architecture, plastic art, sculpture, navigation, agriculture, and textile industry, seem, all of them, to have had their origin in one or other of these two countries” (Rawlinson, p. 75).

If, as some suppose, Mizraim in the lists of Genesis 10, and 1 Chronicles 1, stands for Mizrim, we should take the singular Mazor to be the name of the progenitor of the Egyptian tribes. It is remarkable that Mazor appears to be  identical in signification with Ham, so that it may be but another name of the patriarch. SEE EGYPT. In this case the mention of Mizraim (or Mizrim) would be geographical, and not indicative of a Mazor, son of Ham.

The Mizraites, like the descendants of Ham, occupy a territory wider than that bearing the name of Mizraim. We may, however, suppose that Mizraim included all the first settlements, and that in remote times other tribes besides the Philistines migrated, or extended their territories. This we may infer to have been the case with the Lehabim (Lubim) or Libyans, for Manetho speaks of them as in the remotest period of Egyptian history subject to the Pharaohs. He tells us that under the first king of the third dynasty, of Memphites, Necherophes, or Necherochis, “the Libyans revolted from the Egyptians, but, on account of a wonderful increase of the moon, submitted through fear” (Cory's Anc. Frag. 2nd edit. p. 100, 101). It is unlikely that at this very early time the Memphite kingdom ruled far, if at all, beyond the western boundary of Egypt. SEE MIZRAIM.

Land of Ham. — By this and similar poetic terms the Psalmist designates Egypt in Psa 105:23 (“Jacob sojourned in the land of-Ham,” חָםבְּאֶרֶוֹ, here parallel and synonymous with מַגְרִיַם,with which compare Psa 105:27; Psa 106:22-23), and in Psa 78:51 (where “the tabernacles of Ham,” אָהַלֵיאּחָם. , is again parallel with מַצְרִים). What in these passages is the poetical name of Egypt in Hebrew, was among the Egyptians themselves probably the domestic and usual designation of their country (Gesenius). According to Gesenius, this name of Ham (“Coptic Chemi,” for which Lepsius, however, substitutes another word, Hem [Memph.] or Hem [Thebaic]) is derived from the swarthy complexion of the people (what Gesenius calls Coptic Lepsius designates by the now more usual term Memphitic: Gesenius adds the Sahidic [Lepsius's Thebaic] form of “our word Keme [from kern, black]; but Lepsius denies that the name of Egypt, Ham [חָם],has “any direct connection” with this word; he substitutes the root hem, or hem [Memphitic], which is softened into hhem, or hhem, in the sister dialect of Thebes; the meaning of which is to be hot [Tattam, Lex. ,Egypt. Lat. p. 653, 671]. Chemi, however, and Khem, are, no doubt, the constantly used terms for the name of the country [see Tattam, p. 155, 560, and Uhlemann, Copt. Gr. et Lex. p. 154]), while Lepsius says, “not from the color of its inhabitants, which was red, but from that of its soil, which formed a strong contrast with the adjacent  countries.” (Comp. Herodotus's μελάγγαιον, 2, 12, and Plutarch's Αἴγυπτον ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα μελάγγειον ο῏υσαν Χημίακαλοὔσι, De Isid. et Osir. [Reiske] 7,437.) In the hieroglyphic language the name occurs as KM. The inscription of it, as it frequently occurs on the Rosetta stone, is pronounced by Champollion, Akerblad, and Spohn, Chmd (Gesen. Thes. p. 489). The name by which Egypt is commonly called in Hebrew, מָצור מַצְרִיַםshould probably be translated Egypt in 2Ki 19:24; Isa 19:6; Isa 37:25; and Mic 7:12; Gesen. and Furst, s.v.), was not used by the Egyptians (Bahr, Herodot. note, ad 1. c.), but by Asiatics it appears to have been much used of the land of the Nile, as is evident from the cuneiform inscriptions. The Median form of the name was Mitzariga; the Babylonian, Mizir; the Assyrian, Aluzri. The Arabic name of the present capital of Egypt is El Mazr, and the country also is Misr (Sir H. Rawlinson, Jour. R. As. Soc. Vol. 14, pt. 1, p. 18; Lepsius, in Herzog, s.v. Egypt). Josephus (Ant. 1, 6, 2) renders the Hebrew name of Egypt by Μέστρη, and of the people by Μεστρῖοι. Whether, however, we regard the native name from the father, or the Asiatic from the son, they both vouch for the Hamitic character of Egypt, which probably differed from all the other settlements of this race in having Ham himself as the actual ἀρχηγός of the nation, among whom also he perhaps lived and died. This circumstance would afford sufficient reason both why the nation itself should regard the father as their eponymus rather than the son, who only succeeded him in the work of settlement, and why, moreover, foreigners with no other interest than simply to distinguish one Hamitic colony from another should have preferred for that purpose the name of the son, which would both designate this particular nation, and at the same time distinguish it from such as were kindred to it.

On the sons of Mizraim we must be brief, Josephus noticed the different fortune which had attended the names of the sons from that of the grandsons of Ham, especially in the family of Mizraim; for while “time has not hurt” the former, of the latter he says (Ant. 1, 6, 2), “we know nothing but their names.” Jerome (who in these points mostly gives us only the echo of Josephus) says similarly: “Caeterse sex gentes ignotse sunt nobis... quia usque ad oblivionem prseteritorum nominum pervenere.” They both, indeed, except two names from the obscurity which had oppressed the other six, Labin and Philistim, and give them “a local habitation with their name.” What this is we shall notice soon; meanwhile we briefly state such identifications of the others as have occurred to commentators. Josephus, it  will be observed, fenders all these plural Hebrew names by singular forms. These plurals seem to indicate clans speaking their own languages (comp. Mic 7:20, which surmounts our table), centered around their patriarch, from whom, of course, they derived their gentile name: thus, Ludim from Lud; Pathrusim from Pathros, etc. (Feldhoff, p. 94). Lenormant notices the fact of so many nations emerging from Egypt, and spreading over Africa (L'Asie Occidentale, p. 244), for he understands these names to be of peoples, not individuals; so Michaelis, Spicileg. p. 254, who quotes Aben- Ezra for the same opinion. Aben-Ezra, however, does not herein represent the general opinion of the Jewish doctors. The relative אשר משםmisled him; he thought it necessarily implied locality, and not a personal antecedent. Mendelssohn declares him wrong in this view, and refers to Gen 49:24. “It is probable,” he adds, “that Ludim and the other names were those of men, who gave their names to their descendants. Such was the opinion of Rashi, etc.,” who takes the same view as the old Jewish historian.

1. Ludins (Josephus Λουδιείμος) is not to be confounded with Shem's son Lud (Gen 49:22), the progenitor of the Lydians. The Ludim are often mentioned in Scripture (Isa 66:19; Jer 46:9; Eze 27:10; Eze 30:5) as a warlike nation, skilled in the use of spear and bow, and seem to have been employed (much as the Swiss have been) as mercenary troops (Gesen. Jesaias, 3, 311). Bochart (who placed Cush in Arabia) reserved Ethiopia for these Ludim; one of his reasons being based on their use of the bow, as he learns of Herodotus, Strabo, Heliodorus, and Diodorus Siculus. But the people of North Africa were equally dexterous with this implement of war; we have therefore no difficulty in connecting the Ludim with the country through which the river Lud or Laud ran (Pliny, 5, 2), in the province of Tingitania (Tangier); so Bohlen, Delitzsch, and Feldhoff, which last writer finds other names of cognate origin in North Africa, e.g. the tribe called Lucdaa, inhabiting one of the oases, and the district of Ludconar, in Nigritia. Kalisch suggests the Egyptian Letopolis or Letus, and Clarke the Mareotis of Egypt; while Keil supposes the Berber tribe Lecwatah; and Lenormant (L'Asie Occid. p. 244) the Nubians; they think a proximity to Egypt would be most compatible with the fact that the Ludim were Egyptian auxiliaries (Jer 46:9). SEE LUINM.

2. Amarnim (Josephus Ε᾿νενίμος) are, with unusual unanimity, placed by the commentators in Egypt. Calmet represents the older opinion, quoting  Jonathan's Targ. for the Mareotis. Knobel (with whom agree Delitzsch, Keil, and Feldhoff) places them in the Delta, the Sept. rendering Ε᾿νεμετιείμ suggesting to him Sanernhit, the Egyptian word for north country. The word occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament.

3. Leabim (Josephus Λαβιείμ, Λαβίμος) is; with absolute unanimity, including even Jerome and Josephus (who says, Λ. τοῦ κατοικήσαντος ἐν Λιβύη καὶ τὴν χώραν ἀφ᾿ αὑτοῦ καλέσαντος), identified with the shorter word לוּבַים, Lubim, in 2Ch 12:3; 2Ch 16:8; and again in Nah 3:9; Dan 11:43. They are there the Libyans; Bochart limits the word to the Liby-aegyptii, on the west frontier of Egypt; so Knobel. The Hebrew word has been connected (by Bochart) with לֶהָבָה, and the plur. of לִהִב, which means flame; Rashi supposing that they are so called “because their faces were inflamed with the sun's heat” (Isa 13:8), from their residence so near the torrid zone. Hitzig's idea that the Lehabim may be Nubians is also held by Lenormant (L'Asie Occid. p. 244). The opinion of the latter is based upon the general principle entertained by him, that, as Cush peopled Ethiopia, and Phut Libya, and Canaan Phoenicia, so to Mizraim must be appropriated Egypt, or (at least) the vicinity of that country. There is some force in this view, although the application of it in the case of Lehabim need not confine his choice to Nubia. Libya, with which the name is associated by most writers since Josephus, is contiguous to Egypt, on its western frontier, and would answer the conditions as well as Nubia. SEE LEHABIM.

4. Caphtufhins (Josephus Νέδεμος), according to Bochart and Rosenmüller, should be identified with Nephtys, in the north of Egypt; Bohlen suggests the Nobatce, in Libya; Corn. a Lap. the Numidians; Patrick (after Grotius) Nepata, in Ethiopia; but none of these opinions appear to us so probable as that of Knobel, who thus vindicates for the Memphitic, or Middle Egyptians, the claim to be the Naphtuhim. Memphis was the chief seat of the worship of Phthah, an Egyptian deity. If the plural possessive particle na= οἱ τοῦ (Uhlemann, sec. 14, 1) be prefixed, we get the word na-Ptahh, the people of Phthah, οἱ τοῦ Φθάτ, just as the Moabites are designated the people of Chemosh (Num 21:29; Jer 48:46), and the Hebrews the people of Jehovah (Eze 36:20). SEE NAPHTUHIM.

5. Pathrusim (Josephus (Φεδρωσίμος) are undoubtedly the people of Upper Egypt, or the Thebaid, of which the capital, Thebes, is mentioned,  under the name of No and No-Amon, in Nah 3:8; Eze 30:14-16; and Jer 46:25. Pathros is an Egyptian name, signifying the South country (pet-res), which may possibly include Nubia also; in Isa 11:11, and probably Jer 44:15, Pathros is mentioned as distinct from, though in close connection with, Egypt. By Greek and Roman writers the Thebaid is called Nomus Phaturites (Pliny, Hist. Xat. v, 9; Ptol. 4:5, 69). So Bochart, Bohlen, Delitzsch, Kalisch, Keil, Knobel. Brugsch's suggestion that our word comes from Pa-Hathor, that is, the Nome of Hathor, an Egyptian deity of the nether world, is an improbable one. SEE PATHAUSIM.

6. Casluhim (Josephus Χεσλοῖμος). In addition to what is said under the article CASLUHIM SEE CASLUHIM , it may be observed that the Coptic (Basmuric) name of the district called Casiotis, which Rosenmüller writes Chadsaieloihe, is compounded of ges, a “mount,” and lokh, “to burn,” and well indicates a rugged and arid country, out of which a colony may be. supposed to have emigrated to a land called so nearly after their own home. (Comp. כִּסְלוֹח, and Cheslokh, and Κολχίς, with the metathesis which Gesenius suggests.) This proximity to southwest Palestine of their original abode also exactly corresponds to the relation between these Casluhim and the next mentioned people, expressed in the parenthetical clause, “Out of whom came Philistim” (Gen 10:14); i.e. the Philistines were a colony of the Casluhim,. probably drafted off into the neighboring province in consequence of the poverty of their parental home, the very cause which we may suppose impelled some of the Casluhim themselves to seek a more favorable settlement on the south-east shore of the Black Sea, in Colchis.

Philistin (Josephus Φυλιστινός), who, according to Josephus, suggested to the Greeks the name of Palestine. We here advert to the various readings of the Hebrew text suggested by Michaelis (Spiciley. p. 278), who, after Rashi and Masius, would transpose the sentence thus: וְאֶתאּכִּס8 וְאֶתאּכִּפְ8 אֲשֶׁר יָצְאוּ מַשָׁם פְּל, that is, “And Casluhim, and Capthorim (out of whom came Philistim”). This transposition makes Caphtorin the origin of the Philistines, according to Amo 9:7, and perhaps Deu 2:23; Jer 47:4. Rosenmüller, Gesenius, and Bohlen assent to this change, but there is no authority for it either in MSS., Targums, or Versions; and another rendering of the passage, “Out of whom came Philistim and Caphtorim,” is equally without foundation. In  the Hebrew text, as well as the Targums and the Sept., Philistim alone appears as a subject, all the other proper names (including the last, Caphtorim) have the objective sign אֶת,יִת, and τούς. This is decisive. SEE PHILISTINES.

7. Capthorim (Josephus Χεφθόριμος by Onkelos is rendered קִפּוּטְקָאֵי, “Cappadocians;” in the Peshito also “Cappadocians.” So the other Targums, and (according to Calmet) “veteres omnes ac recentiores stant pro Cappadocibus.” SEE CAPHTHOR. In support of the opinion advanced concerning the Caphthorim in this article, it may be observed that in the Mishna (Cethuboth [Surenh.], 3:103), the very word of the Targum, קפוטקיא, Cappadocia, repeatedly occurs; and (what escaped the notice of Bochart) Maimonides, an excellent authority in Egyptian topography, and Bartenora, both in their notes explain this Calphutkaja to be Caphtor, and identify it with Damietta, in the north of Egypt, in ‘the immediate vicinity of that Casiotis where we placed the primitive Casluhim. It may be added, as some support to our own opinion, that Benjamin of Tudela says (Asher, p. 158; ed. Bohn, p. 121, 123), “Damietta is Caphtor in Scripture.”

III. PHUT (Josephus Φούτης.), the third son of Ham, is thus noticed by Josephus (Ant. 1, 6, 2): “Phut was the founder of Libya; he called the inhabitants Phutites, after himself; there is a river in the country of the Moors which bears that name; whence it is that we may see the greatest part of the Grecian historiographers mention that river and the adjoining country by the appellation of Phut; but its present name has been given it from one of the sons of Mizraim, who was called Libys [the progenitor of the Labin].” Jerome of course adopts this view, which has also been endorsed by Bochart, Michaelis, Rosenmuller, Gesenius, Bohlen, Delitzsch, Keil, and Kalisch. The versions corroborate it also, Tor in Jer 46:9 [Sept. 26:9], פּוּט (Phut) is rendered “Libyans” in the A.V., Libyes in the Vulg., and Λίβυες in the Sept. Similarly the פּוֹּט of Eze 30:5, is “Libya” in the A.V., Libyes in the Vulg., and Λίβυες in the Sept. (so Eze 38:5).

Like some of their kindred races, the children of Phut are celebrated in the Scriptures “as a warlike, well-armed tribe, sought as allies, and dreaded as enemies” (Kalisch). Phut means a bow; and the nation seems to have been skilled in archery, according to the statements of the Bible. We may add, in confirmation of the preceding view of the locality of Phut, that the Coptic name of Libya, nearest to Egypt, was Phaiat. The supposition of Hitzig that Phut was Πούτεα, west of Libya, on the north coast of  Africa, and of Kalisch that it might have been Buto the capital of the Delta, on the south shore of the Butic lake, are unlikely to find much acceptance by the side of the universal choice of all the chief writers, which we have indicated above. (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 5, 1, has mentioned the river, referred to by Josephus, as the Fut [or Phuth], and Ptolemy, in like manner, as the 4῎οᾷ-, 4:1, 3; comp. Michaelis, Spicileg. 1, 160.) It must be admitted that Josephus and those who have followed him are vague in their identification. Libya was of vast extent; as, however, it extended to the Egyptian frontier, it will, perhaps, best fulfil all the conditions of the case, keeping in view the military connection which seems to have existed between Phut and Egypt, if we deposit the posterity of Phut in Eastern Libya contiguous to Egypt, not pressing too exactly the statement of Josephus, who probably meant no more, by his reference to the country, of the Moors and the river Phut, than the readily allowed fact that in the vast and unexplored regions of Africa might be found traces, in certain local names, of this ancient son of Ham. The only objection to this extent of Libya is that this part of the country has already been assigned to the Lehabins (see above). To us, however, it seems sufficient to obviate this difficulty to hold that while the Lehabim impinged on the border of Upper Egypt, the children of Phut were contiguous to Lower Egypt, and extended westward along the north coast of Africa, and into the very interior of the continent. Phut was no doubt of much greater extent than the Lehabim, who were only a branch of Mizraim; for it will be observed that in the case of Phut, unlike his brothers, he is mentioned alone without children. Their settlements are included in the general name of their father Phut, without the subdivisions into which the districts colonized by his brothers' children were arranged. The designation, therefore, of Phut is generic; of Ludim, Lehabim, etc., specific, and in territory limited.

IV. CANAAN (Josephus Χανάανος) was the youngest of the sons of Ham, and there is less obscurity concerning his descendants. “Canaan, the fourth son of Ham,” says Josephus (Ant. 1, 6, 2), “inhabited the country now called Judaea (τὴν νῦν καλουμένην Ι᾿ουδαίαν. In the time of Josephus, it must be recollected, this included the entire country which we loosely call the Holy Land), and called it after his own name, “Canaan.” This country is more distinctly described than any other in Holy Scripture, and in the record of Ham's family in Genesis 10, its boundary is sketched (see Gen 10:19), excluding the district east of the Jordan. The name Canaan, however, is sometimes used in a more limited sense than is indicated here  and elsewhere. Thus, in Num 13:29, “the Canaanites” are said to “dwell by the sea and by the coast of the Jordan” (i.e. obviously in the lowlands, both maritime and inland), in opposition to the Hittites and others who occupy the highlands. This limitation probably indicates the settlements of Canaan only--as a separate tribe, apart from those of his sons-afterwards to be enumerated (compare, for a similar limitation of a more extensive name, Caesar, De Bell. Gall. 1, 1, where Gallia has both a specific and a generic sense; comp. also the specific as well as generic meaning of Angle or Enyle in the Saxon Chronicle [Gibson, p. 13; Thorpe, 1, 21] “of Angle common ... East Engla, Middel Angla”). On the much- vexed questions of the curse of Noah (who was the object of it, and what was the extent) we can here only touch. SEE NOAH. What we have already discovered, however, of the power, energy, and widely spread dominion of the sons of Ham, whom we have hitherto mentioned, offers some guidance to the solution of at least the latter question. The remarkable enterprise of the Cushite hero, Nimrod, his establishment of imperial power, as an advance on patriarchal government; the strength of the Egypt of Mizraim, and its long domination over the house of Israel; and the evidence which now and then appears that even Phut (who is the most obscure in his fortunes of all the Hamitic race) maintained a relation to the descendants of Shem which was far from servile or subject-all clearly tend to limit the application of Noah's maledictory prophecy to the precise terms in which it was indited: “Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he [not Cush, not Mizraim, not Phut; but he] be to his brethren” (Gen 9:25); “that is,” says Aben-Ezra, “to Cush, Mizraim, and Phut, his father's sons”-with remarkable inattention to the context: “Blessed be the Lord God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japhet and Canaan shall he his servant” (Gen 9:26-27). If we, then, confine the imprecation to Canaan, we can without difficulty trace its- accomplishment in the subjugation of the tribes which issued from him, to the children of Israel from the time of Joshua to that of David. Here would be verified Canaan's servile relation to Shem; and when imperial Rome finally wrested “the scepter from Judah,” and (“dwelling in the tents of Shem”) occupied the East and whatever remnants of Canaan were left in it, would not this accomplish that further prediction that Japhet, too, should be lord of Canaan, and that (as it would seem to be tacitly implied) mediately, through his occupancy of “the tents of Shem?”  1. Sidon (Josephus Σιδὼν δ᾿ ὑφ᾿ ῾Ελλήνων καὶ νῦνκαλεῖται, Ant. i,6, 2) founded the ancient metropolis of Phoenicia, the renowned city called after his own name, and the mother-city of the still more celebrated Tyre: on the commercial enterprise of these cities, which reached even to the south of Britain, SEE SIDON; SEE TYRE.

2. Heth (Josephus Χετταῖος) was the father of the well-known Hittites, who lived in the south of Palestine around Hebron and Beersheba; in the former of which places the family sepulchre of Abraham was purchased of them (Gen 23:3). Esau married “two daughters of Heth,” who gave great sorrow to their husband's mother (Gen 27:46)..

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

4. The Amorite (Josephus Α᾿μοῤῥαῖος) seems to have been the largest and most powerful of. the tribes of Canaan. (The name “Amorites” frequently denotes the inhabitants of the entire country.) This tribe occupied portions of territory on both sides of the Jordan, but its strongest hold was in “the hill country” of Judah, as it was afterwards called.

5. The Girgasite (Josephus Γεργεσαῖος) cannot be for certain identified. (Origen conjectured that the Girgasites might be the Gergesenes of Mat 8:18.)

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

7. The Arkite (Josephus adds for once a locality Α᾿ρουκαῖος δὲ ῾ἔσχεν, ῎Αρκην την ἐν τῷ Λιβάνῳ, Ant. 1, 6, 2) lived in the Phoenician city of Arc, north of Tripolis. Under the emperors of Rome it bore the name of Ccesarea (Libani). It was long celebrated in the time of the Crusades. Its ruins are still extant at Tell Arka (Burckhardt, Syria, p. 162).

8. The Sinite (Josephus Σειναῖος) probably dwelt near his brother, the Arkite, on the mountain fortress of Σιννᾶς, mentioned by Strabo (15, 755) and by Jerome.

9. The Arvadite (Josephus Α᾿ρουδαῖος) is mentioned by Josephus as occupying an island which was very celebrated in Phoenician history.  (Strabo describes it in 16:753.) “The men of Arvad” are celebrated by Eze 27:8; Eze 27:11. SEE ARVAD.

10. The Zemarite (Josephus Σαμαραῖος) inhabited the town of Simyra Σίμυρα, mentioned by Strabo), near the river Eleutherus, at the western extremity of the mountains of Lebanon; extensive ruins of this city are found at the present day bearing the name of Sumrah.

11. The Hamathite (Josephus Αμάθιος). “The entering in of Hanmath” indicates the extreme northern frontier of the Holy Land, as “the river of Egypt” does its southernmost limit (1Ki 8:65 sq.).

In the verse following the enumeration of these names, the sacred writer says, “Afterwards were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad.” This seems to indicate subsequent conquests made by them previous to their own subjugation by the Israelites. “To show the great goodness of God towards Israel,” says the Jewish commentator Mendelsson, “Moses records in Genesis 10 the original narrow limits of the land possessed by the Canaanites, which they were permitted to extend by conquest from the neighboring nations, and that (as in the case of the Amorite Sihon, Num 21:26) up to the very time when Israel was ready to take possession of the whole. To prepare his readers for the great increase of the Canaanitish dominions, the sacred historian (in this early chapter, where he mentions their original boundaries) takes care to state that subsequently to their primitive occupation of the land, “the families of the Canaanites spread abroad, until their boundaries became such as are described in Numbers 24.” The Hamathites alone of those identified were settled in early times wholly beyond the land of Canaan. Perhaps there was a primeval extension of the Canaanitish tribes after their first establishment in the land called after their ancestor. One of their most important extensions was to the northeast, where was a great branch of the Hittite nation in the valley of the Orontes, constantly mentioned in the wars of the Pharaohs, and in those of the kings of Assyria. Two passages which have occasioned much controversy may here be noticed. In the account of Abraham's entrance into Palestine it is said, “And the Canaanite [was] then in the land” (Gen 12:6); and as to a somewhat later time, that of the separation of Abraham and Lot, we read that the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelt then in the land” (Gen 13:7). These passages have been supposed either to be late glosses, or to indicate that the Pentateuch was written at a late period. A comparison of all the passages referring to  the primitive history of Palestine and Idumaea shows that there was an earlier population expelled by the Hamitic and Abrahamite settlers. This population was important in the time of the war of Chedorlaomer; but at the Exodus, more than four hundred years afterwards, there was but a remnant of it. It is most natural, therefore, to infer that the two passages under consideration mean that the Canaanitish settlers were already in the land, not that they were still there.

General Characteristics. — Such were Ham and his family; notwithstanding the stigma which adhered to that section of them which came into the nearest relation to the Israelites afterwards; they were the most energetic of the descendants of Noah in the early ages of the postdiluvian world-at least we have a fuller description of their enterprise than of their brethren's as displayed in the primitive ages. The development of empire among the Euphratean Cushites was a step much in advance of the rest of mankind in political organization; nor was the grandson of Ham less conspicuous as a conqueror. The only coherent interpretation of the important passage which is contained in Gen 10:10-12, is that which is adopted in the margin of the A V. After Nimrod had laid the foundation of his empire (“the beginning of his kingdom,” רֵאשַׁית מִמְלִכְתּוֹ, the territory of which it was at first composed-comp. Hos 9:10, “as the first ripe in the fig-tree בְּרֵאשַׁיתָהּat her first time,” that is, when the tree first begins to bear Gesen.) in his native Shinar, not satisfied with the splendid acquisitions which he took at first, no doubt, from his own kinsmen, he invaded the north-eastern countries, where the children of Shem were for the first time disturbed in their patriarchal simplicity: “Out of that land [even Shinar, Nimrod] went forth to Asshur [or Assyria], and builded Nineveh, and the city Rehoboth, and Calah, and Resen, between Nineveh and Calah; the same is a great city,” i.e. the combination of the aforementioned four formed, with their interjacent spaces, the “great city.” (The objection to this rendering is based by Rosenmüller [Schol. ad loc.), after other commentators, on the absence of the ה“local” appended to אִשּׁוּר[which they say ought to be אִשּׁוּרָהto produce the meaning to Assyria]. The ה“local” is, however, far from indispensable for the sense we require, which has been advocated by authorities of great value well versed in Hebrew construction; Knobel [who himself holds our view] mentions Onkelos, Targ. Jonath., Bochart, Clericus, De Wette, Tuch, Baumgarten, Delitzsch, as supporting it. He might have added Josephus,  who makes Nimrod the builder of Babylon [Ant. 1, 4], and Kalisch, and Keil. To make the passage Gen 10:10-12 descriptive of the Shemitic Asshur, is to do violence to the passage itself and its context. Asshur, moreover, is mentioned in his proper place in Gen 10:22, without, however, the least indication of an intention of describing him as the founder of a rival empire to that of Nimrod. Gesenius admits the probability of our view, without any objection of grammatical structure. [See, for instances of the accus. noun (without the suffix of “local” ה) after verbs of motion, Num 34:4; Gen 33:18; 2Ch 20:36. Compare Gesenius, Gram. p. 130, 172, and Nordheimer's Gram. sec. 841].) This is the opinion of Knobel, answering to the theory which has connected the ruins of Khorsabad, Koyunjik, Nimrfid, and Keremlis together as the remains of a vast quadrilateral city, popularly called Nineveh. (For a different view of the whole subject the reader is referred to Mr. Rawlinson's recent volume on The Five Great Monarchies, i, 311-315.) But the genius which molded imperial power at first, did not avail to retain it long; the scepter, before many ages, passed to the race of Shem (for the Shemitic character of the Arabian tribes who crushed the primitive Cushite power of Babylon, see Rawlinson, Great Empires, i, 222, 223. The Arabian Hamites of Yemen seem also to have merged, probably by conquest, into a Joktanite population of Shemitic descent [see for these Gen 10:25-29, and Assemani, Bibl. Orient. III, 2, 553, 544].), except in Africa, where Mizraim's descendants had a longer tenure of the Egyptian monarchy. It is well to bear in mind (and the more so, inasmuch as a different theory has here greatly obscured plain historic truth) that in the primeval Cushite empire of Babylon considerable progress was made in the arts of civilized society (an early allusion to which is made in Jos 7:21; and a later in Dan 1:4 : see Rawlinson, First Monarchy, chap. 5).

In the genealogical record of the race of Ham (Genesis 10 reference is made to the “tongues” (or dialects) which they spoke (Gen 10:20). Comparative philology, which is so rich in illustrations of the unity of the Indo Germanic languages, his done next to nothing to elucidate the linguistic relations of the families of Ham. Philologers are not agreed as to a Hamitic class of languages. Recently Bunsen has applied the term “Hamitism,” or, as he writes it, Chamitism, to the Egyptian language, or, rather, family. He places it at the head of the “Shemitic stock,” to which he considers it as but partially belonging, and thus describes it: “Chamitism, or ante-historical  Shemitism: the Chamitic deposit in Egypt; its daughter, the Demotic Egyptian; and its end the Coptic” (Outlines, 1, 183). Sir H. Rawlinson has applied the term Cushite to the primitive language of Babylonia, and the same term has been used for the ancient language of the southern coast of Arabia. This terminology depends in every instance upon the race of the nation speaking the language, and not upon any theory of a Hamitic class. There is evidence which, at the first view, would incline us to consider that the term Shemitic, as applied to the Syro-Arabic class, should be changed to Hamitic; but, on a more careful examination, it becomes evident that any absolute classification of languages into groups corresponding to the three great Noachian families is not tenable. The Biblical evidence seems, at first sight, in favor of Hebrew being classed as a Hamitic rather than a Shemitic form of speech. It is called in the Bible “the language of Canaan,” שַׂפִת כְּנִעִן(Isa 19:18), although those speaking it are elsewhere said to speak יְהוּדית, Judaice (2Ki 18:26; 2Ki 18:28. Isa 36:11; Isa 36:13; Neh 13:24). But the one term, as Gesenius remarks (Gramm. Introd.), indicates the country where the language was spoken; the other as evidently indicates a people by whom it was spoken: thus the question of its being a Hamitic or a Shemitic language is not touched; for the circumstance that it was the language of Canaan is agreeable with its being either indigenous (and therefore either Canaanite or Rephaite), or adopted (and therefore perhaps Shemitic). The names of Canaantish persons and places, as Gesenius has observed (1. c.), conclusively show that the Canaanites spoke what we call Hebrew. Elsewhere we might find evidence of the use of a so-called Shemitic language by nations either partly or wholly of Hamitic origin. This evidence would favor the theory that Hebrew was Hamitic; but, on the other hand, we should be unable to dissociate Shemitic languages from Shemitic peoples. The Egyptian language would also offer great difficulties, unless it were held to be but partly of Hamitic origin, since it is mainly of an entirely different class from the Shemitic. It is mainly Nigritian, but it also contains Shemitic elements. It is the opinion of the latest philologers that the groundwork is Nigritian, and that the Shemitic part is a layer added to a complete Nigritian language. The two elements are mixed, but not fused. Some Iranian scholars hold that the two elements are mixed, and that the ancient Egyptian represents the transition from Turanian to Shemitic. The only solution of the difficulty seems to be that what we call Shemitic is early Noachian. (See Rawlinson, Five Great Monarchies, First Mon. ch. 4,  Lenormant, Introduction a l'histoire de l'Asie occidentale, ler Appendice; Meier, Heb. Wurzel. w. b. 3te Anhang; Gesenius, Sketch of the Hebr. Lang. (prefixed to his Grammar); Bunsen, Egypt's Place, etc., vol. i, Append. 1; Wiseman, Lectures on Science and Revealed Religion, p. 445, 2nd ed.; Max Miller, Science of Language, p. 269.) SEE SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.

Theories more or less specious have been formed to account for these affinities to the Hebrew from so many points of the Hamitic nations. None of these theories rise above the degree of precarious hypothesis, nor could it be expected that they should in the imperfection of our present knowledge. It is, indeed, satisfactory to observe that the tendency of linguistic inquiries is to establish the fact avouched in the Pentateuch of the original unity of human speech. The most conspicuous achievement of comparative philology hitherto has been to prove the affinity of the members of that large class of languages which extend from the Eastern Sanskrit to the Western Welsh; parallel with this is the comparison among themselves of the various members of the Shemitic class of languages, which has demonstrated their essential identity; but greater still will be the work of establishing, on certain principles, the natural relationship of tongues of different classes. Among these divergences must needs be wider; but when occasional affinities crop out they will be proportionately valuable as evidences of a more ancient and profound agreement. It seems to us that the facts, which have thus far transpired, indicative of affinity between the languages of the Hamitic and Shemitic races, go some way to show the probability of the historical and genealogical record of which we have been treating, that the tribes to whom the said languages were vernacular were really of near kindred and often associated in abode, either by con quest or amicable settlement, with one another. An inquiry into the history of the Hamitic nations presents considerable difficulties, since it cannot be determined in the cases of the most important of those commonly held to be Hamite that they were purely of that stock. It is certain that the three most illustrious Hamitic nations — the Cushites, the Phoenicians, and the Egyptians-were greatly mixed with foreign peoples. In Babylonia the Hamitic element seems to have been absorbed by the Shemltic, but not in the earliest times. There are some common characteristics, however, which appear to connect the different branches of the Hamitic family, and to distinguish them from the children of Japheth and Shem.

Their architecture has a solid grandeur that we look for in vain  elsewhere. Egypt, Babylonia, and Southern Arabia alike afford proofs of this, and the few remaining monuments of the Phoenicians are of the same class. What is very important as indicating the purely Hamitic character of the monuments to which we refer is that the earliest in Egypt are the most characteristic, while the earlier in Babylonia do not yield in this respect to the later. The national mind seems in all these cases to have marked these material forms. The early history of each of the chief Hamitic nations shows great power of organizing an extensive kingdom, of acquiring material greatness, and checking the inroads of neighboring nomadic peoples. The Philistines afford a remarkable instance of these qualities. In every case, however, the more energetic sons of Shem or Japheth have at last fallen upon the rich Hamitic territories and despoiled them. Egypt, favored by a position fenced round with nearly impassable barriers-on the north an almost havenless coast, on the east and west sterile deserts-held its freedom far longer than the rest; yet even in the days of Solomon the throne was filled by foreigners, who, if Hamites, were Shemitic enough in their belief to-revolutionize the religion of the country. In Babylonia the Medes had already captured Nimrod's city more than 2000 years before the Christian sera. The Hamites of Southern Arabia were so early overthrown by the Joktanites that the scanty remains of their history are alone known to us through tradition. Yet the story of the magnificence of the ancient kings of Yemen is so perfectly in accordance with all we know of the Hamites that it is almost enough of itself to prove what other evidence has so well established. The history of the Canaanites is similar; and if that of the Phoenicians be an exception, it must be recollected that they became a merchant class, as Ezekiel's famous description of Tyre shows (chap. 27). In speaking of Hamitic characteristics we do not intend it to be inferred that they were necessarily altogether of Hamitic origin, and not at least partly borrowed.

Among other points of general interest, the reader will not fail to observe the relations in which the different sections of the Hamitic race stand to each other; e.g. it is important to bear in mind that the Philistines were not Canaanites, as is often assumed through an oversight of the fact that the former were descended from the second and the latter from the fourth son of Ham. The Toledoth Beni Noah of Genesis is a precious document in many respects, as has often been acknowledged (see Rawlinson, Bampton Lectures, p. 68); out in no respect does it bear a higher value than as an introduction, provided by the sacred writer himself, to the subsequent  history of the Hebrew nation in its relations to the rest of mankind. The intelligent reader of Scripture will experience much help in his study of that history, and indeed of prophecy also, by a constant recurrence to the particulars of this authoritative ethnological record.

We conclude with an extract from Mr. Rawlinson's Free Great Monarchies, which describes, in a favorable though hardly exaggerated light, some of the obligations under which the primitive race of Ham has laid the world: Not possessed of many natural advantages, the Chaldean people yet exhibited a fertility of invention, a genius, and an energy which place them high in the scale of nations, and more especially in the list of those descended from the Hamitic stock. For the last 3000 years the world has been mainly indebted for its advancement to the Shemitic and Indo- European races; but it was otherwise in the first ages. Egypt and Babylon, Mizraim and Nimrod-both descendants of Hamled the way and acted as pioneers of mankind in the various untrodden fields of art, literature, and science. Alphabetic- writing, astronomy, history, chronology, architecture, plastic art, sculpture, navigation, agriculture, textile industry-seem, all of them, to have had their origin in one or other of these two countries. The beginnings may often have been humble enough. We may laugh at the rude picture writing, the uncouth brick pyramid, the coarse fabric, the homely and ill-shapen instruments, as they present themselves to our notice in the remains of these ancient nations. but they are really worthier of our admiration than of our ridicule. The first inventors of any art are among the greatest benefactors of their race and mankind at the present day lies under infinite obligations to the genius and industry of these early ages” (p. 75, 76).

2. “THEY OF HAM” [or Cham] (מַןאּחָם; Sept. Ε᾿κτῶν υἱῶν Χάμ; Vulg. de stirpe Cham) are mentioned in 1Ch 4:40 -in one of those historical fragments for which the early chapters of these Chronicles are so valuable, as illustrating the private enterprise and valor of certain sections of the Hebrew nation. On the present occasion a consideciole portion of the tribe of Simeon, consisting of thirteen princes and their clansmen, in the reign of Hezekiah, sought to extend their territories (which from the beginning seem to have been too narrow for their numbers) by migrating “to the entrance of Gelor, even unto the east side of the valley, to seek pasture for their flocks.” Finding here a quiet, and, as it would seem, a secure and defenseless population of Hamites (the meaning of 1Ch 4:40 receives illustration from Jdg 18:7; Jdg 18:28), the  Simeonites attacked them with a vigor that reminds us of the times of Joshua, and took permanent possession of the district, which was well adapted for pastoral purposes. The Gedor here mentioned cannot be the Gedor (q.v.) of Jos 15:58. There is strong ground, however, for supposing that it may be the Gederah (q.v.) of Jos 15:36; or, if we follow the Sept. rendering, Γέραρα, and read גרר for גדר, it would be the well- known Gerar. This last would, of course, if the name could be relied on, fit extremely well; in its vicinity the patriarchs of old had sojourned and fed their flocks and herds (see Gen 20:1; Gen 14:15; Gen 26:1; Gen 26:6; Gen 26:14, and especially Gen 26:17-20). Bertheau (die B. der Chronik) on this passage, and Ewald (Gesch. des Volkes Israel [ed. 2], 1, 322), accept the reading of the Sept., and place the Simeonite conquest in the valley of Gerar (in Williams, Holy City [2nd ed.], 1, 463-468, there is a note, contributed by the Rev, J. Rowlands, on the Southern Border of Palestine, and containing an account of his supposed discovery of the ancient Gerar [called Khirbet el-Gerar, the ruins of Gerar]; see also Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 314). In the determination of the ultimate question with which this article is concerned, it matters but little which of these two localities we accept as the residence of those children of Ham whom the Simeonites dispossessed. Both are within the precincts of the land of the Philistines: the latter, perhaps, may be regarded as on the border of the district which we assigned in the preceding article to the Cusluhini; in either case “they of Ham,” of whom we are writing, m 1Ch 4:40, must be regarded as descended from Ham through his second son Mizraim.

3. HAM (Heb. id. הָם, with he, prob. meaning a multitude; Furst [Lex. s.v.] compares the Lat. Turba and Copia as names of places: the Sept. and Vulg. translate [Χαἀ αβροζχ, [cum] eis), in Gen 14:5, if a proper name at all, was probally the principal town of a people whose name occurs but once in the O.T., “the Zuzims” (as rendered in the A.V.). If these were “the Zamzummisms” of Deu 2:20 (as has been conjectured by Rashi, Calmet, Patrick, etc., among the older writers, and Gesenius, Rosenmüller, Ewald [ Volkes Israel, 1, 308], Delitzsch, Knobel, and Keil among the moderns), we have some clew to the site; for it appears from the entire passage in Deuteronomy that the Zamzummim were the original occupants of the country of the Ammonites. Tuch and others have accordingly supposed that our Ham, where the Zuzim were defeated by Chedorlsomer on his second invasion, was the primitive name of Rabbath Aimon, afterwards Philadelphia (Jerome and Eusebius, Onomast. s.v.  Amman), the capital of the Ammonitish territory. It is still called [the ruins of] ‘Amnnian, according to Robinson (Researches, 3, 168). There is some doubt, however, whether the word in Gen 14:5 be anything more than a pronoun. The Masoretic reading-of the clause, indeed, is בהם וְאֶתאּהִזּוּזַים, the last word of which is pointed, בְּהָם (A.V. “In Ham”), as if there were three battles, and one of them had been fought at a place so called; and it perhaps makes for this reading that, according to Kennicott, seven Samaritan MSS. read בחם (with Heth), which can produce no other meaning than in Ham, or Cham with the aspirate. Yet the other (that is, the pronominal) reading must have been recognized in ancient Hebrew MSS. even as early as the time of the Sept. translators, who render the phrase “together with them;” as if there were but two conflicts, in the former of which the great Eastern invader “smote the Rephaim in Ashteroth- Karnaim, and the Zuzim [which the Sept. makes an appellative Ivrj ἔθνη ἰσχυρά, “strong nations” “along with them,” as their allies. Jerome's Qucest. Hebr. Opera (ed. Bened., Ven. 1767, 3:2, 327) proves that the Hebrew MSS. extant in his day varied in their readings of this passage. This reading he seems to have preferred, בָּהֶם, for in his own version [Vulgate] he renders the word like the Sept. Onkelos, however, regarded the reading evidently as a proper name, for he has translated it by בְּהֶמְתָא, “in Hemfa,” and so has the Pseudo-Jonathan's Targum; while the Jerusalem has בְּהוֹן, “with them.” Saadias, again, has the proper name, in Hama.” Hillerus, whom Rosenmüller quotes, identifies this Ham with the fulminous Ammonitish capital Rabbah (2Sa 11:1; 1Ch 20:1); “the two names.” he says, “are synonymous-Rabbah meaning populous, as in Lam 1:1, where Jerusalem is, רִבָּתיאּעִם, ‘the city [that was] full of people, while the more ancient name of the same city, הָם, has the same signification as the collective word הָמוֹן, that is, a multitude.” SEE GILEAD, 1.

## Ham-menuchoth[[@Headword:Ham-menuchoth]]

             SEE MANAHETHITE.

## Hamadryads[[@Headword:Hamadryads]]

             were certain rural deities in the pagan theogony, or nymphs of the woods, whose fate depended on particular trees with which they were associated.

## Hamaker, Heinrich Arens[[@Headword:Hamaker, Heinrich Arens]]

             a Dutch Orientalist, was born at Amsterdam Feb. 25, 1789; became professor of Oriental languages in the Academy of Franeker in 1815, assistant professor in 1817, and in 1822 professor ordinarius of the same in the University of Leyden, where he died Oct. 10, 1835. He was a man of great erudition, and was regarded as one of the first Oriental scholars of Holland. His works are not free from marks of negligence, due probably to  hasty composition and the great variety of subjects treated. Among them may be named Oratio de religione Muhammedica, mnagno virtutis bellicae. apud orientalis incitamento (Leyd. 181718, 4to): Specimen Catalogi Codicum MSS. Orientalium Bibliotheca Academice Lugduno- Batavae (Leyden, 1820, 4to; with valuable notes from Oriental MSS. — a new ed. by Dozy [Leyd. 1848-52, 2 vols. 8vo] contains bibliographical notes left in MS. by Hamaker): — Incerti Auctoris Liber de Expugnatione Memphidis et Alexandriae, etc. (Leyden, 1825, 4to): — Miscellanea Phoenicia (Leyden, 1828): — Commenentatio in libro de Vita et Morte Prophetarum, etc. (Amst. 1833, 4to): — Miscellinea Samaritana, a posthumous work edited by Weyers. He published also various papers in Annalen of the universities of Göttingen (1816-17) and Leyden (1823-24); in the Bibliotheca Nova of Leyden, Magazin voor Wetenschappen of Van der Kampen, and in the Journal Asiafique of Paris. Others have been posthumously published in the Orientalia (Leyden), vol. 1 and 2. — Pierer, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 209; De Sacy, in Jour. des Savants, 1820, 1827, 1829, 1834. (J.W. M.)

## Haman[[@Headword:Haman]]

             (Heb. Haman', הָמָן, perh. from the Pers. homam, magnificent, or the Sanscr. heman, the planet Mercury; Sept. Α᾿μάν), a favorite and chief minister or vizier of the king of Persia, whose history is involved in chat of Estherand Mordecai (Est 3:1 sq.), B.C. 473. SEE AHASUERUS. He is called an Agagite; and as Agag was a kind of title of the kings of the Amalekites, SEE AGAG, it is supposed that Haman was descended from the royal family of that nation (see Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 20). He or his parents probably found their way to Persia as captives or hostages; and that the foreign origin of Haman was no bar to his advancement at court is a circumstance quite in union with the most ancient and still subsisting usages of the East. Joseph, Daniel, and Mordecai afford other examples of the same kind. After the failure of his attempt to cut off all the Jews in the Persian empire, he was hanged on the gallows which he had erected for Mordecai. Most probably he is the same Aman who is mentioned as the oppressor of Achiacharus (Tob 14:10). The Targum and Josephus (Ant. 11, 6, 5) interpret the description of him the Agagite as signifying that he was of Amalekitish descent; but he is called a Macedonian by the Sept. in Est 9:24 (comp. 3:1), and a Persian by Sulpicius Severus. Prideaux (Connexion, anno 453) commutes the sum which he offered to pay into the  royal treasury at more than £2,000,000 sterling. Modern Jews are said to be in the habit of designating any Christian enemy by his name (Eisenmenger, Ent. Jud. 1, 721). The circumstantial details of the height which he attained, and of his sudden downfall, afford, like all the rest of the book of Esther, a most faithful picture of the customs of an Oriental court and government, and furnish invaluable materials for a comparison between the regal usages of ancient and modern times. (See Kitto's Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.). SEE ESTHER, BOOK OF.

## Hamann, Johann Georg[[@Headword:Hamann, Johann Georg]]

             an eminent German writer and poet, was born at Konigsberg, in Prussia, on the 27th of August, 1730. His early education was miscellaneous, and to it he attributed the want of taste and elegance of his style. At last, when about sixteen years old, his father decided on sending him to the high school. He there acquired a knowledge of Latin and of ancient literature. For a while he felt inclined to study theology, but an impediment in his speech, and want of memory incident upon a sickness he had while at school, made him give it up. Law, for which his parents destined him, was distasteful to him, and he applied himself diligently to the study of antiquity, the fine arts, and modern literature. In 1751 he closed his course of study at Kinigsberg with a philosophical dissertation entitled De somno et somnis, and turned his attention to teaching. After teaching for about eighteen months in Courland he returned to Riga, where he became a friend of John Christopher, son of a rich merchant named Berens, at whose house he met all the celebrities of the day, and for whom, some years afterwards, he made a journey through Hamburg, Bremen, and Amsterdam, going so far as London to transact business. Before he set out on this journey, however, he lost his mother, which event deeply affected him. While in London he consulted a distinguished physician, hoping to have the obstruction in his speech removed; disappointed in that hope, he spent some months in dissipation; and then, deep in debt, and disheartened, he retired to an obscure part of London, procured a Bible, and applied himself diligently to its study. His eyes were opened, and he beheld his past life in its true colors, of which he gives evidence in his Gedanken über izeinen Lebenslauf (Thoughts on my Life). He then returned to Riga, where he resided with his friend Berens until family circumstances led to an estrangement between them, and in 1759 he returned to his parents' house. There he wrote his Sokratische Denkwürdigkeiten, which were severely criticized at their first appearance by the majority of the literati of the day,  but which gained him the esteem and respect of such men as Claudius, Herder, and Moser, to which we must afterwards add Lavater, Jacobi, and Goethe. His writings did not suffice for his support, and he had to take other employment, first as copyist, afterwards as clerk in a public office. On the slender income derived from these two sources Hamann married in 1763; but, unfortunately, this marriage cost him many of his friends, and shortly afterwards he lost his situation. In 1754 he took a journey to Switzerland in the hope of meeting his friend Moser, who was to obtain him employment; but, not meeting with him, we next find him again filling a small subaltern position. In 1767, his father having died, he inherited some property; but having at the same time to assume the charge of an infirm brother, his worldly position was not much improved thereby. Shortly afterwards, however, he obtained another situation, and in 1777 was appointed to a good position in the customhouse. From that period date his finest epistolary and miscellaneous writings, among which we find his admirable Golgotha and Scheblimini — “Seat thee at my right.” His prospects now brightened; one of his admirers, Francis Buchholz, offered- him a handsome fortune, with $1000 towards the education of each of his four children, on the condition of his adopting him. The well-known princess Galitzin having in 1784 become acquainted with his writings, was brought over by them to a positive Christian belief. In 1787 he came to Minster with his adopted son Buchholz, and became acquainted with the princess; from thence he went to Pempelfort to the philosopher Jacobi, with whom he remained a short time. He intended to return there once more, but was prevented by his death, which occurred on the 20th of June, 1788. He was, by order of the princess Galitzin, interred in her garden, from whence, in 1851, his remains were transferred to the cathedral at Münster.

Among the great men of his country, Hamann is worthy of a place alongside of Copernicus, Kant, Herder, and kindred intellects. Although he cannot be called a classical German writer-his weird, irregular style forbids it-yet can he be classed among the patriarchs of the modern school, the uniting link between the old and the new German literatures. “Hamann is one of those men of whom it is difficult to give an estimate correct and satisfactory in all respects. Our estimation of his character cannot be blended with our general opinion of the age, as may be done with many other men, because he stood rugged and alone, like a rocky island in the midst of the waves of the surrounding ocean. As we cannot wholly praise  or blame that age, we shall not admire, much less censure, all in Hamann” (Hagenbach, German Rationalism, tr. by Gage, p. 268). Herder says: “The kernel of Hamann's writings contains many germs of great truths, as well as new observations, and an evidence of remarkable erudition; the shell thereof is a laboriously woven web of pithy expressions, of hints, and flowers of rhetoric.” “His understanding,” says F. H. Jacobi, “was penetrating like lightning, and his soul was of more than natural greatness.” Most of his writings are collected in Roth's edition of his works (Berlin, 1821-43, 8 vols.). See A. W, Muller's work, entitled J. G. Hamann, Christliche Bekenntnisse und Zeugnisse (Münster, 1826). — Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 5, 486; Biographie v. Joh. Geo. Hamann, by Charles Carvacchi (Münster, 1855); Hegel, Werke, 7, 38; Vilmar, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur; Gildemeister, Hamann's Leben und Schriften (1864- 6, 4 vols.); Saintes, History of Rationalism, ch. 8.

## Hamath[[@Headword:Hamath]]

             (Heb. Chamath', חֲמָת, fortress; Sept. Ε᾿μάθ, Αἰμάθ, and ῾Ημάθ), a large and important city, capital of one of the smaller kingdoms of Syria, of the same name, on the Orontes, at the northern boundary of the Holy Land. Thus it is said (Num 13:21) that the spies “went up and searched the land, from the wilderness of Zin unto Rehob, as men come to Hamath.” Gesenius is probably right in deriving the word from the Arabic root Chamaz, “to defend;” with this agrees the modern name of the city Hamnah. The city was at the foot of Hermon (Jos 13:5; Jdg 3:3), towards Damascus (Zec 9:2; Jer 49:20; Eze 47:16). The kingdom of Hamath, or, at least, the southern or central parts of it, appear to have nearly corresponded with what was afterwards denominated Caele-Syria (q.v.). It is more fully called Hamath the Great in Amo 6:2, or HAMATH-ZOBAH in 2Ch 8:3. The country or district around is called “the land of Hamath” (2Ki 23:33; 2Ki 25:21).

Hamath is one of the oldest cities in the world. We read in Gen 10:18 that the youngest or last son of Canaan was the “Hamathite” (q.v.) — apparently so called because he and his family founded and colonized Hamath. It was a place of note, and the capital of a principality, when the Israelites conquered Palestine; and its name is mentioned in almost every passage in which the northern border of Canaan is defined (Num 13:22; Num 34:8; 1Ki 8:65; 2Ki 14:25, etc.). Toi was king of  Hamath at the time when David conquered the Syrians of Zobah, and it appears that he had reason to rejoice in the humiliation of a dangerous neighbor, as he sent his own son Joram to congratulate the victor (2Sa 8:9-10), and (apparently) to put Hamath under his protection. Hamath was conquered by Solomon (2Ch 8:3), and its whole territory appears to have remained subject to the Israelites during his prosperous reign (2Ch 8:4-6). The “store-cities” which Solomon “built in Hamath” (2Ch 8:4) were perhaps for staples of trade, the importance of the Orontes valley as a line of traffic always being great. On the death of Solomon and the separation of the two kingdoms, Hamath seems to have regained its independence. In the Assyrian inscriptions of the time of Ahab (B.C. 900) it appears as a separate power, in alliance with the Syrians of Damascus, the Hittites, and the Phoenicians. About three quarters of a century later Jeroboam the second “recovered Hamath” (2Ki 14:28); he seems to have dismantled the place, whence the prophet Amos, who wrote in his reign (Amo 1:1), couples “Hamath the Great” with Gath, as an instance of desolation (Amo 6:2). At this period the kingdom of Hamath included the valley of the Orontes, from the source of that river to near Antioch (2Ki 23:33; 2Ki 25:21). It bordered Damascus on the south, Zobab. on the east and north, and Phoenicia on the west (1Ch 18:3; Eze 47:17; Eze 48:1; Zec 9:2). In the time of Hezekiah, the town, along with its territory, was conquered by the Assyrians (2Ki 17:24; 2Ki 18:34; 2Ki 19:13; Isa 10:9; Isa 11:11), and afterwards by the Chaldaeans (Jer 39:2; Jer 39:5). It is mentioned on the cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.). It must have been then a large and influential kingdom, for Amos speaks emphatically of “Hamath the Great” (6, 2); and when Rabshakeh, the Assyrian general, endeavored to terrify king Hezekiah into unconditional surrender, he said, “Have the gods of the nations delivered them which my fathers have destroyed, as Gozan, and Haran, and Rezeph? Where is the king of Hamath, and the king of Arphad, and the king of the city of Sepharvaim, Hena, and Ivah?” (Isa 37:12-14; 2Ki 18:34 sq.). SEE ASHIMA. The frequent use of the phrase, “the entering in of Hamath,” also shows that this kingdom was the most important in Northern Syria (Jdg 3:3). Hamath remained under the Assyrian rule till the time of Alexander the Great, when it fell into the hands of the Greeks. The Greeks introduced their noble language as well as their government into Syria, and they even gave Greek names to some of the old cities; among these was Hamath, which was called Epiphania  (Ε᾿πιφάνεια), in honor of Antiochus Epiphanes (Cyril, Comment. ad Amos).

This change of name gave rise to considerable doubts and difficulties among geographers regarding the identity of Hamath. Jerome affirms that there were two cities of that name-Great Hamath, identical with Antioch, and another Hamath called Epiphania (Comment. ad Amos , 6). — The Targums in Num 13:22 render Hamath Anztukia (Reland, Palcest. p. 120). Eusebius calls it “a city of Damascus,” and affirms that it is not the same as Epiphania; but Jerome states, after a careful investigation, “reperi AEmath urbem Coeles Syrie appellari, quae nunc Graeco sermone Epiphania dicitur” (Onomast. s.v. AEmath and Emath). Theodoret says that Great Hanath was Emesa, and the other Hamath Epiphania (Comment. ad Jeremiah 4). Josephus is more accurate when he tells us that Hamath “was still called in his day by the inhabitants Α᾿μάθη, although the Macedonians called it Epiphania” (Ant. 1, 6, 2). There is reason to believe that the ancient name Hamath was always retained and used by the Aramaic-speaking population; and, therefore, when Greek power declined, and the Greek language was-forgotten, the ancient name in its Arabic form Hamâh became universal (so הֲמָהin Eze 47:16, first occurrence). There is no ground whatever for Reland's theory (Palaest. p. 121) that the Hamath spoken of in connection with the northern border of Palestine was not Epiphania, but some other city much further south. The identification of Riblah and Zedad places the true site of Hamath beyond the possibility of doubt (Porter, Damascus, 2, 355, 354).

Epiphania remained a flourishing city during the Roman rule in Syria (Ptolemy, 5, 15; Pliny, Hist. Nat, 5, 19). It early became, and still continues, the seat of a bishop of the Eastern Church (Caroli a san. Paulo, Geogr. Sac. p. 288). It was taken by the Mohammedans soon after Damascus. On the death of the great Saladin, Hamath was ruled for a long period by his descendants, the Eiyubites. Abulfeda, the celebrated Arab historian and geographer of the 14th century, was a member of this family and ruler of Hamâh (Bohadin, Vita Saladini; Schulten's Index Geographicus, s.v. Hamata). He correctly states (Tab. Syriae, p. 108) that this city is mentioned in the books of the Israelites. He adds: “It is reckoned one of the most pleasant towns of Syria. The Orontes flows round the greater part of the city on the east and north. It boasts a lofty and well-built citadel. Within the town are many dams aid water-machines, by means of which the water is led off by canals to irrigate the gardens and  supply private houses. It is remarked of this city and of Schiazar that they abound more in water-machines than any other cities in Syria.”

This description still, in a great degree, applies. Hamath is a picturesque town, of considerable circumference, and with wide and convenient streets. In Burckhardt's time the attached district contained 120 inhabited villages, and 70 or 80 that lay waste. It is now a town of 30,000 inhabitants, of whom about 2500 are Greek Christians, a few Syrians, some Jews, and the rest Moslems. It is beautifully situated in the narrow and rich valley of the Orontes, thirty-two miles north of Emesa, and thirty-six south of the ruins of Assamea (Antonini Itinerarium, edit. Wesseling, p. 188). Four bridges span the rapid river, and a number of huge wheels turned by the current, like those at Verona, raise the water into rude aqueducts, which convey it to the houses and mosques. There are no remains of antiquity now visible. The mound on which the castle stood is in the center of the city, but every trace of the castle itself has disappeared. The houses are built of sun-dried bricks and timber. Though plain and poor externally. some of them have splendid interiors. They are built on the rising banks of the Orontes, and on both sides of it, the bottom level being planted with fruit-trees, which flourish in the utmost luxuriance. The western part of the district forms the granary of Northern Sria, though the harvest never yields more than a tenfold return, chiefly on account of the immense numbers of mice, which sometimes completely destroy the crops. The inhabitants carry on a considerable trade in silks and woolen and cotton stuffs with the Bedawin. A number of noble but decayed Moslem families reside in Hamah, attracted thither by its beauty, celebrity, and cheapness (Pococke, Travels, 2, pt. 1, p. 143 sq.; Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, p. 146 sq.; Handbook for Syria and Palestine, 2, 620; Richter, Wallfahrten, p. 231; comp. Rosenmüller's Bib. Geogr. 2, 243-246; Biblioth. Sacra, 1848, p. 680 sq.; Robinson's Res. new ed. 3:551, 568).

“The ENTRANCE OF HAMATH,” or “entering into Hamath” (בּוֹא חֲמָת; Sept. εἰσπορευομἐνων εἰς Αἰμάθ, Vulg. introitum Emath), is a phrase often used in the O.T. as a geographical name. It is of considerable importance to identify it, as it is one of the chief landmarks on the northern border of the land of Israel There can be no doubt that the sacred writers apply the phrase to some well-known “pass” or “opening” into the kingdom of Hamath (Num 34:8; Jos 13:5). The kingdom of  Hamath embraced the great plain lying along both banks of the Orontes, from the fountain near Riblah on the south to Apamea on the north, and from Lebanon on the west to the desert on the east. To this plain there are two remarkable “entrances” one from the south, through the valley of Cele-Syria, between the parallel ranges of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon; the other from the west, between the northern end of Lebanon and the Nusairtyeh Mountains. The former is the natural “entrance” from Central Palestine, the latter from the seacoast. The former is on the extreme south of the kingdom of Hamath, the latter on its western border.

Until within the last few years sacred geographers have almost universally maintained that the southern opening is the “entrance of Hamath.” Reland supposed that the entrance described in Num 34:8; Num 34:10, did not extend further north than the parallel of Sidon. Consequently, he holds that the southern extremity of the valley of Caele-Syria, at the base of Hermon, is the “entrance” of Hamath (Palaestina, p. 118 sq.). Kitto set forth this view in greater detail (Pictorial Bible); and he would identify the “entrance of Hamath” with the expression used in Num 13:21, “as men come to Hamath.” Of late, however, some writers regard the latter as only intended to define the position of Beth-rehob, which was situated on the road leading from Central Palestine to Hamath-” as men come to Hamath;” that is, in the great valley of Caele-Syria. Van de Velde appears to locate the “entrance of Hamath” at the northern end of the valley of Caele-Syria (Travels, 2, 470); and Stanley adopts the same view (Sinai and Palest. p. 399). Dr. Keith would place the “entrance of Hamath” at that sublime gorge through which the Orontes flows from Antioch to the sea (Land of Israel, p. 112 sq.). A careful survey of the whole region, and a study of the passages of Scripture on the spot, however, leads Porter to conclude that the “entrance of Hamath” must be the opening towards the west, between Lebanon and the Nusairiyeh Mountains. The reasons are as follow:

1. That opening forms a distinct and natural northern boundary for the land of Israel, such as is evidently required by the following passages: 1Ki 8:65; 2Ki 14:25; 1Ch 13:5; Amo 6:14.

2. The “entrance of Hamath” is spoken of as being from the western border or sea-board; for Moses says, after describing the western border, “This shall be your north border, from the great sea ye shall point out for you Mount Hor; from Mount Hor ye shall point out unto the entrance of Hamath” (Num 34:7-8). Compare this with Eze 47:20, “the  west side shall be the great sea from the (southern) border, till a man come over against Hamath;” and Eze 47:16, where the “way of Hethlon as men go to Zedad” is mentioned, and is manifestly identical with the “entrance of Hamath,” and can be none other than the opening here alluded to.

3. The “entrance of Hamath” must have been to the north of the entire ridges of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon (Jos 13:5; Jdg 3:3); but the opening from Caele-Syria into the plain of Hamath is not so.

4. The territory of Hamath was included in the “Promised Land,” as described both by Moses and Ezekiel (Num 34:8-11; Eze 47:15-20; Eze 48:1). The “entrance of Hamath” is one of the marks of its northern border; but the opening from Caele-Syria is on the extreme south of the territory of Hamath, and could not, therefore, be identical with the “entrance of Hamath.”

5. The “entrance to Hamath” was on the eastern border of Palestine, but north of Riblah (Num 34:10-11), which is still extant between Hums and the northern point of Anti-Lebanon. SEE RIBLAH.

6. This position agrees with those of the other names associated on the northerly and easterly boundaries, e.g. Mount Hor, Hazar Ellan, etc. (see Porter's Damascus, 2, 354 sq.; also Robinson, Biblical Res. 3:568). These arguments, however, will be found, on a closer inspection, to be incorrect (see Keil and Delitzsch, Comment, on Pentat. 3:255 sq.). The only real force in any of them is that derived from the supposed identity of Zedad (q.v.) and Siphron (q.v.); and this is counterbalanced by the facts (1) that this district never was actually occupied by the Israelites, and (2) that the more definite description of the boundary of Asher and Naphtali in Jos 19:24-39 does not extend so far to the north. Hence we incline to the older views on this question. SEE TRIBE.

## Hamath-Zobah[[@Headword:Hamath-Zobah]]

             (Heb. Chamath' Tsobah'צוֹבָה חֲמִת, i.e. Hamath of Zobah; Sept. Αἰμὰθ Σωβά v. r. Βαισωβά, Vulg. Emath Suba), a place on the borders of Palestine, said to have been attacked and conquered by Solomon (2Ch 8:3). It has been conjectured to be the same as HAMATH SEE HAMATH (q.v.), here regarded as included in Aram-Zobah-a geographical expression which is a usually a narrower meaning. The conjunction of the two names here probably indicates nothing more than that the whole country round Hamath was brought by Solomon under the power of Judah. The possessions of David extended to Hamath, and included Zobah (1Ch 18:3), and Solomon probably added Hamath also to his empire; certain it is that he had possessions in that district, and that part of it, at least, was included in his dominion (1Ki 9:19). SEE ZOBAH.

## Hamathite[[@Headword:Hamathite]]

             (Hebrew Chamathi', with the article הִחֲמָתַי; Sept. οΑ῾᾿μαθί), a designation (Gen 10:18;. 1Ch 1:16) of the last named of the families descended from Canaan (q.v.); doubtless as having settled (founded) the city HAMATH SEE HAMATH (q.v.). The Hamathites were thus a Hamitic race, but there is no reason to suppose with Kenrick (Phoenicia, p. 60) that they were ever in any sense Phoenicians. We must  regard them as closely akin to the Hittites (q.v.), on whom they bordered, and with whom they were generally in alliance. SEE CANAANITE.

## Hambraeus, Jonas[[@Headword:Hambraeus, Jonas]]

             preacher to the Swedish ambassador at Paris, and professor of Oriental languages there, was born in 1588. He studied at Upsala, Greifswald, and Rostock, was professor of Hebrew at Upsala, accompanied some noblemen on their travels in 1626, and settled at Paris as professor of Oriental languages. In 1635 he became preacher to Hugo Grotius, and died in 1665. He wrote, Disp. de Accentibus Hebraeis (Greifswald, 1616): — Institutio Hebraica Compendiosa (Rostock, 1618): — Loci Theologici Latino- Suedici (Stockholm, 1622). He translated into Swedish the Ethica Christiana of Dareus (Rostock, 1618); also Erasmus's Παράκληθις ad Christianos Omnes, ut Libenter Audiant et Legant Verbum Dei (1620). See Hambraus, Disp. I. et II. de Meritis ac Fatis Jonae Hambraei (Upsala, 1743, 1749); Moller, Cimbria Litterata; Stiernmann, Bibl. Suiogothica, page 313; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hambroeck Anton[[@Headword:Hambroeck Anton]]

             a Protestant missionary surnamed the “Dutch Regulus,” was born in the early part of the 17th century. He went as missionary to the East Indies, and settled in the island of Formosa, then the most important establishment of the Dutch in the China Sea. He converted a large number of natives, and the mission was prospering, when the celebrated Chinese pirate Coxinga, driven away by the Tartars, landed in Formosa, aid set siege to Tai-Ouan with an army of 25,000 men, April 30, 1661. Hambroeck, his wife, and two of his children, were made prisoners, and the former was sent by Coxinga as envoy to the commander of the town, Frederick Coyet, to advise him to surrender. Instead of this, he advised him to defend the city to the last, and then returned to the camp of Coxinga, notwithstanding the remonstrance's of Coyet, and the prayers of his two daughters, still in Tai- Ouan, saying that he “would not permit heathen to say that the fear of death had induced a Christian to violate his oath.” Coxinga, enraged at his courage, caused him to be beheaded on his return (in 1661), together with the other Dutch prisoners, some 500 in number. Coyet was nevertheless obliged to capitulate in Jan. 1662. See Du Bois, Vies des Gouverneuers Hollandais (La Haye, 1763, 4to), p. 210; Recueil des Voyages qui ont servi a Hablissenent et aux progrez de la Compagnie des Indes orientales (Rouen, 1725, 10 vols. 8vo), vol 10; Raynal, Hist, philosophique des deux  Indes (Lond. 1792,17 vols. 8vo) 2, 26, 27; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 217.

## Hamburg[[@Headword:Hamburg]]

             a noted city of Germany. When the reformation was introduced there in 1529, the city adopted the Church constitution prepared by Bugenhagen. This Kirchenordnung provided that all nonLutherans should be excluded from the city and its territory. In 1567 members of the Anglican Church, in 1605 members of the Dutch Reformed Church, and in 1648, by the peace of Westphalia, Roman Catholics, were allowed to live in the city, but they could not become citizens, nor could they celebrate worship in public. These latter restrictions were removed by the new civil constitution of September 28, 1860. The Lutheran Church is governed by a synod consisting of fifty-three members, of whom sixteen are clergymen, thirty- five laymen, and two senators, and by an ecclesiastical council consisting of nine members, viz. four laymen, three ecclesiastics, and two senators. The ecclesiastical council has the executive power, and carries out the resolutions of the synod, which meets every five years. In the year 1877, Hamburg, with. a territory comprising an area of about eight square miles, had a population of 406,014, of which about eighty-nine per cent. were Lutherans, 13,796 were Jews, 7771 were Roman Catholics, and 5585 belonged to other evangelical denominations. See Plitt-Herzog, Real-  Encyclop. s.v.; Statistik des hamburgischesn Staates (Hamburg, 1878, part 6). (B.P.)

## Hamel, Jean Baptiste Du[[@Headword:Hamel, Jean Baptiste Du]]

             a French philosopher and theologian, was born in 1624 at Vire, in Normandy In 1663 he was chancellor at Bayetux, in 1666 secretary of the Academy of Sciences at Paris, and died August 6, 1706. He published, Biblia Latina Vulg. etc. (Paris, 1706 fol.): — Theologia Speculativa et Practica (1691): — Theologiae Clericorum Seminariis Accommodates Summarium (1694, 5 volumes). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:60, 291; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hamelin[[@Headword:Hamelin]]

             a French prelate of the 12th century, was the nephew of Odon, dean of St. Martin of Tours, and a scholastic of that church from the year 1186. He was elected bishop of Le Mans in December, 1190, and consecrated by pope Celestine III at Rome in the beginning of the following year. He established in all the parishes of his diocese the capitulary jurisdiction, and being devoted to the interests of the king of England, refused to render it to the French king. Upon this the revenues of the bishop were confiscated by the latter, who ordered also the suspension of the divine service in the Church of Le Mans. These troubles were settled in 1804. Hamelin abdicated about the middle of Lent, 1214, and died probably November 1, 1218. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Hamelmann, Hermann[[@Headword:Hamelmann, Hermann]]

             a German Protestant theologian and historian, was born at Osnabrick in 1525. He was brought up in the Roman Catholic Church, and became curate of Camern. Having subsequently embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, he lost his position, and went to Wittemberg, where he lived some time in intimacy with Melancthon. He afterwards preached the Protestant doctrines at Bielefeld and Lemgo, and in the counties of Waldeck, Lippe, Spiegelberg, and Pyrmont, and in Holland. He acquired great renown as a preacher, and prince William of Orange called him to Antwerp, to participate in the preparation of a new ecclesiastical discipline. In 1569 duke Julius of Brunswick appointed him first superintendent of Gandersheim, and his aid was requested by the counts John and Otho oi Oldenburg, to introduce the Reformation in their states. He spent the last years of his life in this occupation, acting as general superintendent of the Protestant churches of Oldenburg, Elmenhorst and Jever. He died in Oldenburg June 26,1595. His theological and historical works are valuable for the history of the Reformation. Among them are De Traditionibus veris falsisque (Frankfort, 1555): — De Eucharistia et controversiis inter Pontificos et Lutheranos hoc de articulo agitatis (Frankf. 1556): — De conjugio sacerdot. brevis interlocutorins a suffaganeo et diacono (Dortmund, 2nd ed. 1582):Historia ecclesiastica renati Evangel. (Altenburg, 1586). See Historische Nachricht fiber d. Leben, Bedienungen u. Schriften Ham. (Quedlinburg, 1720); Burmann, Syllog. Epist. 1, 430; Rotermund, Gelehrtes Hannover, vol. 2, p. 44; Jocher, Allg. Gelehrten Lexikon, 2, 1340.

## Hamelsveld, Ysbrand Van[[@Headword:Hamelsveld, Ysbrand Van]]

             a former professor of theology at Utrecht, who, died May 9, 1812, at Amsterdam, is the author of Aardrijkunde des Bijbels, mit Karten (Amsterdam, 1790, 6 volumes; Germ. transl. Biblische Geographie, ubersetzt nit Anmerkungen, von Rudolf Janisch, Hamburg, 1793-96): — Allgeneene Kerkelyke Geschiedenis der Christenen (Harlem, 1799 sq., 23 volumes). See, Winer, Handbuch ders theol. Lit. 1:149, 537; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:360. (B.P.)

## Hamet[[@Headword:Hamet]]

             a Mohammedan prophet, who began to teach on the western coast of Africa in 1792. He rejected the ancient doctrine of the Caliphs, introduced  certain modifications into the Moslem faith, and thus gathered a number of followers. Hamet was finally killed, and his followers soon dispersed.

## Hamill, Hugh, D.D[[@Headword:Hamill, Hugh, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Norristown, Pennsylvania, February 28, 1810. He received his preparatory education at Norristown Academy; graduated from Rutgers College, N.J., in 1827; entered Princeton Theological Seminary in November of the same year, and left in April, 1830; then spent the winter of 1831-32 at Yale Divinity School; was licensed by the Presbytery of Philadelphia, April 30, 1830; ordained an evangelist at Buffalo, N.Y., October 31, 1832; became stated supply at Black Rock (now the Breckenridge Street Church, Buffalo), from November 1, 1830, until November 1, 1833; began to preach at Elkton, Maryland, and Pencader Church, Delaware, where he was installed pastor by New Castle Presbytery, January 21, 1834; in 1837 became connected with the High School at Lawrenceville, N.J., where he remained thirty- three years; but about 1870; was obliged to withdraw from the work of teaching on account of impaired hearing, and in 1873 took up his residence at Newark, Delaware, where he spent his remaining years in study, and died August 1, 1881. He was a man of fine scholarship, and his life was pure, noble, and useful. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1882, page 20.

## Hamilton, Alfred, D.D[[@Headword:Hamilton, Alfred, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Culpepper Court-House, Virginia, May 1, 1805. He was educated at Jefferson College, Pennsylvania, graduated from the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, in 1830; was licensed by the Ohio Presbytery, and commissioned by the Board of Domestic Missions to make a tour through Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee. In 1835 he accepted a call to the old church of Fagg's Manor, Chester County, Pennsylvania, in New Castle Presbytery, where he remained for twenty-three years as pastor. He died in Chicago, Illinois, September 13, 1867. He was for some years associate editor of the Northwestern Presbyterian. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, page 103.

## Hamilton, David[[@Headword:Hamilton, David]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of Argyle in 1506. He was witness to the grant which James, earl of Arran, made to James Hamilton, his son, of the lands of Finnart, in 1507. He also held in commendam the two abbeys of Dryburgh and Glenluce, and obtained the abbey of Sandal, in Kintyre, to be annexed to his episcopal see. He was still bishop in 1520. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 289.

## Hamilton, David Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Hamilton, David Henry, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Canajoharie, N.Y., October 29, 1813. He graduated from Union College in 1839; studied and practiced law in Amsterdam; graduated from the Auburn Theological Seminary in 1841; entered upon his ministry in 1843 in Trumansburg; subsequently was pastor of three other churches, in New Haven, Connecticut, Jacksonville, Illinois, and Ripley, Ohio. There was an interval of two years between his labors in New Haven and Jacksonville, which was spent in study at the University of Berlin, Germany. He died at Kingsborough, N.Y., July 4, 1879. As a preacher and pastor he was highly prized. He toiled incessantly, and seemed to rest in labors that would utterly break other men down. In these efforts hundreds and thousands were converted, and the churches quickened and strengthened. His Autology, an inductive system of mental science, a large octavo of seven hundred pages, published in 1873, is a monument not less to his industry than his mastery of philosophy, and his remarkable powers of independent, bold, sharp thinking. He had spent years in the preparation of a second volume, which he left unfinished, in which the system of theology was to be elaborated in accordance with his mental science. See Genesis Cat. of Auburn Theol. Sem. 1883, page 273. (W.P.S.)

## Hamilton, Gavin[[@Headword:Hamilton, Gavin]]

             a Scotch prelate, was first a minister at Hamilton, and afterwards promoted to the see of Galloway in 1606, and because the revenue was small, king James gave him the abbey of Dundrennan. He was consecrated bishop of Brechin, October 20, 1610, according to the form of the Church of England. He had also a grant from the priory of Whitern annexed to the see of Galloway. Here he sat until his death, in 1614. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 280.

## Hamilton, Henry Parr[[@Headword:Hamilton, Henry Parr]]

             an English divine, son of Dr. Alexander Hamilton, of Edinburgh, was born there in 1794, and educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated with high honors in 1816. He held a living for several years in Yorkshire, and in 1850 was made dean of Salisbury. He died February 9, 1880. Dean Hamilton published, The Principles of Analytical Geometry: — Analytical System of Conic Sections: — Remarks on Popular Education: — The Education of the Lower Classes, and several sermons.

## Hamilton, James (1)[[@Headword:Hamilton, James (1)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was reader at Petyn, in the diocese of Moray, and afterwards rector of Spot, in East Lothian. He was elected to the see of Glasgow in 1547. In 1558 he was put into the see of Argyle, and about the same time got the subdeanery of Glasgow in commendam. It is not certain whether he was ever consecrated a bishop. He became a Protestant at the Reformation. In 1565 he granted a charter to Alexander Stewart. He was still in the see in 1575. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 289.

## Hamilton, James (2)[[@Headword:Hamilton, James (2)]]

             a Scotch bishop, was born in August, 1610, and ordained minister at Cambusnethan in 1634. He was then called to London by the king, and consecrated bishop of the see of Galloway in 1661. He died in 1674. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 281.

## Hamilton, James (3), M.D[[@Headword:Hamilton, James (3), M.D]]

             an intimate friend and helper of John Wesley, was born at Dunbar, Scotland, in November or December, 1740. When about the age of eighteen he was appointed surgeon to the Isis man-of-war, and it was while that ship was off Malta that Dr. Hamilton became religious. His health declining after four years' service, he settled down in his native town as surgeon and apothecary, where his eminent success soon admitted him as a fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, Edinburgh. After a number of years he removed to Leeds, and subsequently, on invitation of his friends, to London, where he became physician to the London Dispensary. He followed his profession until his death, April 21, 1827. Dr. Hamilton joined the Methodist society on his return to Dunbar, and ever after continued an earnest and devoted member of the community he loved. His Christian  character was peculiarly excellent. He cooperated with his friend Wesley, and his advice was sought for by the Methodist preachers, by whom he was much beloved. See Wesl. Meth. Mag. July and August, 1829; Stenunson, City Road Chapel, page 503.

## Hamilton, James, D.D[[@Headword:Hamilton, James, D.D]]

             an eminent Presbyterian minister, was born in Strathblane, Scotland, in 1814. He commenced his ministry at Abernyte, Scotland, and after a short time was called to Edinburgh. In 1841 he was called to be pastor of the National Scotch Church, Regent's Square, London, and was soon known as one of the most eloquent and powerful ministers of the metropolis. He  died in London November 24, 1867. Dr. Hamilton's labors as a minister were very successful, and he was equally eminent in the field of authorship, especially in the field of experimental and practical religion. Of his Life in Earnest, scores of editions have appeared in England (sixty-fifth thousand, Lond. 1852) and America; and his Mount of Olives (sixty-fifth thousand, London, 1853) has been almost as widely circulated. “He was not only one of the most popular religious writers of the day, and master of one of the most fascinating styles in which Christian truth and feeling were ever clothed, but he was also no ordinary theologiane in the proper scientific sense of that term,” though he never wrote any theological work in scientific form. A complete edition of his works in six volumes is now (1869) publishing in London, as follows: vol. 1, Life in Earnest; Mount of Olives; A Morning beside the Lake of Galilee; Happy Home: — vol. 2, Light for the Path; Emblems from Eden; The Parable of the Prodigal Son; The Church in the House; Dew of Hermon; Thankfulness: — vol. 3, The Royal Preacher; Lessons from the Great Biography: — vol. 4, Notes on Job and Proverbs; Reviews, Essays, and Fugitive Pieces: — vols. 5 and 6, Selections from unpublished Sermons and MSS. See Brit. and For. Evang. Review, Jan. 1869, art. 5.

## Hamilton, John (1)[[@Headword:Hamilton, John (1)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was made abbot of Paisley in 1525, and went to France to pursue his studies. In 1543 he was made keeper of the privy seal, and soon after lord treasurer. He became bishop of St. Andrews the same year, and in 1545 was translated to the see of Dunkeld. Under the regency of the earl of Moray, he was accused of treason, and hanged publicly, April 1, 1570. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, pages 38, 95.

## Hamilton, John (2)[[@Headword:Hamilton, John (2)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was made bishop of Dunkeld, October 19, 1686. He survived the Revolution, and died one of the ministers of Edinburgh, and sub-dean of his majesty's chapel-royal. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 100.

## Hamilton, Patrick[[@Headword:Hamilton, Patrick]]

             the first Scotch reformer, nephew to James, earl of Arran, was born in 1503, and was educated at St. Andrew's, after which he went to Germany, where he imbibed the opinions of Luther, and became professor at Marburg. On his return home he was made abbot of Ferne, in the shire of Ross, where he promulgated the doctrines of the Reformation with so much zeal as to excite the wrath of the clergy, who caused him to be apprehended and sent to Beaton, archbishop of St. Andrew's. After a long examination he was burnt at the stake, opposite St. Salvador's College, Mar. 1,1527, in his 24th year. At the place of execution he gave his servant his garments, saying, “These are the last things you can receive of me, nor have I anything now to leave you but the example of my death, which I pray you to bear in mind; for though it be bitter to the flesh, and fearful before men, yet it is the entrance into eternal life, which none shall inherit who deny Jesus Christ before this wicked generation.” The fire burning slowly, his sufferings were long and dreadful, but his patience and piety were only more fully displayed thereby, insomuch that many were led to inquire into his principles, and to abjure the errors of popery. “The smoke of Mr. Patrick Hamilton,” said a papist, “infected as many as it blew upon.”  His writings called Patrick's Places may be found in Richmond's Fathers of the English Church, 1, 475. See Robertson, History of Scotland, bk. 2; Fox, Book of Martyrs, bk. 8; Burnet, History of the Reformation, 1, 490 sq.; Hetherington, History of the Church of Scotland, 1, 36 sq.

## Hamilton, Richard Winter, D.D[[@Headword:Hamilton, Richard Winter, D.D]]

             an English Independent minister, was born in London July 6,1794 and died in 1848. His mother had been a member of one of John Wesley's societies, and is mentioned (as Miss Hesketh) in Wesley's Journal. At sixteen-he entered the theological college at Hoxton, and even while he was a student his talent for preaching and the remarkable exuberance of his style attracted great attention. Soon after leaving the college (1812 or 1813) he was called to the charge of an Independent congregation at Leeds, and he held this position during the remainder of his life. He attained great eminence as a preacher, and still greater as a platform speaker. With great excellences he combined grave defects: he was deficient in taste, and his style was often extravagant and pompous; but there was a wide sweep in his thoughts, and he was sometimes eloquent even to sublimity. During his life he was a diligent student. He was president of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Leeds, and contributed for it many valuable papers, some of which were published in his Nugae Literariae (1841, sm. 8vo). His other writings are, The little Sanctuary (domestic prayers and offices; Lond. 1838, 8vo): Sermons, first series (1837, 8vo; republished by Carlton and Lanahan, N. York, 1869); second series, 1846, 8vo: The Institutions of popular Education (2nd ed. 1846, post 8vo): — The revealed Doctrine of Rewards ad Punishments (Lond. 1847, 8vo; N. Y., Carlton and Lanahan, 1869, 12mo): — Horce et Vindiciae Sabbaticae (1848,12mo): Missions, their Authority, Scope, and Encouragement, a prize essay, second after Harris's Mammon (2nd ed. 1846, post 8vo): — Pastoral Appeals on Personal, Domestic. cad Social Devotion (2nd ed. 1848; also Carlton and Lanahan, N. York, 1869, 12mo); besides occasional sermons, etc. There is a poor biography of him by Stowell (1850, 8vo). (J.B.L.)

## Hamilton, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Hamilton, Robert, D.D]]

             a minister of the Church of Scotland, was a son of Dr. William Hamilton, for many years a professor in Edinburgh University, and was born and educated within its walls. He was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Edinburgh, and served the Church of Cramond, near by, and Lady Yestor's Old Greyfriars' Church in the same city. In 1754 he was elected to the chair of divinity in the university, where he labored until failing health caused the election of Dr. Andrew Hunter as his assistant, and afterwards as his successor. Dr. Hamilton retired soon after this election, in 1779, from active work, and died April 3, 1787. He was moderator of the assembly in 1754 and 1760. See Annals of the Church of Scotland, 1739-66, 2:386.

## Hamilton, Samuel[[@Headword:Hamilton, Samuel]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Monongahela Co., Va., Dec. 17, 1791 and removed to Ohio in 1806; was converted in 1812; entered the Ohio Conference in 1815; and died May 4, 1853. He was a pioneer of  Western Methodism, and a widely known and excellent minister. As a preacher, presiding elder; and delegate to General Conference, he was in all respects “a workman that needed not to be ashamed.” He was “shrewd, sarcastic, and eloquent,” and his labors were abundantly successful among all classes of society. — Min. of Conferences, 5, 268; Wakeley, Heroes of Methodism, p. 337. (G. L. T.)

## Hamilton, Sir William[[@Headword:Hamilton, Sir William]]

             a recent Scotch philosopher, who will probably be regarded as the most subtle logician and the most acute metaphysician produced in Britain since Duns Scotus and William of Ockham. (He must not be confounded with his scarcely less distinguished contemporary, Sir William Rowan Hamilton the Irish mathematician.) He is included, and included himself, among the adherents of the Scotch school of psychology, but he is not of them, having remodeled, interpreted, expanded, and transmuted their doctrines in such a manner as to elevate their character and entirely change their nature. His potent influence is manifested in nearly all the current speculation of the British Isles. After having created by the labors of his life and by the fascination of his example a new class of inquirers, his mind still dominates over those who reject, as well as over those who accept his principles.

Life. — Sir William Hamilton was born at Glasgow March 8,1780, eight years before the decease of Reid; he died at Edinburgh on May 6,1856. He thus lived through the whole of the revolution which convulsed the governments, societies, industries, and opinions of modern Europe, and prepared the new earth which is yet to be revealed. He was the son of Dr. William Hamilton, professor of anatomy at Glasgow; but he came of a long-descended line. He claimed a hereditary baronetcy, and deduced his lineage from the ducal and almost royal house of Hamilton and Chastelherault. The illustration of his birth was obscured by the splendor of his intellectual career. He received his early education in his native city. From the University of Glasgow he passed to Baliol College, Oxford, and distinguished himself by his attainments in both classics and mathematics. Here he gained his acquaintance with the writings of Aristotle, which have never been disregarded in this ancient seat of learning. In the competition for graduating honors, he professed his readiness to be examined on most of the recognized Greek and Latin classics, including many of the works of Plato and Aristotle, and of the writings of the Neo-Platonists and the peripatetic scholiasts. He had, moreover, already obtained some knowledge  of Averroes and Avicenna; of the Latin fathers and the great schoolmen; of Cardan, Agricola, Laurentius Valla, and the Scaligers; and had formed a less questionable intimacy with Des Cartes, Leibnitz, and other luminaries of the Cartesian school.

The erudition of Hamilton commenced early, and was extended throughout his life. It was vast, curious, and recondite. It produces amazement by the continual array of forgotten names and unexplored authors — omne ignotum pro mirabili. But it is needlessly ostentatious and frequently deceptive. It is received without challenge, from the inaccessibility of the authorities alleged, and the disinclination to verify citations from unfamiliar works. Hare has shown that the imputations against Luther rest on invalid quotations taken at second-hand. It is alleged that, in his attack on mathematical studies, he has employed mangled extracts without regarding the context. His references to Aristotle, and his representations of the doctrines of the Stagyrite, are unreliable, being fragmentary, distorted or misapprehended, from ignorance of the tenor of his writings. There is too much reason for believing that Hamilton's familiarity with “many a quaint and curious volume of forgotten lore” was derived from the diligent consultation of indexes, and the hasty appreciation of passages thus indicated.

The young philosopher had been designed for the legal profession. He removed to Edinburgh in 1812 to prosecute his juridical studies, and was called to the Scotch bar in 1813. In 1820, on the death of Dr. Thomas Brown, he was a candidate for the chair of moral philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. John Wilson, the poet, and editor of Blackwood's Magazine, was a Tory, and, as such, was preferred by the Tory town council, which constituted the electoral body. In the course of the ensuing year, the defeated candidate, rich in brains and various accomplishments, but poor in purse, was appointed by the Faculty of Advocates to the chair of history. His lectures on this great branch of knowledge, which is philosophy in its concrete and dynamical aspects, are reported to have been vigorous, original, learned, and acute. This period of Sir William's life exemplified his indefatigable industry, patient research, versatility of talent, and zealous solicitude for truth. George Combe had attracted much attention in Edinburgh to Phrenology-a suspicious province of speculation lying along the indistinct boundary between intellectual and physical science. The profession of Hamilton's father, and his own youthful associations, may have cherished in him some aptitudes for anatomical and  physiological inquiries. He now engaged in such pursuits with the earnest pertinacity that had been displayed by Des Cartes when tracing the mechanism of vision and endeavoring to discover in the pineal gland the domicile of the mind. With saw and scalpel, and tape and balance, he divided skulls, dissected, measured, and weighed their contents. The conclusions thus reached were communicated to the Royal Society of Edinburgh in 1826 and 1827, and dissipated the pretensions of Phrenology by demonstrating the falsity of the facts alleged as its foundation. These researches also rectified some physiological misapprehensions, and enabled Sir William to make those delicate observations on the composition and action of the nerves which are introduced into his notes on Reid.

In 1829, his friend, professor Napier, requested from him a philosophical article to inaugurate his literary reign as editor of the Edinburgh Review. The paper furnished in compliance with his request was the first, and still remains the most satisfactory exposition of Hamilton's metaphysical views. It purported to be a notice of Victor Cousin's eclecticism, but it presented in broken outlines “the Philosophy of the Conditioned.” No such tractate had appeared in Britain for centuries. It recalled the ancient glories of the 13th and 14th centuries. It united the speculative subtlety of Berkeley with the dialectical skill of the schoolmen. It attracted universal admiration at home and abroad, and was promptly translated into foreign languages. It placed its author at once among the sovereigns of thought, and restored the British Isles to their place among the combatants in the shadowy arena of abstract disputation. This remarkable production was followed by others scarcely less remarkable, and similarly distinguished by comprehensive erudition, logical perspicacity, analytical precision, breadth of reasoning, and profundity of thought. Thus his claims were immeasurably superior to those of any other aspirant when the professorship of logic and metaphysics in the university became vacant in 1836. He was not elected, however, to this position without hesitancy, and the hesitancy was removed chiefly by the earnest testimonials of Victor Cousin, and professor Brandis, of Bonn.

In his new domain Sir William commenced the rehabilitation of logical studies, and the restoration of the prince of philosophers to the throne from which he had been removed by more than two centuries of ignorant and uninquiring clamor. So far, indeed, as originality appertains to his own logical and metaphysical speculations, it is obtained by recurrence to the instructions or to the hints of “the master of the wise.” He held his chair for  twenty years, till his death. To the discharge of his academical duties are due the lectures on logic and on metaphysics. They afford a very imperfect exhibition of either his abilities or his philosophy. They were the first fruits of his service, hurriedly prepared to satisfy immediate requirements, and precariously modified at irregular times. They never received final elaboration or systematic revision, and were published posthumously from such sketches and loose notes as had been preserved. Throughout the period of their recurrent delivery, their development was restrained and distorted by the traditions, associations, and expectations of the school. He could not renounce allegiance to Reid, or proclaim an independent authority, or render liege-homage to Aristotle. Hence there is throughout his career a continual effort to reconcile by ingenious tours-de, force his own more profound and comprehensive views with the narrow, shallow, and timid utterances of the common sense brotherhood. There is nothing in the history of philosophy more grotesque, more inconclusive, and better calculated to mislead, than the array of the hundred and six witnesses to the universality of the philosophy of common sense. What these deponents unanimously attest is not the truth of Reid's characteristic dogmas, but the necessity of admitting indemonstrable principles — a thesis which may be, and has been associated with many dissimilar systems. Sir William would have been swift to expose this fallacy had such an ignoratio elenchi been detected in any victim of his critical lash.

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

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

During his later years Sir William was chiefly occupied with the extension and application of his logical innovations. These were expounded to his class as early as 1840, and announced to the world in 1846. They provoked a bitter controversy with professor De Morgan. It is unnecessary to enter into the examination of a dispute in which the parties are satisfied neither with themselves nor with each other, and in which the language is so tortuous, rugged, and peculiar as to be almost equally unintelligible in both.

Some critics have commended the style of Sir William Hamilton as “unequalled for conciseness, precision, and force” as “a model of philosophical clearness, conciseness, and energy” (non cuicumque datum est haebere nasu n). Mr. De Morgan characterized the Hamiltonian style as bombinans, whatever that may mean; and of one expression he says that it is “hard to make sense or English of it.” The censure may be applied to both the combatants in this unseemly controversy. Sir William's dialect may be clear, precise, significant, when it has been mastered; but it is not English. It is a concrete of his own compounding, requiring special study just as much as any archaic patois. Berkeley and Hume, Stewart and Spencer, have shown that it is possible to write philosophically, and yet maintain a pure, transparent, natural English idiom. This Sir William rarely does.

Writings. — The published works of Hamilton embrace the lectures on logic and on metaphysics; an edition of Reid, never completed; an edition of the works of Dugald (Stewart; and a volume of Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform (1852; 2nd edit. enlarged, 1853; reprinted by Harper and Brothers, N. York). There is little evidence of any taste for literature, properly so called, in the volume. The only essay connected even remotely with polite letters is that on the authorship of the Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum, which is, in some respects, his most curious contribution to periodical literature. A wide chasm separates this from the instructive and entertaining papers On the Revolutions of Medicine, and on Mathematics snot Philosophy. Both of these readily consort with the laborious and learned investigation of the history, condition, objects, and possible ameliorations of university education. The remainder of the “Discussions” is devoted to logic and metaphysics. The former science is illustrated by the essay on Logic  contributed to the Edinburgh Review in April, 1833; and that on Syllogism, its kinds, canons, notations, etc., contained in the appendix. The peculiar views of the author are further expounded in the Prospectus of an Essay on the New Analytic of Logical Forms, and in the Prize Essay of Thomas Spencer Baynes on the same subject, to which should be added the appendix to the lectures on logic.

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

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

The character of his metaphysical doctrine is manifested by the designation which he bestowed upon it. The Philosophy of the Conditioned. It is critical in its procedure; it is mainly negative in its results. In these respects it resembles the philosophy of Kant, to which it approximates in many of its developments. It is a crusade against all theories reposing on the absolute and the unconditioned. It sets out with affirming the essential relativity of all knowledge; it concludes with the restriction of philosophy to the determination of the conditions of thought. In this there is nothing new but the mode of exposition. It was a familiar aphorism of the schoolmen, founded upon the teachings of Aristotle, that all thought was bounded by the limits of the thinking mind- “omne perceptum est secundum modum percipientis”- “omne scitum est in sciente secundeum modum scientis”- “species cogniti est in cognoscente.” From this position Hamilton deduces the invalidity of all conceptions pretending to be  absolute, and hence denies the possibility of any positive conception of the infinite. Herein he merely repeats Aristotle, but with less moderation in his doctrine. This thesis has been violently opposed, and usually misapprehended. It was assailed by Calderwood, Philosophy of the Infinite, who confounds the negation of the Infinite in thought with the negation of the infinity of God. It has been accepted and applied by Mansel to theology in his Limits of Religious Thought. The next step is to a purely negative exposition of causality, as resulting from “mental impotence” to conceive an absolute commencement. Sir William recognizes that this interpretation conflicts with the idea of a great First Cause, and he propounds a very ingenious apology for his doctrine. He similarly follows out his fundamental tenet to other applications, and arrives uniformly at negative conclusions.

The tenet, however, is not presented as an axiom, but receives interpretation, if not demonstration. It is the inevitable consequence of the dualism of our knowledge — a thesis contained in Aristotle. Every act of consciousness “gives a knowledge of the ego in relation and contrast to the non-ego, and a knowledge of the non-ego in relation and contrast to the ego. The ego and non-ego are thus given, in an original synthesis, as conjoined in the unity of knowledge, and in an original antithesis, as opposed in the contrariety of existence.” This “natural dualism” is accepted by professor Ferrier as the beginning of an antagonistic scheme of philosophy. With Hamilton it is made to rest upon the basis of immediate perception, and thus he is led to the affirmation of direct or presentative perception in opposition to the older theory of indirect or representative perception. This brings him into accordance with the school of Reid- though Reid and his school would scarcely have understood, and certainly could not have appreciated his delicate distinctions; and it must be acknowledged that it is a coarse and materialistic conception of species, images, and impressions which requires any deadly opposition between presentative and representative perception. To one cultivating such divisions and differences, the treatise of Roger Bacon, De Multiplicatione Specierum — the most marvelous result of mediaeval science-would be utterly unintelligible.

On Sir William Hamilton's principles, the only object of philosophy is the determination of the limits and requirements of thought, or, as he phrases it,” the Conditions of the Thinkable.” On this subject he has left an admirable and most suggestive paper; but his whole scheme of speculation  is without any basis for certainty, without any witness of “the Spirit bearing witness to our spirit.” It is thus built upon the void; and, like the eclecticism of Cousin, and the transcendentalism of Hegel and Schelling, which it was specially designed to oppose, it tends, however unconsciously, to practical skepticism. “Such (φωνᾶντα συνετοῖσιν),” says Sir William, “are the hints of an undeveloped philosophy, which, I am confident, is founded upon truth.” Doubtless this philosophy is undeveloped, and doubtless it is founded upon truth; but the foundation may not be homogeneous or sufficient, and the superstructure may not be composed of the same materials as the substruction. The most dangerous error is that which proceeds from mutilated, distorted, or alloyed truth.

“The views of Sir William Hamilton are before us, in certain parts, in his own exposition;” they invite and require rigorous examination. “That they have already been much discussed, and have exerted a powerful influence on speculation, is a good omen for philosophy. We have, especially, his treatment of three great problems in philosophy. First, there is the theory of the two kinds of human knowledge, Immediate and Mediate. Secondly, there is a special application of this theory to the construction of a theory of External Perception. Thirdly, there is an exhaustive system of Metaphysics Proper, or Ontology, in his ‘Philosophy of the Conditioned' and ‘Conditions of the Thinkable' a vast and noble idea, traced out for us in nothing but a tantalizing fragment. His Logical system is to be gathered from the sources already mentioned. They will probably convey no distinct notion of the system, unless to readers who are familiar with the German methods of logical analysis since Kant. The leading points may be said to be four; and it is perhaps possible to make these intelligible very briefly to persons acquainted with the outlines of the science in its received forms.

1. Hamilton insists on having, in all propositions through common terms which are set forth for logical scrutiny, a sign of quantity prefixed to predicate as well as to subject. The point, though merely- one of form, is curiously suggestive of difficulties, and hence of solutions.

2. Instead of recognizing only four forms of propositions, the A, E, I, O of the old logicians, he insists (on admitting all the eight forms which are possible. (See Thomson and Solly.)

3. He widens the range of the syllogism by admitting all moods which can validly be constructed by any combination of any of his eight kinds of propositions.  4. The Port-Royal doctrine of the inverse ratio of the extension and comprehension of terms is worked out by him in reference to the syllogism. This application of the doctrine has certainly not been anticipated by any logician; and, when elaborated to its results, it throws many new lights on the characters and mutual relations of the syllogistic figures.” The value of these innovations has riot been definitely settled, nor has it been ascertained whether they were overlooked by Aristotle, misapprehended by him, or deliberately rejected from his Analytics.

Authorities. — An earnest discussion of Hamilton's doctrines may be found in the Methodist Quarterly Review for 1857; a sketch of his metaphysical views is given in the Princeton Review for 1855. One of the most unfortunate, features in the literary history of Sir William was his attack on the reputation of Luther, which was fully answered by Hare in his Vindication of Luther. Hare convicts Hamilton of using second-hand knowledge as if he had studied the original sources. See A. Brit. Rev. Nov. 1848, Feb. 1853, July, 1859; Revue des Deux Mondes, April, 1856; Gentleman's Magazine, June, 1856; North American Review, Oct. 1845, p. 485-9; Jan. 1853, art. 3; British Quarterly Review, 16:479; Wight, Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton (N. Y. 1855); Mill, Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy (Lond. 1865) —reviewed in the Westminster Review, Jan. 1866, and elaborately answered by H. L. Mansel, The Philosophy of the Conditioned (Lond. 1866); De Morgan, Formal Logic (London, 1847); Bowen, A Treatise on Logic (Cambridge, 1864). The Life of Sir William Hamilton, by J. Veitch (1869), which had been long expected, has been recently published. (G. F. H.)

## Hamilton, William[[@Headword:Hamilton, William]]

             a veteran Irish Wesleyan minister, was born near Newry in 1761. He became a member of a Methodist society at the age of fourteen, in 1788 received an appointment to the Brookboro' Circuit, and for twenty-nine years labored for the evangelism of Ireland. He was the first preacher who encouraged Ouseley's extraordinary plan of labor, inducing the conference to sanction it, and to enroll the missionary on their minutes. Hamilton had  superior talents; he was an effective preacher, singularly can himself, but as singularly powerful over the passions of his hearers. His thoughts were original and often humorous; his arguments ingenious and irresistible; his style simple; the effect of his discourses sometimes magical. He worked with his might. Ouseley declared that he never saw a more indefatigable laborer. Broken down in the labors of the ministry, he was compelled to retire from the active service in 1816. He was one of the eight preachers who received a rebuke of the Irish Conference for the administration of the Lord's Supper. He died October 8, 1843. See Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, 3:420, 435; Minutes of the British Conference, 1844; Smith, Hist. of Wesleyan Methodism, 3:24, 25.

## Hamital[[@Headword:Hamital]]

             SEE HAIMUTAL.

## Hamline, Leonidas Lent, D.D. LL.D[[@Headword:Hamline, Leonidas Lent, D.D. LL.D]]

             a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Burlington, Conn., May 10,1797. His early education was obtained with some view to the Christian ministry; but, arriving at manhood, he studied law, and was admitted to the bar in Lancaster, Ohio. He married in Zanesville, Ohio, and settled there to practice his profession. The death of a little daughter in 1828 led him to seriously consider his own moral state, and he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church in the autumn of 1828. Soon after he was licensed to exhort, then (1829) to preach. In 1832 he was received on trial in the Ohio Conference, and appointed to Granville Circuit. In 1833 he traveled Athens Circuit, and in 1834 and 1835 he was stationed at Wesley Chapel, Cincinnati. In 1836 he was elected assistant editor of the Western  Christian Advocate, with the Rev. Dr. Charles Elliott. When the Ladies' Repository was established in January 1841, Hamline was assigned to the work of editing that journal. He remained in this position until, in 1844, he was elected one of the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This office he filled with great usefulness for eight years, when ill health compelled him to resign it to the General Conference of 1852. His name was reattached to the list of members of the Ohio Conference, and he was granted a superannuated relation. In 1857 he removed to Mount Pleasant, Iowa, his former confidential friendship with Dr. Elliott, who resided in that place, leading to this change. In an account of his life which bishop Hamline wrote for his family, he thus refers to the years from 1852 to 1860: “For eight years I have been superannuated, and God has tried me as silver is tried; but he has often sweetened those trials by his presence in a marvelous manner. And now day by day my fellowship is with the Father, and with his son Jesus Christ. Though almost helpless, and dependent on my devoted, affectionate wife for personal attentions, which her exemplary patience never wearies in bestowing on me (thanks be to thy name, O God, for such a gift!), yet I am far more contented and cheerful than in the best days of my youth.” He was taken severely ill Jan. 25, 1865. On the 10th of February, having called his family in to pray with them once more, “he uttered remarkable expressions of adoration of the Savior on the throne in special reference to his humiliation, crucifixion, resurrection, ascension on, exaltation, etc. He prayed for his family, the Church, for his own Conference (the Ohio), the missions, the country the world. All the forenoon he expressed much thankfulness for everything. He then had occasion to drink, and his painful thirst reminded him of the exclamation on the cross when the Savior said, ‘I thirst.' He then burst into tears, and broke out again in praise. He then spoke of his present state as a fresh baptism into Christ, into his glorious name, and exclaimed, ‘O wondrous, wondrous, wondrous love!' When Mrs. Hamline raised the window-shade at sunset he exclaimed, ‘O beautiful sky! beautiful heaven!” He- died on the 23rd of March. Of the character and attainments of bishop Hamline, Dr. Elliott says, “My pen is wholly incompetent to draw out in its full extent an adequate portrait of his high and holy character, whether it regards his natural talents or his extensive attainments; but especially the sanctity and purity of his religious life. As a preacher, he was in the first rank in all respects that regard the finished pulpit orator. His style as a writer would compare favorably with the best writers in the English language. He had no superior for logic, argument, or oratory. He was the  subject of much bodily affliction, and yet, amid excruciating pains, he retained the full exercise of his intellectual powers to the very last hour of his life. The leading characteristic of him in his sufferings was his complete patience and resignation to the will of God.” His principal writings (chiefly sermons) are given in the Works of L. L. Hamline, DD.D edited by the Rev. F. G. Hibbard, D.D. (N. York, 1869, 8vo). — See Minutes of Conferences, 1866; Meth. Quart. Rev. October, 1866; Palmer, Life and Letters of Leonidas L. Hamline, D.D. (N. Y. 1866, 12mo).

## Hammahlekoth[[@Headword:Hammahlekoth]]

             SEE SELA-HAM-MAHLEKOTH.

## Hamman[[@Headword:Hamman]]

             or rather CHAMMAN (חִמָּן, only in the plur. hammanim'), signifies images, idols of some kind for idolatrous worship (and so the Sept. and Vulg. understand it). It is rendered “images” in Lev 26:30; 2Ch 14:5; 2Ch 34:7; Isa 17:8; Isa 27:9; Eze 6:4; Eze 6:6; but in the margin almost invariably “sun images.” In these passages Hammanizmi is several times joined with Asherim-statues of Astarte; while from 2Ch 34:4, it appears further that the Hammanim stood upon the altars of Baal. SEE ASHERAH; SEE BAAL. Kimchi, and the Arabic of Erpenius, long ago explained the word by suns, images of the sun; and both this interpretation and the thing itself are now clearly illustrated by ten Punic cippi with inscriptions, consecrated to Baal Hamman, i.e. to Baal the solar, Baal the sun. (See the whole subject discussed in Gesenius's Thes. Heb. p. 489-491.) The form chainman, solar, is from חִמִּה, cham'mah, the sun; and the plural Hammanim, in the Old Testament, is put elliptically for Baalim Hammanim, and is. found in the same context as elsewhere Baalim, images of Baal.

## Hammath[[@Headword:Hammath]]

             (Heb. Chammath', חִמִּת, warn springs; Sept. Α᾿μάθ v.r. [by incorporation of the following name] Ωμαθαδακέθ, Vulg. Emath), one of the “fenced cities” of Naphtali, mentioned between Zer and Rakkath (Jos 19:35); generally thought to be the hot spring referred to by Josephus (War, 4:1, 3) under the name Ammaus (Α᾿μμαοῦς), near Tiberias (Ant. 18:2, 3); which latter is, no doubt, the same with the famous warm baths  still found on the shore a little south of Tiberias, and called Hanummani Tubariyteh (“Bath of Tiberias”); properly Hammath-rakkath (? the Yamrim of (en. 36 24). SEE EMMARAS.

They have been fully described by Robinson (Researches, 3, 258 sq.; see also Hackett's Script. Illust. p. 315). Pliny, speaking of the Sea of Galilee, says, “Ab occidente Tiberiade, aquis calidis salubri” (Hist. Nat. 5, 15). Spacious baths were built over the principal spring by Ibrahim Pasha; but, like everything else in Palestine, they are falling to ruin. Ancient ruins are strewn around it, and can be traced along the shore for a considerable distance; these were recognized by Irby and Mangles (p. 89, b) as the remains of Vespasian's camp (Josephus, War, 1, 4, 3). There are also three smaller warm springs at this place. The water has a temperature of 144° Fahr; the taste is extremely salt and bitter, and a strong smell of sulphur is emitted. The whole surrounding district has a volcanic aspect. The warm fountains, the rocks of trap and lava, and the frequent earthquakes, prove that the elements of destruction are still at work beneath the surface. It is said that at the time of the great earthquake of 1837 the quantity of water issuing from the springs was greatly increased, and the temperature much higher than ordinarily (Porter, Handbook for S. and P. 2, 423; Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 66; Wilson, Lands of the Bible, 2, 397; Reland, Palaest. p. 302, 703). This spot is also mentioned in the Talmud (Schwarz, Palest. p. 182) as being situated one mile from Tiberius (Lightfoot, Opp. 2, 224). The HAMMOTH-DOR of Jos 21:32 is probably the same place. SEE HEMATH; SEE HAMION.

The Hamath of Gadara, however, located by the Talmudists (see Lightfoot, ib.) at the mouth of the Jordan, is a different place (see also Zunz, Appendix to Benj. of Tudela, 2, 403); doubtless the AMATHA SEE AMATHA (q.v.) of Josephus (Ant. 10:5, 2), and the modern Amateh on the Yarmuk (Van de Velde, Map).

## Hammedatha[[@Headword:Hammedatha]]

             (Heb. Hammedatha', הִמְּדָתָא; Sept. Α᾿μάδαθος, Vulg. Amadathus, but both sometimes omit), father of the infamous Haman (q.v.), and commonly designated as “the Agagite” (Est 3:1; Est 3:10; Est 8:5; Est 9:24), though also without that title (9, 10). By Gesenius (Lex. 1855, p. 539) the name is taken to be Medatha, preceded by the definite article; but Furst (Lex. s.v.), with more probability, identifies it with the Zendic hamodata, i.e “given by Hom,” one of the Izeds. For other explanations, see Simonis  (Onomasticon, p. 586), who derives it from a Persian word meaning “double.” For the termination, compare SEE ARIDATHA. B.C. ante 474.

## Hammelech[[@Headword:Hammelech]]

             (Heb. ham-Me'lek, הִמֶּלֶךְ', which is merely מֶלֶךְ', me'lek, king, with the article prefixed; Sept. translates ὁ βασιλεύς, Vulg. Amelech), the father of Jerahmeel, which latter was one of those commanded by Jehoiakim to arrest Jeremiah and Baruch (Jer 36:26). B.C. ante 605. It is doubtful whether this was the same with the Hammelech, father of Malchiah, into whose dungeon Jeremiah was afterwards cast (Jer 38:6). B.C. ante 589.'Others, however, regard the word in both cases as an appellative, referring in the first passage to Jehoiakim, and in the latter to Zedekiah. SEE HAMMOLEKETH.

## Hammer[[@Headword:Hammer]]

             an indispensable tool designated by several Heb. terms:

1. Patiish' (פִּטַּושׁ, connected etymologically with πατάσσω, to strike), which was used by the gold-beater (Isa 41:7, Sept. σφῦρα) to overlay with silver and “smooth” the surface of the image, as well as by the quarryman (Jer 23:29, Sept. πέλυζ); metaphorically of Babylon as a destructive agent (Jeremiah 1, 23, Sept. σφῦρα). This seems to have been the heaviest instrument of the kind for hard blows.

2. Makkabah' (מִקָּבָח), properly a tool for hollowing, hence a stonecutter's mallet (1Ki 6:7), and generally any workman's hammer (Jdg 4:21 [where the form is מִקֶּבֶתSmakke'beth]; Isa 44:12; Jer 10:4). In Isaiah the Sept. uses τἐρετρον, a gimlet, in all the rest σφῦρα; Vulg. malleus. SEE MACCABAEUS.

3. Halmuth' (הִלַמוּת); used only in Jdg 5:26; Sept. σφῦρα, Vulg. mallei [q. d. הלמוֹת]; and then with the addition of the word “workmen's” by way of explanation, as this is a poetical word, used instead of the preceding more prosaic term. The pins of the tent of the Bedouin are generally of wood, and are driven into the ground by a mallet, which is  probably the “hammer” referred to in this passage (Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 149). Dr. Hackett observes (Amer. ed. of Smith's Dict. s.v.) that “it is spoken of as ‘the hammer,' being the one kept for that purpose;” but the Hebrew term used in Judges 5, 26 (to which he refers) is without the art., which is employed, however, with that found in Jdg 4:21. SEE NAIL.

4. A kind of hammer, named mappets' (מִפֵּוֹ), Jer 51:20 (A.V. “battle-axe”), or mephits' (מֵפַיוֹ), Pro 25:18 (A.V. “maul”), was used as a weapon of war.

5. Only in the plur. (כֵּילִפּוֹת, keylappoth', Sept. λαξυτήρια Vulg. ascice), a poetic term equivalent to the preceding (Psa 74:6). SEE HANDICRAFT.

## Hammer, Christoph[[@Headword:Hammer, Christoph]]

             professor of Oriental languages at Jena, who died March 19, 1597, is the author of Pcedagoqus Linguarum Quinque Orientaliun (Jena, 1595). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:360; Steinschneider, Bibl. Handbuch, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph von[[@Headword:Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph von]]

             a German Orientalist of great celebrity, was born July 9, 1774, at (Gratz, in Syria, and died in Vienna Nov. 24,1856. His family name was Hammer, and he is frequently referred to under that name, or as Von Hammer; but having inherited in 1837 the estates of the counts of Purgstall, he added that name to his own, and was made a baron. He entered at an early age the Oriental Academy at Vienna, and acquired a knowledge of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish. Being subsequently employed in various diplomatic posts in the East, he greatly extended his acquaintance with Oriental languages and literature. He wrote and spoke ten foreign languages, viz. the three above named, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, French, English, and Russian; but his works show rather varied and extensive research and learning than- profound mastery of his subjects. They are by no means free from errors, though his careful reference to authorities makes correction of mistakes comparatively easy. His writings, including contributions to journals and scientific associations, would make more than 100 octavo volumes, and, on the whole, are regarded as among the most valuable contributions of the present century to Oriental history and literature. They are noticed here because of the information they give as to the religious history and condition of Oriental nations. The most important of his works in this respect are Encyclopaedische Uebersicht der Wissenschaften des Orients (Lpz. 1804, 2 vols. in 1, 8vo); a work based on seven Oriental works, especially the bibliographical dictionary of Hadgi Khalfa: Ancient Alphabets and Hieroglyphic Characters explained, with an Account of the Egyptian Priests, their Classes, Initiation, and Sacrifices (translated from the Arabic of Ahwad bin-Abubakr bin. — Wahshih, London, 1806, small 4to): — Fundgruben des Orients, etc., ou Miniees de l'Orient exploitees (Vienna, 1809-18, 6 vols. in 3, fol., of which Hammer-Purgstall was the chief editor): — Mogenländisches Kleeblatt (Persian and Arab hymns, etc.; Vienna, 1818, 4to): — Geschichte der schinen, Redekünste Persiens (Vienna, 1818, 4to): A Mysteriun Baphometis revelatum (Vienna, 1818, fol.; also in vol. 6 of Mines de l'Orient: the author herein seeks to prove from emblems on monuments once belonging to the Templars that their order was guilty of the crimes charged to it. Raynouard [Journal des Savants, 1819] refuted this opinion, but Hammer Purgstall defended it with new arguments in a paper in the Memoirs of the Academy of Vienna,  1855): — Geschichte der Assassinen (Paris, 1833, 8vo, and an English ed. by Wood, History of the Assassins, Lond. 1835, 8vo. The author makes curious comparisons between the Assassins, the Templars, the Freemasons, and the Jesuits): — Geschichte des Osmanischen Reichs (best ed. Pesth, 1827-35, 10 vols. 8vo; French translations by Dochez, Paris, 1844, 3 vols. 8vo, and by Hellert, with notes and an Atlas, Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, Paris, 1835-43, 18 vols. 8vo): — Geschichte der Osmanischen Dichtkunst (Pesth, 1836-38, 10 vols. 8vo — a completer history of Turkish poetry than any existing, even in Turkey itself): — the celebrated treatise on morals by Ghazal, under the title of O Kind! die berühmte ethische Abhandlung Ghasalis (Vienna, 1838, 12mo): — Zeitwarte des Gebetes, a prayer-book in Arabic and German (Vienna, 1844, 8vo) — Literatur- Geschichte der Araber (Vienna, 1856, 7 vols. 4to: this work, as first published, ends with the Bagdad caliphate, and contains about 10,000 biographical. and bibliographical notices): — Das Arabische Hohe Lied der Liebe, etc., with commentary, and an introduction relative to mysticism among the Arabs (Vienna, 1854, 8vo). Hammer left an autobiography (Denk würdigkeiten aus neinem Leben) and other writings in MS., which have been published, or are publishing, under the direction of Auer, director of the imperial printing-press of Vienna. — New American Cyclopaedia, 8, 690; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 259 sq.; Pierer, s.v.; K. Schlottman, Joseph von H. — Purgstall, ein kritischer Beitrag zur Geschichte neuere'deutscher Wissenschaft (Zurich, 1857, [73 p.] 8vo). (J.W.M.)

## Hammerlin or Hammerlein, Felix[[@Headword:Hammerlin or Hammerlein, Felix]]

             (Lat. Malleolus), a Swiss theologian, was born at Zurich in 1389. He studied canon law at Erfurt, was in 1421 appointed canon of Zofingen, and in 1422 provost of Solothurn. With the income of these offices he bought a large library, and applied himself earnestly to study. He subsequently took part in the Council of Basle, where he showed great zeal for the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, and thus made himself a number of enemies. An attempt was made to assassinate him in 1439, but he escaped, though not without being dangerously wounded. The 30th chapter of his De Nobilitate, in which he abused the confederate cantons which had waged war on Zurich in 1443, made him an object of hatred to a large party of his countrymen. A number of these, having gone to Zurich on the occasion of the Carnival of 1454, seized Hammerlin, dragged him to Constance, and had him thrown into prison. As he refused to retract anything he had said or written, he was condemned to imprisonment for life in a convent. He was accordingly placed in a convent of barefooted monks at Lucerne, where he died some time after 1457, a victim to his zeal for justice and truth. He wrote Variae Oblectationis Opuscula et Tractatus (Basle, 1497, fol.), containing a number of treatises on exorcism, on monkish discipline, against the Beghards, etc. He is very severe in these writings against the prevailing corruptions of the clergy and the convents. He also left some MSS., which are preserved in the collegiate library of Zurich. See Bodmer u. Breitinger, Helvetische Bibliothek (Zurich, 1735): Hottinger, Schola  Tigurina, p. 24; Niceron, Memoires, vol. 37; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 268: Reber, Felix Hemmerlin (Zurich, 1846).

## Hammerschmid, Johann Florian[[@Headword:Hammerschmid, Johann Florian]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, was born May 4, 1652, in Bohemia. He was chaplain at Budweis, rector of the archiepiscopal seminary at Prague, and died there in 1737, dean and apostolical prothonotary. He wrote, Magnalia S. Andrae (Prague, 1685): — Magnalia S. Joannis Baptistae (ibid. 1690): — Magnalia S. Joannis Evangelistc (ibid. eod.): — Magnalia S. Matthiae (ibid. 1700). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:566, 567. (B.P.)

## Hammoleketh[[@Headword:Hammoleketh]]

             (Heb. hamn-Mole'keth, הִמֹּלֶכֶת, which is the art. prefixed to מֹלֶכֶת, mnle'keth, fem. part. =“the Queen;” Sept. ἡ Μαλεχέφ,Vulg. translates regina), a woman introduced in the genealogies of Manasseh as daughter of Machir and sister of Gilead (1Ch 7:17-18), and as having among her three children Abi-ezer, from whose family sprang the great judge Gideon. B.C. prob. between 1874 and 1658. The Targum translates the name by דַּ מְלָכִת, who reigned. The Jewish tradition, as preserved by Kimchi in his commentary on the passage, is that “she used to reign over a portion of the land which belonged to Gilead,” and that for that reason her lineage has been preserved. Smith, s.v. SEE HAMMELECH.

## Hammon[[@Headword:Hammon]]

             (Heb. Chammon', חִמּוֹן, warm; Sept. Α᾿μών and Χαμών), the name of two places.

1. A town in the tribe of Asher, mentioned between Rehob and Kanah (Jos 19:28). Dr. Robinson quotes the suggestion of Schultz as possible, that it may be the ruined town Hamul, at the head of a wady of the same name which comes down to the Mediterranean just north of En- Nakurah, somewhat south of Tyre (new ed. of Researches, 3, 66). Schwarz thinks it is identical with a village Hamani, situated, according to him, two miles south by east of Tyre (Palest. p. 192); probably the place marked on Zimmerman's and Van de Velde's Maps as Hunnaweh. The scriptural text, however, would seem to indicate a position on the northern boundary, about midway between Naphtali (at Rehob) and Sidon. Hence Knobel (Erklar. ad loc.) connects it with the village Hammana, on a wady of the same name east of Beirut, where there is now a Maronite monastery (Seetzeln, 1, 260); but this, again, is too far north (Keil, in Keil and Delitzsch, ad loc.). Van de Velde (Memoir and Map) adopts the first of the above sites, which, although neither the name nor the situation exactly agrees, is perhaps the best hitherto suggested.

2. A Levitical city of Naphtali, assigned, with its suburbs, to the descendants of Gershom (1Ch 6:76). Schwarz (Palest. p. 183) not improbably conjectures that it is the same with HAMMATH (Jos 19:25). SEE HAMBIOTH-DOR (Jos 21:32).

## Hammon (2)[[@Headword:Hammon (2)]]

             (Jos 19:28). Tristram thinks (Bible Places, page 293) that this is one of the mounds "just north of Alma, SEE UMMAH, bearing the name of Ilamnzuz;" but no such name appears on the Ordnance Map, nor in the accompanying Memnoirs. The Hamul which has been thought to be the best modern representative of Hammon is laid down on the Map at one and a half miles north-east of Nakmah, as Ain-Hdmul; which is described in the Memoirs (1:157) as "a large perennial spring of good water, irrigating gardens and turning a mill near its source; a plentiful supply." No ancient ruins are noted in the immediate vicinity. Trelawney Saunders locates it (Map of the O.T.) at Khurbet el-Hima, ten miles south-east of Tyre, which  consists simply of "large heaps of stones" (Memoirs, 1:176) without any special marks of antiquity.

## Hammond, Charles, LL.D[[@Headword:Hammond, Charles, LL.D]]

             a Congregational minister, son of Dr. Shubael Hammond, was born at Union, Connecticut, June 15, 1813. He studied at Monson Academy, and graduated from Yale College in 1839; entered Andover Theological Seminary, and from 1842 to 1844 attended Yale Divinity School. In the meanwhile (1839-41), he was principal of the Monson Academy, and afterwards again occupied that position (1844-1859). From this time till 1863 he was connected with the Lawrence Academy, at Groton, and then was a third time chosen principal of the Monson Academy, a position which he retained until his death, November 7, 1878. He was ordained an evangelist, October 5, 1855, at Tolland, Connecticut. He was the author of many educational articles, and published several pamphlets. See Cong. Yearbook, 1879; page 43.

## Hammond, Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Hammond, Henry, D.D]]

             a learned divine of the English Church, was born Aug. 18, 1605, at Chertsey, Surrey. He was sent at an early age to Eton, whence he removed to Magdalen College, Oxford, and became a fellow of that society in 1625. In 1633 the earl of Leicester presented him to the rectory of Penshurst, Kent, where he resided till 1643, when he was made archdeacon of Chichester. “By birth and education a confirmed Royalist, he retired to Oxford soon after the civil war broke out, continued to reside there while that city was held by the king, and attended the king's commissioners to Uxbridge, where he disputed with Vines, a Presbyterian minister. He was appointed canon of Christchurch and public orator in 1645, and attended Charles I as his chaplain from the time when he fell into the hands of the army until the end of 1647, when the king's attendants were sent away  from him. Hammond then returned to Oxford, and was chosen sub dean of Christchurch, from which situation he was expelled in March 1648, by the parliamentary visitors, and placed for some time in confinement. On his release he repaired to Westwood, Worcestershire, the seat of Sir John Packwood, where the remainder of his life was spent in literary labor, ‘doing much good to the day of his death, in which time he had the disposal of great charities reposed in his hands, as being the most zealous promoter of almsgiving that lived in England since the change of religion.' He died after long suffering from a complication of disorders, April 25,1660. It is said that Charles II intended for him the bishopric of Worcester. Hammond was a man of great learning, as well in the classics and general philology as in doctrinal and school divinity, and possessed great natural ability” (Jones, Christ. Biogr. p. 210). Of his writings the following are some of the most important: Practical Catechism (1644): — Paraphrase and Annotations on the New Testament (Lond. 1653, 8vo; often reprinted; last edition 1845, 4 vols. 8vo). It was translated into Latin by Leclerc (Amster. 1698), with observations and criticisms. Dr. Johnson was very fond of Hammond's Annotations, and recommended them strongly. The theology of the work is Arminian. Paraphrase and Annotations upon the Psalms (1659, fol.; new ed. 1850, 2 vols. 8vo ): — Discourses on God's Grace and Decrees (1660, 8vo), taking the Arminian view: — Annotations on the Proverbs (1683, fol.): — Sermons (1644, fol.). These, with many valuable writings on the Romish controversy, may be found in Fulman's Collected Works of Dr. Hammond (3rd edi., London, 1774, 4 vols. fol.), of which the 1st vol. contains his Life by Dr. Fell. The Life was reprinted in 1849, and may be found in Wordsworth, Eccles. Biography, 4, 313. See also Hook, Eccl. Biography, 5, 534. Hammond's miscellaneous theological writings are reprinted in the Library of Anglo- Catholic Theology (Oxford 1847-51, 4 vols. 8vo).

## Hammond, J. Pinkney, D.D[[@Headword:Hammond, J. Pinkney, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Annapolis, Maryland, May 20, 1826. He graduated from St. John's College in 1845, was settled successively at Upper Marlborough, Maryland, Bangor, Maine, Morrisania, N.Y., Reading, Pennsylvania, Omaha, Nebraska, Annapolis, Maryland, and finally at Whittingham Church, Baltimore. He died August 9, 1884.

## Hammond, William[[@Headword:Hammond, William]]

             an English Calvinistic Methodist minister, was born at Battle, Sussex, January 6, 1719. In 1745 he published a volume of original Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs. Among these were several which are found in many of our modern collections: Lord, we come before thee now; Would you win a soul to God? and Awake and sing the song. Mr. Hammond was an educated man, having been connected with St. John's College, Cambridge. Later in life he joined the Moravian Brethren, and, upon his decease, August 19, 1783, was interred in their burying-ground in London. He was the author of a volume entitled The Marrow of the Gospel. See Belclier, Historical Sketches of Hymns, page 163. (J.C.S.)

## Hammoth-dor[[@Headword:Hammoth-dor]]

             (Heb. Chammoth'-Dor, חִמֹּת דּאֹרprob. for חִמִּתאּדּוֹר, Hammath of Dor, but the reason of the latter part of the name is not clear; Sept. Α᾿μαθδώρ, Vulg. Hamoth Dor), a Levitical and refuge city of Naphtali (Jos 21:32); probably the same elsewhere called simply HAIMMATH (Jos 19:35).

## Hamon[[@Headword:Hamon]]

             SEE BAAL-HAMON; SEE HAMON-GOG.

## Hamon, Jean[[@Headword:Hamon, Jean]]

             a distinguished French moralist, was born at Cherbourg in 1618. He was a graduate physician of the University of Paris. He had already established a great reputation, and was offered a good charge by his pupil, M. de Harlay (afterwards president of the Parliament); but, by the advice of his spiritual director, Singlin, he sold all his goods, gave the proceeds to the poor, and became a hermit of Port Royal in 1651. He nevertheless continued practicing medicine, visiting the poor in the neighborhood of Port Royal, and administering to them both spiritual advice and remedies. The Necrologe de Port Royal says: “After a life as carefully guarded as though each day was to be the last, he ended it joyfully by a peaceful death, as he had wished, and entered into eternal life,” Feb. 22, 1687. He wrote Divers Traites de Piete (Paris, 1675, 2 vols. 12mo): — Sur la Priere et les Devoirs des Pasteurs (Par. 1689,2 vols. 12mo): — La Pratique de la Priere continuelle (Paris, 1702, 12mo): — Explication du Cantique des Cantiques, with an introduction by Nicole (Paris, 1708, 4 vols. 12mo): — Instructions pour les Religieuses de Port Royal (1727 and 1730, 2 vols.): — Instructions sur les Sacraments, sur le Jubile, etc. (Paris, 1734, 12mo): Explication de l'Oraison Doninicale (Par. 1735), besides other practical and controversial writings. See Necrologe de Port Royal (Amst. 1723, 4to); Thomas Dufossd, Histoire de Port Royal; Memoires de Fontaine; Dupin, Hist. Eccles. du 17me siecle; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 23, 272.

## Hamon-gog[[@Headword:Hamon-gog]]

             (Heb. Hamon'-Gog, הָמוֹן גּוֹג, multitude of Gog; fully with גֵּיא, valley, prefixed; Sept. τὸ Γαϊv τὸ πολυάνδριον τοῦ Γώλ,Vulg. Vallis  multitudinis Gog), the name prophetically ascribed to the valley in which the corpses of the slaughtered army of Gog are described as to be buried (Eze 39:11; Eze 39:15); represented as situated to the east of the Dead Sea, on the thoroughfare of commerce with Arabia (comp. the route of the Ishmaelites to whom Joseph was sold, Gen 17:25), probably the present Haj road between Damascus and Mecca, but scarcely referring to any particular spot. (See Havernick, Commentar, ad loc.;. Stuart's Comment. on the Apocalypse, 2, 367.) SEE GOG.

## Hamonah[[@Headword:Hamonah]]

             (Heb. Hamonah', הֲמוֹנָה, multitude; Sept. translates Πολυάνδριον, Vulg. Amon), a name figuratively assigned to the sepulchral “city” of the valley in which the slaughter and burial of the forces of Gog are prophetically announced to take place (Eze 39:16), emblematical of the multitude of graves (compare Joe 3:14). SEE HAMON-GOG.

## Hamor[[@Headword:Hamor]]

             (Heb. Chamor', חֲמוֹר, a he-ass; Sept. Ε᾿μμώρ, N.T. Εμμόρ), a Hivite, from whom (or his sons) Jacob purchased the plot of ground in which Joseph was afterwards buried (Gen 33:19; Jos 24:32; Act 7:15; in which last passage the name is Anglicized E.M-OR), and whose son Shechem seduced Dinah (Gen 34:2). B.C. cir. 1905. As the latter appears to have founded the city of Shechem (q.v.), Hamor is also named as the representative of its inhabitants (Jdg 9:28) in the time of Abimelech (q.v.). His character and influence are indicated by his title (“prince” of the Hivite tribe in that vicinity), and his judicious behavior in the case of his son; but neither of these saved him from the indiscriminate massacre by Dinah's brothers. SEE JACOB.

## Hampden Cases[[@Headword:Hampden Cases]]

             SEE HAMPDEN, R. D.

## Hampden, Renn Dickson, D.D[[@Headword:Hampden, Renn Dickson, D.D]]

             bishop of Hereford, England, a descendant of John Hampden, was born A.D. 1792, in the island of Barbados, where his family had settled in 1670. He entered Oriel College, Oxford, as a commoner, in 1810, and subsequently was admitted a fellow, appointed a tutor, and, in 1829 and 1831, was public examiner in classics. lie delivered the Bampton lecture in 1832, choosing for his subject The Scholastic Philosophy considered in its relation to Christian Theology (3rd edit. Lond. 1848, 8vo), and in 1833 was appointed principal of St. Mary's Hall. In 1834 he was elected White's professor of moral philosophy (Oxford), and published a pamphlet entitled Observations on Religious Dissent. The opinions expressed in this work and in his Bampton lecture were made the grounds of opposition to his confirmation in 1836 as regius professor of divinity (Oxford), to which Lord Melbourne, then premier, had appointed him. The controversy over this appointment, which assumed the character of a violent struggle, — and is known as the First Hampden Case, appears to have been based on  political feelings as well as theological grounds. His principal opponents were Tories and High-Churchmen, among whom were Dr. Pusey and J. H. Newman, now a Roman Catholic.

A remonstrance against the appointment was sent to the archbishop of Canterbury, to be presented to the crown. A declaration, condemning Hampden's “mode of viewing the doctrines of the Bible and the Articles of the Church” was numerously signed by residents of the university, and an effort was made in the House of Convocation to pass a statute expressing want of confidence in his views, which was only frustrated by the interposition of the proctors. The struggle was renewed in the Second Hampden Case, occasioned by Hampden's appointment to the see of Hereford by lord John Russell in 1847. Thirteen of the bishops remonstrated against the appointment, “appealing to the former controversy, and urging the inexpediency of placing over the clergy one whose opinions were rendered suspicious by the decision of a body like the University of Oxford.” Hampden's friends replied that a change had taken place in the minds of the members of the Convocation of the University, reducing the proportions of 474 to 94 in 1836, to 330 to 219 in 1842, on the proposition to repeal the expression of censure; and further, that many who censured Hampden “objected to the university as an arbiter of doctrine in the case of Tract 90, and of Mr. Ward's ideal of the Church.” The opposition, as in the former case, arose mainly from political opponents and from Tractarians. The government refused to yield, and Dr. Hampden was installed as bishop of Hereford, and thenceforth devoted himself to his episcopal duties, the attacks upon him gradually ceasing. He died April 23,1868. His position was that of a moderate churchman, and the expression of his views at this day could hardly provoke so fierce an opposition as in 1836. A list of the most important pamphlets relating to the Hampden cases is given by Allibone, s.v. Hampden. Besides the works mentioned above, Dr. Hampden's most important writings are, Philosophical Evidence of Christianity, etc. (1827, 8vo): — Lectures on Moral Philosophy (8vo): — Parochial Sermons (1836, 8vo): — Lecture on Tradition (1841, 8vo): — Sermons before the University of Oxford (1836- 1847): — a Review of the writings of Thomas Aquinas in the Encycl. Metropolitana, which led Hallam to characterize Hampden “as the only Englishman who, since the revival of letters, has penetrated into the wilderness of scholasticism;” and the articles on Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, in the Encycl. Britannica. See English Review, 8, 430; 9:229; Blackw. Mag. No. 246 (April, 1836); Brit. and For. Rev. 15 ,169; N. Brit. Review, 8, 286; Edin. Rev. 63, 225; Fraser's Mag., 37, 105; Eclec. Revelation 4 th series, 23:221; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 780; Chambers's Cyclop. of English Literature, 2, 733 (Philada. 1867); Rose, in Church Hist. from Thirteenth Century to Present Time, in crown 8vo edition of Encycl. Metropolitana, p. 385. (J. W. M.)

## Hampton-Court Conference[[@Headword:Hampton-Court Conference]]

             SEE CONFERENCE.

## Hampulling-Cloth[[@Headword:Hampulling-Cloth]]

             SEE AMPULLING-CLOTH.

## Hamran[[@Headword:Hamran]]

             SEE HEMDAN.

## Hamuel[[@Headword:Hamuel]]

             (Heb. Chamnuel', חִמּוּאֵל, heat [anger or light] of God; Sept. Α᾿μουήλ,Vulg. Hamuel), the son of Mishma and (apparently) father of Zacchur, of the tribe of Simeon (1Ch 4:26). B.C. ante 1046.

## Hamul[[@Headword:Hamul]]

             (Heb. Chamul', חָמוּל, spared; Sept. Ι᾿εμουήλ), the second of the two sons of Pharez, son of Judah (1Ch 2:5). He could not have been born, however, before the migration of Jacob into Egypt (as appears to be stated in Gen 46:12), since Pharez was not at that time grown up (Gen 38:1). His descendants were called HAMULITES (Num 26:21). B.C. between 1870 and 1856.

## Hamul (2)[[@Headword:Hamul (2)]]

             the angel who was regarded by the ancient Persians as the inspector of the heavens.

## Hamulite[[@Headword:Hamulite]]

             (Heb. Chamuli', חָמוּלַי, Sept. Ι᾿εμουῃλί), a descendant of HAMUL SEE HAMUL (q.v.), the grandson of Judah (Num 26:21).

## Hamutal[[@Headword:Hamutal]]

             (Heb. Chamutal', חֲמוּטל, kinsnzan of the dewu; Sept. Α᾿μιτάλ, but in Jer 52:1 Α᾿μιτάαλ, Vulgate Amital; but the Heb. text has

חֲמַיטִל, Chamital' [of the same import], in 2Ki 24:18; Jer 52:1), the daughter of Jeremiah of Libnah, wife of king Josiah and mother  of king Jehoahaz (2Ki 23:31), also of king Zedekiah (2Ki 24:18; Jer 52:1). B.C. 632-619.

## Hamza[[@Headword:Hamza]]

             in the mythology of the Druses, was a prophet of the Egyptian god Hakem, whom the Druses call their supreme deity. Hamza is an honored hero. Seven times he has come from heaven to the earth. The sacred books of the Druses call Hamza the guide of the compass, the straight road to the only salvation, the establisher of truth, the Imam of all times, the holy spirit, the final cause of all causes. He was the highest Nezir of the god Hakem. He was so highly esteemed by the latter that he ordered all angels to worship him, which they all did except Sheitun (Satan), and for this reason the latter was damned. The four other prophets, Ismael, Mahommed, Selami, and Ali, are called Hamza's wives.

## Hanameel[[@Headword:Hanameel]]

             (Heb. Chanamel', חֲנִמְאֵל, perh. i.q. Hananeel; Sept. Α᾿ναμεήλ,Vulg. lanameel),-son of Shallum and cousin of Jeremiah, to whom, before the siege of Jerusalem, he sold a field which he possessed in Anathoth, a town of the Levites (Jer 32:6-12). If this field belonged to Hanameel as a Levite, the sale of it would imply that an ancient law had fallen into disuse (Lev 25:34); but it is possible that it may have been the property of Hanameel in right of his mother. Compare the case of Barnabas, who was also a Levite; and the note of Grotius on Act 4:37. Henderson (on Jer 32:7) supposes that a portion of the Levitical estates might be sold within the tribe. Fairbairn (s.v.) suggests that as this was a typical act, the ordinary civil rules do not apply to it. The transaction, however, was conducted with all the forms of legal transfer, at the special instance of Jehovah, and was intended to evince the certainty of restoration from the approaching exile by showing that possessions which could be established by documents would yet be of future value to the possessor (Jer 32:13-15). B.C. 589.

## Hanan[[@Headword:Hanan]]

             (Heb. Chanan', חָנָן, merciful, or perh. rather an abbreviation of ווֹחָנָן, later John [ SEE ANANIAS; SEE HANANI, etc.]; Sept. Α᾿ναν, but in Jer 35:4 Α᾿νανίας), the name of at least seven men. See BAAL- HANAN; SEE BEN-HANAN; SEE ELON-BETH-HANAN.

1. One of the sons (or descendants) of Shashak, a chief of the tribe of Benjamin resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:23). B.C. apparently between 1612 and 1093.

2. Son of Maachah, and one of David's heroes (1Ch 11:43). B.C. 1046.

3. Father of Igdaliah, “a man of God;” in the chamber of his sons Jeremiah tested the fidelity of the Rechabites (Jer 35:4). B.C. ante 606.

4. The last named of the six sons of Azel the Benjamite (1Ch 8:38; 1Ch 9:44). B.C. cir. 588.  5. One of the Nethinim whose family returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2, 46; Neh 7:49). B.C. ante 536.

6. One of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the law to the people (Neh 8:7; comp. 9:4, 5). He also subscribed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:10). From Neh 13:13, it appears that he was the son of Zaccur, and, on account of his integrity, he was one of those appointed to distribute the Levitical revenues among his brethren. B.C. cir. 410.

7. One of the chiefs of the people who subscribed the solemn covenant drawn up by Nehemiah (Neh 10:22). In Neh 10:26 his name appears to be repeated in the same list. B.C. cir. 410.

## Hananeel[[@Headword:Hananeel]]

             (Heb. Chananel', חֲנִנְאֵל, which God has graciously given; Sept. Α᾿ναμεήλ, Vulgate Hananeel), a tower (מַגְדָּל) of Jerusalem, situated on the exterior wall beyond the tower of Meah in going from the Sheepgate towards the Fish-gate (Neh 3:1; Neh 12:39). It is also mentioned in Jer 31:38; Zec 14:10. Its position appears to have been at the north-eastern corner of the present mosque enclosure (see Strong's Harmony and Expos., Append. 2, p. 19). Schwarz (Palest. p. 251) also locates it in this vicinity, but absurdly identifies it with the tower of Hippicus. SEE JERUSALEM. Gesenius (Thes. Heb. s.v.) suggests that it may have been so called from the name of its founder or builder.

## Hanani[[@Headword:Hanani]]

             (Heb Chanani', חֲנָנַי, God has gratified me, or an abbreviation of the name Hananiah; Sept. Α᾿νανί, but Α᾿νανία in Ezr 10:10, and Α᾿νανίας in Neh 7:2; Vulg. Hanani), the name of at least three men.

1. One of the sons of Heman, who (with his eleven kinsmen) had charge of the eighteenth division of Levitical musicians in the appointments of David (1Ch 25:4; 1Ch 25:25). B.C. 1014.

2. A prophet who was sent to rebuke king Asa for his want of faith in subsidizing the king of Syria against the rival king Baasha, whereas he should rather have seized the occasion to triumph over both (2  Chronicles 16:1-10). In punishment for this defection from the true God, he was threatened with a troublous residue to his reign. SEE ASA. Enraged at the prophet's boldness, the king seized and thrust him into prison, from which, however, he appears to have been soon released. B.C. 928. This Hanani is probably the same with the father of the prophet Jehu, who denounced king Baasha (1Ki 16:7), also king Jehoshaphat (2Ch 19:2; comp. 20:34).

3. Apparently a brother of Nehemiah, who went from Jerusalem to Shushan, being sent most probably by Ezra, and brought that information respecting the miserable condition of the returned Jews which led to the mission of Nehemiah (Neh 1:2). Hanani came back to Judaea probably along with his brother, and, together with one Hananiah, was appointed to take charge of the gates of Jerusalem, and see that they were opened in the morning and closed in the evening at the appointed time (Neh 7:2). The circumstances of the time and place rendered this an important and responsible duty, not unattended with danger. B.C. 446.

## Hananiah[[@Headword:Hananiah]]

             (Heb. [and Chald.] Chananyah', חֲנִנְיָה:N, also [1Ch 25:23; 2Ch 26:11; Jer 36:12] in. the prolonged form Chananya'hu, חֲנִנְיָחוּ, whom Jehovah has graciously given, comp. Ananias, etc.; Sept. Α᾿νανία or Α᾿νανίας, Vulg. Hanania), the name of a number of men. SEE ANANIAH; SEE ANNAS, etc.

1. A “son” of Shashak and chief of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:24). B.C. apparently between 16i2 and 1093.

2. One of the sons of Heman, who (with eleven of his kinsmen) was appointed by David to superintend the sixteenth division (blowers on horns) of Levitical musicians (1Ch 25:4; 1Ch 25:23). B.C. 1014.

3. One of king Uzziah's chief military officers (2Ch 26:11). B.C. 803.

4. The father of Shelemiah and grandfather of Irijah, which last was the guard of the gate of Benjamin who arrested Jeremiah (Jer 37:13). B.C. considerably ante 589.  5. Father of Zedekiah, which latter was one of the “princes” to whom Michaiah reported Baruch's reading of Jeremiah's roll (Jer 36:12). B.C. ante 605.

6. Son of Azur, a false prophet of Gibeon, who by opposing his prophecies to those of Jeremiah, brought upon himself the terrible sentence, “Thou shalt die this year, because thou hast taught rebellion against the Lord.” He died accordingly (Jeremiah 28, sq.). B.C, 595. Hananiah publicly prophesied in the Temple that within two years Jeconiah and all his fellow captives, with the vessels of the Lord's house which Nebuchadnezzar had taken away to Babylon, should be brought back to Jerusalem (Jeremiah 28): an indication that treacherous negotiations were already secretly opened with Pharaoh-Hophra (who had just succeeded Psammis on the Egyptian throne), and that strong hopes were entertained of the destruction of the Babylonian power by him. The preceding chapter (Jer 27:3) shows further that a league was already in progress between Judah and the neighboring nations of Edom, Ammon, Moab, Tyre, and Zidon, for the purpose of organizing resistance to Nebuchadnezzar, in combination no doubt, with the projected movements of Pharaoh Hophra. IInaaniah corroborated his prophecy by taking off from the neck of Jeremiah the yoke which he wore by divine command (Jeremiah 27) in token of the subjection of Judaea and the neighboring countries to the Babylonian empire), and breaking it, adding, “Thus, saith Jehovah, Even so will I break the yoke of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, from the neck of all nations within the space of two full years.” But Jeremiah was bid to go and tell Hananiah that for the wooden yokes which he had broken he should make yokes of iron, so firm was the dominion of Babylon destined to be for seventy years. The prophet Jeremiah added this rebuke and prediction of Hananiah's death, the fulfillment of which closes the history of this false prophet. The history of Hananiah is of great interest, as throwing much light upon the Jewish politics of that eventful time, divided as parties were into the partisans of Babylon on one hand, and Egypt on the other. It also exhibits the machinery of false prophecies, by which the irreligious party sought to promote their own policy, in a very distinct form. At the same tine, too, that it explains in general the sort of political calculation on which such false prophecies were hazarded, it supplies an important clew in particular by which to judge of the date of Pharaoh-Hophra's (or Apries's) accession to the Egyptian throne, and the commencement of his ineffectual effort to restore the power of Egypt (which had been prostrate since  Necho's overthrow, Jer 46:2) upon the ruins of the Babylonian empire. The leaning to Egypt indicated by Hananiah's prophecy as having begun in the fourth of Zedekiah, had in the sixth of his reign issued in open defection from Nebuchadnezzar, and in the guilt of perjury, which cost Zedekiah his crown and his life, as we learn from Eze 17:12-20; the date being fixed by a comparison of Eze 8:1 with 20:1. The temporary success of the intrigue, which is described in Jeremiah 37, was speedily followed by the return of the Chaldaeans and the destruction of the city, according to the prediction of Jeremiah. This history of Hananiah also illustrates the manner-in which the false prophets hindered the mission, and obstructed the beneficent effects of the ministry of the true prophets, and affords a remarkable example of the way in which they prophesied smooth things, and said peace when there was no peace (compare 1Ki 22:11; 1Ki 22:24-25). SEE JEREMIAH.

7. The original name of one of Daniel's youthful companions and one of the “three Hebrew children;” better known by his Babylonian name SHADRACH (Dan 1:6-7).

8. Son of Zerubbabel, and father of Rephaiah; one of the paternal ancestors of Christ (1Ch 3:19; 1Ch 3:21). (See Strong's Harm. and Expos. Of the Gospels, p. 16, 17.) B.C. post 536. He is possibly the same with No 10. SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

9. One of the “sons” of Bebai, an Israelite who renounced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Ezr 10:28). B.C. 459.

10. The “ruler of the palace” (שִׂר הִבַּירה), and the person who was associated with Nehemiah's brother Hanani in the charge of the gates of Jerusalem. SEE HANANI. The high eulogy is bestowed upon him that “he was a faithful man, and feared God above many”. (Neh 7:2). His office seems to have been one of authority and trust, and perhaps the same as that of Eliakim, who was “over the house” in the reign of Hezekiah. SEE ELIAKIM. The arrangements for guarding the gates of Jerusalem were entrusted to him with Hanani, the Tirshatha's brother. Prideaux thinks that the appointment of Hanani and Hananiah indicates that at this time Nehemiah returned to Persia, but without sufficient ground. Nehemiah seems to have been continuously at Jerusalem for some-time after the completion of the wall (Neh 7:5; Neh 7:65; Neh 8:9; Neh 10:1). If, too, the term הִבַּירָהmeans, as Gesenius supposes, and as the use of it in Neh 2:8, makes not improbable. not the palace, but the fortress of the Temple, called by Josephus Βάρις, there is still less reason to imagine Nehemiah's absence. In this case Hananiah would be a priest, perhaps of the same family as the preceding. The rendering, moreover, of Neh 7:2-3, should probably be, “And I enjoined (or gave orders to) Hanall… and Haanaiah, the captains of the fortress concerning Jerusalem, and said, Let not the gates,” etc. There is no authority for rendering עִלby “over” He gave such an one charge over Jerusalem.” The passages quoted by Gesenius are not one of them to the point.

11. The son of “one of the apothecaries” (or makers of the sacred ointments and incense, Exo 30:22-38), who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 3:8); possibly the same with No. 9. B.C. 446.

12. A son of Shelemiah, and one of the priests who repaired those parts of the wall of Jerusalem opposite their houses (Neh 3:30). B.C. 446.

13. A priest, apparently son of Jeremiah, after the captivity (Neh 12:12); probably the same with one of those who celebrated the completion of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 12:41). B.C. 446.

## Hanap[[@Headword:Hanap]]

             a mediaeval term for a drinking-cup.

## Hanby, Thomas[[@Headword:Hanby, Thomas]]

             an English Wesleyan preacher, was born at Carlisle Dec. 16, 1733; was left an orphan at seven, and bound to a trade at twelve. He had little education, but had serious thoughts from infancy, and was confirmed at thirteen. Some time after, through Methodist influence, he was converted. — In 1754 he began to preach, and, during his first year of work, was often in danger of violent death from mobs. In 1755 he was admitted into the itinerancy. He afterwards preached in most of the cities of the kingdom. He (lied at Nottingham Dec. 29,1796. Mr. Hanby's labors tended greatly to the spread of vital religion among some of the most abandoned and violent districts of England. See Jackson, Lives of Early Methodist Preachers, 1, 274. (G. L T.)

## Hanckel, Christian, D.D[[@Headword:Hanckel, Christian, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was rector, for several years, in Charleston, S.C., and in 1858 in Radcliffborough. At this time he was president of the standing committee of his diocese, a position to which he was re-elected several successive years. In 1866 he retired from the active duties of the ministry, and in 1867 was elected honorary rector of the same church. He died in 1870. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1871, page 118.

## Hancock, Thomas[[@Headword:Hancock, Thomas]]

             a patron of Harvard College. He left most of his property to his nephew, governor Hancock, but yet bequeathed £1000 for the foundation of a professorship of the Hebrew and other Oriental languages at Harvard;  £1000 to the Society for propagating the Gospel among the Indians, and £600 to the town of Boston for the establishment of a hospital for the insane. He died at Boston August 1, 1764. — Ann. Register, 1764.

## Hand[[@Headword:Hand]]

             (יָד,yd, the open palm; כִּ, kaph, the hollow of the partly-closed hand; Greek χείρ; יָמַין, yanin', the right hand, δεξιά; שְׂמוֹל, semel', the left hand, ἀριστερά, εὐώνυμον), the principal organ of feeling, rightly denominated by Galen the instrument of instruments since this member is wonderfully adapted to the purposes for which it was designed, and serves to illustrate the wisdom and providence of the great Creator (The Hand, its Mechanism and vital Endowments, as evincing Design, by Sir Charles Bell). Considering the multiplex efficacy of the human hand, the control which it has given mail, the conquest over the external world which it has enabled him to achieve, and the pleasing and useful revolutions and improvements which it has brought about, we are not surprised to read the glowing eulogy in which Cicero (De Nat. Deor. 2, 60) has indulged on the subject, nor to find how important is the part which the hand performs in the records of divine revelation. The hand itself serves to distinguish man from other terrestrial beings. Of the two hands, the right has a preference derived from natural endowment. — SEE LEFTHANDED.

Hands are the symbols of human action; pure hands are pure actions; unjust hands are deeds of injustice; hands full of blood, actions stained with cruelty, and the alike (Psa 90:17; Job 9:30; 1Ti 2:8; Isa 1:15). Washing of the hands was the symbol of innocence (Psa 26:6; Psa 73:13). Of this Pilate furnishes an example (Mat 27:24). It was the custom of the Jews to wash their hands before and after meat (see Mar 7:3; Mat 6:2; Luk 11:38). Washing of hands was a symbol of expiation, as might be shown by numerous references; and of sanctification, as appears from several passages (1Co 6:11; Isa 1:16; Psa 24:3-4). SEE WASHING OF HANDS. Paul, in 1Ti 2:8, says, “I will therefore that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands,” etc. (see Job 11:13-14). The elevation or extension of the right hand was also the ancient method of voting in popular assemblies, as indicated by the Greek term χειροτονέω (Act 14:23; 2Co 8:19). In Psa 77:2, for “sore,” the margin of our version has “hand;” and the correct sense is, “My hands in the night were spread out, and ceased not.”  To smite the hands together over the head was a gesture of despairing grief (2Sa 13:19; Jer 2:37). The expression in Jer 2:37, “Thy hands upon thy head,” may be explained by the act of Tamar in laying her hand on her head as a sign of her degradation and sorrow (2Sa 13:19). The expression “Though hand join in hand” in Pro 11:21, is simply “hand to hand,” and signifies through all ages and generations, ever: “through all generations the wicked shall not go unpunished.”

To the right hand signified to the south, the southern quarter, as the left hand signified the north (Job 23:9; 1Sa 23:19; 2Sa 24:5). The term hand is sometimes used for a monument, a trophy of victory (1Sa 15:12); a sepulchral monument, “Absalom's Place,” literally Absalom's Hand (2Sa 18:18; see Erdmann, Monunentum Absalomi, Helmst. 1740). So in Isa 56:5, “to them will I give a place within my walls — a monument (or portion) and a name” (Gesenius, Thesaur. Heb. p. 568).

To give the right hand was a pledge of fidelity, and was considered as confirming a promise or bargain (2Ki 10:15; Ezr 10:19); spoken of the vanquished giving their hands as a pledge of submission and fidelity to the victors (Eze 17:18; Jeremiah 1, 15; Lam 5:6); so to strike hands as a pledge of suretiship (Pro 17:18; Pro 22:26; 2Ch 30:8, margin). The right hand was lifted up in swearing or taking an oath (Gen 14:22; Deu 32:40; Eze 20:28; Psa 144:11; Isa 62:8); similar is the Arabic oath, “By the right hand of Allah.” (See Taylor's Fragments, No. 278.)

Hand in general is the symbol of power and strength, and the right hand more particularly so. To hold by the right hand is the symbol of protection and favor (Psa 18:35). To stand or be at one's right hand is to aid or assist any one (Psa 16:8; Psa 109:31; Psa 110:5; Psa 121:5); so also “man of thy right hand,” i.e. whom thou sustainest, aidest (Psa 80:17); “my hand is with any one,” i.e. I aid him, am on his side (1Sa 22:17; 2Sa 23:12; 2Ki 23:19); and to take or hold the right hand, i.e. to sustain, to aid (Psa 73:23; Isa 41:13; Isa 45:1). So the right hand of fellowship (Gal 2:9) signifies a communication of the same power and authority. To lean upon the hand of another is a mark of familiarity and superiority (2Ki 5:18; 2Ki 7:17). To give the hand, as to a master, is the token of submission and future obedience. Thus, in 2  Chronicles 30:8, the words in the original, “Give the hand unto the Lord,” signify, Yield yourselves unto the Lord. The like phrase is used in Psa 68:31; Lam 5:6. “Behold, as the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress, so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God”(Psa 123:2), which refers to the watchful readiness of a servant to obey the least sign of command (Kitto's Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.). To kiss the hand is an act of homage (1Ki 19:18; Job 31:27). To pour water on any one's hands signifies to serve him (2Ki 3:11). To “seal up the hand”(Job 37:7) is to place one in charge of any special business, for which he will be held accountable. Marks in the hands or wrists were the tokens of servitude, the heathens being wont to imprint marks upon the hands of servants, and on such as devoted themselves to some false deity. Thus in. Zec 13:6, the man, when challenged for the scars visible on his hands, would deny that they had proceeded from an idolatrous cause, and pretend that they were the effects of the wounds he had given himself for the loss of his friends. The right hand stretched out is the symbol of immediate exertion of power (Exo 15:12); sometimes the exercise of mercy (Isa 65:2; Pro 1:24).

The hand of God is spoken of as the instrument of power, and to it is ascribed that which strictly belongs to God himself (Job 27:11; Psa 31:16; Psa 95:4; Isa 62:3; Pro 21:1; Act 4:28; 1Pe 5:6). So the hand of the Lord being upon or with any one denotes divine aid or favor (Ezr 7:6; Ezr 7:28; Ezr 8:18; Ezr 8:22; Ezr 8:13; Neh 2:8; Isa 1:25; Luk 1:66; Act 11:21); further, the hand of the Lord is upon or against thee, denotes punishment (Exo 9:3; Deu 2:15; Jdg 2:15; 1Sa 7:13; 1Sa 12:15; Eze 13:9; Amo 1:8; Act 13:11). In Job 33:7, “my hand shall not be heavy upon thee,” the original term is אֶכֶ, ekeph; and the passage signifies “my dignity shall not weigh heavy upon thee”(Gesenius, s.v.). The hand of God upon a prophet signifies the immediate operation of his Holy Spirit on the soul or body of the prophet, as in 1Ki 18:46; 2Ki 3:15; Eze 1:3; Eze 3:22; Eze 8:1. As the hand, so also the finger of God denotes his power or Spirit (see Luk 11:20, and comp. Mat 12:28). Thus our Savior cast out devils or daemons by his bare command, whereas the Jews cast them out only by the invocation of the name of God. So in Exo 8:19, the finger of God is a work which none but God could perform. SEE ARM.

The hands of the high priest were laid on the head of the scape-goat when the sins of the people were publicly confessed (Lev 16:21). Witnesses laid their hands oil the head of the accused person, as it were to signify that they charged upon him the guilt of his blood and freed themselves from it (Deu 13:9; Deu 17:7). The Hebrews, when presenting their sin-offerings at the tabernacle, confessed their sins while they laid their hands upon the victim (Lev 1:4). To “fill one's hands,” is to take possession of the priesthood, to perform the functions of that office; because in this ceremony those parts of the victim which were to be offered were put into the hand of the new-made priest (Jdg 17:5; Jdg 17:12; Lev 16:32; 1Ki 13:33). Jacob laid his hands on Ephraim and Manasseh when he gave them his last blessing (Gen 48:14). The high priest stretched out his hands to the people as often as he recited the solemn form of blessing (Lev 9:22). Our Savior laid his hands upon the children that were presented to him and blessed them (Mar 10:16). (See Tiemeroth, De χειροθεσίᾷ, χειρολογιᾷ, Erford. 1754.)

Imposition of hands formed at an early period a part of the ceremonial observed on the appointment and consecration of persons to high and holy undertakings. In Num 27:19, Jehovah is represented as thus speaking to Moses, “Take thee Joshua, the son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit, and lay thine hand upon him, and set him before Eleazar the priest, and before all the congregation, and give him a charge in their sight,” etc.: where it is obvious that the laying on of hands did neither originate nor communicate divine gifts; for Joshua had “the spirit” before he received imposition of hands; but it was merely an instrumental sign for marking him out individually, and setting him apart; in sight of the congregation, to his arduous work. Similar appears to be the import of the observance in the primitive Church of Christ (Act 8:15-17; 1Ti 4:14; 2Ti 1:6). A corruption of this doctrine was that the laying on of hands gave of itself divine powers, and on this account Simon, the magician (Act 8:18), offered money, saying, “Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands he may receive the Holy Ghost,” intending probably to carry on a gainful trade by communicating the gift to others. SEE IMPOSITION OF HANDS.

The phrase “sitting at the right hand of God,” as applied to the Savior, is derived from the fact that with earthly princes a position on the right hand of the throne was accounted the chief place of honor, dignity, and power:  “upon thy right hand did stand the queen”(Psa 45:9; comp. 1Ki 2:19; Psa 80:17). The immediate passage out of which sprang the phraseology employed by Jesus may be found in Psa 110:1 : “Jehovah said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.” Accordingly the Savior declares before Caiaphas (Mat 26:64; Mar 14:62), “Ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven;”where the meaning obviously is that the Jews of that day should have manifest proof that Jesus held the most eminent place in the divine favor, and that his present humiliation would be succeeded by glory, majesty, and power (Luk 24:26; 1Ti 3:16). So when it is said (Mar 16:19; Rom 8:34; Col 3:1; 1Pe 3:22; Heb 1:3; Heb 8:1) that Jesus “sits at the right hand of God,” “at the right hand of the Majesty on high,” we are obviously to understand the assertion to be that, as his Father, so he worketh always (Joh 5:17) for the advancement of the kingdom of heaven, and the salvation of the world.

In Col 2:13-14, “the law of commandments contained in ordinances”(Eph 2:15) is designated “the handwriting of ordinances that was against us,” which Jesus blotted out, and took away, nailing it to his cross; phraseology which indicates the abolition, on the part of the Savior, of the Mosaic law (Wolfius, Curce Philolog. in N.T. 3, 16).

## Hand, Aaron Hicks, D.D[[@Headword:Hand, Aaron Hicks, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Albany, N.Y., December 3, 1811. He graduated from Williams College in 1831, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1837; was licensed by the Presbytery of New Brunswick the same year, and ordained by the Presbytery of Flint River, Georgia, in 1841. He became stated supply of the churches of Roswell and Marietta in 1838, and remained until 1841. He then became pastor of the Church in Berwick, Pa., and accepted a call to the Church of Greenwich, N.J. His last charge was the Palisades Presbyterian Church N.Y., where he remained eight years, and was in consequence of infirmity compelled to resign. His labors in all the churches of which he was pastor were attended with revivals. He died at Easton, Pennsylvania, March 3, 1880. See New York Observer, March 18, 1880. (W.P.S.)

## Hand-breadth[[@Headword:Hand-breadth]]

             (Heb. טֵפִח, te'phach, or טֹפִח, to'phacch), the palm, used as a measure of four fingers, equal to about four inches (Exo 25:25; Exo 37:12; 1Ki 7:26; 2Ch 4:5; Eze 40:5; Eze 40:43; Jer 52:21). In Psa 39:5, the expression “Thou hast made my days palm- breadths,” signifies very short.

## Hand-mill[[@Headword:Hand-mill]]

             SEE MILL. Hand-staff (מִקֵּל, kke, ak', rod or staff as usually rendered), a spear or javelin (Eze 39:9). SEE ARMOR.

## Handcock, William John[[@Headword:Handcock, William John]]

             noted for his labors in connection with the French Wesleyan work under the British Conference, was born in the island of Jersey in 1813. He was converted in his nineteenth year, entered the ministry in 1838, and for five years labored in the south of France. His first circuit extended from the Alps to the Mediterranean. In 1841 he was made superintendent of the work in the Upper Alps, and his labors in those dreary regions were the most fatiguing and self-denying, and contributed to the shortening of his days. The eighteen years following 1849 were spent in the French circuits in the Channel Islands.

Besides pastoral work he did much in the educational and literary line. The Wesleyan day-schools were established through his efforts, and for several years he edited the French Methodist Magazine, a periodical of large circulation and influence. In conjunction  with one of his brethren, he prepared the new French Hymn-Book, completed in 1867. Failing health compelled him to seek a change of climate, and the same year he went to Birmingham. In 1868 he was appointed to the Uxbridge and Rickmansworth circuits, and died at the latter place, March 25, 1870. Handcock was studious, pious, and of unassuming manners, evangelical as a preacher, and conscientious in the discharge of his duties. He wrote, Sommaire des Lois Organiques et Regles de Discipline des Eglises Methodistes d'Angleterre (Guernsey, 1858, 18mo), and an Exposition of the First Epistle of St. John (Lond. 1861, 8vo). His biographer, in the Wesleyan Methodist Magazine (May, 1876, art. 1) (T.J. McCartney), characterized the latter work as learned and original. See also Minutes of the British Conference, 1870, page 29.

## Handel, Christian Friedrich[[@Headword:Handel, Christian Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian, who died at Neisse, Silesia, September 6, 1841, a superintendent, is the author of, Evangelische Christenlehre (11th ed. Breslau, 1852): — Materialieni zu einem vollstandigen Unterricht im Christenthum (3d ed. Halle, 1840): — Kurzer Inbegriff der christlichen Religionslehre (Neisse, 1841): — Alethosebia oder Liturgenfur gebildete Gemeinden (1824). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:216, 230, 281; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:497. (B.P.)

## Handel, Georg Friedrich[[@Headword:Handel, Georg Friedrich]]

             one of the greatest of musical composers and musicians, was born at Halle, in the Prussian province of Saxony, Feb. 24, 1684. He manifested in early youth an extraordinary passion for music, and at the age of seven was a good player on the piano and the organ. At the age of nine he began to compose for the Church service, and continued doing so every week until he was thirteen. In 1698 he was sent to Berlin, where he enjoyed the instruction of Attilio. An offer by the elector of Brandenburg was declined by his father. On the death of the latter in 1703, he went to Hamburg,  where he played a violin in the orchestra of the opera, and composed his first opera, Allnira. He next visited Italy, where he wrote operas for Florence, Venice, and Rome. On his return from Rome he was, in 1709, appointed chapel-master by the elector of Hanover. In 1710 he paid a short visit to England, and in 1712 he took up his permanent abode in that country. He composed, in honor of the peace of Utrecht, his celebrated Te Deum and Jubilate, and numerous operas. A Royal Academy was established (1720) and placed under his management, but his violent temper involved him in many troubles; an opposition house was started, and soon both failed, with a loss to Haindel of £10,000. Soon after he quitted the stage altogether, in order to devote himself wholly to the composition of oratorios. His oratorio Esther had appeared as early as 1720; in 1732 it was produced at the Haymarket Theatre ten nights in succession. In 1733 he produced at Oxford the oratorio Athalia; in 1736, Alexander's Feast; in 1738, Israel in Egypt and L'allegro ed ilpenseroso. On the 12th of April, 1741, the Messiah, the most sublime of his compositions, was produced for the first time in London, where it met, however, with no favor; while in Dublin, on the other hand, it was received with the greatest applause. Handel remained in Dublin for nine months, and met there with a generous support. On his return to London he composed his Samson, and for the benefit of the Foundling Hospital again produced the Messiah, which now secured to him a general admiration; and, being repeated annually, brought to the Foundling Hospital, from 1749 to 1777, £10,300. In 1751 Handel became blind, but he still continued to compose and to play on the piano. He died, as he wished, on Good Friday, April 13, 1759, “in hopes,” he said, “of meeting his good God, his sweet Lord and Savior, on the day of his resurrection.” Among his works, which are in the queen's library, are 50 operas-8 German, 26 Italian, 16 English; 20 oratorios, a great quantity of Church music, cantatas, songs, and instrumental pieces. He was a wonderful musician, and his compositions are often full of grandeur and sublimity. His operas are seldom performed, but his oratorios hold the same place in music that in the English drama is accorded to the plays of Shakespeare; and the Handel festivals, lasting several days, in which they are performed by thousands of singers and musicians, are the grandest musical exhibitions of our times. See V. Scholcher, The Life of Handel (London, 1857); Chrysander, G. F. Handel (Lpz. 1858); Gervinus, Handel und Shakespeare (Lpz. 1868); Contemporary Review, April, 1869, p. 503. (A. J. S.)

## Handful[[@Headword:Handful]]

             a representative in the A. Vers. of several Heb. terms and phrases; prop. מְלֵא כִ, the fill of the hand (1Ki 17:12), or מַלֵּא כִ, to fill the hand (“take a handful,” Lev 9:17); also קֹמֶוֹ, a fist-full (Lev 2:2; Lev 5:12; Lev 6:15; but sheaf in Gen 41:47), or קָמִוֹ, to press, sc. the fist full (“take a handful,” Num 5:26); and שֹׁעִל,. the hollow palm itself (Isa 40:12), hence its fill (1Ki 20:10; Eze 13:19); less prop. חָבְנִיַם(Exo 9:8), the two fists (as rendered. Pro 30:4; elsewhere “hands”) improp. צָמַיד. (Jer 9:22), and צֶבֶת(Rth 2:16), which denotes a sheaf (as the former is elsewhere rendered), the one as standing uncut, and the other as cut and housed; falsely פַּסָּהabundance (Psa 72:16).

## Handicraft[[@Headword:Handicraft]]

             a general term (not occurring, however, in the Bible) for any manufacture. SEE ARTIFICER. Although the extent cannot be ascertained to which those arts were carried whose invention is ascribed to Tubal-Cain (Gen 4:22), it is probable that this was proportionate to the nomadic or settled habits of the antediluvian races. Among nomad races, as the Bedouin Arabs, or the tribes of Northern and Central Asia and of' America, the wants of life, as well as the arts which supply them, are few; — and it is only among the city dwellers that both of them are multiplied and make progress. The following particulars may be gathered respecting the various handicrafts mentioned in he Scriptures. SEE CRAFTSMAN.

1. The preparation of iron for use either in war, in agriculture, or for domestic purposes, was doubtless one (the earliest applications of labor; and, together with iron, working in brass, or, rather, copper alloyed with tin, bronze (נַחשֶׁת, Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 875), is mentioned in the same passage as practiced in antediluvian times (Gen 4:22). The use of this last is usually considered as an art of higher antiquity even than that of iron (Hesiod, Works and Days, p. 150; Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 2, 152, abridgment), and there can be no doubt that metal, whether iron or bronze, must have been largely used, either in material or in tools, for the construction of the ark (Gen 6:14; Gen 6:16). Whether the weapons for war or chase used by the early warriors of Syria and Assyria, or the arrow- heads of the archer Ishmael, were of bronze or iron, cannot be ascertained;  but we know that iron was used for warlike purposes by the Assyrians (Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 194); and, on the other hand, that stone-tipped arrows, as was the case also in Mexico, were used in the earlier times by the Egyptians, as well as the Persians and Greeks, and that stone or flint knives continued to be used by them, and by the inhabit-ants of the desert, and also by the Jews,

For religious purposes, after the introduction of iron into general use (Wilkinson, Anc. Ay. 1, 353, 354; 2, 163; Prescott, Mexico, 1, 118; Exo 4:25; Jos 5:2; Joshua 1 st Egypt. room, Brit. Mus. case 36, 37). In the construction of the tabernacle, copper, but no iron, appears to have been used, though the utility of iron was at the same period well known to the Jews, both from their own use of it and from their Egyptian education, while the Canaanitish inhabitants of Palestine and Syria were in full possession of its use both for warlike and domestic purposes (Exo 20:25; Exo 25:3; Exo 27:19; Num 35:16; Deu 3:11; Deu 4:20; Deu 8:9; Jos 8:31; Jos 17:16; Jos 17:18). After the establishment of the Jews in Canaan, the occupation of a smith (חָרָשׁ) became recognized as a distinct employment (1Sa 13:19). The designer of a higher order appears to have been called specially חשֵׁב (Gesenius, p. 531; Exo 35:30; Exo 35:35; 2Ch 26:15; Saalschtitz, Arch. Hebr. c. 14, § 16).. The smith's work (including workers in the precious metals) and its results are often mentioned in Scripture (2Sa 12:31; 1Ki 6:7; 2Ch 26:14; Isa 44:12; Isa 54:16). Among the captives taken to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar were 1000 “craftsmen” and smiths, who were probably of the superior kind (2Ki 24:16; Jer 29:2). SEE CHARASHIIM.

The worker in gold and silver (צוֹרֵ; ἀργυροκόπος; χωνευτής, argentarius, aurifex) must have found employment both among the Hebrews and the neighboring nations in very early times, as appears from the ornaments sent by Abraham to Rebekah (Gen 24:22; Gen 24:53; Gen 35:4; Gen 38:18; Deu 7:25). But, whatever skill the Hebrews possessed, it is quite clear that they must have learned much from Egypt and its “iron- furnaces,” both in metal-work and in the arts of setting and polishing precious stones; arts which were turned to account both in the construction of the Tabernacle and the making of the priests' ornaments, and also in the casting of the golden calf as well as its destruction by Moses, probably, as suggested by Goguet, by a method which he had learnt in Egypt  (Gen 41:42; Exo 3:22; Exo 12:35; Exo 31:4-5; Exo 32:2; Exo 32:4; Exo 32:20; Exo 32:24; Exo 37:17; Exo 37:24; Exo 38:4; Exo 38:8; Exo 38:24; Exo 38:24-25; Exo 39:6; Exo 39:39; Neh 3:8; Isa 44:12). Various processes of the goldsmiths' work, including operations in the raw material, are illustrated by Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 2, 136,152,162). SEE GOLDSMITH, etc.

After the conquest, frequent notices are found both of molded and wrought metal, including soldering, which last had long been known, in Egypt; but the Phoenicians appear to have possessed greater skill than the Jews in these arts, at least in Solomon's time (Jdg 3:24; Jdg 3:27; Jdg 17:4; 1Ki 7:13; 1Ki 7:45-46; Isa 41:7; Wis 15:4; Sir 38:28; Bar 6:50; Bar 6:55; Bar 6:57; Wilkinson, 2, 162). SEE ZAREPHATH. Even in the desert, mention is made of beating gold-into plates, cutting it into wire, and also of setting precious stones in gold (Exo 39:3; Exo 39:6, etc.; Beckmamn, tist. nouv. 2, 414; Gesenius, p. 1229). SEE METAL.

Among the tools of the smith are mentioned tongs (מֶלְקַחִים, λαβίς. forceps, Gesenius, p. 761; Isa 6:6), hammer (פִּטַּישׁ, σφυρἄ, malleus, Gesen. p. 1101), anvil (פִּעִם, Gesenius, p. 1118), bellows. (מִפֻּח, φυσητήρ, sufflatorium, Gesenius, p. 896; Isa 41:7; Jer 6:29; Sir 38:28; Wilkinson, 2, 316). See each word.

In the N.T., Alexander “the coppersmith”(ὁ χαλκεύς) of Ephesus is mentioned, where also was carried on that trade in “silver' shrines”(ναοὶ ἀρλυποῖ) which was represented by Demetrius the silversmith (ἀρλυροκόπος) as being in danger from the spread of Christianity (Act 19:24; Act 19:28; 2Ti 4:14). SEE COPPERSMITH.

2. The work of the carpenter' (חָרִשׁ עֵצַים, τέκτω (Wilkinson.) artifex lignarius) is often mentioned in Scripture (e.g. Gen 6:14; Exodus 37; Isa 44:13). In the palace built by David for himself, the workmen employed were chiefly Phoenicians sent by Hiram (2Sa 5:11; 1Ch 14:1), as most probably were those, or at least the. principal of those who were employed by Solomon in his works (1Ki 5:6). But in the repairs of the Temple, executed under Joash, king of Judah, and also in the rebuilding under Zerubbabel, no mention is made of foreign  workmen, though in the latter case the timber is expressly said to have been brought by sea to Joppa by Zidonians (2Ki 11:11; 2Ch 24:12; Ezr 3:7). That the Jewish carpenters must have been able to carve with some skill is evident from Isa 41:7; Isa 44:13, in which last passage some of the implements used in the trade are mentioned: the rule (שֶׂרֶר, μέτρον, norma, possibly a chalk pencil, Gesenius, p. 1337), measuring-line (קָר, Gesenius, p. 1201), compass (מְחיּגָה, παραγραφίς, ypaoil, circinus, Gesenius, p. 450), plane, or smoothing instrument (מַקַצוּעָה, κόλλα, uncina (Gesen. p. 1228, 1338), axe (גִּרְזֶן, Gesen. p. 302, or קִרְדֹּם, Gesen. p. 1236, ἀξίνη, securis). See each of these words.

The process of the work, and the tools used by Egyptian carpenters, and also coopers and wheelwrights, are displayed in Egyptian monuments and relics; the former, including dovetailing, veneering, drilling, gluing, varnishing, and inlaying, may be seen in Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 2, 111-119. Of the latter, many specimens, including saws, hatchets, knives, awls, nails, a hone, and a drill, also turned objects in bone, exist in the British Museum, 1st Egypt room, case 42-43, Nos. 6046-6188. See also Wilkinson, 2, p. 113, fig. 395. SEE CARPENTER.

In the N.T. the occupation of a carpenter (τέκτων) is mentioned in connection with Joseph, the husband of the Virgin Mary, and ascribed to our Lord himself by way of reproach (Mar 6:3; Mat 13:55; and Just. Mart. dial. Tryph. c. 88).

3. The masons (גֹּדנְרַים, 2Ki 12:12 [18], wallbuilders, Gesenius, p. 269) employed by David and Solomon, at least the chief of them, were Phoenicians, as is implied also in the word גַּבְלַים, men of Gebal, Jebail, Byblus (Gesen. p. 258; 1Ki 5:18; Eze 27:9; Burckhardt, Syria, p. 179). Other terms employed are חָרָשֵׁי אֶבֶן קַיר, workers of wall-stone (2Sa 5:11; 1Ch 22:15); הֹצְבַים, stone- cutters or hewers (1Ch 22:2; 1Ch 22:15, “workers of stone;” Ezr 2:7, etc.). The בֹּנַים(2Ki 12:12) were probably maste-masons (“builders,” 2Ki 12:11). Among their implements are mentioned the saw (מַגַרָה, πριων), the plumb-line (אֲנָךְ, Gesen. p. 215), the measuring-reed  (קָנֶה, κάλαμος, calamus, Gesen. p. 1221). As they also prepared the stones by hewing (1Ch 22:2), they must have used the chisel and the mallet (מַקָבָה, 1Ki 6:7), though no mention of the former occurs in Scripture. They used also the measuring-line (קָי, Job 38:5 Zec 1:16) and the axe (גַּרַזֶן, 1Ki 6:7). See each word. Some of these, and also the chisel and mallet, are represented on Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians, 313, 314), or preserved in the British Museum (1st Egypt. room, No. 6114, 6038). The large stones used in Solomon's Temple are said by Josephus to have been fitted together. exactly without either mortar or cramps, but the foundation stones to have been fastened-with lead (Josephus, Ant. 8, 3 2; 15, 11, 3). For ordinary building, mortar, ry1s (Gesen. p. 1328), was used; sometimes, perhaps, bitumer. as was the case at Babylon (Gen 11:3). The lime, clay, and straw of which mortar is generally composed in the East requires to be very carefully mixed and united so as to resist wet (Lane, Mod. Eg. 1. 27; Shaw, Travels, p. 206). The wall “daubed with untempered mortar”of Ezekiel (Eze 13:10) was perhaps a sort of cob-wall of mud or clay Without lime (תָּפֵל, Gesenius, p. 1516),which would give way under heavy rain. The use of whitewash on tombs is remarked by our Lord (Mat 23:27; see also Mishn. Maaser Sheni, 5, 1). Houses infected with leprosy were required by the law to be replastered (Lev 14:40-45). For kindred works in earth and clay, SEE BRICK, SEE POTTER; SEE GLASS, etc.

4. Akin to the craft of the carpenter is that of ship and boat building, which must have been exercised to some extent for the fishing-vessels on the lake of Gennesaret (Mat 8:23; Mat 9:1; Joh 21:3; Joh 21:8). Solomon built at Ezion-Geber ships for his foreign trade, which were manned by Phoenician crews, an experiment which Jehoshaphat endeavored n vain to renew (1Ki 9:26-27; 1Ki 22:48; 2Ch 20:36-37). The shipmen were הבֵל, a sailor (Jon 1:6; Eze 27:8; Eze 27:27-29; ναύτης, Act 27:30; Rev 18:17); רַב הִחבְל, shipmaster (Jon 1:6; ναύκληρος, Act 27:11); מַלָּח, mariner (Eze 27:9, etc.; Jon 1:5). SEE SHIP.

5. The perfumes used in the religious services, and in later times in the funeral rites of monarchs, imply knowledge and practice in the art of the “apothecaries”(יִקָּחים, μυρεψοί, pigmentarii), who appear to have  formed a guild or association (Exo 30:25; Exo 30:35; Neh 3:8 : 2Ch 16:14; Ecc 7:1; Ecc 10:1; Sir 38:8). SEE PERFUME.

6. The arts of spinning and weaving both wool and linen were carried on in early times, as they still are usually among the Bedouins, by women. The women spun and wove goat's hair and flax for the Tabernacle, as in later times their skill was employed in like manner for idolatrous purposes. One of the excellences attributed to the good housewife is her skill and industry in these arts (Exo 35:25-26; Lev 19:19; Deu 22:11; 2Ki 23:7; Eze 16:16; Pro 31:13; Pro 31:24, Burckhardt, Notes on Bed. 1, 65; comp. Homer, II. 1, 123; Od. 1, 356; 2, 104). The loom, with its beam (מָנוֹר, μεσάντιον, liciatorium, 1Sa 17:7; Gesen. p. 883), pin (יָתֵד, πάσσαλος, clavus, Jdg 16:14; Gesen. p. 643), and shuttle (אֶרֶג, δρομεύς, Job 7:6; Gesen. p. 146) was, perhaps, introduced later, but as early as David's time (1Sa 17:7), and worked by men, as was the case in Egypt, contrary to the practice of other nations. This trade also appears to have been practiced hereditarily (1Ch 4:21; Herod. 2, 35; Sophocles, (Ed. Col. 339). SEE WEAVING.

Together with weaving we read also of embroider, in which gold and silver threads were interwoven with the body of the stuff, sometimes in figure patterns, or with precious stones set in the needlework (Exo 26:1; Exo 28:4; Exo 39:6-13). SEE EMBROIDERY.

7. Besides these arts, those of dyeing and of dressing cloth were practiced in Palestine [ SEE FULLER, etc.], and those also of tanning and dressing leather (Jos 2:15-18; 2Ki 1:8; Mat 3:4; Act 9:43; Mishna, Megill. 3, 2). Shoemakers, barbers, and tailors are mentioned in the Mishna (Pesach, 4, 6): the barber (גִּלָּב, κουρεύς, Gesenius, p. 283), or his occupation, by Ezekiel (Eze 5:1; Lev 14:8 : Num 6:5; Josephus, Ant. 16, II, 5; War, 1, 27, 5; Mishna, Shabb. 1, 2); and the tailor (1:3), plasterers, glaziers, and glass vessels, painters and goldworkers, are mentioned in Mishna (Chel. 8, 9; 29, 3, 4; 30, 1).

The art of setting and engraving precious stones was known to the Israelites from a very early period (Exo 28:9 sq.). See GEM. Works in alabaster were also common among them (בָתֵּי הִנֶפֶשׁ, smelling-boxes,  or boxes of perfume; comp. Mat 26:7, etc.). SEE ALABASTER. They also adorned their houses and vessels with ivory (1Ki 22:39; Amo 3:15; Amo 6:4; Son 5:14). SEE IVORY.

Tent-makers (σκηνοποιοί) are noticed in the Acts (Act 18:3), and frequent allusion is made to the trade of the potters. See each word.

8. Bakers (אֹפַים, Gesen. p. 136) are noticed in Scripture as carrying on their trade (Jer 37:21; Hos 7:4; Mishna, Chel. 15, 2); and the well-known valley Tyropoeon probably derived its name from the occupation of the cheese-makers, its inhabitants (Josephus War, 5, 4, 1). Butchers, not Jewish, are spoken of in 1Co 10:25.

Trade in all its branches was much developed after the Captivity; and for a father to teach his son a trade was reckoned not only honorable, but indispensable (Mishna, Pirke Ab. 2, 2; Kiddush. 4, 14). Some trades, however, were regarded as less honorable (Jahn, ibl Arch. § 84).

Some, if not all, trades had special localities, as was the case formerly in European and is now in Eastern cities (Jer 37:21; 1Co 10:25; Josephus, War, 5, 4, 1, and 8, 1; Mishna, Becor. 5, 1; Russell, Aleppo, 1, 20; Chardin, Voyages, 7, 274, 394; Lane, Mod. gq. 2, 145). SEE BAZAAR.

One feature, distinguishing Jewish from other workmen, deserves peculiar notice, viz. that they were not slaves, nor were their trades necessarily hereditary, as was and is so often the case among other, especially heathen nations (Jahn, Bibl. Arch. c. 5, § 81-84; Saalschitz, Hebr. Arch. c. 14). SEE MECHANIC.

## Handkerchief or Napkin[[@Headword:Handkerchief or Napkin]]

             (σουδάριον; Vulg. sudarium) occurs in Luk 19:20; Joh 11:44; Joh 20:7; Act 19:12. The Greek word is adopted from the Latin, and properly signifies a sweat-cloth, or pocket-handkerchief, but in the Greek and Syriac languages it denotes chiefly napkin, wrapper, etc. In the first of the above passages (Luk 19:20) it means a wrapper, in which the “wicked servant” had laid up the pound entrusted to him by his master. For references to the custom of laying up money, etc., in σουδάρια, both in classical and rabbinical writers, see Wetstein's N.T. on Luk 19:20. In the second instance (Joh 11:44) it appears as a kerchief, or cloth attached to the head of a corpse. It was perhaps brought round the  forehead and under the chin.. In many Egyptian mummies it does not cover the face. In ancient times, among the Greeks, it did (Nicolaus, De Graeco. Luctu, c. 3:§ 6, Thiel. 1697). Maimonides, in his comparatively recent times, describes the whole face as being covered, and gives a reason for the custom (Tract Efel, c. 4). The next instance is that of the σουδάριον which had been “about the head” of our Lord, but which, after his resurrection, was found rolled up, as if deliberately, and put in a place separately from the linen clothes. The last instance of the Biblical use of the word (and the only one in which it is rendered “handkerchief”) occurs in the account of “the special miracles” wrought by the hands of Paul (Act 19:11); “so that σουδάρια (handkerchiefs, napkins, wrappers, shawls, etc.) were brought from his body to the sick; and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them.” The Ephesians had not unnaturally inferred that the apostle's miraculous power could be communicated by such a mode of contact; and certainly cures thus received by parties at a distance, among a people famed for their addictedness to “curious arts,” i.e. magical skill, etc., would serve to convince them of the truth of the Gospel by a mode well suited to interest their minds. The apostle is not recorded to have expressed any opinion respecting the reality of this intermediate means of those miracles. He had doubtless sufficiently explained that these and all the other miracles “wrought by his hands,” i.e. by his means, were really wrought by God (Act 19:11) in attestation of the mission of Jesus. If he himself did not entertain exactly the same ideas upon the subject as they did, he may be considered as conceding to, or, rather, not disturbing unnecessarily, popular notions, rendered harmless by his previous explanation, and affording a very convenient medium for achieving much higher purposes. If the connection between the secondary cause and the effect was real, it reminds us of our Savior's expression, “I perceive that virtue has gone out of me”(Mar 5:30); which is, however, regarded by many critics as a popular mode of saying that he knew that a miracle had been wrought by his power and efficacy a mode of speaking in unison at least with the belief of the woman that she should be healed if she could but touch the hem of his garment unperceived by him, and perhaps even conceded to, in accordance with the miracles wrought through the medium of contact related in the Old Testament (1Ki 17:21; 2Ki 4:29, etc.), and in order, by a superior display, in regard both to speed and extensiveness, to demonstrate his supremacy by a mode through which the Jews were best prepared to perceive it (Luk 6:19; see Schwarz, iad Olear. de Stylo N.T. p. 129;  Soler. De Pileo, p. 17; Pierson, ad Mer. p. 348; Lydii Flor. Spars. iad Pass. J. C. p. 5; Drusius, Quaest. Heb. c. 2; Rosenmuller and Kuinlol on the passages). SEE KERCHIEF; SEE NAPKIN; SEE HOLY HANDKERCHIEF.

## Handkerchief, Holy[[@Headword:Handkerchief, Holy]]

             SEE VERONICA, ST.

## Handle[[@Headword:Handle]]

             (as a noun) occurs but once (Son 5:5) in the plural (כִּפּוֹת, kappoth', lit. hands), for the thumbpieces or bzobs. of the bolt or latch to a door (compare יָדוֹת, arms of a throne, etc., 1Ki 10:19). SEE LOCK.

## Handmaid or Handmaiden[[@Headword:Handmaid or Handmaiden]]

             (שַׁפְחָה, shiphchah', or אָמָה,amah', Gen 16:1, etc.; Rth 3:9, etc.; δούλη, Luk 1:48), a maid-servant (as both Heb. terms are often translated; the latter being rendered “handmaid” only in a metaphorical or self-deprecatory sense). We find on the paintings in the tombs of Egypt various representations of female domestics employed in waiting on their mistresses, sometimes at the bath, at others at the toilette, and likewise in bringing in refreshments and handing them round to visitors. An upper servant or slave had the office of handing the wine, and a black woman sometimes followed, in an inferior capacity, to receive an empty cup when the wine had been poured into the goblet. The same black slave also carried the fruits and other refreshments; and the peculiar mode of holding a plate with the hand reversed, so generally adopted by women from Africa, is characteristically shown in the Theban paintings (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 1, 142 sq., abridgm). SEE BANQUET. It appears most probable that Hagar was given to Sarai as her personal attendant while she was in the house of Pharaoh, and that she was permitted to retain her when she departed. Jewish tradition reports that Hagar was a daughter (by a concubine, as some say) of Pharaoh, who, seeing the wonders wrought on account of Sarai, said, “It is better that my daughter should be a handmaid in this household than a mistress in another,” and therefore gave her to Sarai. She was, no doubt, a female slave, and one of those maidservants whom Abram had brought from Egypt. These females among the Jews, as they still are in the East, are entirely under the control of the mistress of the family. SEE SLAVE; SEE HAGAR.

## Hands, Imposition of[[@Headword:Hands, Imposition of]]

             SEE IMPOSITION OF HANDS; SEE ORDINATION.

## Handschub, John Fredrick[[@Headword:Handschub, John Fredrick]]

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

## Handy, Isaac William Ker, D.D[[@Headword:Handy, Isaac William Ker, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington, D.C., December 14, 1815. A part of his early education was received from Salmon P. Chase, afterwards chief-justice of the United States. He graduated from Jefferson College, Pennsylvania, in 1834; entered Princeton Theological Seminary in November 1835, and studied there between one and two years. He was licensed by the Presbytery of the District of Columbia, April 3, 1838; ordained by Lewes Presbytery, November 22, 1838; and installed as pastor of the churches of Buckingham, Blackwater, and Laurel. He next went to Missouri to labor as a missionary, and met with much success at Warsaw and vicinity. He afterwards served the churches at Odessa, Port Penn, and Middletown, Delaware, where he labored two years. From 1853 for two years he was missionary, on the eastern peninsula of Maryland. His next  pastorate was at Portsmouth, Virginia. He was installed pastor of Augusta Church, in Virginia, May 13, 1870. From the division of the Church in 1861, Dr. Haindy adhered throughout the rest of his life to the Southern General Assembly. During the civil war he was a prisoner for fifteen months at Fort Delaware in 1863-64. He died June 14, 1878. Dr. Handy was many years a trustee of Delaware College at Newark, Delaware, a member of the Presbyterian Historical Society, of the American Scientific Association, and of the Maryland Historical Society. He had a wide reputation for accurate research. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1879, page 37.

## Hane, Philipp Friedrich[[@Headword:Hane, Philipp Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born February 2, 1696, at Belitz, in Mecklenburg. He studied at Rostock and Jena, was in 1724 librarian at Kiel, in 1730 doctor and professor of theology, and in 1733 member of consistory. He died September 27, 1774, leaving, Leben und Thaten Ignatii Loyola (Rostock, 1721, 1725): — De Conciliis Lateranensibus (Kiel, 1726): — De Sacrorum Christianorum in Cimbria Primordiis (1728): — De Melanchthonis Moderatione in August. Confess. Negotio Conspicua (1730): — Historia Critica August. Confessionis (1732): — Sermones de Tempore (1766). See Moser, Jetztlebende Theologen; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:328, 329, 723, 827. (B.P.)

## Haneberg, Daniel Bonifacius[[@Headword:Haneberg, Daniel Bonifacius]]

             bishop of Spires, was born June 16, 1816, at Tanne, Bavaria. He studied at Munich, was priest in 1839, and commenced his academical career in 1840. In 1850 he entered the newly founded Benedictine monastery of St. Bonifacius, at Munich, and was made abbot in 1854. In 1861 he went to Algiers and Tunis, and in 1864 to Jerusalem. In 1868 he was called to Rome as consulter of the Romish congregation for Oriental rites, and at the same time to take part in the preparations for the Vatianm Council. Like many others, he was at first opposed to the dogma of papal infallibility, but finally yielded to it. In 1872 Haneberg was appointed bishop of Spires, and died May 31, 1876. He published, Ueber die in einer munchener Handschrift aufbehalten arsabische Psalmenubersetzung des Rabbi Saadia Gaon (Ratisbon, 1841): — Religiose Alterthumer der Hebraer (1844; 2d ed. 1869): — Einleitung in das Alie Testament (1845): —  Geschichte der biblischen Offenbarung (1850; 3d ed. 1863): — Renan's Leben Jesu beleuchtet (1864): — Zur Erkenntnisslehre von Ibn Sina und Albertus Magnus (Munich, 1866): — Canones S. Hippolyti Arabiae e Codicibus Romanis (1870). From his manuscript Schegg published Evangelium nach Johannes ubersetzt und erklart (1878-80, 2 volumes). See Schegg, Erinn rungen an Haneberg (Munich, 1877). (B.P.)

## Haner, Georg[[@Headword:Haner, Georg]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born April 8, 1672. He studied at Wittenberg, was in 1736 superintendent in Transylvania, and died July 10, 1759, leaving, De Subjecto Philosophies Moralis (Wittenberg, 1691): — De Lustratione Hebraeorum (1692): — De Litter arum Hebraicarum Origine (eod.): — De Punctorum Hebraerum cum Litteris Cooevitate. (1693): — Historia Ecclesiarum Transylvanicarum a Primis Populorum Originibus ad Haecusque Tempora (Frankfort, 1694). See Benko, Transylvania, 2:205, 429; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:839; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:360; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hanes[[@Headword:Hanes]]

             (Hebrew Chânês', חָנֵס, doubtless of Egyptian. etymology), a place in Egypt only mentioned in Isa 30:4 : “For his princes were at Zoan, and his messengers came to Hanes.” The Septuagint renders the latter clause καὶ ἄλλεγοι αὐτοῦ πονηροί, “And his ambassadors worthless.” The copy from which this translation was made may have read חנם ייגעיinstead of חנס יגיעו; and it is worthy of note that the reading חנםis still found in a number of ancient MSS..(De Rossi, Varice Lectiones Vet. Test. 3:29), and is approved by Lowth and J. D. Michaelis. The old Latin  version follows the Sept., “Nuncii pessimi;” but Jerome translates ‘from a text similar to our own, rendering the clause as follows: “Et nuncii tui usque ad Hanes pervenerunt” (Sabbatier, Biblior. Sacrorum Latin. Verss., ad loc.). Jerome adds, in his commentary on the verse, “Intelligimus ultimam juxta Ethiopas et Blemmyas esse AEgypti civitatem.” Vitringa would identify Hanes with the Anusis (῎Ανυσις) of Herodotus (2, 137; compare Champollion, L'Egypte, 1, 309; Quatremere, Memoires, 1, 500), which he, with Gesenius and others, supposes to be the same as Heracleopolis (City of Hercules) of Strabo (17, 812), the ruins of which are now called Anacsieh (Edrisi, Afric. p. 512). The Coptic name was Hnes or Ehnes, and it was one of the ancient royal cities of Egypt. Anasieh stands on a high mound some distance west of the Nile, near the parallel of Benisuef. The great objection to this theory is the distance of Anasieh from Zoan, which stood in the eastern-part of the Delta, near the sea. Gesenius remarks, as a kind of apology for the identification of Hanes with Heracleopolis Magna, that the latter was formerly a royal city. It is true that in Manetho's list the 9th and 10th dynasties are said to have been of Heracleopolite kings; but it has lately been suggested, on strong grounds, by Sir Gardner Wilkinson, that this is a mistake in the case of the 9th dynasty for Hermonthites (Rawlinson, Herod. 2, 348). If this supposition' be correct as to the 9th dynasty, it must also be so as to the 10th; but the circumstance of Heracleopolis being a royal city or not, a thousand years before Isaiah's time, is obviously of no consequence here.

The prophecy is a reproof of the Jews for trusting in Egypt; and, according to the Masoretic text, mention is made of an embassy, perhaps from Hoshea, or else from Ahaz, or possibly Hezekiah, to a Pharaoh. As the king whose assistance is asked is called Pharaoh, he is probably not an Ethiopian of the 25th dynasty, for the kings of that line are mentioned by name-So, Tirhakah — but a sovereign of the 23rd dynasty, which, according to Manetho, was of Tanite kings. It is supposed that the last king of the latter dynasty, Manetho's Zet, is the Sethos of Herodotus, the king in whose time Sennacherib's army perished, and who appears to have been mentioned under the title of Pharaoh by Rabshakeh (Isa 36:6; 2Ki 18:21), though it is just possible that Tirhakah may have been intended. If the reference be to an embassy to Zet, Zoan was probably his capital, and in any case then the most important city of the eastern part of Lower Egypt. Hanes was most probably in its neighborhood; and we are disposed to think that the Chald. Paraphr. is right in identifying it with  Tahpanhes ( תִּחְפִּנְחֵסor תְּחִפְנְחֵס, once written, if the Kethib be correct, in the form תִּחְפְּנֵס, Daphnae), a fortified town on the eastern frontier. Grotius considers Hanes a contraction of this name (Commentar. ad loc.). With this may be connected the remark of De Rossi — “Codex meus 380 notat ad Marg. esse תחפנהסJer 2:16” (Var. Lect., 1. c.). On the whole, this seems to be the most probable theory, as Tahpanhes was situated in the eastern part of the Delta, and was one of the royal cities about the time of Isaiah. SEE TAHPANHES.

## Hanging[[@Headword:Hanging]]

             (as a punishment, הוֹקַיעִ, to impale with dislocation of the limbs, Num 25:4; 2Sa 21:6; 2Sa 21:9; תָּלָה, to suspend, as among the Hebrews, Deu 21:22; the Egyptians, Gen 40:19; and the Persians, Est 7:10; Est 5:14; κρεμάννυμι). SEE CRUCIFIXION. Hanging on a tree or gibbet appears to have been a mark of infamy, inflicted on the dead bodies of criminals, rather than a punishment, as modern nations employ it. The person suspended was considered as a curse, an abomination in the sight of God, and as receiving this token of infamy at his hand. The body, nevertheless, was to be taken e down and buried on the same day. The hanging mentioned in 2Sa 21:6, was the work of the Gibeonites, and not of the Hebrews. Posthumous suspension of this kind, for the purpose of conferring ignominy, differs materially from the crucifixion that was practiced by the Romans, although the Jews gave such an extent to the law in Deu 21:22-23, as to include the last-named punishment (Joh 19:31; Act 5:30; Gal 3:13; 1Pe 2:24). The more recent Jews attributed the origin of the punishment of strangulation to Moses, and supposed it to have been meant by the phrase, “He shall die the death,”but without cause. SEE PUNISHMENT.

## Hanging (2)[[@Headword:Hanging (2)]]

             (as a curtain) is the rendering of three Heb. terms, two of them having reference to the furniture of the tabernacle and Temple.

1. The “hanging”( מָסָךְa masak'; Sept. ἐπίσπαστρον,Vulg. tentorium) was a curtain or covering (as the word radically means, and as it is  sometimes rendered) to close an entrance. It was made of variegated stuff wrought with needlework (compare Est 1:5), and (in one instance, at least) was hung on five pillars of acacia wood. The term is applied to a series of curtains suspended before the successive openings of entrance into the tabernacle and its parts. Of these, the first hung before the entrance to the court of the tabernacle (Exo 27:16; Exo 38:18; Num 4:26); the second before the door of the tabernacle (Exo 26:36-37; Exo 39:38); and the third before the entrance to the Most Holy Place, called more fully פָּרֹכֶת הִמָּסָךְ(“vail of the covering,” Exo 35:12; Exo 39:34; Exo 40:21). SEE CURTAIN.

2. The “hangings”(קְלָעַים, kelaim'; Sept. ἱστια, Vulg. tentoria) were used for covering the walls of the tabernacle, just as tapestry was in modern times (Exo 27:9; Exo 35:17; Exo 38:9; Num 3:26; Num 4:26). The rendering in the Sept. implies that they were made of the same substance as the sails of a ship, i.e. as explained by Rashi) “meshy, not woven” this opinion is, however, incorrect, as the material of which they were constructed was “fine twined linen.” The hangings were carried only five cubits high, or half the height of the walls of the court (Exo 27:18; compare Exo 26:16). They were fastened to pillars which ran along the sides of the court (Exo 27:18). SEE TABERNACLE.

3. The “hangings”(בָּתַּים, bottim', 2Ki 23:7, margin houses, which is the literal rendering) are of doubtful import. Ewald conjectures that the reading should be בְּגָדַים, clothes, and supposes the reference to be to dresses for the images of Astarte; but this is both gratuitous and superfluous. The bottim which these women wove were probably cloths for tents used as portable sanctuaries. SEE IDOLATRY.

## Haniel[[@Headword:Haniel]]

             (1Ch 7:39). SEE HANNIEL.

## Hanifees[[@Headword:Hanifees]]

             an orthodox Mohammedan sect, who derived their name from their founder, Abn-Hanifa, the first Moslem casuist, who flourished in the 8th century. He learned the principles and traditions of Mohammedanism from those who had lived in the time of the prophet, and was a life long partisan of Ali. (q.v.), although now he is regarded as the chief authority of the Sonnites (q.v.). He was imprisoned for refusing to accept the office of judge, and is said to have been poisoned for resisting the execution of a severe edict against the citizens of Mosul in 767. The Hanifees are usually called. the followers of reason, because they are guided chiefly by their own judgment in giving decisions, while the other Mohammedan sects adhere more closely to the letter of tradition. This is now the established faith of the Turks and Tartars, but it has branched into numerous subdivisions.

## Hanlein, Heinrich Carl Alexander Von[[@Headword:Hanlein, Heinrich Carl Alexander Von]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Anspach, July 11, 1762. He studied at Erlangen and Gottingen was in 1788 professor of theology at Erlangen, in 1808 a member of consistory at Munich, in 1818 director of the Protestant superior consistory, and died at Esslihgen, May 15, 1829.  He wrote, Observationes ad loca Quaedam Vet. Test. (Gottingen, 1788): — Einleitung in, die Schriften des Neuen Testaments (Erlangen, 1794, 2 volumes; 2d ed. 1801-1803): — Symbolae Criticae ad Intepretationem Vaticiniorum Habacuci (ibid. 1795): — Commentarius in Epistolam Juds (ibid. 1795-96): — De Lectoribus Epistolae Pauli ad Ephesios (ibid. 1797): — Curae in Librios Novi Federis (1798-1804, 7 parts): — Lehrbuch der Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments (1802): Epistola Judae, Graecae (1804). See Doring, Die Gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:9, 75, 103, 210, 229, 273, 556; 2:173. (B.P.)

## Hanmer, Meredith[[@Headword:Hanmer, Meredith]]

             an English Church historian, was born at Porkington- Shropshire, in 1543. He became chaplain of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and afterwards rector of St. Leonard, at Shoreditch. Here he sold the brass ornaments which decorated the graves of the church, which so displeased his parishioners that he was obliged to resign about 1693. He then went to  Ireland, where he was finally made treasurer of the Church of the Holy' Trinity, Dublin. He died in 1604, not without suspicion of suicide. He was a skillful Greek scholar, and well acquainted with Church history. He wrote Translation of the ancient ecclesiastical Histories of the first six hundred Years after Christ, originally written by Eusebius, Socrates, and Evagrius (1576; reprinted in 1585 with the addition of The Lives of the Prophets and Apostles by Dorotheus, bishop of Tyre) The Ephenzeris of the Saints of Ireland; and the Chronicle of Ireland (Dublin, 1633, fol.): — A Chronography (Lond. 1585, fol.). See Fuller, Worthies; Wood, Athence Oxon. vol. 1.

## Hanna, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Hanna, Thomas, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born October 4, 1799. He graduated at Jefferson College, Pennysylvania, in 1818; was licensed by the Chartiers Presbytery in 1820; in 1821 became pastor at Cadiz, Ohio; in 1850 at Washington, Pennsylvania; and died February 9, 1864. As a preacher he was clear and methodical, though his doctrines and mode of treating them was not according to the modern school. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, page 205.

## Hanna, William, D.D., LLD[[@Headword:Hanna, William, D.D., LLD]]

             a Presbyterian minister, son of Reverend Dr. Samuel Hanna, was born at Belfast, Irdland, in 1808. He received his literary and theological education at the University of Glasgow, Scotland, and entered the ministry in 1835, in which he spent a laborious and useful life, and died May 24, 1882. He wrote the biography of Dr. Chalmers, and also of Wycliffe, and an interesting history of the Hugutenots, besides several other valuable works.

## Hannah[[@Headword:Hannah]]

             (Heb. Channah', חָגָּה, graciousness: Sept. ῎Αννα; SEE ANNA, a name known to the Phoenicians [Gesen. Mon. Phoen. p. 400], and attributed by Virgil to Dido's sister), wife of a Levite named Elkanah, and mother of Samuel (1 Samuel 1, 2). She was very dear to her husband, but, being childless, was much aggrieved by the insults of Elkanah's other wife, Peninnah, who was blessed with children. The family lived at Ramathaim- zophim, and, as the law required, there was a yearly journey to offer sacrifices at the sole altar of Jehovah, which was then at Shiloh. Women were not bound to attend; but pious females free from the cares of a family often did so, especially when the husband was a Levite. Every time that Hannah went there childless she declined to take part in the festivities which followed the sacrifices, being then, as it seems, peculiarly exposed to the taunts of her rival. At length, on one of these visits to Shiloh, while she prayed before returning home, she vowed to devote to the Almighty the son which she so earnestly desired (Num 30:1 sq.). It seems to have been the custom to pronounce all vows at the holy place in a loud voice, under the immediate notice of the priest (Deu 22:23; Psa 66:14); but Hannah prayed in a low tone, so that her lips only were seen to move. This attracted the attention of the high priest, Eli, who suspected that she had taken too much wine at the recent feast. From this suspicion Hannah easily vindicated herself, and returned home with a lightened heart. Before the end of that year Hannah became the rejoicing mother of a son, to whom the name of Samuel was given, and who was from his birth placed under the obligations of that condition of Nazariteship to which his mother had devoted him. B.C. 1142. Hannah went no more to Shiloh till her child was old enough to dispense with her maternal services, when she  took him up with her to leave him there, as it appears was the custom when one already a Levite was placed under the additional obligations of Nazariteship. When he was presented in Sue form to the high priest, the mother took occasion to remind him of the former transaction: “For this child,” she said, “I prayed, and the Lord hath given me my petition which I asked of him”(1Sa 1:27). Hannah's gladness afterwards found vent in an exulting chant, which furnishes a remarkable specimen of the early lyric poetry of the Hebrews (see Schlosser, Canticum Hannae, Erlangen, 1801), and of which many of the ideas and images were in after times repeated by the Virgin Mary on a somewhat similar occasion (Luk 1:46 sq.; comp. also Psalms 113). It is especially remarkable as containing the first designation of the Messiah under that name. In the Targum it has been subjected to a process of magniloquent dilution, for which it would be difficult to find a parallel even in the pompous vagaries of that paraphrase (Eichhorn, Einl. 2, 68). After this Hannah failed not to visit Shiloh every year, bringing a new dress for her son, who remained under the eye and near the person of the high priest. SEE SAMUEL. That great personage took kind notice of Hannah on these occasions, and bestowed his blessing upon her and her husband. The Lord repaid her abundantly for that which she had, to use her own expression, “lent to him;” for she had three sons and two daughters after Samuel (see Kitto's Daily Bible Illust.).

## Hannah, John, D.D[[@Headword:Hannah, John, D.D]]

             an eminent Wesleyan minister, was born at Lincoln, Eng., Nov. 3, 1792. After receiving a Christian education, he entered the Wesleyan ministry in 1814 at Bruton, Somersetshire. From 1815 to 1817, inclusive, he was on the Gainsborough Circuit; 1818 to 1820, Lincoln; 1821 to 1823, Nottingham; 1824 to 1826, Leeds; 1827 to 1829, third Manchester Circuit; 1830 to 1832, Huddersfield; 1833, Liverpool; and in 1834 he became theological tutor at the Wesleyan Training Institution at Hoxton. In 1842 he was removed to the college at Didsbury, where he remained as theological tutor till he became a supernumerary at the Conference of 1867. In the year that he was removed to Didsbury he was elected president of the Conference (London), and he was again president in 1851, when the Conference met at Newcastle upon Tyne. He was Conference secretary in the years 1840, 1841, 1849, 1850, and 1854 to 1858. On two occasions he represented the Wesleyan Conference, once with the Rev. R. Reece, and the second time with Dr. J. F. Jobson, at the General  Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. His full term of service as a Methodist minister extended without interruption from 1814 to 1867 fifty-three years. After becoming ‘supernumerary in 1867 he continued to reside at Didsbury, under an arrangement liberally devised by Mr. Heald and other prominent Wesleyan laymen. He died in Didsbury from congestion of the lungs, after a brief illness, Dec. 29, 1867. “For about thirty-three years he was a chief instructor of the young Wesleyan ministry, sending out such men as Arthur, Hunt, Calvert, etc.; men who have attested his salutary power throughout the United Kingdom, and in the hardest mission fields of the Church. Nearly three hundred preachers were trained by him. His influence over the connection through these men has been beyond all estimation. As a preacher he was exceedingly interesting and effective not remarkably ‘fanciful,' seldom rising into declamation, but full of entertaining and impressive thought, and a certain sweet grace, or, rather, graciousness and unction, which charmed all devout listeners. He was singularly pertinent, and often surprisingly beautiful in Scripture citation; his discourses were mosaics of the finest gems of the sacred writings. He was a fond student of the sterling old Anglican divines; he delighted, in his vacation excursions, to make pilgrimages to their old churches and graves, and his sermons abounded in the golden thoughts of Hooker, South, and like thinkers. He was constitutionally a modest man, in early life nervously timid of responsibility, but, whether in the pulpit or on the platform, always acquitted himself with ability; and often his sensitive spirit kindled into a divine glow that rapt himself and his audience with holy enthusiasm. For fifty-three years his labors for Methodism had no interruption; they were unobtrusive, steady, quietly energetic, and immeasurably useful. With Thomas Jackson, he was one of the last of that second and mighty rank of Wesleyan preachers, healed by Bunting, Watson, and Newton, who, when Wesley's immediate companions were rapidly disappearing, caught the Methodistic standard from their trembling hands, and bore it forward abreast of the advancing times, and planted it, especially by the missionary enterprise, in the ends of the earth. He was, withal, a model of Christian manners-a perfect Christian gentleman; not in the sense deprecated by Wesley in his. old Minutes, but in the sense that Wesley himself so completely exemplified. His amiability and modesty disarmed envy. No prominent man passed through the severe internal controversies of Wesleyan Methodism with, less crimination from antagonists. The whole connection spontaneously recognized him as impeachable, amid whatever  rumors or clamors. All instinctively turned towards him as an example of serenity, purity, and assurance, in whatever doubtful exigency. The influence of Dr. Hannah's character, aside from his talents, on the large ministry which he educated, has been one of the greatest blessings Wesleyan Methodism has enjoyed in this generation.”-Methodist (newspaper), Jan. 25, 1868; Annual American Cyclopaedia for 1867, p. 601; Wesleyan Minutes, 1868, p. 14.

## Hannapes, Nicolas De[[@Headword:Hannapes, Nicolas De]]

             a French prelate, the last of the Latin patriarchs of Jerusalem, was born at Hannapes, in the Ardennes mountains, about 1525. At the age of twelve he joined the Dominicans at Rheims, afterwards studied at the convent of St. Jacques, Paris, was ordained priest, and taught theology. He was called to Rome by pope Innocent V, where he exercised the functions of grand- penitentiary, later was selected by Nicolas IV as patriarch of Jerusalem, aid in 1289 apostolic legate in Syria, Cyprus, and Armenia. Jean d'Acre was taken by the Turks, and the mission was broken up. Hannapes died in 1291, leaving, Virtutun Vitiorunmque Exempla ex Sacris Litteris Excerpta  (Tubingen, 1533): — Dicta Salutis Nicolai de Hannapiis, ard. Prcedicat. (Mayence, 1609): — Nicolai Patriarchae Hyerosoly. Typicon de Jejuniis Graecorum, etc. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Hannathon[[@Headword:Hannathon]]

             (Heb. Channmathonm', חִנָּתוֹן, graciously regarded; Sept. Α᾿νναθών, v. Ε᾿νναθωθ and Α᾿μώθ), a place on the northern boundary of Zebulon, apparently about midway between the Sea of Galilee and the valley of Jiphthah-El (Jos 19:14); probably among the range of Jebel Jermik, not far from el-Mughar.

## Hannathon (2)[[@Headword:Hannathon (2)]]

             For this site Tristram suggests (Bible Places, page 253) Deir Hannan, meaning doubtless what is laid down on the Ordnance Map as Deir Hanna, three miles south-west of Mughar (the locality which we had conjectured), and thus described in the Memoirs (1:364): “High walls all round the village, which is built of stone. The walls have round towers, and were built by Dhaker el-'Amr's son, S'ad el-'Amr. It is situated on the top of a high ridge, and contains about four hundred Christians. It is surrounded by olive groves and arable land. Water is obtained from cisterns and an old paved birkeh [pool] to the north of the village." No ancient remains are noted in the immediate vicinity. Mr. Trelawney Saunders coincides with this location (Map of the O.T.). Lieut. Conder, however, prefers (Tent Work, 2:337) Kefr 'Andn, which is too far north, being five miles south- west of Sofed, and equally destitute of any traces of antiquity (Memoirs, 1:203).

## Hannauer, Georg[[@Headword:Hannauer, Georg]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born in 1817. In 1843 he was made priest, in 1851 professor of philosophy at the Lyceum in Ratisbon, and died January 11, 1868. He wrote Ueber den Ursprnung der Ideen nach Thomas von Aquin (Ratisbon, 1855). (B.P.)

## Hannay, Alexander, D.D[[@Headword:Hannay, Alexander, D.D]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born at Kirkcudbright, East Galloway, February 27, 1822. In 1846 he left college to take charge of a church in Dundee. About the year 1866 he became secretary of the Colonial]Missionary Society, and in 1870 secretary of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. He died November 12, 1890. He was one of the founders of the London Congregational Union, and occupied its chair in 1888. "There was scarcely a society among English Congregationalists in which he was not an active and valued counselor." See (English) Cong. Year-book, 1891, pages 176-180.

## Hanneken, Menno[[@Headword:Hanneken, Menno]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born March 1, 1595, at Blaxen, in Oldenburg. He studied at Giessen, was in 1619 conrector at Oldenburg, in 1626 professor at Marburg, in 1646 superintendent at Lubeck, and died February 17, 1671. He wrote, Scutum Veritatis Catholica contra Thomam Henrici: — Synopsis Theologiae: — Expositio Epistolae Pauli ad Ephesios: — Doctrina de Justificatione Hominis coram Deo: — Grammatica Hebraica: — Quattuor Disput. de Augustana Confessione Invariata; Tres Disp. Hebraeo-Theologicce. See Moller, Cimbria Litterata; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:361; Steinschneider, Bibl. Handbuch, s.v. Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hanneken, Philip Ludwig[[@Headword:Hanneken, Philip Ludwig]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, son of Menno, was born at Marburg, June 5, 1637. He studied at different universities, was in 1663 professor of elocution at Giessen, in 1668 doctor and professor of theology there, in 1693 professor at Wittenberg, and died January 16, 1706, leaving, Annotata Philologica in Josuam: — Declaratio Augustanae Confessionis: — Mysterium Antichristi Ostensum: — Disputationes de Providentia, de Sessione Christi ad Dexteram Dei, de Baptismo Primarum Chiliadum ad Christum Conversarum, de Amore Dei Salutari in Judam Proditorem, de Moribus Regni Christi Illisque Oppositis Pietismo et Chiliasmno, etc. See Moller, Cimbria Litterata; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:361; Steinschneider, Bibl. Handbuch, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hannieel[[@Headword:Hannieel]]

             (Heb. Cihanniel', חִנַּיאֵלgrace of God; Sept. Α᾿νιήλ,Vulg. Hanniel and Haniel), the name of two men.

1. Son of Ephod and phylarch of the tribe of Manasseh, appointed by Moses at the divine nomination as one of the commissioners to divide the promised land (Num 34:23). B.C. 1618.

2. One of the sons of Ulla and chief of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:39, where the name is less correctly Anglicized “Haniel”). B.C. ante 720.

## Hannover, Nathan, ben-Moses[[@Headword:Hannover, Nathan, ben-Moses]]

             a Jewish writer of the 17th century, is the author of יון מצולה, or a history of the persecution of the Jews in Poland, Lithuania, etc. (Venice, 1653; transl. also into Judaeo-German): — שפה ברורה, a dictionary of the Hebrew language, with the corresponding German, Italian, and Latin words (Prague, 1660; an edition containing also the French was edited by Koppel ben-Wolf, Amsterdam, 1701). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:361 sq.; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), page 122. (B.P.)

## Hanoch[[@Headword:Hanoch]]

             (Gen 25:4; Gen 41:9; Exo 6:14; Num 26:5; 1Ch 5:3).' SEE ENOCH 3, 4.

## Hanochite[[@Headword:Hanochite]]

             (Heb. Chanoki', חֲנֹכַי; Sept. Ε᾿νώχ, Vulg. Henoczitce, Eng. Vers. “Hanochites”), a descendant of ENOCH or Hanoch, the son of Reuben (Num 26:5).

## Hans Sachs[[@Headword:Hans Sachs]]

             SEE SACHS.

## Hansch, Michael Gottlieb[[@Headword:Hansch, Michael Gottlieb]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born September 22, 1683. He studied at Leipsic, where he also lectured from 1709 to 1711. It was his intention to publish Kepler's manuscripts, which he had bought at Dantzic, but he only succeeded in publishing the first volume, as he could not get the support necessary for such an undertaking. Hansch died in 1752, leaving, De Justficatione Fidelium sub Veteri Testamento, contra Paresin Coccejanam (1702): — De Mediis Cognoscendi Existentiam et Divinitaten Scripturce Sacre (1709): — De Fundamtentali in Fide Dissensu (eod.). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hansell, William Forde, D.D[[@Headword:Hansell, William Forde, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Philadelphia, December 5, 1815. He graduated from Brown University in 1845, and from Princeton Theological  Seminary in 1848; was ordained in 1849 in the First Baptist Church in Philadelphia, and became pastor of the Central Baptist Church in Poughkeepsie, N.Y., April 1, 1849. In April 1853, he was released from that Church, and installed pastor of the Ninth Street Baptist Church in Cincinnati, February 5, 1854. His services ended' here July 18, 1858. For several years he resided in Philadelphia without pastoral charge. Removing to Hartford, Connecticut, in 1872, he preached frequently for various churches in and near that city. On going to Rainbow, a town between Hartford and Springfield, April 12, 1874, he became deeply interested in that field, remaining there and organizing a Church, which was constituted May 18, 1875. The last time he appeared in public was before the annual meeting of the

## Hansen, Franz Volkmar Reinhard[[@Headword:Hansen, Franz Volkmar Reinhard]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born in 1815. In 1843 he was pastor at Keitum, in the island of Sylt, Schleswig, but was deposed by the Danish government in 1850. From 1852 to 1862 he was court-preacher to queen Amalie, at Athens, in 1864 provost and first pastor in Schleswig, and died June 28, 1879. He is the author of, Die Auf gabe Deutschlands und die Union im Zusam Lenhanige der Zeitgeschichte (1873). (B.P.)

## Hansen, Ludwig[[@Headword:Hansen, Ludwig]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born at Hildesheim, February 1, 1664. He studied at Jena, was in 1689 pastor at his native place, and died February 28, 1694, leaving Disp. de Demonibus (Jena, 1684): — De Simplicitate Dei (eod.): — De Salute Mfajorum in Papatu (1688). See Lauenstein, Hildesh. Kirchenhistorie, 7:38; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P).

## Hansen, Petrus[[@Headword:Hansen, Petrus]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born July 6, 1686, in Schleswig. He studied at Kiel, was deacon in 1714, in 1720 first pastor at Plon, Holstein, in 1729  member of consistory and superintendent, and died in 1760, leaving, De Astuto Juliani Apostati Studio in Abolenda cum Scholis Religione Christiana (Plon, 1733): — Diss. Synod. de Differentia inter Religionem Naturalens et Revelatam contra Tindaliuns (1733). Besides, he published a number of ascetical works. See Moser and Neubauer, Jetztlebende Theologen; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hansiz, Markus[[@Headword:Hansiz, Markus]]

             a Jesuit and Church historian of Austria, was born April 23, 1683, at Volkermarkt, in Carinthia. He was educated in the Jesuit college at Eberndorf, studied at Vienna, and, after receiving holy orders, was for many years professor of philosophy at Gratz. His ecclesiastical researches made him conceive the idea of producing a Germania Sacra, after the pattern of the Gallia Christiana (Paris, 1656 sq.), Ughelli's Italia Sacra (Venice, 1717 sq.), and Wharton's Anglia Sacra (Lond. 1691), and he undertook a journey to Rome with a view of examining the libraries there. In 1727 he published the first volume of his Germnania Sacra: Metropolis Laureacensis cure Episcopate Pataviensi, Chronologiae Proposita (fol.); the second volume, published in 1729, is entitled, Archiepiscopatus Salisburgensis Chronol. Prop.; the third volume, published in 1754, is styled, De Episcopatu Ratisbonensi Prodromus, sive. Informatio Summaria de Sede Antiqua Ratisbonensi. The freedom with which he treated local legends roused such an opposition to him that he felt compelled to renounce literary labor in 1756, but he encouraged others to continue his work. Hansiz died September 5, 1766, at Vienna, and his book was continued by Ussermann and others. See Backer, Ecrivains de la. Compagnie de Jesus, 2:285; Werner, Gesch. der kathol. Theologie, page 132; Rettberg, Kirchen-Geschichte Deutschlands, 1:2 sq.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Hanstein, Gottfried August Ludwig[[@Headword:Hanstein, Gottfried August Ludwig]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Magdeburg, September 7, 1761. He studied at Halle, was in 1782 teacher at the cathedral-school of his native place, in 1787 preacher at Tangermunde, in 1804 member of consistory and preacher at Berlin, and died February 25, 1821, doctor of theology. He published homiletical and ascetical works, for which see Doring, Deutsche Kanzelredner; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:62, 94,  97, 118, 130, 148, 156, 158, 164, 168, 170, 172, 173, 175, 177, 197, 199, 203, 205, 206, 227, 233, 357; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:501. (B.P.)

## Hanuman[[@Headword:Hanuman]]

             the ape-god of the Hindus, son of Pavan, lord of the winds. There is a reference to Hanuman in the Ramayana (q.v.), in which the monkey chief is introduced as heading the natives of India, who had come to the assistance of Rama. In memory of this service a small pagoda is erected to his honor in the temples of Vishnu.

## Hanun[[@Headword:Hanun]]

             (Heb. Chanun', חָנוּן, favored), the name of three men.

1. (Sept. Α᾿ννών and Α᾿νάν) The son and successor of Nahash, king of the Ammonites (2Sa 10:14; 1Ch 19:2-6). David, who had in his troubles been befriended by Nahash, sent, with the kindest intentions, an embassy to condole with Hanun on the death of his father, and to congratulate him on his own accession. B.C. cir. 1035. The rash young king, however, was led to misapprehend the motives of this embassy, and to treat with gross and inexpiable indignity the honorable personages whom David had charged with this mission. Their beards were half shaven, and their robes cut short by the middle, and they were dismissed in this shameful trim, which can be appreciated only ‘by those who consider how reverently the beard has al-ways been regarded by the Orientals. SEE BEARD. When the news of this affront was brought to David, he sent word to the ambassadors to remain at Jericho till the growth of their beards enabled them to appear with decency in the metropolis. He vowed vengeance upon Hanun for the insult; and the vehemence with which the matter was taken up forms an instance, interesting from its antiquity, of the respect expected to be paid to the person and character of ambassadors. Hanun himself looked for nothing less than war as the consequence of his conduct; and he subsidized Hadarezer and other Syrian princes to assist him with their armies. The power of the Syrians was broken in two campaigns, and the Ammonites were left to their fate, which was severe even beyond the usual severities of war in that remote age. B.C. cir. 1034. SEE AMMONITE; SEE DAVID.

2. (Sept. Α᾿νούν.) A person who repaired (in connection with the inhabitants of Zanoah) the Valley gate of Jerusalem after the Captivity (Neh 3:13). B.C. 446.

3. (Sept. Α᾿νώμ.) A son (“the sixth”) of Zalaph, who likewise repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 3:30). B.C. 446.

## Hanway, Jonas[[@Headword:Hanway, Jonas]]

             an English philanthropist, was ‘born at Portsmouth in 1712. He established himself as a merchant at St. Petersburg, and became connected, through his Russian dealings, with the trade into Persia. Business having led him into that country, he published in 1753 A historical Account of the British  Trade over the Caspian Sea, with a Journal of Travels from London through Russia into Persia (4 vols. 4to), “a work of no pretension to literary elegance, but containing much information on the commercial subjects of which he speaks, and on the history and manners of Persia. The latter part of his life was employed in supporting, by his pen and personal exertions, a great variety of-charitable and philanthropic schemes; and he gained so high and honorable a name that a deputation of the chief merchants of London made it their request to government that some substantial mark of public favor should be conferred on him. He was, in consequence, made a commissioner of the navy. The Marine Society and the Magdalen Charity, both still in existence, owe their establishment mainly to him; he was also one of the great promoters of Sunday-schools. He died in 1786.” He published also The Importance of the Lord's Supper (London, 1782, 12mo): — Reflections on Life and Religion (Lond. 1761), 2 vols. 8vo). See Pugh, Remarkable Occurrences in the Life of Jonas Hanway (London, 1787, 8vo); English Cyclopedia; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 782.

## Haphraim[[@Headword:Haphraim]]

             (Hebrew Chaphara'yim, חֲפָרִיַם, two pits; Sept. Α᾿φεραϊvμ, Vulg. Hapharaim), a place near the border of Issachar, mentioned between Shunem and Shihon (Jos 19:19). Eusebius (Ononast. s.v.Αἰφαρααίμ,) appears to place it six Roman miles north of Leggio; the Apocrypha also possibly speaks of the same place as APHAEREMA (Α᾿φαίρεμα, 1Ma 11:34; com-pare 10:30, 38). Schwarz (Palestine, p. 166) was unable to find it. Kiepert ( Wandkarte von Palastina, 1857) locates it near the river Kishon, apparently at Tell eth Thorah (Robinson's Researches, new ed. 3:115). Dr. Thomson (Land and Book, 1, 502) imagines it may be the modern Shefa Amer (the Shefa Omar of Robinson, Researches, new ed. 3 103, “on a ridge overlooking the plain” of Megiddo), which, he says, “in old Arabic authors is written Shephram.” SEE ISSACHAR.

## Haphraim (2)[[@Headword:Haphraim (2)]]

             This place, according to Tristram (Bible Places, page 237), "is probably represented by the little village of el-Afuleh, two miles west of Shunem, in the plain;" the position which we had assigned it, SEE ISSACHAR, and which is adopted by Mr. Grove in Dr. Smith's Atlas. It is laid down on the Ordnance Map at two and a half miles due west of Solam, and is described in the Memoirs (2:40) as “a small-village of mud in the plain, supplied by two wells. This is possibly the Ophlah of the lists of Thothmes III (on the temple at Karnak). Compare el-Fueh (one mile to the east). It is also mentioned by Maria Sanuto (A.D. 1321) under the name of Afel." There are no other indications of antiquity. Lieut. Conder suggests (Tent Work, 2:337) the identity of Haphraim with. Khurbet el-Farryieh, which is laid down on the Ordnance Hapi far away from Shunem, at two and a half miles south of Ain-Keimfn (Jokneam), on the north edge of Mount Carmel; and is described as "a steep hillock with traces of ruins, and on the north a good spring in the valley" (Memoir, 2:58, where a description and plan of the ancient tombs are given). In this latter location Mr. Trelawney Saunders coincides (Map of the O.T.).

## Haphtarah, pl. Haphtaroth[[@Headword:Haphtarah, pl. Haphtaroth]]

             (הִפְטָרָה, dismislion, הִפְטָרוֹת). This expression, which is found in foot- notes and at the end of many editions of the Hebrew Bible, denotes the different lessons from the prophets read in the synagogue every Sabbath, and festival of the year. As these lessons have been read from time  immemorial in conjunction with sections from the law, and as it is to both “the reading of the law and the prophets” that reference is made in the N.T. (Act 12:15, etc.), we propose to discuss both together in the present article.

1. Classification of the Lessons, their Titles, Signification, etc. — There are two classes of lessons indicated in the Hebrew Bible: the one consists of fifty-four sections, into which the entire law or Pentateuch (תורה) is divided, and is called Parshioth (פרשיות, plur. of  פרשה from פרש, to separate); and the other consists of a corresponding number of sections selected from different parts of the prophets, to be read in conjunction with the former, and denominated Haphtaroth. As the signification of this term is much disputed, and is intimately connected with the view about the origin of these prophetic lessons, we must defer the discussion of it to section 4. The division of the Pentateuch into fifty-four sections is to provide a lesson for each Sabbath of those years which, according to Jewish chronology, have fifty-four Sabbaths (see sec. 2), and to read through the whole Pentateuch, with large portions of the different prophets, in the course of every year. It must be observed, however, that this annual cycle was not universally adopted by the ancient Jews. There were some who had a triennial cycle (comp. Megilla, 29, b).

These divided the Pentateuch into one hundred and fifty-three or fifty-five sections, so as to read through the law in Sabbatic lessons once in three years. This was still done by some Jews in the days of Maimonides (compare JadHa- Chazaka Hilchoth Tephilla, 13, 1), and Benjamin of Tudela tells us that he found the Syrian Jews followed this practice in Memphis (ed. Asher, 1, 148). The sections of the triennial division are called by the Masorites Sedarim or Sedaroth (סדרים, סדרות), as may be seen in the Masoretic note at the end of Exodus: ‘Here endeth the book of Exodus. it hath eleven Parshioth (פרשיות, i.e. according to the annual division), twenty- nine Sedaroth (סדרות, i.e. according to the triennial division), and forty chapters (פרקים).”Besides the Sabbatic lessons, special portions of the law and prophets are also read on every festival and fast of the year. It must be noticed, moreover, that the Jews, who have for some centuries almost universally followed the annual division of the law, denominate the Sabbatic section Sidra (סידרא), the name which the Masorites give to each portion of the triennial division, and that every one of the fifty-four sections has a special title, which it derives from the first or second word  with which it commences, and by which it is quoted in the Jewish writings. To render the following description more intelligible, as well as to enable the student of Hebrew exegesis to identify the quotations from the Pentateuch, we subjoin on the two following pages chronological tables of the Sabbatical Festival and Fast Lessons from the Law and Prophets, and their titles. (See Clarke's Commentary, s. f. Deuteronomy.)

2. “The Reading of the Law and Prophets” as indicated in the Hebrew Bible, and practiced by the Jews at the present day. — As has already been remarked, this division into fifty-four sections is to provide a special lesson for every Sabbath of those years which have fifty-four Sabbaths. Thus the intercalary year, in which New Year falls on a Thursday, and the months Marcheshvan and Kislev have twenty-nine days, has fifty-four Sabbaths which require special lessons. But as ordinary years have not so many Sabbaths, and those years in which New Year falls on a Monday, and the months Marchesvan and Kislev have thirty days, or New Year falls on a Saturday, and the said months are regular, i.e. Marchesvan having twenty- nine days and Kinsley thirty, have only forty-seven Sabbaths-fourteen of the fifty-four sections, viz. 22 and 23, 27 and 28, 29 and 30, 32 and 33, 39 and 40, 42 and 43, 50 and 51, have been appointed to be read in pairs either wholly or in part, according to the varying number of Sabbaths in the current year. Thus the whole Pentateuch is read through every year. The first of these weekly sections is read on the first Sabbath after the Feast of Tabernacles, which is in the month of Tisri, and begins the civil year, and the last is read on the concluding day of this festival, Tisri 23, which is called The Rejoicing of the Law (שמחת תורה), a day of rejoicing, because on it the law is read through. SEE TABERNACLES, FEAST OF.

According to the triennial division, the reading of the law seems to have been as follows: Gen 1:1 Exo 13:16, comprising history from the creation of the world to the Exodus, was read in the first year; Exo 13:17 Num 6:27, embracing the laws of both Sinai. and the tabernacle, formed the lessons for the Sabbaths. of the second year; and Num 7:1 Deu 34:12, containing both history (i.e. the history of thirty-nine years wanderings in the wilderness) and law (i.e. the repetition of the Mosaic law), constituted the Sabbatic lessons for the third year (compare Megilla, 29, b, and Volkslehrer, 2, 209).

3. The manner of reading the Law and the Prophets. — Every Sabbatic lesson from the law (קריאת התורה) is divided into seven sections  (evidently designed to correspond to the seven days of the week), which, in the days of our Saviour and afterwards, were read by seven different persons (שבעה קרואים), who were called. upon for this purpose by the congregation or its chief Mishla, Megilla, 4, 2; Maimonides, Jad Ha- Chazaka) Hilchoth Tephilla, 12, 7). Great care is taken that the whole nation should be represented at this reading of the law and prophets. Hence a Cohen (כהן) or priest is called to the reading of the first portion, a Levi (לוי) to the second, and an Israel (ישראל) to the third; and after the three great divisions of the nation have thus been duly represented, the remaining four portions are assigned to four others with less care. “Every one thus called to the reading of the law must unroll the scroll, and, having found the place where he is to begin to read, pronounces the following benediction — ‘Bless ye the Lord, who is ever blessed;' to which the congregation respond, ‘Blessed be the Lord, who is blessed for evermore.' Whereupon he again pronounces the following benediction — ‘Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast chosen us from among all nations, and hast given us thy law. Blessed art thou, O Lord, giver of the law;' to which all the congregation respond ‘Amen.' He then reads the seventh portion of the lesson, and when he has finished, rolls up the scroll, and pronounces again the following benediction: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast given us thy law, the law of truth, and hast planted among us everlasting life. Blessed art thou, O Lord, giver of the law” (Maimonides, ibid. 12, 5). The other six, who are called in rotation to the reading of the other six portions, have to go through the same formularies. Then the maphtir (מפטיר), or the one who finishes up by the reading of the Haphtarah, or the lesson from the prophets, is called.

Having read the few concluding verses of the lesson from the law, and passed through the same formularies as the other seven, he reads the appointed section from the prophets. “Before reading it, he pronounces the following benediction ‘Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast chosen good prophets, and delighted in their words, which were spoken in truth. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast chosen the law, thy servant Moses, thy people Israel, and thy true and righteous prophets' and after reading, ‘Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, Rock of all ages, righteous in all generations, the faithful God who promises and performs, who decrees and accomplishes, for all thy words are faithful and just. Faithful art thou, Lord our God and faithful are thy words, and not one of thy words shall return in vain, for  thou art a faithful King. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the God who art faithful in all thy words.' ‘Have mercy upon Zion, for it is the dwelling of our life, and save speedily in our days the afflicted souls. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who wilt make Zion rejoice in her children. Cause us to rejoice, O Lord our God, in Elijah thy servant, and in the kingdom of the house of David thine anointed. May he speedily come and gladden our hearts. Let no stranger sit on his throne, and let others no longer inherit his glory, for thou hast sworn unto him by thy holy name that his light shall not be extinguished forever and ever. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the shield of David.' ‘For the law, the divine service, the prophets, and for “this day of rest”[or of memorial], this goodly day of holy convocation which thou hast given to us, O Lord, for sanctification and rest [on the Sabbath], for honor and glory; for all this, O Lord our King, we thank and praise thee. Let thy name be praised in the mouth of every living creature forever and ever. Thy word, O our King, is true, and will abide forever. Blessed art thou, King of the whole earth, who hast sanctified the Sabbath, and Israel, and the day of memorial'“(Maimonides, ibid.). After the Babylonian captivity, when the Hebrew language became an unknown tongue to the common people, an interpreter (תורגמן מתורגמן) stood at the desk by the side of those who read the lessons, and paraphrased the section from the law into Chaldee verse by verse, the reader pausing at every verse, whilst the lesson from the prophets he paraphrased three verses at a time (Mishna, Megilla, 4,4); and Lightfoot is of opinion that St. Paul, in 1Co 14:22, refers to this circumstance (Horce Hebraicae in loco). The lesson from the law was on these occasions rendered into Chaldee quite literally, owing to the fear which both the interpreters and the congregation had lest a free explanation of it might misrepresent its sense, whilst greater freedom was exercised with the lesson from the prophets. Hence loose paraphrases and lengthy expositions were tolerated and looked for both from the professional interpreter and those of the congregation who were called up to read, and who felt that they could do it with edification to the audience. The Sabbatic lesson from the law was, as we have seen, divided into seven sections or chapters, each of which had at least three verses, according to the verses of those days, so that the whole consisted of at least twenty-one such verses. The lesson from the prophets was not portioned out to seven different individuals, but has also at least twenty-one verses (Mishna, Megilla, 4, 4; Maimonides, Jod Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Tephilla, 12, 13). The lesson from the law for the Day of Atonement is divided into six chapters, for festivals into five, for new moon into four, and for Mondays and Thursdays into  three chapters or sections. The number of persons called up to the reading of the law always corresponds to the number of sections. For Mondays and Thursdays, new moon, and the week days of the festivals (מועד חול)there are no corresponding lessons from the prophets (Mishna, Megilla, 4, 1-3).

4. The Origin of this Institution. — The origin of this custom may easily be traced. The Bible emphatically and repeatedly enjoins upon every Israelite to. study its contents (Deu 4:9; Deu 32:46); Moses himself ordered that the whole law should be read publicly at the end of every Sabbatic year (Deu 31:10-12), whilst Joshua urges that it should be studied day and night (Jos 1:8; comp, also Psa 1:2 sq.). Now the desire to carry out this injunction literally, and yet the utter impossibility of doing it on the part of those who had to work for daily bread all the week, and who could not afford to buy the necessarily expensive scrolls, gave rise to this institution. On the Sabbath and festivals all were relieved from their labor, and could attend places of worship where the inspired writings were deposited, and where care could be taken that no private interpretation should be palmed upon the Word of God. Hence both James (Act 15:21) and Josephus (Contra Apion, 2, 17) speak of it as a very ancient custom, and the Talmud tells us that the division of each Sabbatic lesson into seven sections was introduced in honor of the Persian king (Megilla, 23), which shows that this custom obtained anterior to the Persian rule. Indeed Maimonides positively asserts that Moses himself ordained the hebdomal reading of the law (Hilchoth Tephillt, 12, 1). Equally natural is the division of the law into Sabbatic sections, as the whole of it could not be read at once. The only difficulty is to ascertain positively whether the annual or the triennial division was the more ancient one. A triennial division is mentioned in Megilla 29, b. as current in Palestine; with this agree the reference to 155 sections of the law in the Midrash, Esther 116, b, and the Masoretic division of the Pentateuch into 154 Sedarim. But, on the other hand, R. Simeon b. Eleazar, a Palestinian, declared that Moses instituted the reading of Leviticus 26 before the Feast of Pentecost, and Deuteronomy 28 before New Year. which most unquestionably presuppose the annual division of the Pentateuch into 54 Parshioth. This is, moreover, confirmed by the statement (Ibid. 31, a) that the section וזאת הברכה(Deuteronomy 33 :l- 34, 12) was read on the ninth day of the Feast of Tabernacles, thus terminating the annual cycle, as well as by the fact that the annual festival  of the rejoicing of the law (שמחת תורה) which commemorates the annual finishing of the perusal of the Pentateuch, SEE TABERNACLES, FEAST OF, was an ancient institution. We must therefore conclude that the annual cycle which is now prevalent among the Jews was the generally adopted one, at least since the Maccabaean times, whilst the triennial, though the older, was the exception. Usage, however, probably varied, for we find that our Savior (Luk 4:16-21), in accordance with this custom, on invitation read and expounded, apparently on a Sabbath in January, a passage (Isa 61:1-2), not contained at all in the present scheme of Haphtaroth.

It is far more difficult to trace the origin of the Haphtarah, or the lesson from the prophets, and its signification. A very ancient tradition tells us that the Syrians had interdicted the reading of the law, and carried away the scrolls containing it, and that appropriate sections from the prophets were therefore chosen to replace the Pentateuch (Zunz, Göttesdienstliche Vor. p. 5), whilst Elias Levita traces the origin of the Haphtarah to persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes. In his Lex. (s.v. פטר) he says, “The wicked Antiochus, king of Greece, prohibited the Jews to read the law publicly. They therefore selected sections from the prophets of the same import as the Sabbatic lessons… and though this prohibition has now ceased, this custom has not been left off, and to this day we read a section from the prophets after the reading of the law;”and we see no reason to reject this account. The objection of Vitringa, Frankel, Herzfeld, etc., that Antiochus, who wanted to exterminate Judaism, would not wage war against the Pentateuch exclusively; but would equally destroy the prophetic books, and that this implies a knowledge on the part of the soldiers of the distinction between the Pentateuch and the other inspired writings, is obviated by the fact that there was an external difference between the rolls of the Pentateuch and the other sacred books, that the Jews claimed the Pentateuch as their law and rule of faith, and that this was the reason why it especially was destroyed. (The law has two rollers, i.e. has a roller attached to each of the two ends of the vellum on which it is written, and every weekly portion when read on the Sabbath is unrolled from the right roller and rolled on the left; so that when the law is opened on the next Sabbath the portion appointed for that day is at once found. Whereas the prophetic books have only one roller. and the lesson from the prophets has to be sought out on every occasion [compare Baba Bathra, 14 a].) This is corroborated by 1Ma 1:56, where the law only is said to have been  burned. Accordingly וזפטרה, from פטר, to liberate, to free, signifies the liberating lesson, the portion from the prophets which is read instead of the portion from the law that could not be read, and which liberates from the injunction of reading the Pentateuch. For the other opinions about the signification of Iaphtarah, we refer to the literature quoted below.

5. Literature. — Maimonides, Jod Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Tephilla; Bartolocci, Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinicc, 2, 593 sq.; Zunz, Die Gottesdienstlichen Vortrage der Juden, cap. 1, Frankel, Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta (Leipzig, 1841), p. 48 sq.; Rapaport, Erech Mlillin, p. 66 sq.; Monatschrift fir Geschichte und Wissenschrift des Judenthums, 1, 352; 11:222, Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 2, 209; Der Israelitische Volkslehrer, 2. 205; Ben Chananja, , 125.

## Hapi[[@Headword:Hapi]]

             SEE APIS.

## Happach, Johann Casimir[[@Headword:Happach, Johann Casimir]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1726. He was director and professor of theology at the Coburg gymnasium in 1772, and died August 11, 1783, member of consistory. He wrote, Comm. de Calumnia Religiosa et Theologia Civili Veterum Praesertim Romanorum (Coburg, 1749): — De Conatibus Quibusdam Translationes Bibliorum Emendandi (1772): —  De Pupyro ad Hiob. 8:11 (eod.): — Explicatio Nova Cladis Bethsemiticae, 1Sa 6:19 (3 parts, 1774): — Progr. III ad Gen 47:24 (1775): — Progr. VI Super Quibusdam Locis Prophetae Hoseae (1776, 1777). See Meusel, Gelehrtes Deutschland; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:362; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Happach, Lorenz Philipp Gottfried[[@Headword:Happach, Lorenz Philipp Gottfried]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born January 6, 1742, at Hoyersdorf, near Dessau, studied at Halle, was rector and chaplain in 1764, preacher at Alten in 1772, and in 1780 at Mehringen. He died July 20, 1814, leaving Naemann Syrus, Illustrandum (Bremen, 1774): — Theologische Nebenstunden ( Dessau, 1798-1805): — Ueber die Beschaffenheit des kunftigen Lebens nach dem Tode, aus Ansichten der Bibel (ibid. 1809-11, 2 volumes). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:475; 2:51. (B.P.)

## Happersett, Reese, D.D[[@Headword:Happersett, Reese, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Brandywine, Pennsylvania, July 31, 1810. He graduated from Washington College, Pa., in 1836, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1839; was licensed by the New Castle Presbytery the same year, and ordained in 1841. In 1844 he was appointed agent for the Board of Domestic Missions, and in this position was eminently active and useful. In 1850 he became assistant secretary of the board, and in 1859 was elected corresponding secretary. He died October 2, 1866. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, page 154.

## Happiness[[@Headword:Happiness]]

             absolutely taken, denotes the durable possession of perfect good, without any mixture of evil; or the enjoyment of pure pleasure unalloyed with pain; or a state in which all our wishes are satisfied; in which senses, happiness is only known by name on this earth. The word happy, when applied to any state or condition of human life, will admit of no positive definition, but is merely a relative term; that is, when we call a man happy, we mean that he is happier than some others with whom we compare him; or than the generality of others; or than he himself was in some other situation. Moralists justly observe that happiness does not consist in the pleasures of sense; as eating, drinking, music, painting, theatrical exhibitions, etc., for these pleasures continue but a little while, by repetition lose their relish,  and by high expectation often bring disappointment. Nor does happiness consist in an exemption from labor, care, business, etc.; such a state being usually attended with depression of spirits, imaginary anxieties, and the whole train of hypochondriacal affections. Nor is it to be found in greatness, rank, or elevated stations, as matter of fact abundantly testifies; but .happiness consists in the enjoyment of the Divine favor, a good conscience, and uniform conduct. In subordination to these, human happiness may be greatly promoted by the exercise of the social affections, the pursuit of some engaging end, the prudent constitution of the habits, and the enjoyment of our health.

## Hara[[@Headword:Hara]]

             (Heb. Hara', הָרָא), a province of Assyria. We read that Tiglath-pilneser “brought the Reubenites, Gadites, and the half tribe of Manasseh unto Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and to the river Gozan” (1Ch 5:26). The parallel passage in 2Ki 18:11, omits Hara, and adds “in the cities of the Medes.” Bochart consequently supposes that Hara was either a part of Media, or another name for that country. He shows that Herodotus (7:62) and other ancient writers call the Medes Arians, and their country Aria. He further supposes that the name Hara, which signifies mountainous, may have been given to that northern section of Media subsequently called by the Arabs El-gebal (“the mountains;” see Bochart, Opp. 1, 194). The words Aria and Hara, however, are totally different both in meaning and origin. The Medes were a branch of the great Arian family who came originally from India, and who took their name, according to Muller (Science of Language, p. 237 sq., 2nd ed.), from the Sanskrit word Arya, which means noble, “of a good family.” Its etymological meaning seems to be “one who tills the ground “and it is thus allied to the Latin arare (see also Rawlinson's Herodotus, 1, 401).

Hara is joined with Hala, Habor, and the river Gozan. These were all situated in Western Assyria, between the Tigris and Euphrates, and along the banks of the Khabûr. We may safely conclude, therefore, that Hara could not have been far distant from that region. It is somewhat remarkable that the name is not given in either the Sept. or Peshito version. Some have hence imagined that the word was interpolated after these versions were  made. This, however, is a rash criticism, as it exists in all Hebrew MSS., and also in Jerome's version (see Robinson's Calmet, s.v.Gozan; Grant's Nestorian Christians, p. 120). The conjecture that Hara and Haran are identical cannot be sustained, though the situation of the latter might suit the requirements of the Biblical narrative, and its Greek classical name Carrhae resembles Hara. SEE HARAN. The Hebrew words הַראand חרןare radically different. Hara may perhaps have been a local name applied to the mountainous region north of Gozan, called by Strabo and Ptolemy Mins Masius, and now Karja Baghlar (Strabo, 16:23, Ptolemy, 5, 18, 2). — Kitto, s.v.

## Hara (2)[[@Headword:Hara (2)]]

             one of the names of Siva (q.v.).

## Haradah[[@Headword:Haradah]]

             (Heb. with the article ha-Charadah', הִחֲרָדָה, the fright;. Sept. Χαραδάθ), the twenty-fifth station of the Israelites in the desert (Num 33:24); perhaps at the head of the wadys northeast of Jebel Araif en-Nakah, on the western brow of the high plateau east of Ain el- Mazen. SEE EXODE.

## Harald[[@Headword:Harald]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of the see of Argyle in 1228. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 285.

## Haram[[@Headword:Haram]]

             SEE HOUSE.

## Haram (2)[[@Headword:Haram (2)]]

             a term used by Mohammedans to denote what deserves reprimand or punishment, because expressly forbidden by the law. It is the opposite of Halal (q.v.). The word Haram also signifies a sacred thing from which infidels are to abstain, as the temple of Mecca, or Mohammed's tomb at Medina.

## Haran appears in the Eng. Bible as the name of a place and also of three men, which, however,[[@Headword:Haran appears in the Eng. Bible as the name of a place and also of three men, which, however,]]

are represented by two essentially different Hebrew words. SEE BETH-HARAN

             1. HARAN (Heb. Haran', הָרָן, mountaineer; Sept. αῤῥαν), probably the eldest son of Terah, brother of Abraham and Nahor, and father of Lot, Milcah, and Iscah. He died in his native place-before his father Terah (an event that may in some degree have prepared the family to leave Ur), which, from the manner in which it is mentioned, appears to have been a much rarer case in those days than at the present (Gen 11:27 sq.). B.C. 2223 ante 2088. — Kitto. His sepulcher was still shown there when Josephus wrote his history (Ant. 1, 6, 5). The ancient Jewish tradition is that Haran was burnt in the furnace of Nimrod for his wavering conduct during the fiery trial of Abraham. (See the Targum Ps. — Jonathan; Jerome's Quaest. in Genesim, and the notes thereto in the edition of  Migne). This tradition seems to have originated in a translation of the word Ur, which in Hebrew signifies “fire.” SEE ABRAHAM.

2. CHARAN (Heb. Charan', חָרָן, probably from the Arabic, parched; Sept. Χαῤῥάν, also Josephus, Ant. i, 16, N.T., Act 7:2, where it is Anglicized “Charran”), the name of the place where Abraham, after he had been called from Ur of the Chaldees, tarried till his father Terah died, when he proceeded to the land of Canaan (Gen 11:31; Act 7:4). The elder branch of the family still remained at Haran, which led to the interesting journeys thither described in the patriarchal history (see Hauck, De profectionibus Abrahamie Charris [Lips. 1754, 1776]) —-first, that of Abraham's servant to obtain a wife for Isaac (Genesis 24); and, next, that of Jacob when he fled to evade the wrath of Esau (Gen 28:10). It is said to be in Mesopotamia (Gen 24:10), or, more definitely, in Padan-Aram 25:20), which is the “cultivated district at the foot of the hills”(Stanley, Syr. and Pal. p. 129, note), a name well applying to the beautiful stretch of country which lies below Mount Masius, between the Khabûr and the Euphrates. SEE PADAN-ARAM. Haran is enumerated among the towns which had been taken by the predecessors of Sennacherib, king of Assyria (1Ki 19:12; Isa 37:12), and it is also mentioned by Ezekiel (27:23) among the places which traded with Tyre. It is alluded to in the cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.). Jerome thus describes Haran: “‘Charran, a city of Mesopotamia beyond Edessa, which to this day is called Charra, where the Roman army was cut off, and Crassus, its leader, taken”(Onomast. s.v. Charran). Guided by these descriptions and statements, which certainly appear sufficiently clear and full, sacred geographers have almost universally identified Haran with the Carrct (Kapptai) of classical writers (Herodian. 4:13, 7; Ptol. 5, 18, 12; Strabo, 16:747), and the Harran of the Arabs (Schultens, Index Geogr. in Vitam Saladini. s.v.). The plain bordering on this town (Ammian. Marc. 23:3) is celebrated in history as the scene of a battle in which the Roman army was defeated by the Parthians, and the triumvir Crassus killed (Plin. 5, 21; Dio Cass. 40:25; Lucan. 1, 104). Abulfeda (Tab. Syrice, p. 164) speaks of Haran as formerly a great city, which lay in an arid and barren tract of country in the province of Diar Modhar. About the time of the Christian era it appears to have been included in the kingdom of Eaessa (Mos. Chor. 2, 32), which was ruled by Agbarus. Afterwards it passed with that kingdom under the dominion of the Romans, and appears as a Roman city in the wars of Caracalla (Mos. Chor. 2, 72) and Julian (Jo.  Malal. p. 329). It is remarkable that the people of Harran retained to a late time the Chaldean language and the worship of Chaldean deities (Assemani, Bibl. Or. 1, 327; Chwolson's Sabier und der Sabismus, 2, 39).

About midway in the district above designated is a town still called Harran, which really seems never to have changed its appellation, and beyond any reasonable doubt is the Haran or Charran of Scripture (Bochart's Phaleg, 1, 14; Ewald's Geschichte, 1, 384). It is only peopled by a few families of wandering Arabs, who are led thither by a plentiful supply of water from several small streams. Its situation is fixed by major Rennell as being twenty-nine miles from Orfah, and occupying a flat and sandy plain. It lies (according to D'Anville) in 36° 40' N. lat., and 39° 2' 45”E. long. (See Niebuhr, Travels, 2, 410; Ritter, Erdk. 10:244; 11:291; Cellar. Notit. 2, 726; Mannert, 5, 2, 280; Michaelis, Suppl. 930.) Harran stands on the banks of a small river called Belik, which flows into the Euphrates about fifty miles south of the town. From it a number of leading roads radiate to the great fords of the Tigris and Euphrates; and it thus formed an important station on the line of commerce between Central and Western Asia. This may explain why Terah came to it, and why it was mentioned among the places which supplied the marts of Tyre (Eze 27:23). Crassus was probably marching along this great route when he was attacked by the Parthians. Dr. Beke, in his Origines Biblicae (p. 122 sq.), made the somewhat startling statement that Haran must have been near Damascus, and that Aram-Naharaim is the country between the Abana and Pharpar. After lying dormant for a quarter of a century, this theory was again revived in 1860. The Rev. J. L. Porter visited and described a small village in the plain, four hours east of Damascus, called Harran el-Awamid (“Harran of the columns”). The description having met the eye of Dr. Beke (in Five Years in Damascus, 1, 376), he at once concluded that this village was the site of the real “city of Nahor.” He has since visited Harran el- Awamid, and traveled from it to Gilead, and is more confirmed in his view, though he appears to stand alone. His arguments have not been sufficient to set aside the powerful evidence in favor of Harran in Mesopotamia. The student may see the whole subject discussed in the Athenceunm for Nov. 23, 30; Dec. 7, 1861; Feb. 1, 15; March 1, 22, 29; April 6, 19; and May 24, 1862; also in Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish Church, 1, 447 sq.

3. CHARAN (Heb. same as last, meaning here noble, according to First; Sept. Α᾿ῤῥάν v.r. Α᾿ράμ). The son of Caleb of Judah by his concubine  Ephah, and father of Gazez (1Ch 2:46). B.C. between 1618 and 1083.

4. HARAN (Heb. same as No. 1; Sept. Α᾿ράν v.r. Δάν). One of the three sons of Shimei, a Levite of the family of Gershon, appointed by David to superintend the offices at the tabernacle (1Ch 23:9). B.C. 1014.

## Hararite, the[[@Headword:Hararite, the]]

             (Heb. always [except in 2Sa 23:11] with the art. ha-Harari, הִהֲרָרַי), a distinctive epithet of three members of David's body-guard; probably as natives of the mountains (הִר, plur. constr. חֲרָרֵי) of Judah or Ephraim; but according to Furst from some town of the name of Har (הִר). SEE DAVID.

1. “SHAMMAH [q.v.], the son of Agee”(2Sa 23:11 [Sept. οΑ῾᾿ ραρί v.r. Α᾿ρουχῖος,Vulg. de Arari, A.V. “the Hararite”], 33 [οΑ῾᾿ρωρίτης v.r. Α᾿ρωδίτης, Arorites], which latter verse shows that it was a designation of the son and not of the father), a different person from “Shammoth the Harorite”[q.v. (1Ch 11:27), or “Shammah the Harodite”[q.v.] (2Sa 23:25). SEE AGEE.

2. “JONATHAN [q.v.], the son of Shage”(1Ch 11:34, Sept. οΑ῾᾿ραοί,Vulg. Ararites), mentioned in the parallel passage (2Sa 23:32) without any such distinction. SEE SHAGE.

3. “AHIAM [q.v.], the son of Sacar”(1Ch 11:35, Sept. οΑ῾᾿ραρί v.r. Α᾿χάρ,Vulg. Ararites), or, in the parallel passage (2Sa 23:33),less accurately, “Ahiam, [the] son of Sharar [q.v.] the Ararite'“(Heb. with the art. ha-Arari', הָאֲרָרַי, Sept. οΑ῾᾿ραδίτης lT. r. Α᾿ραϊv, etc., Vulg. Arorites, A.V. “the Hararite”). SEE SACAR.

## Haraseth[[@Headword:Haraseth]]

             SEE KIR-HARASETH.

## Harbads[[@Headword:Harbads]]

             a name substituted by Zoroaster for the magi (q.v.) of the ancient Persians, and designed to denote the priests of the Guebres. SEE PARSEES.

## Harbart, Burchard[[@Headword:Harbart, Burchard]]

             doctor and professor of theology at Leipsic, was born in 1546, and died February 18, 1614. He is the author of, Theses de Smalcaldicae Confessionis Articulis: — Doctrina de Conjuigio: — Capita Doctrinanmde Confessione Verae Fidei Complectentia: — Capita de Lege Divina: — De Spiritu Sancto: — De Liber o Flominis Arbitrio: — De Sacramentis in Genere: — De Ministerio Ecclesiastico. See Vogel,. Leipziger Annalem; Freher, Theatrum Eruditorum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Harbaugh, Henry[[@Headword:Harbaugh, Henry]]

             a prominent minister and writer of the German Reformed Church in the United States, was born Oct. 28,1817, near Waynesborough, Pa. He was descended from a German family, whose name was Herbach, and which had come to this country in 1736 from Switzerland. His father was an elder  in the German Reformed Church at Waynesborough. In early youth he manifested a desire to study for the ministry, but his father was unwilling to allow him to do so. He therefore found employment first with a carpenter, and subsequently with a mill-owner. After a time he became teacher in a primary school. The money saved in these positions enabled him to enter in 1840 Marshall College, Mercersburg, which was at that time under the direction of Dr. Nevin. Both the students' societies of Mercersburg College desired to have him a member. “We have many praying members,” the Goetheans represented to him; “the others have no religion.” For Harbaugh this was a reason to join the other society, that they might have one to do the praying for them. His financial means did not allow him to finish his course in the college and the Theological Seminary. He spent two years in the former and one in the latter, and, having passed his examination, became in 1843 pastor of the congregation in Lewisburg. In 1850 he accepted a call from the congregation in Lancaster, which he left again in 1860 for Lebanon. In 1863 he was elected by the Synod professor of theology in the Seminary of Mercersburg, in the place of Prof. B. C. Wolff. In this position he remained until his death, which occurred Dec. 28, 1867. Harbaugh was an indefatigable worker, and it was overexertion that brought on the disease of the brain by which he was carried off. The loss of his wife and a child in 1847 directed his thoughts to a special consideration of the state after death, and thus called for his works on Heaven, or the Sainted Dead: — The Heavenly Home: — The Heavenly Recognition: — Future Life (3 vols.). Besides these, he wrote The Golden Censer, a collection of “hymns and chants” for Sabbath schools: — A Child's Catechism: — The Glory of Woman: a volume of Poems: — — Union with the Church: — Youth in Earnest Life of Th. D. Fischer: — and a Life of Michael Schlatter, one of the founders of the German Reformed Church in America in the last century. His most important work is the one on The Fathers of the German Reformed Church in America (2 vols.). At the time of his death he was editor of the Mercersburg Review, and also a regular contributor to the columns of the Reformed Church Messenger, which latter relation he sustained during the last six years. He was likewise the originator of the Guardian, and its editor for seventeen years, to the close of 1866, during four of which it was published under the direction of the Board of Publication of the German Reformed Church. In addition to this, he furnished the reading matter for the several almanacs published by this board, and edited the Child's Treasury for the first year and a half after it came under the direct control of the Church Board. Dr. Harbaugh also  contributed a number of biographical articles to this Cyclopedia. While, for the works thus far mentioned, he used the English language, he is also the author of several excellent poems in the German-Pennsylvanian dialect. In fact, the poems of Harbaugh belong among the best that have ever been written in this dialect. In his theological views Harbaugh was one of the foremost representatives of the school which emphasizes the efficiency of the sacraments, and the priestly character of the ministry. In the Order of Worship of the German Reformed Church, which was published in 1866, the burial service was from the pen of Harbaugh. (A. J. S.)

## Harbona[[@Headword:Harbona]]

             (Heb. Charbona', חִרְבוֹנָא, prob. Pers. for ass-driver; Sept. Ο᾿αρεβωά v.r. Θαρρά), one of the seven eunuchs of king Ahasuerus or Xerxes, commanded by him to exhibit the beauty of Vashti (Est 1:10). He was probably the same with the one called HARBONAH (Heb. Charbonah, חִרְבוֹנָה, id.; Sept. changes to Βουγαθάν), who suggested to the king the idea of hanging Haman on his own gallows (chap. 7:9). B.C. 483473.

## Harbonah[[@Headword:Harbonah]]

             (Est 7:9). SEE HARBONA.

## Harcourt, Agnes d[[@Headword:Harcourt, Agnes d]]

             a French nun, sister of Robert, became abbess of Longchamps, and died in 1291.

## Harcourt, Guy d[[@Headword:Harcourt, Guy d]]

             a French prelate, brother of Robert, became bishop of Lisieux in 1303.

## Harcourt, Louis d[[@Headword:Harcourt, Louis d]]

             a French prelate, became archbishop of Narbonne in 1452, and died December 14, 1479. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Harcourt, Philippe d[[@Headword:Harcourt, Philippe d]]

             a French prelate and statesman, was originally archdeacon of Bayeux, became bishop of that see in 1142, and died in the abbey of Le Bee about 1160. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Harcourt, Robert d[[@Headword:Harcourt, Robert d]]

             a French prelate and diplomat, became bishop of Coutances in 1291.

## Hardenberg, Albrecht[[@Headword:Hardenberg, Albrecht]]

             an eminent divine, was born at Hardenberg, in Overyssel, 1510. While studying theology at Louvain, he imbibed the reformed theology, and became a friend and follower of Melancthon, who sent him to Cologne. The disturbances there drove him to Oldenburg, where, and in Knyphausen, he labored until his death in 1574. He is noted in Church History for his attempt, in 1556, to introduce into the re-public of Bremen Calvin's doctrine respecting the Lord's Supper. For the controversy to which this gave rise, see Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, s.v.; also Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. 16:sec. 3:pt. 2, ch. 2; Planck, Hist. Prot. Theol. vol. 5.

## Hardenberg, Jacobus Rutsen, D.D[[@Headword:Hardenberg, Jacobus Rutsen, D.D]]

             an eminent minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Rosendale, N. Y., in 1737. His early opportunities of education were limited, but by persevering industry he became a very creditable scholar.  He was ordained by the “Coetus” in 1757, and in the long strife between that party and the “Conferenties” in the Dutch ,Church, he sided with the former. His talents and reputation gave him great influence in the final settlement of these disputes. In 1758 he became pastor of the church at Raritan, N. J. Queen's College (now Rutgers') obtained its charter in 1770. It languished during the Revolution, but was resuscitated, with Dr. Hardenberg at its head as president, in 1786. He died Oct. 80, 1790. — Sprague, Annals, 9:28. SEE REFORMED (DUTCH) CHURCH.

## Hardenbergh, James B., D.D[[@Headword:Hardenbergh, James B., D.D]]

             an eminent Reformed (Dutch) minister, was born at Rochester, N.Y., June 28, 1800. Early converted and consecrated to the ministry, he graduated from Union College in 1821, and from the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick in 1824. His first settlement was at Helderberg and Princeton, N.Y. (1824-25). He was then called to succeed Dr. Isaac Ferris, in the First Church, New Brunswick, N.J., where he remained four years (1825-29).  From thence he went to Orchard Street, New York city, for a single year, when he succeeded Dr. Bethune at Rhinebeck (1830-36), and followed him again in the First Church of Philadelphia (Crown Street), where he 'labored successfully until 1840, and then accepted the charge of the Franklin Street, or North-west Reformed Dutch Church, in New York.

Here he remained sixteen years, a healer of old dissensions, and a leader of the people to new and long prosperity. Meantime by his exertions the church edifice in Franklin Street was sold, and a new one erected in Twenty-third Street. In 1856 he resigned his pastorate to seek rest and recuperation for wasted health and strength. After a year in Europe, and two winters in the South, he preached in Savannah and Macon, Georgia. Upon his return from a second visit abroad, he devoted his ample means and willing services to the founding of a city mission on the corner of Madison and Gouverneur streets, New York city. He died January 24, 1870. Dr. Hardenbergh was a man of majestic frame, countenance, and bearing, handsome beyond most men, dignified, graceful, and cultivated. His preaching was earnest, evangelical, simple, direct, scriptural, and practical. "His fervor was intense. At communion seasons his face was radiant with emotion, and his tones thrilling with tenderness. He was loyal to the Church of his fathers, active in her benevolent boards, and held high rank among the first men of his period." He was a trustee of Rutgers College from 1825 till his death, and was president of the General Synod in 1842. See Memorial Sermon, by A.R. Thompson, D.D. (W.J.R.T.)

## Hardin, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Hardin, Robert, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Greene County, Tennessee, January 3, 1789. He was educated in Greenville College, and studied theology privately; was licensed by Union Presbytery, ordained by French Broad Presbytery in 1814, and became pastor of the Westminster and St. Paul churches. He died in Lewisburg, September 4, 1867. Dr. Hardin was considered by his brethren as a man of great moral worth and deep piety, and theological attainments far above the average. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, page 333.

## Harding, Nehemiah Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Harding, Nehemiah Henry, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Brunswick, Maine, in October 1794. He graduated from the University of North Carolina in 1825; spent two years in Princeton Theological Seminary; was ordained by the Presbytery  of Orange, April 18,1829; became stated supply for Milton, N.C., Bethany and Red House, and died at the former place, February 17, 1849. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 58.

## Harding, Stephen[[@Headword:Harding, Stephen]]

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

## Harding, Thomas, Jesuit[[@Headword:Harding, Thomas, Jesuit]]

             was born at Comb-Martin, in Devonshire, in 1512, and was educated at Barnstaple and Winchester, whence he was removed to New College, Oxford, of which he became fellow in 1536. In 1542 he was chosen Hebrew professor of the university by Henry VIII; but no sooner had Edward VI ascended the throne, than Harding became a zealous Protestant. He seemed, indeed, merely to be restrained by prudence from proceeding to great extremes. In the country zealous Protestants were edified by his instructions. At Oxford, he himself received instruction from Peter Martyr. From St. Mary's pulpit he derided the “Tridentine fathers as illiterate, paltry papists, and inveighed against Romish peculiarities.” On the accession of queen Mary he became again a papist, and was made chaplain and confessor to Gardiner, bishop of Winchester. In 1555 he was made treasurer of the cathedral of Salisbury. “When Elizabeth came to the crown he could not muster face for a new recantation and being deprived of his preferment, fled to Louvain, and became, says Wood, “the target of Popery” in a warm controversy with bishop Jewel, against whom, between 1554 and 1567, he wrote seven pieces.” He died in 1572. See Life of  Jewel; Zurich Letters; Burnet, Reformation, 1, 271; Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, vol. 1; Dodd, Church Hist.; Prince, Worthies of Devon; Chalmers, General Biog. Dict.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. vol. 5.

## Hardouim, Saint[[@Headword:Hardouim, Saint]]

             SEE CHADENUS.

## Hardouin (Hardinus), Jean[[@Headword:Hardouin (Hardinus), Jean]]

             a Jesuit, one of the most learned, but most eccentric members of his order was born A.D. 1646, at Quimper, in Brittany. His paradoxes on ancient history are well known, and had their origin chiefly in the vanity which prompted him to obtain celebrity at any cost. He endeavored to prove that the AEneid ascribed to Virgil, and the odes attributed to Horace, were really composed by some monks during the Middle Ages! He edited an edition of the Councils to the year 1714 (12 vols. fol.), which is much esteemed. SEE CONCILIA. This may appear singular, considering that Hardouin looked upon all councils preceding that of Trent as supposititious. Father Brun, of the Oratory, knowing the opinions of the Jesuit on that point, asked him one day, “How did it happen that you published an edition of the Councils?” Hardouin answered, “Only God and I know that.” He died at the College of St. Louis, Paris, and Sept. 3, 1729. His most noted work is his Chronologiae ex Nummis Antiquis restitutce Prolusio de Nummis Herodiadum (Paris, 1693, 4to), in which he labors to show that, with few exceptions, the writings ascribed to the ancients are wholly spurious. He wrote also Chronologia Vet. Testamenti (Paris, 1697, 4to): — Commentarius in Nov. Test. (Amst. 1741, fol.): — De situ Paradisi Terrestris Disquisitio (in his edit. of Pliny): — Plinii Historia Naturalis (in the Delphin classics): — Opera selecta (1709, fol.). His Opera Omnia (Amsterdam, 1733, fol.) contains some curious pieces, among which are his Pseudo-Virgilius, Pseudo-Horatius, and especially his Athei detecti, against Jansenius, Arnauld, Nicole, Pascal, Quesnel, Des Cartes, etc. A posthumous work of his, Prolegomena ad Censuram Scriptorum Veterum (1766, 8vo), contains his full theory of the production of the classics by the monks of the Middle Ages. See P. Oudin, Eloges de quelques auteurs frangais; Moreri, Grand Dict. histor.; Dupin, Bibl. des auteurs eccles. 19:109; Journ. des Savants, June, 1726, p. 226; March, 1727, p. 328; January-April, 1728, p. 579; La Croze, Dissert. hist. sur divers sujets, p. 231; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 357.

## Hardt, Anton Julius Von Der[[@Headword:Hardt, Anton Julius Von Der]]

             a German theologian and Orientalist, was born at Brunswick, November 13, 1707. He was professor of theology and: Oriental languages at Helmstadt, and died June 27, 1785, leaving, Epistola Rabbinica de Quibusdam Priscorum Ebraeorum Rectoribus Magnificis (Helmstadt, 1727): — Diss. de Zereda, Gemino in Palestina et Peraea Appido (ibid. 1728): — De Sarepta (eod.): — De Judaeorum Statuto Scripturae Sensum Inflectendi (eod.): — Commentatio in Frontem Libri Moralis Mischnici Pirnke Aboth (eod.): — De Jubilceo Iosis Leviticus 15 (eod.): — De Sophismatibius Judaeorum in Probandis suis Constitutionibus (1729): — Rabbi Isaaci Aramae Diss. Rabbinica de Usu Lingum, cum Versione Latina (eod.): — Commentatio de Medrasch Symbolica Veternum Judaeorum Inteparetandi Ratione (eod.): — De Proverbio Judaeorum de Camelis (eod.): — De Diversa Nominum Dei Jehovah et Elohim Lectione ac Scriptione (1748): — Grammatica Hebraica (1775): — De Christo Rege, ex Stirpe Davidis Oriundo (1766): — Pentecoste Judaeorum (1785). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1: 362; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hardt, Hermann von Der[[@Headword:Hardt, Hermann von Der]]

             SEE HERMANN.

## Hardtschmidt, Johann Nicolaus[[@Headword:Hardtschmidt, Johann Nicolaus]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Strasburg, where he died in 1706, doctor and professor is the author of, De ἀυτοχειρίῳ Simsonis Licita ad Judic. 16:30: — De Jure Dei in Homines: — De Haemorrhoidibus ad 1Sa 6:5 : — De Justificatione ex Fide non ex Legqe, ad Gal 3:11-12 : —De Perfectione Fidelium ad Php 4:13 : — De Religione Ecclesiastica ad 1Th 5:21 : — De Seculo Aureo ad Apocalypsis, 20:5, 6: — De Duratione Angelorum: — De Peccatis Electorum in Judicio Extremo non Publicandis: — De Mundi Eternitate: Theses Theologicae Adversus Errores Quosdam Pietisticos. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hardwick, Charles[[@Headword:Hardwick, Charles]]

             a minister of the Church of England, was born at Slingsby, Yorkshire, September 22, 1821. At fifteen years of age he became pupil assistant teacher in Thornton Grammar-school, and in 1838 he was made assistant tutor in the academy at Malton. In 1840 he entered the University of Cambridge (Catharine's Hall), graduating in 1844 as first senior optime. In 1845 he obtained a fellowship in Catharine's Hall; in 1851 he was appointed Cambridge preacher at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall; and in 1853, professor of divinity in Queen's College, Birmingham, which office he held only for a few months. In 1855 he was made lecturer in divinity in King's College, Cambridge, and “Christian Advocate.” In fulfilling the latter office, he prepared a work (incomplete, but yet of great value to the new science of Comparative Theology), under the title Christ and other Masters; an Historical Inquiry into some of the chief Parallelisms and Contrasts between Christianity and the Religious Systems of the Ancient World (London and Cambridge, 2nd edit. 1853, 2 vols. fop. 8vo).

During a summer tour he was killed by a fall in the Pyrenees, Aug. 18, 1859. His literary activity was very great, and it was accompanied by thorough scholarship and accuracy. Besides editing a number of works for the University press and for the Percy Society, he published the following, which are likely to-hold a durable place in theological literature, viz., A History of the Thirty-nine Articles (Cambridge, 1851; 2nd ed. revised. 1859: reprinted in Philadelphia, 12mo): — Twenty Sermons of Town Congregations (1853, cr. 8vo): — A History of the Christian Church, Middle Age (Cambridge, 1853, fcp. 8vo): — A History of the Christian Church during the Reformation (Cambridge, 1856, fop. 8vo). — Sketch prefixed to second edition of Christ and other Masters (1863).

## Hardy, Nathaniel, D.D[[@Headword:Hardy, Nathaniel, D.D]]

             an English divine, was born in London in 1618; was educated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, and became rector of St. Dionis Back, London. He was a decided Royalist, and yet remained a popular preacher during the Commonwealth. In 1660 he became archdeacon of Lewes and dean of Rochester. He died in 1670. His publications are, The first Epistle of John unfolded and applied (Lond. 1656, 4to): — Sermons on solemn Occasions (London, 168, 4to): — Sermon on the Fire of London (Lond. 1666 4to). — Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, 1, 1394. Hardy, Robert Spence, an  English Methodist missionary, was born at Preston, Lancashire, July 1,1803, and was trained in the house of his grandfather, a printer and bookseller in York. In 1825 he was admitted to the British Conference, and appointed missionary to Ceylon, in which field he labored with great zeal for twenty-three years. In 1862 he was appointed superintendent of the South Ceylon Mission. To the ordinary labors of a missionary Mr. Hardy added an amount of literary activity sufficient to have occupied the whole life of an ordinary man. It is not too much to say that he and his colleague Gogerly (q.v.) have thrown more light upon the Buddhism of Ceylon, and upon Pall literature, than all other English writers. His culture, in the course of his studies, became very wide; he read Latin, Greek, Hebrew, French, Portuguese and Singhalese; and his acquaintance with the Pali and Sanskrit was not only large, but accurate. Towards the end of his life he returned to England, and served as minister on several important circuits. He died at Headingley, Yorkshire, April 16,1868. At the time of his mortal seizure he was engaged upon a work entitled Christianity and Buddhism compared. His most important publications are Eastern Monachism, an Account of the Origin, Laws, Discipline, Sacred Writings, etc. of the Order of Milendicants founded by Gotama Buddha (London, 1850, 8vo): — A Manual of Buddhism in its Modern Development, translated from Singhalese MSS. (Lond. 1853, 8vo): — The Legends and Theories of the Buddhists compared with History and Science (1867, cr. 8vo). — Wesleyan Minutes, 1868, p. 25.

## Hardy, Samuel[[@Headword:Hardy, Samuel]]

             an English divine, was born in 1720, and educated at Emanuel College, Cambridge, where he became fellow. He was for many years rector of Blakenham, Suffolk, and died in 1793. He published Nature and Ends of the Eucharist (London, 1784, 8vo): — Principal Prophecie of the O. and N. Test. compared and explained (London, 1770, 8vo): — Novum Test. Graecum cum scholiis theologicis, etc. (3rd ed. Lond. 1820, 2 vols. 8vo), the annotations in which are chiefly taken from Poole's Synopsis. — Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, 1, 1395.

## Hare[[@Headword:Hare]]

             (אִרְנֶבֶת, arne'beth'; according to Bochart [Hieroz. i, 994], from אָרָה, to crop, and נַיב fruit; Arab. arneb and Syr. arnebo, a hare; Sept. χοιρογρύλλιος and δασύπους, Vulg. lepus and cheerogryllus, both  versions interchanging it with “coney”) occurs in Lev 11:6, and Deu 14:7, and in both instances it is prohibited from being used as food because it chews the cud, although it has not the hoof divided. But the hare belongs to an order of mammals totally distinct from the ruminantia, which are all, without exception, bisulca, the camel's hoof alone offering a partial modification (Ehrenberg, Mammalia, pt. 2). The stomach of rodents is single, and the motion of the mouth, excepting when they masticate some small portion of food reserved in the hollow of the cheek, is more that of the lips, when in a state of repose the animals are engaged in working the incisor teeth upon each other. This practice is a necessary condition of existence, for the e friction keeps them fit for the purpose of nibbling, and prevents their growing beyond a proper length. As hares do not subsist on hard substances, like most of the genera of the order, but on tender shoots and grasses, they have more cause, and therefore a more constant craving, to abrade their teeth; and this they do in a. manner which, combined with the slight trituration of the occasional contents of the cheeks, even modern writers, not zoologists, have mistaken for real rumination.

Physiological investigation having fully determines these questions, it follows that, both with regard to theshaphan (“coney”) and the hare, we should understand the original in the above passages, rendered “chewing the cud,” as merely implying a second mastication, more or less complete, and not necessarily that. faculty of true ruminants which derives its name from a power to draw up aliment after deglutition, when worked into a ball, from the first stomach into the: mouth, and there to submit it to a second grinding process. The act of “chewing the cud” and “rechewing” ‘being considered identical by the Hebrews, the sacred. lawgiver, not being occupied with the doctrines of science, no doubt used the expression in the sense in which it was then understood (compare Michaelis, Anmerk. adloc.). It may be added that a similar opinion, and consequent rejection of the hare as food, pervaded many nations of antiquity, who derived their origin, or their doctrines, from a Shemitic source; and that, among others, it existed among the British Celtae, probably even before they had any intercourse with Phoenician merchants. Thus the Turks and Armenians abstain. from its flesh (Tavernier, Travels, 3, 154), also the Arabians  (Russell's Aleppo, 2, 20), and even the Greeks and Romans avoided it (Hermann, ad Lucian. conscrib. hist. p. 135; P. Castellan. De carnis esu, 3, 5, in Gronov. Thesaur. 9) on sanitary grounds (Aristotle, Hist. Anim. 4:5; Pliny, H. N. 28, 79); but the Bedawin, who have a peculiar mode of dressing it, are fond of its flesh.

There are two distinct species of hare in Syria: one, Lepus Syriacus, or Syrian hare, nearly equal in size to the common European, having the fur ochry buff; and Lepus Sinaiticus, or hare of the desert, smaller and brownish. They reside in the localities indicated by their trivial names, and are distinguished from the common hare by a greater length of ears, and a black tail with white fringe. There is found in Egypt, and higher up the Nile, a third species, represented in the outline paintings on ancient monuments, but not colored with that delicacy of tint required for distinguishing it from the others, excepting that it appears to be marked with the black speckles which characterize the existing species. The ancient Egyptians coursed it with greyhounds as we do, and sometimes captured it alive and kept it in cages. “Hares are so plentiful in the environs of Aleppo,” says Dr. Russell (2, 158), “that it was no uncommon thing to see the gentlemen who went out a sporting twice a week return with four or five brace hung in triumph at the girths of the servants horses.” Hares are hunted in Syria with greyhound and falcon.

## Hare, Augustus William[[@Headword:Hare, Augustus William]]

             (brother of Julius Charles, see below), was born in 1794, graduated at Oxford, became fellow of New College, and in 1829 rector of Alton Barnes, Wiltshire. In conjunction with his brother, he wrote Guesses at Truth (3rd ed. Lond. 1847, 2 vols. 18mo). He also published Sermons to a Country Congregation (London, 4th ed. 1839, 7th ed. 1851; New York, 1839, 8vo), which are models of clear and practical discourse from the pulpit. He died in 1834 at Rome.

## Hare, Edward[[@Headword:Hare, Edward]]

             an English Methodist minister, was born at Mull Sept. 19, 1774, and received his early education under Mihier, author of the Church History. Having a turn for the sea, he became a sailor, and in 1793, while a ship- boy, was converted, and began to hold religious services among the sailors.  During the French war he was twice taken prisoner; and after his second liberation, in 1796, he abandoned the sea. He was admitted into the itinerant ministry of the Wesleyan Church in 1798, and for twenty years was an acceptable and faithful minister of the Gospel. His last station was Leeds. He died of consumption at Exeter in the spring of 1818. Hare was a clear and forcible writer, and produced several valuable apologetical and controversial works on Methodist doctrine. Perhaps the most important of these are A Treatise on the Scriptural Doctrine of Justification (2nd ed., with Preface by T. Jackson, London, 1839, 12mo; also reprinted in New York, 12mo). See also Sermons published from his Manuscripts, with a Memoir of Hare by Joseph Benson (London, 1821). Wesleyan Minutes, 1818; Life of Dr. Jabez Bunting, ch. 14.

## Hare, Francis[[@Headword:Hare, Francis]]

             bishop of Chichester, was born London about 1665. He studied at Eton and at King's College, Cambridge; and, having been employed as tutor to lord Blandford, son of the duke of Marlborough, the latter caused him to be appointed general chaplain of the army. In consequence of services rendered to the Whig party, he was successively made dean of Worcester in 1708, of St. Paul's in 1726, bishop of St. Asaph in 1731, and transferred in the same year to the see of Chichester. He died in 1740. He wrote a work on The Difficulties and Discouragements attending the Study of the Scriptures in the Way of private Judgment: which was condemned for its tendency to skepticism.

He is chiefly famous for his Book of Psalms, in the Hebrew, put into the original poetical Meter (Psalmorau Liber in Versiculos metriae Divisus, Lond. 1736, 8vo), an attempt, now deemed hopeless, to reduce Hebrew poetry to meter, in which he was defended by Dr. Edwards, and assailed by Dr. Lowth. His Works were published in 4 vols. 8vo (Lond. 1746), containing, besides the writings above named, a number of Sermons. See Chalmers, General Biog. Dict.; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 785.

## Hare, Julius Charles[[@Headword:Hare, Julius Charles]]

             one of the brightest ornaments of the Church of England in the present century, was born Sept. 13, 1795, at Hurstmonceux, Sussex, his father being lord of the manor. After a brilliant preparation at the Charter House, he went to Cambridge in 1812, where he graduated B.A. 1816, M.A. 1819, and became fellow of Trinity. He was instituted to the rectory of  Hurstmonceux (the advowson of which was in his own family) in 1832; was collated to a prebend at Chichester in 1851; was appointed archdeacon of Lewes by bishop Otter in 1840; and nominated one of her majesty's chaplains in 1853. He died at the rectory, Jan. 23, 1855.

In 1827 he published the first edition of Guesses at Truth, but his name was first distinguished in the literary world as one of the translators of Niebuhr's History of ‘Rome, in conjunction with Mr. Connop Thirlwall, the present bishop of St. David's. Their version was made from the second German edition, which materially differed from the first, and it was first published in the year 1828. It extends to the first and second volumes only of the standard English edition; the third and fourth were translated by Dr. William Smith and Dr. Leonard Schmitz. In 1829 Mr. Hare published, at Cambridge, A Vindication of Niebuhr's History of Rome from the Charges of the Quarterly Review. Archdeacon Hare's published works extend over a period of nearly thirty years. The most important of them. are, The Children of Light: a Sermon for Advent (Cambridge, 1828, 8vo): — Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge (Feb. 1839): — The Victory of Faith, and other Sermons (Cambridge, 1840, 8vo): — The Better Prospects of the Church: a Charge (1840): — Sermons preached at Hurstmonceux Church (1841, 8vo; 2nd vol. 1849): — The Unity of the Church: a Sermon preached before the Chichester Diocesan Association (1845, 8vo): — The Mission of the Comforter, and other Sermons, with Notes (1846, 2 vols. 8vo; Amer. edit. Boston, 1854, 12mo): — The Means of Unity: a Charge, with Notes, especially on the Institution of. the Anglican Bishopric at Jerusalem (1847, 8vo):A Letter on the Agitation excited by the Appointment of Dr. Hanpden to the See of Hereford (1848, 8vo): — Life and Writings of John Sterling (1848, 2 vols. 12mo):Guesses at Truth, by two Brothers (3rd edit. 1848, 2 vols. 18mo): — The Contest with Rome, especially in reply to Dr. Newman (Lond. 1852, 8vo): — — Vindication of Luther (Lond. 1854, 8vo). — This last is a book of vigorous controversy, and refutes, both on critical and moral grounds, the charges brought against the memory of Luther by Hallam, Newman, Ward, and Sir William Hamilton. These writers are handled by Hare with great, but not unjust severity. There are two admirable articles on Hare, giving a candid and judicious criticism of his career as philosopher, controversialist, and theologian, in heI Methodist Quarterly Review, April and July, 1856; produced by the author, Rev. J. H. Rigg, in his Modern Anglican Theology (London, 1858, 12mo). See also Gentleman's Magazine, April, 1855;  Quarterly Review (London), July, 1855; Blackwood's Magazine, 43, 287; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 785.

## Hareeus, Franz[[@Headword:Hareeus, Franz]]

             a learned Dutch Catholic divine, was born at Utrecht in 1550, and educated in the academy there, after which he. travelled through Germany, Italy, and. Russia. He was made canon of Bois-le-Duc, then of Namur and Louvain. He died at the latter place, January 12, 1632. His principal works are, Biblia Sacra Expositionibus Priscorum Patrum Litteralibus et Mysticis Illusirata (1630): — Catena Aurea in IV Evangelia (1625): — Vitae Sanctorum.

## Harel[[@Headword:Harel]]

             (Heb. with the art. ha-Harel', הִהִרְאֵל, the mount of God; Sept. τὸ ἀριήλ, Vulg. Ariel, Engl. Vers. “the altar,”marg. “Harel”), a figurative name for the altar of burnt-offering (Eze 43:15, first clause), called (in the last clause and in Eze 43:16) ARIEL (Engl.Version also “altar”). “Junius explains it of the Fiaxdpa or hearth of the altar of burnt-offering, covered by the network on which the sacrifices were placed over the burning wood. This explanation Gesenius adopts, and brings forward as a parallel the Arab. ireh, ‘a hearth or fireplace,' akin to the Heb. אוּר, sr, ‘light, flame.' Furst (Handw. s.v.) derives it from-an unused root הָרָא, hard, ‘to glow, burn,' with the termination el; but the only authority for the root is its presumed existence in the word Harel. Ewald (Die Propheten des A. B. 2, 373) identifies Harel and Ariel, and refers them both to a root אָרָה, ar ah, akin to אוּר, ir”

## Harem[[@Headword:Harem]]

             SEE HOUSE; SEE POLYGAMY.

## Haren, Jean de[[@Headword:Haren, Jean de]]

             a Belgian theologian, was born at Valenciennes about 1540. While yet a youth he went to Geneva, where he was well received by Calvin. He was present at the deathbed of the reformer (1564), and was for eighteen years a Protestant minister in several cities. He finally joined the Roman Catholic Church at Antwerp, March 3, 1586, and preached at Venloo, Cologne, Aix-la-Chapelle, Nancy, etc. He returned to Calvinism in 1610, and died about 1620. He wrote Brief Discours des causes justes et equitables gui ont meues AM. Jean Haren, jadis ninistre, de quitter sla religion preftendue reformee, pour se ranger au giron de l'Eglise catholique, etc. (Anvers, 1587,12mo): — thirteen Catechlses contre Calvin et les calvinistes (Nancy, 1599, 12mo): — Profession catholique de Jean Haren (Nancy, 1599, 12mo): — Epitre et Demande Chretienne de Jean Haren a Ambroise Wille, ministre des estrangers walons retirez en la ville d'Aix- la-Chapelle (Nancy, 1599, 12mo). See Calmet, Bibl. de Lorraine, p. 479; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23:380.

## Harenberg, Johann Christoph[[@Headword:Harenberg, Johann Christoph]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born April 24, 1696, studied at Helmstadt, and was rector at Gandersheim in 1720. In 1735 he was pastor, and accepted a call in 1745 as professor of history and antiquities to Brunswick, where he died, November 12, 1774. He wrote, Kurze Einleituuig in die AEthiopische, sonderlich Halbessinische alte und neue Theologie (Helmstadt, 1719): — De Specularibus Veteslim, ad Locunm 1Co 13:12 (ibid. eod.): — Veri Divinique Natales Circumcisionis Judaicae, Tenmpli Salomonei, Musices Davidicae in Sacris, et Baptismi Christianorum (1720): — Jura Israelitatrum in Palaestinams (Hildesheim, 1724): — De Articulis Suobacensibus, Fundamento Augustanae Confessionis (Brunswick, 1730): — Historia Ecclesiae Gundersheimensis Cathedralis et Collegiatae Diplomatica (Hanover, 1734): — Otia Gunderusheimensis, Exponendis Sacris Litteris et Historia Ecclesiastiae Dicata, Complexa XIII Observationes (Utrecht, 1740): — Zwei Religionisspotter, Celsus und Edelmann (Leipsic, 1748): — Amos Propheta, Expositus Inteupretatione Nova Latina (Leyden, 1763): — Auflarung des Buches Daniel (1773, 2 volumes). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:21, 221, 226, 594, 722, 798; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hareph[[@Headword:Hareph]]

             (Heb. Chareph', חָרֵ, plucking off; Sept. Α᾿ρεί v. r. Α᾿ρίμ), the “father”of Beth-Gader, and “son”of Caleb of Judah by one of his legitimate wives (1Ch 2:51). B.C. cir. 1612. The patronymic Haruphite”(q.v.) seems to connect this with HARIPH.

## Hareseth[[@Headword:Hareseth]]

             SEE KIR-HARESETH.

## Haresh[[@Headword:Haresh]]

             SEE KIR-HARESH.

## Haresha[[@Headword:Haresha]]

             SEE TEL-HARESHA.

## Hareth[[@Headword:Hareth]]

             (Heb. Che'reth, חֶרֶת, the form חָרֶת, Cha'reth, is on account of the pause-accent; prob. i.q. חֹרֶשׁa thicket: Sept. Χαρής v.r. [ἐν] πόλει [apparently reading עַיר; so Josephus, Ant. 6:12, 4],Vulg. Haret), a wood (יִעִר) in the mountains of Judah, where David hid himself from Saul, at the instance of the prophet Gad (1Sa 31:5); probably situated among the hills west of Socho. SEE FOREST.

## Hareth (2)[[@Headword:Hareth (2)]]

             Lieut. Conder argues at length (Quar. Statement of the "Pal. Explor. Fund," January 1875, page 42 sq.) against the existence of any forest in  this vicinity, and therefore prefers the reading עַיר(city) to יִעִר(wood); but his reasoning is based upon a misconception (corrected in his Tent Work, 2:88) of the latter word, which usually does not imply timber, but simply a copse or low brushwood. He finds the locality in question in the "small modern village of Kharas, in the hills on the north side of Wady Arneba, one of the heads of the valle of Elah (Wady es-Sunt); an ancient site, with: the usual indications-wells, cisterns, and rough caves in the hill- sides." It is laid down on the Ordnance Map seven and a half miles east of Beit-Jibrin, and two miles east of Khurbet Kila (Keilah). This identification is concurred in by Tristram (Bible Places, pge 43) and Trelawney Saunders (Mcap of the O.T.).

## Harhaiah[[@Headword:Harhaiah]]

             (Heb. Charhayah', חִרְהֲיָה, zeal of Jehovah; Sept. Α᾿ραχίας), the father of Uzziel “of the goldsmiths,” which latter repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem after the Captivity (Neh 3:8). B.C. ante 446.

## Harhas[[@Headword:Harhas]]

             (2Ki 22:14). SEE HASRAH.

## Harhur[[@Headword:Harhur]]

             (Heb. Charchur', חִרְחֻר,fever, as in Deu 28:22; Sept. Α᾿ρούρ), one of the Nethinim whose posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:51; Neh 7:53). B.C. 536.

## Harid[[@Headword:Harid]]

             SEE HADID.

## Harigara[[@Headword:Harigara]]

             a word which, when pronounced along with Siva and Rama, is believed- by the Hindus to bring down numberless blessings upon him who utters it. The moment these three sacred words escape from the lips, all sins are cancelled, but if they are thrice repeated, the gods are so honored that they are at a loss to find a recompense equal to the merit. Such privileged persons are no longer obliged to pass into other bodies, but are straightway absorbed in Brahm.

## Harim[[@Headword:Harim]]

             (Heb. Charim', חָרַם, for חָרַים, i. q. חָרוּם) flat-nosed; Sept. ᾿Ηράμ, but with many v.r. especially Χαρήμ in 1Ch 24:8, ᾿Ηρίμ in Ezr 2:39, Ι᾿ραμ in Neh 10:5, and ‘Api in Neh 12:15), the names of several men, mostly about the time of the Captivity..

1. The head of the second “course” of priests as arranged by David (1Ch 24:8). B.C. 1014.

2. Apparently an Israelite, whose descendants, to the number of 320 males, or 1017 in all, returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:32; Ezr 2:39; Neh 7:35; Neh 7:42. But as among these some are enumerated (Ezr 10:21), as priests in the corresponding lists of those who renounced their Gentile wives, and others (Ezr 10:31) as; ordinary Israelites, it may be doubted whether Harim was not rather a place whose inhabitants are here spoken of, like others in the same list. Accordingly,. Schwarz identifies it with a village Charism, situated, according to him, on a bay of the sea eight Eng. miles northeast of Jaffa (Palest. p. 142). He probably means el- Haran-Ali-Ibn-Aleim (Robinson, Researches, 3, 46),. but his explanation of the compound name is not at all. satisfactory. A better supposition, perhaps, is that Harim in these latter passages stands patronymically as a. representation of the family, q.d. Bene-Harim. SEE ELAM.

3. The father of Malchijah, which latter repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 3:11). B.C. ante: 446. Perhaps identical with No. 2.

4. One of the priests that returned from Babylon. with Zerubbabel (Neh 12:3, where the name is given' as REHUMI; but compare Neh 12:15, where his son Adna is named). B.C. 536. Perhaps the same as No. 3.

5. One of those named first among the signers of the. sacred covenant of Nehemiah (Neh 10:5). B.C. cir.. 410. Perhaps 1. q. No. 3.

6. Another, a chief of the people, in the same list. (Neh 10:27). B.C. cir. 410. Perhaps to be explained like No. 2.

## Harington, Edward Charles[[@Headword:Harington, Edward Charles]]

             an Anglican clergyman, was born about 1807; graduated from Worcester College, Oxford, in 1827; was appointed chancellor in 1847, in 1857 resident canon of Exeter Cathedral, and died July 18, 1881. He wrote numerous works on Church history and polity, for which see Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Harioli[[@Headword:Harioli]]

             were magicians who are mentioned by ancient writers as waiting on the altars of the heathen to receive their inspiration from the fumes of the sacrifices. Harishandis, a sect composed of doms or sweepers in the western province of Hindustan, the members of which are very scarce, or, perhaps, entirely extinct.

## Hariph[[@Headword:Hariph]]

             (Heb. Chariph', חָרַי, autumal rain;Sept. Α᾿ρείμ, Α᾿ρίφ), the name apparently of two men.

1. An Israelite whose descendants (or possibly a place: whose inhabitants), to the number of 112, returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh 7:24). In Ezr 2:18, the name is written in the synonymous form JORAH.. B.C. ante 536. Perhaps identical with the HAREPH of 1Ch 2:51. SEE HARUPHITE.

2. One of the chief of the people who subscribed the covenant of fidelity to Jehovah with Nehemiah (Neh 10:19). B.C. cir. 410. Perhaps the name is here only a patronymic contraction for Ben-Hariph. SEE HARIM.

## Harlay-Chanvallon, Francis de[[@Headword:Harlay-Chanvallon, Francis de]]

             archbishop of Rouen and afterwards of Paris, was born in the latter city Aug. 14, 1625. He studied at the College of Navarre, and was immediately appointed abbot of Jumieges by his uncle, the archbishop of Rouen, whom he succeeded in office, Dec. 28, 1651. The looseness of his, morals ill fitted him for such a position; yet, connecting himself with cardinal Mazarin, he managed to indulge his evil propensities without losing his credit. He represented the clergy at the coronation of Louis XIV in, 1654, and is said to have officiated at the marriage of this king with madame de Maintenon. His name, his fortune, and the flatteries he showered upon the king caused him to be made archbishop of Paris Jan. 3,1671, and he received numerous other marks of the royal Ia-vor. He died at Conflans, where he possessed a fine estate, Aug. 6, 1695. A ready eloquence was joined in him to great ambition, the utmost want of principles, and great intolerance. At Dieppe, where he was master as temporal lord, he obliged the Protestants to come to the cathedral and listen to the sermons he delivered. as spiritual lord. He was one of the prime movers of the revocation of the edict of Nantes. Although a: member of the French Academy, and very fond of making speeches, none of his discourses were published. He published, however, the Synodicon Parisiense, an account of all the synods held by his predecessors. See Legendre, Vie de Harlay (Par. 1720, 4to); Sevignd, Lettres (1818), 10:121, 128); Bausset, Hist. de Fenelon (2nd ed.), 1, 51, 55; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 403.

## Harless, Gottlieb Christoph Adolph[[@Headword:Harless, Gottlieb Christoph Adolph]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Nuremberg, November 21, 1806. He studied philosophy and theology at Erlangen and Halle, and  commenced his academical career at the former place in 1828. In 1836 he was appointed professor and university preacher, in 1838 he took part in starting the Zeitschrifi fur Purotestantismus und Kirche, and in 1842 he published his Christliche Ethik, of which eight editions were printed, and which was also translated into English (Edinbusrgh, 1868). To this period belongs his activity as member of parliament in the Bavarian diet, where he so energetically fought for the cause of Protestantism that the utltramontane minister, Abel, deposed him from his professorship, and in 1845 sent him as member of consistory to Bayreuth. Its the same year, however, he was called to Leipsic, where he labored as professor and preacher at St. Nicholai till 1847, when the king of Saxony appointed him court-preacher and vice-president of the consistory. In 1852 Harless was called to Munich as president of the Protestant superior consistory, and directed the affairs of the Protestant Church its Bavaria for twenty-five years. He died September 5, 1879. Besides his Ethik, he published, De Revelatione et Filde (Erlangen, 1830): — Commentar uber den Brief Pauli an die Epheser (1834; 2d ed. 1858): — Die kritische Bearbeitung des Lebens Jesu von David F. Strauss beleuchtet (1836): — Theologische Encyklopadie und Methodologie (1837): — De Supernaturalismo Gentilium seu de via et Ratione Superstitionem a Religione Recte Distiiguendi (1838): — Lucubrationum Evangelia Canonica Spectantium Pars I et II (1841, 1842): — Die Sonntagsweihe, sermons (2d ed. 1860, 4 volumes): — Kirche und Amt nach lutherischer Lehre (1853): — Die Elhescheidungsfrage (1861): — Das Verhiltniss des Christenthum zu Kulturund Lebensfagen der Gegenwart (1863; 2d ed. 1866): — Jakob Bohme und die Alchimnisten (1870; 2d ed. 1882): — Geschichtsbilder aus der luther. Kirche Livlands (1869): — Stact und Kirche (1870). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:501-503; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v.; Stahlin, G. Chr. A. Hasless, in Zeitschrift fur kirchliche Wissenschaft, 1880, 2 and 3; but especially Harless's own work, Bruchstucke aus dem Leben eines suddeutschen Theologen (Bielefeld,- 1872-75, 2 volumes). (B.P.)

## Harlot, Whore, etc[[@Headword:Harlot, Whore, etc]]

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

1. Properly זוֹנָה(zonah', participle from זָנָה, to play the harlot, Sept. πόρνη,Vulg. meretrix, both these latter terms referring to prostitution for mercenary motives), which occurs frequently, and is often rendered in our version by the first of the above English words, as in Gen 34:31, etc., and sometimes, without apparent reason for the change, by the second, as in Pro 23:27, and elsewhere. In Gen 38:15, the word is זוֹנָה“harlot,” which, however, becomes changed to קְדֵשָׁה, “harlot,” in vers. 21, 22, which means, literally, a consecrated woman, a female (perhaps priestess) devoted to prostitution in honor of some heathen idol. The distinction shows that Judah supposed Tamar to be a heathen: the facts, therefore, do not prove that prostitution was then practiced between Hebrews.

That this condition of persons existed in the earliest states of society is clear from Gen 38:15. From that account it would appear that the “veil” was at that time peculiar to harlots. Judah thought Tamar to be such “because she had covered her face.” Mr. Buckingham remarks, in reference to this passage, that the Turcoman women go unveiled to this day”(Travels in Mesopotanmia, 1, 77). It is contended by Jahn and others that in ancient times all females wore the veil (Bibl. Archceöl. p. 127). Possibly some peculiarity in the size of the veil, or the mode of wearing it, may have been (Pro 7:10) the distinctive dress of the harlot at that period (see New Translation, by the Rev. A. De Sola, etc., p. 116, 248-9). The priests and the high priest were forbidden to take a wife that was (had been, Lev 21:14) a harlot. Josephus extends the law to all the Hebrews, and seems to ground it on the prohibition against oblations arising from prostitution, Deu 23:18 (Ant. 4, 8, 23). The celebrated case of Rahab has been much debated. She is, indeed, called by the word usually signifying harlot (Jos 2:1; Jos 6:17; Sept. πόρνη; Vulg. meretrix; and in Heb 11:31; Jam 2:25); but it has been attempted to show that the word may mean an innkeeper. SEE RAHAB.

If, however, there were such persons, considering what we know of Canaanitish morals (Lev 18:27), we may conclude that they would, if women, have been of this class. The next instance introduces the epithet of “strange woman.” It is the case of Jephthah's mother (Jdg 11:2), who is also called a harlot (πόρνη; meretrix); but the epithet אַשָׁה אִחֶרֶת(achereth), “strange woman,” merely denotes foreign extraction. Josephus says ξένος περὶ τὴνμντέρα, “a stranger by the mother's side.” The masterly description in Pro 7:6, etc. may possibly be that of an abandoned married woman (Pro 7:19-20), or of the solicitations of a courtesan, “fair speech,” under such a pretension. The mixture of religious observances (Pro 7:14) seems illustrated by the fact that “the gods are actually worshipped in many Oriental brothels, and fragments of the offerings distributed among the frequenters”(Dr. A. Clarke's Comment. ad loc.). The representation given by Solomon is no doubt bounded upon facts, and therefore shows that in his time prostitutes plied their trade- in the “streets”(Pro 7:12; Pro 9:14, etc.; Jer 3:2; Eze 16:24-25; Eze 16:31). As regards the fashions involved in the practice, similar outward marks seem to have attended its earliest forms to those which we trace in the classical writers, e.g. a distinctive dress and a seat by the way- side (Gen 38:14; compare Eze 16:16; Eze 16:25; Bar 6:43; Petron. Arb. Sat. 16; Juv. 6:118 foll.; Dougtaei Analect. Sacr. Exc. 24). Public singing in the streets occurs also (Isa 23:16; Sir 9:4). Those who thus published their infamy were of the worst repute; others had houses of resort, and both classes seem to have been known among the Jews (Pro 7:8-12; Pro 23:28; Sir 9:7-8); the two women, 1Ki 3:16, lived as Greek hetaerae sometimes did, in a house together (Smith, Dict. Gr. and Roman Ant. s.v. Hetaera).

The baneful fascination ascribed to them in Pro 7:21-23, may be compared with what Chardin says of similar effects among the young nobility of Persia (Voyages en Perse, 1, 163, ed. 1711), as also may Luk 15:30, for the sums lavished on them (ib. 162). In earlier times the price of a kid is mentioned (Genesis 38), and great wealth doubtless sometimes accrued to them (Eze 16:33; Eze 16:39; Eze 23:26). But lust, as distinct from gain, appears as the inducement in Pro 7:14-15 (see Dougtaei Anal. Sacr. ad loc.), where the victim is further allured by a promised sacrificial banquet (comp. Ter. Eun. 3:3). The “harlots” are classed with “publicans,” as those who lay under the ban of society in the N.T. (Mat 21:32). No doubt they multiplied with the increase of polygamy, and consequently lowered the estimate of marriage. The corrupt practices imported by Gentile converts into the Church occasion most of the other passages in which allusions to the subject there occur, 1 Corinthians 1, 9, 11; 2Co 12:21; 1Th 4:3; 1Ti 1:10. The decree, Act 15:29, has occasioned doubts as to the meaning of 7opveia there, chiefly from its  context, which may be seen discussed at length in Deyling's Observ. Sacr. 2, 470, sq.; Schöttgen, Hor. Hebr. 1, 468; Spencer and Hammond, ad loc. The simplest sense, however, seems the most probable. The children of such persons were held in contempt, and could not exercise privileges nor inherit (Joh 8:41; Deu 23:2; Jdg 11:1-2). The term “bastard” is not, however, applied to any illegitimate offspring born out of wedlock, but is restricted by the Rabbins to the issue of any connection within the degrees prohibited by the law. A manner, according to the Mishna (Yebamoth, 4:13), is one, says R. Akiba, who is born of relations between whom marriage is forbidden. Simeon the Temanite says it is every one whose parents are liable to the punishment of “cutting off” by the hands of Heaven; R. Joshua, every one whose parents are liable to death by the house of judgment, as, for instance, the offspring of adultery. On the general subject, Michaelis's Laws of Moses, bk. 5, art. 268; Selden, De Ux. Hebr. 1, 16; 3. 12; and De Jur. Natur. 5, 4, together with Schottgen, and the authorities there quoted, may be consulted.

The words וְהֲזֹּנוֹת רָחָצוּ, A.V. “and they washed his armor”(1Ki 22:38), should be, “and the harlots washed,” which is not only the natural rendering, but in accordance with the Sept. and Josephus.

Since the Hebrews regarded Jehovah as the husband of his people, by virtue of the covenant he had made with them (Jer 3:1), therefore to commit fornication is a very common metaphor in the Scriptures to denote defection on their part from that covenant, and especially by the practice of idolatry. SEE FORNICATION. Hence the degeneracy of Jerusalem is illustrated by the symbol of a harlot (Isa 1:21), and even that of heathen cities, as of Nineveh (Nah 3:4). Under this figure the prophet Ezekiel delivers the tremendous invectives contained in Eze 16:23. In the prophecy of Hosea the illustration is carried to a start-ling extent. The prophet seems commanded by the Lord to take “a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms”(Hos 1:2), and “to love an adulteress”(Hos 3:1). It has, indeed, been much disputed whether these transactions were real, or passed in vision only; but the idea itself, and the diversified applications of it throughout the prophecy, render it one of the most effective portions of Scripture. SEE HOSEA.

2. קְדֵשָׁה(kedeshah', from קָדִשׁ, to consecrate, occurs Gen 38:15; Gen 38:21-22; Deu 23:17; Hos 4:14). It has already been observed that the proper meaning of the word is consecrated prostitute.  The very early allusion to such persons, in the first of these passages, agrees with the accounts of them in ancient heathen writers. Herodotus refers to the “abominable custom of the Babylonians, who compelled every native female to attend the temple of Venus once in her life, and to prostitute herself in honor of the goddess”(i, 199; Bar 6:43). Strabo calls prostitutes, who, it is well known, were at Athens dedicated to Venus, ἱερόδουλοι γυνἃ ικες, “consecrated servants,” “votaries”(Geog. 8:378; Grotius, Annotat. on Baruch; Beloe's Herodotus, Notes, 1, 272, Lond. 1806). The transaction related in Num 15:1-15 (compare Psa 106:28) seems connected with idolatry. The prohibition in Deu 23:17, “there shall be no קְדֵשָׁה, ‘whore,' of the daughters of Israel,” is intended to exclude such devotees from the worship of Jehovah (see other allusions, Job 36:14; 1Ki 14:24; 1Ki 15:12). The law forbids (Lev 19:29) the father's compelling his daughter to sin, but does not mention it as a voluntary mode of life on her part without his complicity. It could, indeed, hardly be so. The provision of Lev 21:9, regarding the priest's daughter, may have arisen from the fact of his home being less guarded, owing to his absence when ministering, as well as from the scandal to sanctity so involved. Perhaps such abominations might, if not thus severely marked, lead the way to the excesses of Gentile ritualistic fornication, to which, indeed, when so near the sanctuary, they might be viewed as approximating (Michaelis, Laws of Moses, art. 268). Yet it seems to be assumed that the harlot class would exist, and the prohibition of Deu 23:18, forbidding offerings from the wages of such sin, is perhaps due to the contagion of heathen example, in whose worship practices abounded which the Israelites were taught to abhor. The term there especially refers to the impure worship of the Syrian Astarte (Num 25:1; comp. Herod. 1, 199; Justin, 18:5; Strabo, 8, 378; 12, 559; Val. Max. 2, 6, 15; August. De Civ. Dei, 4, 4), whose votaries, as idolatry progressed, would be recruited from the daughters of Israel; hence the common mention of both these sins in the Prophets, the one, indeed, being a metaphor of the other (Isa 1:21; Isa 57:8; Jer 2:20; comp. Exo 34:15-16; Jer 3:1-2; Jer 3:6; Ezekiel 16, 23; Hos 1:2; Hos 2:4-5; Hos 4:11; Hos 4:13-15; Hos 5:3). The latter class would grow up with the growth of great cities and of foreign intercourse, and hardly could enter into the-view of the Mosaic institutes.

3. נָכְרְיָּה(nokriyah', from נָכִי, to ignore), the strange woman” (1Ki 11:1; Pro 5:20; Pro 6:24; Pro 7:5; Pro 23:7; Sept. ἀλλοτρία; Vulg.  aliena, extranea). It seems probable that some of the Hebrews in later times interpreted the prohibition against fornication (Deuteronomy 22:41) as limited to females of their own nation, and that the “strange women”in question were Canaanites and other Gentiles (Jos 23:13). In the case of Solomon they are specified as Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians, and Hittites. The passages referred to discover the character of these females. To the same class belongs זָרָה(zarah', from זוּר,to turn in as a visitor), “the strange woman”(Pro 5:3; Pro 5:20; Pro 22:14; Pro 23:33; γύνη πόρνη ἀλλοτπία; meretrix, aliena, extranea): it is sometimes found in full, אַשָּׁה זָרָה(Pro 2:16; Pro 7:5). To the same class of females likewise belongs אֶשְׁת כְּסַילוּת(kesiluth', folly), “the foolish woman,” i.e. by a common association of ideas in the Shemitic dialects, sinful (Psa 14:1). The description in Pro 9:14, etc. illustrates the character of the female so designated. To this may be added אֶשֶׁת רִע(ra, wrong), “the evil woman”(Proverbs 5, 24).

In the New Testament πόρνη occurs in Mat 21:31-32; Luk 15:30; 1Co 6:15-16; Heb 11:31; Jam 2:25. In none of these passages does it necessarily imply prostitution for gain. The likeliest is Luk 15:30. It is used symbolically for a city in Revelation 17:1; 5:15, 16; 19:2. where the term and all the attendant imagery are derived from the Old Testament. It may be observed in regard to Tyre, which (Isa 23:15-17) is represented as “committing fornication with all the kingdoms of the world upon the face of the earth,” that these. words, as indeed seems likely from those which follow, may relate to the various arts which she had employed to induce merchants to trade with her (Patrick, ad loc.). So the Sept. understood it, ἔσται ἑμπόριον πάσαις πά῝ ις βασιλείαις τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς.Schleusner observes that the same words in Rev 18:3 may also relate to commercial dealings. (Fesselii Adversar. Sacr. 2, 27, 1, 2 [Wittenb. 1650]; Frisch, De muliere pere niud ap. Hebr. [Lips. 1744J). Cuillpare PROSTITUTE.

## Harmar, John[[@Headword:Harmar, John]]

             an English clergyman and scholar was born about 1594, at Churchdowne, near Gloucester and educated at Winchester School. He was appointed Greek professor in that school in 1650, and in, 1659 was presented to the rectory of Enhurst, in Hampshire. He died November 1, 1670. His principal works are, Eclogae Sententiarum et Similitudinum, e Chrysostonimo  Decerptae (Greek and Latin, with notes, 1622): — Epistola ad Lambertum Osbaldestonum (1649): — A Short Catechism. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Harmer, Thomas[[@Headword:Harmer, Thomas]]

             a learned dissenting divine of England, was born in Norwich in 1715, and became minister of a dissenting congregation at Wattesfield, Suffolk. He was much esteemed in the literary world for his attainments in Oriental literature and for his skill in antiquities. Availing himself of some MSS. of  the celebrated Sir John Chardin, who had traveled into Persia and other Eastern countries, Harmer seized the idea of applying the information thus obtained to the illustration of many portions of the prophetical writings, and of the evangelists also. The first volume of the Observations on various Passages of Scripture appeared in 1764; in 1776 the work again made its appearance in two volumes octavo, and in 1787 were published two additional volumes; a fourth edition, in four volumes, was called for in a short time afterwards, and a fifth edition was edited by Adam Clarke (Lond. 1816, 4 vols. 8vo), with considerable additions and corrections, to which is prefixed a life of the author. Mr. Harmer also published Outlines of a new Commentary on Solomon's Song (Lond. 1768, 8vo); and a posthumous volume has appeared, entitled The Miscellaneous Works of the Rev. Thomas Harmer, with an introductory memoir by William Youngman (Lond. 1823, 8vo). Mr. Harmer died in 1788. — Jones, Christian Biography; Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, i, 400.

## Harmon[[@Headword:Harmon]]

             (Heb. Harmon', הִרְמוֹן probably from הָר, to be high; Sept. τὸ ὄρος τὸ ῾Ρομμάν; Vulg. excelsus mons; A.V. "the palace"), a place only mentioned in Amo 3:4, as that to which the inhabitants of Samaria would be led forth by their Assyrian conquerors, evidently, therefore, some unknown locality of the captivity. The ancient interpretations are obviously mere etymological conjectures, chiefly by a resolution of the first part of the name into הִר a mountain; "and the latter into a form of מַנַּי, Armenia, or

רַמּוֹן,' Rimmon; which are unsuitable. Kimchi makes it equivalent to אִרְמוֹן a town.

## Harmonists or Harmonites[[@Headword:Harmonists or Harmonites]]

             SEE RAPPISTS.

## Harmony    [[@Headword:Harmony    ]]

             as a technical name of a Biblical work, is applied to books the object of which is to arrange the Scriptures in chronological order, so that the mutual agreement of the several parts may be rendered apparent, and the true succession of events clearly understood. With this view various scholars have compiled harmonies of the Old Testament, of the New, and of particular portions of both. Harmonies of the Old Testament exhibit the books disposed in chronological order, as is done by Lightfoot in his Chronicle of the Times, and the Order of the Texts of the Old Testament, and by Townsend in his Old Testament arranged in historical and chronological Order. Harmonies of the New Testament present the gospels and epistles distributed in like order, the latter being interspersed among the Acts of the Apostles. In this way Townsend has proceeded in his valuable work entitled The New Testament arranged in chronological and historical Order. Books, however, of this kind are so few in number that the term harmony is almost appropriated by usage to the gospels. It is this part of the New Testament which has chiefly occupied the attention of those inquirers whose object is to arrange the Scriptures in their true order. The memoirs of our Lord written by the four evangelists have chiefly  occupied the thoughts of those who wish to show that they all agree, and mutually authenticate one another. Accordingly, such compositions are exceedingly numerous. The four gospels narrate the principal events connected with our Lord's abode on earth, from his birth to his ascension. There must therefore be a general resemblance between them, though that of John contains little in common with the others, being apparently supplementary to them. Yet there are considerable diversities, both in the order in which facts are narrated, and in the facts themselves. Hence the difficulty of weaving the accounts of the four into a continuous and chronological history. Those portions of the gospels that relate to the resurrection of the Savior have always presented the greatest obstacles to the compilers of harmonies, and it must be candidly admitted that the accounts of this remarkable event are not easily reconciled. Yet the labors of West and Townson, especially the latter, have served to remove the apparent contradictions. In addition to them may be mentioned Cranfield and Hales, who have endeavored to improve upon the attempts of their predecessors. SEE GOSPELS.

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

The following questions relative to harmonies demand attention; and in treating them, we avail ourselves chiefly of the art. on the subject in Kitto's Cyclopaedia, s.v.

1. Have all or any of the evangelists observed chronological arrangement in their narratives? It was the opinion of Osiander and his followers that all the evangelists record the facts of the Savior's history in their true order. When, therefore, the same transactions are placed in a different order by the writers, they were supposed to have happened more than once. It was assumed that they took place as often as they were differently arranged. This principle is too improbable to require refutation. Instead of endeavoring to solve difficulties, it boldly meets them with a clumsy expedient. Improbable, however, as the hypothesis is, it has been adopted by Macknight. It is our decided conviction that all the evangelists have not adhered to chronological arrangement.  The question then arises, have all neglected the order of time? Newcome and many others espouse this view. “Chronological order,” says this writer, “is not-precisely observed by any of the evangelists; John and Mark observe it most, and Matthew neglects it most.” Bishop Marsh supposes that Matthew probably adhered to the order of time, because he was for the most part an eyewitness of the facts. The others, he thinks, neglected the succession of events. The reason assigned by the learned prelate in favor of Matthew's order is of no weight as long as the inspiration of Mark, Luke, and John is maintained. If they were infallibly directed in their compositions, they were in a condition equally favorable to chronological narration.

A close inspection of Matthew's Gospel will show that he did not intend to mark the true succession of events. He gives us no definite expressions to assist in arranging his materials in their proper order. Very frequently he passes from one occurrence to another without any note of time; sometimes he employs a τότε, sometimes ἐνταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ, or ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὤρᾷ.. Rarely is he so minute as to use μεθ᾿ ἡμέρας ἔξ (17, 1). In short, time and place seem to have been subordinated to the grand object which he had in view, viz. the lively exhibition of Jesus in his person, works, and discourses. In pursuing this design, he has often brought together similar facts and addresses. Although, therefore, Kaiser founds upon the phrases we have adduced a conclusion the very reverse of ours, yet we believe that Matthew did not propose to follow chronological order. The contrary is obviously implied.

Mark, again, is still more indefinite than Matthew. Even the general expressions found in the first gospel are wanting in his. The facts themselves, not their true succession, were the object of his attention. Chronological order is not observed in his gospel, except in so far as that gospel agrees with Luke's. Yet Cartwright, in his Harmony, published about 1630, makes the arrangement of Mark his rule for method.

With regard to Luke, it is probable that he intended to arrange everything in its true place, because at the beginning of his work he employs the term καθεξῆς. This word is often referred to succession of events, without involving time; but it seems clearly to imply chronological succession (compare Act 11:4). Although, therefore, Grotius and many others oppose the latter view, we cannot but coincide with Beza when he says: “In harmonia Evangelistarum scribenda, rectiorem ordinem servari putem  si in iis quae habent commulia, reliqui ad Lucam potius accommodentur, quam Lucas ad caeteros”(comp. also Olshausen, Die Echtheitder vier Canon. Evang. etc., 1, 82-3, 3rd ed.). We may therefore conclude that this evangelist usually follows the chronological order, especially when such passages as Luk 3:1 and Luk 3:23 are considered, where exact notices of time occur. But as the gospel advances, those expressions which relate to time are as indeterminate as Matthew's and Mark's. Frequently does he pass from one transaction to another without any note of time; and again, he has μετὰ τἃντα, ἐν μιᾶ'/ τῶν ἡμερῶν. In consequence of this vagueness, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to make out a complete harmony of the gospels according- to the order of Luke, because we have no precise data to guide us in inserting the particulars related by Matthew and Mark in their proper places in the third gospel. All that can be determined with any degree of probability is that Luke's order seems to have been adopted as the true, chronological one. Whether the writer has deviated from it in any case may admit of doubt. We are inclined to believe that in all minute particulars chronological arrangement is not observed. The general body of facts and events seems to partake of this character, not every special circumstance noticed by the evangelist. But we are reminded that the assignment of dates is distinct from chronological arrangement. A writer may narrate all his facts in the order in which they occurred, without specifying the particular time at which they happened; or, on the other hand, he may mark the dates without arranging his narrative in chronological order. But attention to one of these will naturally give rise to a certain opinion with regard to the other. The more indeterminate the notification of time, the less probable is it that time was an element kept before the mind of the writer. If there be a few dates assigned with exactness. it is a presumption that the true arrangement is observed in other parts where no dates occur. In the succession of events Luke and Mark generally agree.

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

It thus appears that no one gospel taken singly is sufficient to form a guide for the Gospel harmonist; nor is he justified in selecting any one evangelist as a general guide, modifying that single narrative only as absolutely  demanded by the statements of the other three. He must place them all together, and select from among them as the exigencies in each particular case may require. Of course he will take definite notes of time as a peremptory direction wherever they occur, and in the absence of these he will naturally follow the order of the majority of the Gospel narratives. Nor in this matter is he at liberty, as Stier has too often done (Words of Jesus, Am. ed., 1, 31), to prefer one evangelist's authority to another, e.g. Matthew or John to Mark or Luke, on the ground that the former were apostles and the latter not, for they are all equally inspired. Again, the same liberty or discretion that is called for in arranging the order and date of the acts and journeys of our Lord must be exercised in adjusting his words and teachings; that is, the simple juxtaposition of passages is not absolute evidence of coincidence in time and immediate connection in utterance without some express intimation to that effect; so that incoherence, where palpable, or want of unanimity in this particular among the Gospel reports or summaries themselves, requires the harmonizer to exercise the same judgment in the adjustment as in other particulars. (See the Meth. Quart. Review, Jan. 1854, p. 79.) With these points premised and duly observed, there is no greater difficulty in adjusting the four accounts of our Lord's life and labors with a reasonable degree of certainty than there would be in harmonizing into one consistent account the separate and independent depositions of as many honest witnesses in any case of law. The only real questions of serious dispute in fact, aside from the main one presently to be mentioned, are those of a purely chronological character affecting the general date of Christ's ministry as a whole, and the particular spot where certain incidents or discourses transpired; the relative order and position of nearly everything is but little disturbed by the various theories or views as to even these points. Hence is evident the rashness of those who assert, like Stier (Pref. to Matthew and Mark, in Words of Jesus), that the construction of a Harmony of the Gospels is impracticable; for in the very same work he forthwith proceeds to construct and publish one himself!

2. What was the duration of our Lord's ministry? This is a question upon which the opinions of the learned have been much divided, and which cannot be settled with conclusive certainty. In order to resolve it, it is necessary to mark the different Passovers which Christ attended. Looking to the gospels by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, we should infer that he was present at no more than two: the first at the time of his baptism, the second immediately before his crucifixion. But in John's gospel three Passovers at  least are named during the period of our Lord's ministry (2, 13; 6:4; 11:55), It is true that some writers have endeavored to adapt the gospel of John to the other three by reducing the Passovers mentioned in the former to two. So Priestley, Vossius, and Mann. In order to accomplish this, it was conjectured that πάσχα, in ch. 6; 4, is an interpolation, and then that ἑορτή denotes some other Jewish festival. Bishop Pearce went so far as to conjecture that the entire verse has been interpolated. For these rash speculations there is no authority. The received reading must here be followed (Lücke's Commentar über Johannes, 3rd ed. 2, 104). In addition to these passages, it has been thought by many that another Passover is referred to in 5, 1, where, although πάσχα does not occur, ἡ ἑορτή is supposed to denote the same feast. But this is a subject of dispute. Ireneus is the oldest authority for explaining it of the Passover. Cyril and Chrysostom, however, referred it to the Feast of Pentecost, an opinion approved of by Erasmus, Calvin, and Beza; but Luther, Chemnitz, Calovius, Scaliger, Grotius, and Lightfoot returned to the ancient view of Irenmeus. Keppler seems to have been the first who conjectured that it meant the Feast of Purimn immediately preceding the second Passover. He was followed by Petau, Lamy, D'Outreinl, etc. Cocceius, followed by Kaiser, referred it to the Feast of Tabernacles; while Keppler and Petau intimated that it may possibly have been the Feast of Dedication. Bengel defended the opinion of Chrysostom; while Hug, with much plausibility, endeavors to show that it alludes to the feast of Purim immediately before the Passover. The latter view is adopted by Tholuck, Olshausen, and Clausen, though Greswell maintains that the Passover is meant. It would occupy too much space to adduce the various considerations that have been urged for and against the two leading opinions, viz. the Passover and the Feast of Purim. The true meaning of ἑορτή (for Lachmann has rightly omitted the article from before it; see Tischendorf, Nov. Test. 7th ed. ad loc.) is still indeterminate (see especially Alford, Gr. Test. ad loc.). To us it appears most probable that the most ancient hypothesis is correct, al. though the circumstances urged against it are neither few nor feeble. The following arguments, however, seem to determine the question in favor of the Passover: 1. Had any less noted festival been meant, it would, as in other cases (see chap. 7:2; 10:22), have been specified; but in the present case not even the article was required to distinguish it; whereas John by one instance only (6, 4) uses πάσχα to qualify a following ἑορτή, when the latter is thus defined by τῶν Ι᾿ουδαίων. 2. The ensuing Sabbath (δευτερύπρωτος of Luk 6:1) can only be that which was second after  the offering of the wavesheaf, and first after the Passover-week, and, however interpreted, shows that a Passover had just preceded, for the harvest was just ripe. SEE PASSOVER.

Sir Isaac Newton and Macknight suppose that five Passovers intervened between our Lord's baptism and crucifixion. This assumption rests on no foundation. Perhaps the term ἑορτή in Joh 7:2 may have given rise to it, although ἑορτή is explained in that passage by σκηνοπηγία.

During the first three centuries it was commonly believed that Christ's ministry lasted but one year, or one year and a few months (Routh, Reliq. Sacrs 4, 218). Such was the opinion of Clemens Alexandrinus (Stromata, 1, 21; 6:11) and Origen (de Principiis, 4, 5). Eusebius thought that it continued for above three years, which hypothesis became general. The ancient hypothesis, which confined the time to one year, was revived by Mann and Priestley; but Newcome, with more judgment, defended the common view, and refuted Priestley's arguments. The one-year view has found few late advocates except Jarvis (Introd. to History of Church) and Browne (Ordo Saeclorum). It has been well remarked by bishop Marsh that the Gospel of John presents almost insuperable obstacles to the opinion of those who confine Christ's ministry to one year. If John mentions but three Passovers, its duration must have exceeded two years; but if he mentions four, it must have been longer than three years. In interweaving the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke with that of John, the intervals between the Passovers are filled up by various transactions. Were the number of these feasts determinate and precise, there would be a general agreement in the filling up of the times between them; but in consequence of the uncertainty attaching to the subject, Harmonies are found materially to differ in their modes of arrangement. One thing is evident, that the moderns, in their endeavors after a chronological disposition of the gospels, adopt a far more rational course than the ancients. The latter strangely supposed that the first six chapters of John's Gospel relate to a period of Christ's ministry prior to that with which the other three evangelists begin their accounts of the miracles. Thus John alone was supposed to narrate the events belonging to the earlier part of his ministry, while Matthew, Mark, and Luke related the transactions of the last year.

The most ancient Harmony of the Gospels of which we have any account was composed by Tatian of Syria in the 2nd century, but it is now lost (see  H. A. Daniel's Tatianus der Apologet. Halle, 1837, 8vo). In the 3rd century, Ammonius was the author of a Harmony supposed to be still extant. Eusebius of Caesarea also composed a Harmony of the Gospels about A.D. 315. In it he divided the Gospel history into ten canons or tables, according as different facts are related by one or more of the evangelists. These ancient Harmonies, however, differ in character from such as belong to modern times. They are summaries of the life of Christ, or indexes to the four gospels, rather than a chronological arrangement of different facts, accompanied by a reconciliation of apparent contradictions. (See Scrivener, Introd. to N.T. p. 50.) In modern times, Andreas Osiander published his Harmony of the Gospels in 1537. He adopted the principle that the evangelists constantly wrote in chronological order. Cornelius Jansenius's Concordis Anger (1851), Tischendorf (1851), Strong (English, 1852; Greek, 1854), Stroud.(1853), Douglas (1859). Other similar works are mentioned in Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graeca, vol. 4:ed. Harles; Walch, Bibliotheca Theologica, vol. 4; Michaelis, Introd. vol. 3 ed. Marsh; Hase, Le-ben Jesu, § 27; Danz, Wlrterb. d. Theol. Lit. s.v.; Darling, Cyclopced. Bibliograph. col. 119,136,761. See Brit. and For. Review, Oct. 1856; Jour. Sac. Liter. 1852, p. 60 — sq.; Wieseler, Chronicles Synopsis of Gospels (tr. by Venables, Lond. 1864,8vo). SEE JESUS CHRIST.

## Harms, Claus[[@Headword:Harms, Claus]]

             a German revivalist, was born at Fahrstedt, in Holstein, May 25,1778. He showed at an early age signs of a deep and devotional piety. He made rapid progress at school, and at eighteen entered the University of Kiel. Young and ardent, the skeptical spirit of the time could not but have some effect on him; its influence, however, was counteracted by Schleiermacher's Reden uib. d. Religion, which brought him back to the simple faith of childhood, from whence he never afterwards strayed. In 1802 he passed his examination in theology, and in 1806 was appointed deacon in Lunden. The fame of his talent as a preacher, and of his devotion to pastoral labor, soon spread abroad. His first publication was Winter — Postille (Kiel, 1808), which was followed by Summer — Postille (Kiel, 1809). Two Catechisms, published by Harms soon afterwards, ran through many editions. In 1816 he was appointed archdeacon of St. Nicholas at Kiel. In this position he was at first highly esteemed, and afterwards bitterly opposed on account of his so-called pietism. The opposition against him culminated at the occasion of the jubilee of the Reformation held in 1817. It became daily more apparent to him that the Church in Germany  was:steadily receding from the principles of the Reformation and of the Holy Scriptures. He therefore gave out that he was prepared at any time to sustain, demonstrate, and defend Luther's 95 theses, with 95 additional ones of his own, against any one who chose to dispute with him. His first point, When our Lord Jesus Christ says ‘repent,' he means that we shall conform to his precepts, not that his precepts shall be conformed to us, as is done in our days to suit the public mind,” was striking at the very root of the then wide-spread religious indifference. The discussions which ensued gave rise to a vast number of publications, many of which were very bitter. The effect, on the whole, was a deep awakening in the Church. The theological faculty of Kiel, which, with the exception of the celebrated Kleuker and Twesten, had bitterly opposed Harms, was in after years almost exclusively brought over to his side. His publications after this (showing his theological views more fully) include the following, viz., Predigten (1820, 1822, 1824, 1827, 1838, 1852): — Religions handlungen der Lutherischen Kirche (1839): — Christliche Glaube (1830-1834): — Vaterunser (1838): — d. Bergrede d. errn (1841): — d. Offenbarung Johannis (1844): — Reden an Theologie-studirende (3 vols. 1, d. Prediger; 2, d. Priester; 3, d. Pastor, Kiel, 1830-34). Many beautiful hymns by Harms may be found in the Gesinge f. d. gemeinschaftliche u. d. einsame Andacht (1828). In 1841, on the 25th anniversary of his entering on his pastoral duties at Kiel, a great jubilee was held there, and a fund having been formed to defray his traveling expenses, he was named “Oberconsistorial rath.”His eyesight failed him a few years after, but he still continued writing, and published a revised edition of his works (1851). He died peacefully Feb. 1, 1855. See Harms's Selbst-biographie (Jena, 1818); Renter's Repertorium (1849); Baumgarten, Ein Denkmalf. C. Harms (1855); Herzog Real-Encyklopadie, 5, 567.

## Harms, Louis[[@Headword:Harms, Louis]]

             usually known as Pastor Harms, one of the most eminent among the Lutheran pastors in Germany. He was born in Herrmansburg, in the kingdom of Hanover, about the year 1809. His father was pastor of the church in Herrmansburg before him, and was remarkable for the strict discipline of his family. As a boy, Louis ‘excelled all his comrades in wrestling, boxing, and other athletic sports. He prepared for the university at the gymnasium of Celle, completing the course in two years. From 1827 till 1830 he studied at the University of Göttingen with signal ardor and success. He was repelled from theology at this time partly on account of  the state of the science, partly owing to difficulties in his own mind, devoting himself to mathematics, astronomy, philosophy, and the languages, including the Spanish, Sanskrit, and Chaldee. — To the last he was an enthusiastic student of Tacitus. His conversion, which probably occurred soon after leaving the university, was of a very thorough character. “I have never in my life,” said he, “known what fear was; but when I came to the knowledge of my sins, then I quaked before the wrath of God, so that my limbs trembled.” A Christian hope soon took complete and ever-increasing possession of his mind, and in 1844 we find him engaged in preaching at Herrmansburg, beginning his labors as an assistant to his father.

With the settlement of this young minister, a mighty influence began to go forth from the little German village, which soon changed the aspect of the country around him, and before his own death it was felt all over the world. The minds of the people had been benumbed by Rationalism or by a dead orthodoxy, which vanished like a cloud before the apostolic ardor of Harms. All in the neighborhood became at once regular attendants at church, devout observers of the Sabbath and strict in maintaining family prayer. Young Harms soon found himself to be virtually the pastor of a region ten miles square, containing seven villages, which in an incredibly short time he brought into a state of working religious activity.

And now, having regulated affairs immediately around him, this extraordinary man- began to feel the care of the whole world upon his mind. He felt responsible even for Africa and the East Indies. But how to bring the moral force of his little German village to bear upon the continent of Africa was the problem. The result formed one of the most remarkable feats of spiritual enterprise ever recorded. Harms first worked through the North German Missionary Society. But he soon became dissatisfied, and resolved to have a mission which should carry out his own ideas and be under his own control. He proposed to select pious and intelligent young men from the peasantry around him, who were already masters of some trade, give them a theological training of four. years in length, and then send them forth, ordained as missionaries, to the heathen. Twelve young men presented themselves at once, but Harms had not the means of educating them. His best friends hinted to him that he was a little out of his senses. He then, to use his own expression “knocked on the dear Lord in prayer.” His mind had been powerfully impressed by the words of a courier, spoken to duke George of Saxony, who had lain on his death-bed  hesitating whether to flee for salvation to the Savior or to the pope. “Your grace,” said the courtier, “Straightforward is the best runner.” In a few moments the purpose of Harms was formed so completely that no doubt ever again occurred to him. His plan of action was struck out at once. Without ever asking a single man, he prayed to God for money. Funds poured in upon him. He built a large edifice for his missionary college. More students came than he could accommodate. He prayed for more money. It came to him from Germany, Russia, England, America, and Australia. He erected another building. The fact of his not asking any money at all became the most efficient advertisement of his cause which could be made. He called his mission school “Swimming Iron.” Soon the first class of missionary candidates graduated and were ready for Africa, but the pastor had no means of sending them there. “Straightforward is the best runner,” said Harms; again he prayed to God for counsel, and decided to build a ship. The project was rather original, as Herrmansburg was sixty miles from the sea, and most of the people had never seen a ship. Again Harms prayed for the necessary money. Funds came as usual, and the ship was built and launched. As the day of sailing approached, the simple Herrmansburgers brought to the vessel fruits and flowers, grain and meats, ploughs, harrows, hoes, and a Christmas-tree, that the missionaries might have the means of celebrating that festival upon the seas. The day of sailing, Oct. 1,8,1853, was held as a gala by the simple people; but soon news came that the ship was lost. “What shall we do?” said the people. “Humble ourselves, and build a new ship,” said the minister. The report proved untrue, and that vessel is still plying her missionary voyages between Hamburg and Africa. Harms's preachers have also penetrated to Australia, the East Indies, and our Western States.

In 1854 Harms felt the need of diffusing missionary intelligence among his own countrymen, and arousing a more universal interest in the cause. He desired to establish a journal devoted to missions, but his friends did not see how it could be published. “Let us have a printing-press upon the heath,” said Harms. At once he asked God for the money, and it reached him as usual. The missionary journal was soon established, and in a few years it attained a circulation of fourteen thousand copies, only two periodicals in all Germany having a larger edition. It still abounds with racy letters from the missionaries, and the stirring essays of Harms formed its chief attraction until his death. He also established a missionary festival, held annually in June in the open air on Luneberger Heath. On some years  this festival was attended by six thousand people, including strangers from all parts of Europe. “How enchanting,” said he, “are such Christian popular festivals, under the open sky, with God's dear Word, and accounts of his kingdom and prayer, and loud-sounding hymns and tones of the trumpet.”

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

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

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

## Harms, Theodor[[@Headword:Harms, Theodor]]

             brother of Louis (q.v.), was born in 1819. When thirty years of age he was called as missionary inspector to Hermannsburg, and succeeded his brother in 1865. In 1878 Harms put himself at the head of those ministers who left the State Church and formed separate congregations. This separation was neither in the interest of the Church nor in the interest of the great missionary work with which Harms was intrusted, and the more so as he had not those talents which would qualify him to become a party leader. Friends of Harms had, therefore, often tried to heal the breach between the State Church and the Hermannsburg Mission, but all efforts were in vain, on account of Harms being too headstrong a person. He died February 16, 1885. Besides a biographical sketch of his brother Louis (5th ed. 1877), he published, Das Hohelied kurz erklart (Leipsic, 1870): — Der zweite Brief Petri (1873): — Der Psalter erklart (2d ed. 1870): — Das dritte Buch Mose kunz ausgelegt (1871): — Der Heilsweg in 22 Predigten (1871; 3d ed. 1877): — Die letzten Dinge (1872; 3d ed. 1875): — Der Prophet Maleachi erklart (1878): — Zu Jesu Fussen, Predigten (1877). (B.P.)

## Harnepher[[@Headword:Harnepher]]

             (Heb. Charne'pher, חִרְנֶפֶר, perhaps snorer; Sept. Α᾿ρναφάρ, Vulg. Harnaphers one of the sons of Zophah, a chief of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:36). B.C. between 1612 and 1053.

## Harness[[@Headword:Harness]]

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

1. אָסָר (asar', prop. to bind, as it is generally rendered) is sometimes applied to the act of fastening animals to a cart or vehicle, e.g. yoking kine (1Sa 6:7; 1Sa 6:10, “tie”) or horses (Jer 46:4, “harness”), gearing a chariot (Gen 46:29; Exo 14:6; 2Ki 9:21, “make ready”), or absolutely (1Ki 18:44; 2Ki 9:21, ‘prepare”). From the monuments we see that the harness of the Egyptian  war-chariots was composed of leather, and the trappings were richly decorated, being stained with a great variety of colors, and studded with gold and silver. SEE CHARIOT.

2. In the old English sense for armor ( נֵשֶׁקor נֶשֶׁקne'shek, warlike accoutrements, elsewhere “armor,”“weapons,”etc.), 2Ch 9:24. SEE ARMOR.

3. In a like sense for שַׁרְיָן(shiryan', 1Ki 22:34; 2Ch 18:33), a coat of mail (“breastplate,” Isa 59:17). SEE ARMOR.

4. “Harnessed”(חֲמֻשַׁים, chamushim', from חָמִשׁin the sense of being fierce for battle) is the expression used to represent the equipped condition of the Israelites as they passed out of Egypt (Exo 13:18, “armed,” Jos 1:14; Jos 4:1-2 Jdg 7:11), and seems to denote their orderly and intrepid disposal as if to meet a foe (the ancient versions interpret generally full-armed). (See Gesenius, Lex. s.v.)

## Harney, Martin[[@Headword:Harney, Martin]]

             a Dominican of Amsterdam, was born May 6, 1634, and died at Louvain, April 22, 1704, professor of theology. He was an opponent of the Jansenists, and wrote L'Obeissance Raisonnable des Catholiques des  Pays-Bas (Antwerp, 1636; transl. also into Latin). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Harnisch, Wilhelm[[@Headword:Harnisch, Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Wilsnack, Brandenburg, August 28, 1786. For some time first teacher at Teachers' Seminary, in Breslau, he was called in 1822 as director to Weissenfels, and died August 15, 1864, leaving, Luther's kleiner Katechismus fur die Schujugend (18th ed. Eisleben, 1862): — Vollstandiger Unterricht im evangelischen Christenthum (Halle, 1831, 2 volumes): — Entwurfe und Stoffe zu Unterredungen uber Luther's kleinen Katechismus (1841-45, 3 volumes): — Erbauliche Betrachtungen uber Luther's Katechismus (1836): — Die Geschichte des Reiches Gottes auf Erden (2d ed. 1844): — Die kunftige Stellung der Schule zu. Kirche, Staat und flaus (Erfurt, 1858). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:70, 217, 233, 380; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:507. (B.P.)

## Harod[[@Headword:Harod]]

             (Heb. Charod', חֲרוֹד; Sept. Α᾿ρώδ v.r. Α᾿ράδ), a brook or place (עִיַן, a spring or fountain, “well,” Sept. πηγή) not far from Jezreel and Mount Gilboa (“Gilead,” Jdg 7:3), by (עִל)'which Gideon and his great army encamped on the morning of the day which ended in the rout of the Midianites (Jdg 7:1), and where the trial of the people by their mode of drinking apparently took place. SEE GIDEON. The name means “palpitation,” and it has been suggested that it originated in consequence of the alarm and terror of most of the men who were here tested by Gideon (Jdg 7:3; Jdg 7:5); but this supposition seems very far-fetched, and the name more probably arose from some peculiarity in the outflow of the stream, or from some person or circumstance otherwise unknown. The word, slightly altered, recurs in the proclamation to the host-”Whosoever is fearful and trembling (חָרֵד, chared'), let him return”(Jdg 7:3); but it does not follow that the name Charod was, as Prof. Stanley proposes, bestowed on account of the trembling, for the mention of the trembling may have been suggested by the previously existing name of the fountain; either would suit the paronomastic vein in which these ancient records so delight... The word charred (A V. was afraid”) recurs in the description of another event which took place in this neighborhood, possibly at this very spot-Saul's last encounter with the Philistines-when he “was afraid, and his heart trembled  greatly” at the sight of their fierce hosts (1Sa 28:5). It was situated south of the hill Moreh, where the Midianites were encamped in the valley of Jezreel (1Sa 28:1), and on the brow of the hills overlooking that plain on the south (1Sa 28:8). As the camps were not far distant from each other (compare 1Sa 28:10-15), it must have been in a narrow part of the valley, and probably near its head (for the invaders came from the east, 1Sa 6:3, and fled down the eastern defiles, 1 Samuel 7:22). Hence the position of the present Ain Jalud, south of Jezreel, is very probably that of the fountain in question (Stanley's Sinai and Palest. p. 334-336). This spring, which gives rise to a small stream flowing east-ward down the wady of the same name, is evidently there presentative of the ancient name Gilead applied to this spot, SEE GILEAD, 2, and has thus supplanted the other name Harod. Indeed it, is probable that the latter was rather the name of a town in the neighborhood, since we find mention of its inhabitants (2Sa 23:25). SEE HARODITE.

“The valley of Jezreel”referred to is an eastern arm of, the great plain of Esdraelon; bounded on the south by Gilboa, and on the north by a parallel ridge called the “hill of Moreh” (q.v.). It is. about three miles wide. SEE JEZREEL. The Midianites: were encamped along the base of Moreh, and probably near the town of Shunem. On the south side of the valley, at the base of Gilboa, and nearly opposite Shunem, is the fountain of Ain Jalud. It is about a mile east of Jezreel, and hence it was also called the “fountain of Jezreel.” The water bursts out from a rude grotto in a wall of conglomerate rock, which here forms the base of Gilboa. It first flows into a large but shallow pond, and then winds away through the rich green vale past the ruins of Bethshean to the Jordan. Theside of Gilboa rises over the fountain steep and rugged. Some have thought it strange that the Midianites should not have seized on this fountain but, as many of the Israelites probably lurked in the mountain, the Midianates may have deemed it more prudent to encamp in the open plain to the north, where there are also fountains. The Jerusalem Itinerary seems to indicate that the name Ain Jalud (q. d. “Fountain of Goliath”) arose from an ancient tradition that the adjoining valley was the site of David's victory over the giant (ed. Wesseling, p. 586). The fountain was a noted camping-ground for both ‘Christians and Saracens during the Crusades. William of Tyre calls it Tubania (Gesta Dei per Francos, p. 1037; Bohadin, Vita Saladini, p. 53). The valley of Jezreel still forms a favorite haunt of the wild Bedawin, who periodically cross from the east side of the Jordan, as in Jdg 6:5 : “They came up with their cattle and their tents, and they came as grasshoppers for multitude;  both they and their camels were without number”(Porter, Handbook fr Syr. and Pal. 2, 355; Robinson, Bib. Res. 2, 324).

## Harod, Spring Of[[@Headword:Harod, Spring Of]]

             Lieut. Conder suggests for this (Tent Work, 2:69) the modern Ain el- Jema'm (“fountain of the two troops"), described (Memoirs to Ordnance Map, 2:81) as "a small spring of fresh water, with a considerable stream, between two larger ones," and laid down three miles west of Beisan. But this is to accommodate his theory of the location of Megiddo as near the Jordan. There is no good reason to desert the traditionary site of Ain Jalid, which is briefly described in the same Memoirs (2:79).

## Harodite[[@Headword:Harodite]]

             (Heb. Charodi', חֲרדי, Sept. Α᾿ροδί), an epithet of Shammah and Elika, two of David's heroes (2Sa 23:25), probably from their being natives of HAROD, a place near the fountain of the same name (Jdg 7:1). SEE HARORITE.

## Haroeh[[@Headword:Haroeh]]

             (1Ch 2:52). SEE REAIAH.

## Harorite[[@Headword:Harorite]]

             (Heb. Charori', חֲרוֹרַי, prob. by erroneous transcription for חֲרודַי, Harodite; Sept. has θαδί, Vulg. Arorites), an epithet of Shammoth, one of David's heroes (1Ch 11:27); for which the parallel passage (2Sa 23:25) more correctly reads HARODITE SEE HARODITE (q.v).

## Harosheth[[@Headword:Harosheth]]

             (Heb. Charo'sheth) OF THE GENTILES “(חֲרשֶׁת הִגּוֹיַם, workmanship of the nations; i.e. city of handicrafts; Sept. Α᾿ρισώθ τῶν ἐθνῶν, Vulg. Haroeeth gentium), a city supposed to have been situated near Hazor, in the northern parts of Canaan, afterwards called Upper Galilee, or Galilee of the Gentiles, from the mixed races inhabiting it. SEE GALILEE. Harosheth is said to have been the residence of Sisera, the general of the armies of Jabin, king of Canaan, who reigned in Hazor (Jdg 4:2). Here the army and chariots of Jabin were marshaled under the great captain before they invaded Israel, and defiled from the northern mountains into the broad battlefield of Esdraelon (Jdg 4:13). After the terrible defeat and slaughter on the banks of the Kishon, to this place the fugitives of the army returned, a shattered and panic-stricken Tenant. Barak and his victorious troops followed them into the fastnesses of their own mountains, to the very gates of Harosheth (Jdg 4:16). The city is not again mentioned in the Bible, nor is it referred to by Josephus, Jerome, or any ancient writer. It was at the extreme of Jabil's territory, opposite the Kishon (Jdg 4:13), ‘and also at a good distance from Tabor (Jdg 4:14). It is supposed to have stood on the  west coast of the lake Merom (el-Hulbh), from which the Jordan issues forth in one unbroken stream, and in the portion of the tribe of Naphtali. Jabin's capital, Hazor, one of the fenced cities assigned to the children of Naphtali (Jos 19:36), lay to the northwest of it. Probably from intermarriage with the conquered Canaanites, the name of Sisera afterwards became a family name (Ezr 2:53). Neither is it irrelevant to allude to this coincidence in connection with the moral effects of this decisive victory; for Hazor, once “the head of all those kingdoms”(Jos 11:6; Joshua 10), had been taken and burnt by Joshua; its king, Jabin I, put to the sword; and the whole confederation of the Canaanites of the north broken and slaughtered in the celebrated battle of the waters of Blerom (Jos 11:5-14) —the first time that “chariots and horses” appear in array against the invading host, and are so summarily disposed of, according to divine command, under Joshua, but which subsequently the children of Joseph feared to face in the valley of Jezreel (Jos 17:16-18). and before which Judah actually failed in the Philistine plain (Jdg 1:19).

Herein was the great difficulty of subduing plains, similar to that of the Jordan, beside which Harosheth stood. It was not till the Israelites had asked for and obtained a king that they began “to multiply chariots and horses” to themselves, contrary to the express words of the law (Deu 17:16), as it were to fight the enemy with his own weapons. (The first instance occurs 2Sa 8:4; comp. 1Ch 18:4; next in the histories of Absalom, 2Sa 15:1, and of Adonijah, 1Ki 1:5; while the climax was reached under Solomon, 1Ki 4:26.) Then it was that the Hebrews' decadence set in! They were strong in faith when they hamstrung the horses and burned with fire the chariots of the kings of Hazor, of Madon, of Shimron, and of Achshaph (Jos 11:1). Yet so rapidly did they decline when their illustrious leader was no more that the city of Hazor had risen from its ruins; and, in contrast with the kings of Mesopotamia and Moab (Judges 3), who were both foreign potentates, another Jabin, the territory of whose ancestors had been assigned to the tribe of Naphtali, claimed the distinction of being the first to revolt against and shake off the dominion of Israel in his newly acquired inheritance, But the victory won by Deborah and Barak was well worthy of the song of triumph which it inspired (Judges 5), and of the proverbial celebrity which ever afterwards attached to it (Psa 83:9-10; a passage which shows that the fugitives were overtaken as far as Endor). The whole territory was gradually won back, to be held permanently, as it would seem (Jdg 4:24); at all events, we hear  nothing more of Hazor, Earosheth, or the Canaanites of the north in the succeeding wars. The etymology of the name Harosheth, q.d. “wood- cuttings,” joined with the above facts, may justify us in locating the city on the upland plains of Naphtali, probably on one of those ruin-crowned eminences still existing, from which the mother of Sisera, looking out from her latticed window, could see far along that road by which she expected to see her son return in triumph (Jdg 5:28). Deborah, in her beautiful ode, doubtless depicted the true features of the scene. , Remnants of the old forests of oak and terebinth still wave here over the ruins of the ancient cities, and travelers may see the black tents, of the Arabs-fit representatives of the Kenites (4, 17) —pitched beneath their shade (Porter, Handbook for Syr. and Palest. 2, 442 sq.; Stanley, Jewish Chuth, 1, 359). Schwarz (Palestine, p. 184) thinks it identical with the village Girsh, situated on a high mount one English mile west (on Zimmerman's Map north-west) of Jacob's bridge across the Jordan, and nearly destroyed by an earthquake in 1837. Dr. Thomson, however, who gives a vivid description of the geographical features of Barak's victory. (Land and Book, 2, 142 sq.), regards the site as that of the present village Harothieh (a name, according to in, giving: the exact Arabic form of the Hebrew), an enormous double mound or tell along the Kishon, about eight miles from Megiddo, covered with the remains of old walls and buildings.

## Harosheth (2)[[@Headword:Harosheth (2)]]

             The modern el-Harithiyeh, which is thought to represent the ancient site, is placed on the Ordnance Map nine miles south-east of Haifa, and is described in the accompanying Memoirs (1:270) as "a miserable hamlet of mud, on high ground, with an open plateau to the east, and a spring below on the west (Ain el-Ghafr). The population in 1859 is stated by consul Rogers at one hundred and twenty souls, and the tillage at twelve feddans." According to the same authority, however (1:96), "Guerin suggests that we have the ancient name of Harosheth or Haris," three and a half miles  south-west of Jibrin, in the north of Palestine, where "there appear to be no vestiges of ancient constructions, except a circular cistern cut in the rock. This identification is strengthened by the fact that the same word which occurs in the name Kir Haroseth, the modern Kerak, exists in the present local dialect of Moab under the same form, Harith or Haris" (ibid. page 116).

## Harp[[@Headword:Harp]]

             is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of the following terms in the original: usually כַּנּוֹר, kinnor' (whence the Greek κινύρα), the lyre or cythara (invariably rendered “harp”), N. Test. κιθάρα (1Co 14:7; Rev 5:8; Rev 14:2; Rev 15:2), whence the verb κιθαρίζω (1Co 14:7; Rev 14:2), and the compound noun κιθαεῳδός (“harper,” Rev 14:2; Rev 18:22); elsewhere only of the Chald. קַיתָרֹס, kitharos' (text of Dan 3:5; Dan 3:7; Dan 3:10; Dan 3:15), or קִתְרוֹס,kathros' (margin), from the latter Greek term. See Music.

The “harp” was David's favorite instrument, on which he was a proficient (see Dreschler, De cithara David, Lips. 1712; also in Ugolino, 32). It probably did not essentially differ from the modern Arabic cithere (Niebuhr, Tramv. 1, 177, pl. 26; Descript. de l'Egypte, 17:365, pl. BB, fig. 12, 13). SEE DAVID.

Gesenius inclines to the opinion that כַּנּוֹר is derived from כָּנִר, kanar', “an unused onomatopoetic root which means to give forth a tremulous and stridulous sound, like that of a string when touched.” The kimnor was the national instrument of the Hebrews, and was well known throughout Asia. There can be little doubt that it was the earliest instrument with which man was acquainted, as the writer of the Pentateuch assigns its invention, together with that of the עוּגָב, ugab', incorrectly translated “organ” in the A.V., to the antediluvian period (Gen 4:21). Kalisch (Hist. and Crit. Com. on the Old Test.) considers kinnor to stand for the whole class of stringed instruments (neginoth), as ugab, says he, “is the type of all wind instruments.” Writers who connect the κινύρα with κινυρός (wailing), κινύρομαι (to lament), conjecture that this instrument was only employed by the Greeks on occasions of sorrow and distress. If this were the case with the Greeks, it was far different with the Hebrews, amongst whom the kinnor served as an accompaniment to songs of cheerfulness and mirth, as well as of praise and thanksgiving to the supreme Being (Gen 31:27; 1Sa 16:23; 2Ch 20:28; Psa 33:2), and was very rarely used, if ever, in times of private or national affliction. The Jewish bard finds no employment for the kinnor during the Babylonian captivity, but describes it as put aside or suspended on the willows (Psa 137:2); and in like manner Job's harp “is changed into mourning”(Job 30:31) while the hand of grief pressed heavily upon him. The passage “my bowels shall sound like a harp for Moab”(Isa 16:11) has impressed some Biblical critics with the idea that the kinnor had a lugubrious sound; but this is art error, since ככנור יהמוrefers to the vibration of the chords, and not to the sound of the instrument (Gesen.. and Hitzig, in Comment.).

Touching the shape of the kinnor, a great difference of opinion prevails. The author of Shilte Haggibborimn (c. 6) describes it as resembling the modern harp; Pfeiffer gives it the form of a guitar; and St. Jerome declares that it resembled in shape the Greek letter delta (quoted. by Joel Brill in the preface to Mendelssohn's Psalms). Josephus records (Ant. 7:12, 3) that the kinnor had ten strings (compare Theodoret, Quaest. 34 on 1 Kings), and  that it was played on with the plectrum; others assign to it twenty-four; and in the Shilte Haggibborim it is said to have had forty-seven. Josephus's statement, however, ought not to be received as conclusive, as it is in open contradiction to what is set forth in the 1st book of Samuel (16:23; 18:10), that David played on the kinnor with his hand. As it is reasonable to suppose that there was a smaller and a larger kinnor, inasmuch as it was sometimes played by the Israelites whilst walking (1Sa 10:5), the opinion of Munk. “On jouait peutetre des deux manieres, suivant les dimensions de l'instrument” is well entitled to consideration. The Talmud (Berachoth) has preserved a curious tradition, to the effect that over the bed of David, facing the north, a kinnor was suspended, and that when at midnight the north wind touched the chords they vibrated, and produced musical sounds.

The כבנור על השמינית— “harp on the Sheminith” (1Ch 15:21) was so called from its eight strings. Many learned writers, including the author of Shilte Haggibborim, identify the word. “sheminith” with the octave; but it would indeed be rash to conclude that the ancient Hebrews understood the octave in precisely the sense in which it is employed in modern times. SEE SHEMINITH. The skill of the Jews on the kinnor appears to have reached its highest point of perfection in the age of David, the effect of whose performances, as well as of those by the members of the “schools of the prophets,” are described as truly marvelous (compare 1Sa 10:5; 1Sa 16:23; 1Sa 19:20).

Two instruments of the lyre species are delineated on a bass-relief of the Assyrian monuments, representing the return of a monarch celebrated by a procession of musicians (Layard, Nineveh and Bab. p. 388 sq.). The ancient Babylonian instrument is probably that represented in a single instance on the Assyrian monuments at Khorsabad, depicting three short- bearded performers on the lyre ushered into the great chamber by two eunuchs. The musicians are clad in a short tunic held fast by a girdle, and their hair is drawn back, and terminates above the shoulders in a single row  of curls. They proceed with measured step, singing and twanging their lyres, which are suspended by a broad band passing over the right shoulder. The instrument itself somewhat resembles the Greek lyre: it has a square body and upright sides, the latter being connected by a crossbar, to which are fixed strings that seem to have been rather numerous, for we can count eight at least, and in the part that is corroded away there is room for three or four more. Exactly similar instruments are now seen in Nubia and Dongola; and the mode of playing is that the right hand holds a short plectrum to strike the intervals, while the left is used to stop and twang the cords (Bonomi's Nineveh, p. 187).

Harps or guitars are constantly, in the Holy Scriptures, instruments of joy. They are mentioned in very ancient times as musical instruments, used both by Jews and Gentiles, and their employment in the Temple worship frequently occurs. Moses has named their original inventor in Gen 4:21, viz. Jubal; and in Gen 31:27, Laban says to Jacob, “Why did you not tell me, that I might have sent you away with mirth and songs, with tabret and with harp?”Even in that very ancient writing, the book of Job (Gen 21:12), that patriarch, speaking of the prosperity of the wicked, says, “They take the timbrel and harp, and rejoice at the sound of the organ.” So, when complaining of his own condition (Gen 30:31), he says, “My harp also is turned into mourning, and my organ to the voice of them that weep.” Isaiah speaks of the harp under the same character, as an instrument of joy (Gen 24:8). Divine subjects used to be brought forward with the accompaniments of the harp (Psa 59:5), and the high praises of God were so celebrated (Psa 33:2; Psa 53:4; Psa 57:8; see also Psa 71:22-23; Psa 92:4-6; Psa 98:5; Psa 147:7; Psa 150:3). That harps are used to celebrate the praises of heroes is well known. Harps, in Solomon's day, were made of the almug-tree, as our translators have it (1Ki 10:11-12). They were often gilded, and hence called golden harps (Rev 5:8). A harp of eight strings is mentioned (1Ch 15:21), called in our version “harp on the Sheminith.”

But amongst the Greeks it had, for the most part, seven strings. Josephus (Ant. 7, 12) describes a harp of ten strings. The distinct sounds uttered by these strings or chords are alluded to by Paul in 1Co 14:7. Its soothing effect was exemplified in 1 calming down the furious spirit of Saul (1Sa 16:17; 1Sa 17:24; 1Sa 18:9; 1Sa 19:9). The spirit of prophecy appears to have been excited by instrumental music of this kind (2Ki 3:15). Harpers held the instrument in the hand, or placed it on a pillar, or sat down by a riverside (Ovid, Fasti, 2, 115).  Sometimes they suspended them from trees, to which there is an allusion in Psa 137:1-2. The harp was used in processions and public triumphs, in worship and the offices of religion, and was sometimes accompanied with dancing (Psa 149:3). They were also used after successful battles. (see 2Ch 20:28; 1Ma 13:51). Isaiah alludes to this custom (Isa 30:32). So in the victory of the Lamb. (Rev 14:1-2): “I heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps;” the Church in heaven being represented as composing a grand chorus, in celebration of the triumphs of the Redeemer. At solemn feasts, and especially of the nuptial kind, harps were employed. To this the prophet Isaiah alludes (Isa 5:11-12). The use of harps in worship has already been adverted to, and that the heathen employed them on such occasions appears from Dan 3:5; Dan 3:7; Dan 3:15. “Harps of God”(Rev 15:2) are either a Hebraism to show their excellence,. as the addition of God often signifies (the most excel-lent things in their kind being in the Scriptures said to be of God), as a prince of God (Gen 23:6, in the original), the mountains of God (Psa 36:6, in the. original), cedars of God (Psa 80:11, in the original), and the like; or else they mean harps given as from God; or harps of God may be harps used in the service of God, in opposition to harps common and profane (1Ch 16:42; 2Ch 7:6).

## Harper, James, D.D[[@Headword:Harper, James, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Glasgow, Scotland, July 28, 1802. He graduated from Glasgow University in 1823, studied divinity under Dr.. Dick, was ordained by the United Secession Presbytery of Glasgow, came to New York in 1833, became pastor at Galway, then at Ellicott city, Maryland (1838), and finally at Shippensburg, Pennsylvania (1840), until his resignation in 1870. He died May 9, 1876. See Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v.

## Harphius, Henri[[@Headword:Harphius, Henri]]

             a Flemish mystic, was born at Erp (whence he is sometimes called also ERPIUS or ER-PEN), in Brabant, towards the beginning of the 15th century. He entered the order of St. Francis, in which he soon became distinguished for his learning, particularly in mystical theology. He attained the highest dignities of the order, and succeeded in restoring the discipline in several convents of gray friars where it had been relaxed. He died at Mechlin Feb. 22,1478. The Franciscans count him among the blessed, yet Bossuet: seems to have considered him only as an enthusiast and visionary. He wrote Le Directoire des Contemnplatis first published in Low Dutch, then in Latin by Blomeven, under the title Directorium aureun Contemplativorum (Cologne, 1513, 8vo, Antw. 1513. 12mo); there are generally three other works of Harphius published with; it: Tractatus de Eliusione Cordis: — Modus legendi rosarium Virginis Marice: — Remedia contra Distractiones. The Directorium aureum was republished with commentaries and corrections (Paris, without date, 12mo; Cologne, 1527, 12mo; 1611, 16mo; 1645, fol.; Antwerp, 1536, 12mo; Cologne,  1555, fol.; Rome, 1585,4to; Brescia, 1601,. 4to; translated into French by Mme. E. B., Paris, 1552, 16mo): — Sermons, etc., with Trois Parties de la Penitence and Triple Avenement de Jesus Christ (these works,. written at first in Flemish, were translated into Latin,. Nuremberg, 1481, 4to; Spire, 1484, 4to): — Speculum aulreum decem Preceptorum Dei, etc. (Mayence, 1474, 4to):: Speculum Perfectionis (Venice, 1524,12mmo; transl. into Italian, 1546, 12mo): — Explicatio succincta et perspicuac Novena Rupium (of Suso), written first in Low Dutch, then transl. into Latin by Surius, and inserted in the Opera omnia of Henry Suso (Cologne, 1533,1555,1588,. and 1615, 12mo; Naples, 1658, 12mo): — De Mortificatione pravorum Affictuums (Cologne, 1604,16mo): — Cantici Canticorum mystica Explicatio (Cologne, 1564, fol.). See Trithemius, De Scriptoribus ecclesiasticis (col. 817);. Bellarmin, De Scriptoribus ecclesiasticis, p. 415; Wadding, Script. Ordinis Minorum, p. 164; Fleury, Hist. Ecclesiastique, vol. 16, lib. 79, p. 5; Quètif and Echard, Script. Ordinis Prcedicatorum, 2, 558; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 23, 439; Dupin, Eccles. Writers, cent. 15

## Harpies[[@Headword:Harpies]]

             (ςΑρπυιαι), in Greek mythology, were daughters of Thaumas and Electra (an Oceanid). Sometimes two, sometimes three, are mentioned, under the different names, Aello, Podarge, Ocypete, Celano, Thyella, Acholoe, Aellopos, Nicothoe, and the like. In the descriptions of them there is also a great difference. With Homer they are storm goddesses, fleet, but beautiful; Hesiod also calls them swift goddesses, but in JEschylus they appear as hateful, winged monsters. They were usually represented as eagles with maiden faces. At times they had human arms and legs, which ended in claws and hens' feet. They were generally sent out by the gods to punish criminals.

## Harpocrates[[@Headword:Harpocrates]]

             in Graeco-Egyptian mythology, was the name of an Egyptian deity, which originated from the words, Har-pachrut, i.e., "Har the child." This Har the Greeks usually called Horus, and distinguished him as Horus Harpocrates from another Horus. Both were sons of Osiris and Isis. What the ancients say about Harpocrates is quite incomplete, and therefore dark as to its significance. That he was not the god of silence, as once believed, is now fully accepted. In Rome he was worshipped as such, but probably only because he had his finger in his mouth, which is but the figurative representation of sucking, and designates him as an infant. Beans and cherries were offered to him, and on special festive days he was fed, by men, with milk, his image being carried around in procession. Among animals, scorpions, snakes, crocodiles, lions, and reindeer were sacred to him. SEE HORUS.

## Harpsfeld or Harpsfield, John[[@Headword:Harpsfeld or Harpsfield, John]]

             was born about 1510, and died in London in 1578. He was educated at Winchester School and New College, Oxford, whereof he was admitted fellow in 1534. He became chaplain to ‘bishop Bonner, whose bitter persecuting spirit he shared, and was collated to St. Martin's, Ludgate, in 1554, but resigned in 1558, on being presented to the living of Lavndon in Essex. Shortly before the death of queen Mary he was made dean of Norwich, but on the accession of Elizabeth was deprived of that post, and committed to the Fleet Prison until he gave security for his good behavior. His published works are Concio ad Clerum (London, 1553, 8vo): — Homilies (London, 1554-56; he wrote 9 of Bonner's Homilies) — Supputatio tempoumn a diluvio ad a. D. 1559 (London, 1560). He wrote also some Disputations and Epistles to be found in Fox's Acts and Monuments. — Rose, New Géneralé Biog. Dict. 8: — 212; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 442 Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 788; Wood, Athen. Oxon. 1. (J. W. M.)

## Harpsfield, Nicholas[[@Headword:Harpsfield, Nicholas]]

             an English Roman Catholic historian, and brother of the preceding, was also educated at Winchester School and New College, Oxford, where he  was admitted fellow in 1536, and bachelor of laws in 1543. He was made principal of Whitehall in 1544, regius professor of Greek in 1546, archdeacon of Canterbury and prebendary of St. Paul's in 1554. He also received the living of Layndon, but resigned it to his brother John in 1558. He was a very zealous Roman Catholic, and, on the accession of Elizabeth, refusing to acknowledge her supremacy, he was deprived of his preferments and imprisoned, or at least kept under restraint until his death in 1583. During his imprisonment (receiving every needed help from his custodian. bishop Parker) he composed his Historia Anglicana Ecclesiastica (Douay, 1622, fol.). To this there is appended, according to Nutt's catalogue (1837), a treatise entitled Brevis Narratio de Divortio Henrici VIII ab E. Campiana, which may be the “Treatise concerning Marriage” mentioned by Wood (see Appendix to Butler's Hist. of Reformation). His other works are Historia haeresis Wickliance (published with Hist. Ang.) Chronicon a Diluvio Noe ad annum 1559; and a very bitter attack upon the Protestant ecclesiastical historians, Fox in particular, which was conveyed secretly to the Netherlands, and published by his friend Alan Cope under his own name, to screen the real author from punishment at the hands of Elizabeth-the title in full is Alani Copi Dialogi ix contra Summi Pontificatus, Monastici Vitce Sanctorums, S. Imaginum oppugnatores et pseudo- Martyres: in quibus Centurionum Magdeburgeensium, Auctorum Apologice Anglicanae, Pseudo- Martyrologicorum nostri temporis, maxime vero Job. Foxi et aliorum, varice fraudes, putida calumniae et insignia mendacid., deteguntur (Antwerp, Plautin, 1556, 4to). He left also many MSS. — Rose, New Genesis Biog. Dict. 8, 212; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 442; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 788. (J. W. M).

## Harrington, Calvin Sears, D.D[[@Headword:Harrington, Calvin Sears, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal educator, was born at St. Johnsbury, Vermont, May 17, 1826. He graduated from Wesleyan University, Connecticut, in 1852, and immediately engaged in teaching; in 1854 joined the New Hampshire Conference, in 1861 became professor of languages in his alma mater, Land retained that position until his death, February 16, 1886. See Alumni Record of Wesleysan University, 1883, pages 116, 577; Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1886, page 91.

## Harris, Howell[[@Headword:Harris, Howell]]

             an eminent Welsh evangelist, was born at Trevecca in 1714. In 1735 he went to Oxford to study for the Church, but disgust at the infidelity and immorality which prevailed there drove him away. Returning to Wales, he began to exhort the neglected poor in their cottages, and was so successful that in a few months he formed several societies among them, thus affording another of those providential coincidences which mark the religious history of the times. Thirty:of these organizations were sustained by him at the time of Whitefield's arrival in Wales in 1739, and in three years more they numbered three hundred. He lived and died a Churchman, but received little sympathy from the established clergy, and, until the visits  of the Methodist founders, pursued his evangelical labors almost alone, apparently without anticipating that they would result in a widespread evangelical dissent. In 1715 there were only thirty Dissenting chapels in the principality, and in 1736 only six in all north Wales in 1860 there were 2000. Harris was a lay preacher; he applied repeatedly for ordination, but was denied it by the bishops on account of his irregular modes of labor. Whitefield passed from Kingswood to Cardiff, and there saw him for the first time. Their souls met and blended like two flames, and “set the whole principality in a blaze.” For years the laborious layman traveled, and preached twice or three times every day. “He is full of the Holy Ghost,” wrote Whitefield; “blessed be God, there seems a noble spirit gone out into Wales.” Wesley speaks of him as “a powerful orator”(Journal, 1756). He was repeatedly assaulted by mobs, and suffered many forms of persecution from the magistrates, clergy, and people, but his courage and zeal never failed. At last his health declined, and he returned to Trevecca, where he organized a Christian household, built a chapel, and arranged his grounds with great taste. Wesley calls it “one of the most beautiful places in Wales”(Journal, 1763, p. 156). In the French war, when England was threatened with invasion, he thought it his duty to take a commission in the army, which he held for three years, preaching wherever he went with his regiment. He died in great peace, July 21,1773. See Jackson, Christian Biography, 12:168; Stevens, History of Methodism, i, 118; 2, 86.

## Harris, John, D.D[[@Headword:Harris, John, D.D]]

             an eminent Independent minister and scholar, was born at Ugborough, in Devonshire. March 8, 1802, and was admitted a student at the Hoxton Academy for the education of ministers belonging to the Independent denomination in 1821. In 1827 he settled at Epsom as a minister amongst the Independents. His first literary work, entitled The Great Teacher, was favorably received; but he became most widely known as the successful competitor for a prize of one hundred guineas, offered by Dr. Conquest for the best essay on the subject of “Covetousness.” Mr. Harris's essay was entitled Mammon, and had a large sale, upwards of thirty thousand copies having been sold in a few years. He subsequently obtained two other prizes for essays-one entitled “Britannia on the Condition and Claims of Sailors;” the other on Missions, with the title The Great Commission. “On account of the reputation brought by these works, be received the degree of D.D. from Amherst College, and was also invited to fill the post of president in lady Huntingdon's Theological College at Cheshunt. Here he remained till the union of the three Independent colleges of Highbury, Homerton, and Coward in New College, when he accepted the office of principal, and conducted several of the theological courses in that institution. He filled this position with efficiency, and by his industry and amiable character contributed to the success which has attended this establishment. Whilst at Cheshunt, Dr. Harris published the first of a series of works, in which his object was to illustrate the history of man from a theological point of view. The first volume was entitled The Pre-Adanite Earth (1847). In it he displayed a great amount of learning, and especially an acquaintance with the natural sciences, which he brought to bear on his theological views. The second volume of the series was entitled Man Primeval (1849), in which the intellectual, moral, and religious character of man is discussed. A third volume, entitled Patriarchy, or the Family, appeared in 1854. Two other volumes were to have completed the series, and to have been devoted to the ‘State,' or the political condition of man, and the ‘Church,' or his religious relations; but the plan was cut short by the death of Dr. Harris, Dec. 21, 1856.”These Writings evince careful study and a broad range of thought. Dr. Harris's practical writings have had an immense circulation both in England and America. See Fish, Pulpit Eloquence (1857); Gilfillan, Modern Masterpieces of Pulpit Oratory; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 455; British Quarterly Review, 5, 387; N. American Review, 70, 391; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 791.

## Harris, John, D.D., F.R.S[[@Headword:Harris, John, D.D., F.R.S]]

             an English divine, was born about 1667. He studied at St. John's College, Cambridge, and became successively rector of St. Mildred's London; perpetual curate of Stroud, prebendary of Rochester, and fellow, secretary, and vice-president of the Royal Society. He died in 1719. Dr. Harris was the first compiler of a dictionary of arts and sciences in England (1708, 2 vols. fol.), and was a careful and able editor; but he was improvident, and died completely destitute. He wrote A Refutation of the atheistical Objections against the Being and Attributes of God (London. 1698, 4to): — Sermon, Joh 16:2 : — The Wickedness of the Pretence of Treason and Rebellion for God's sake (Nov. 5th) (London, 1715, 8vo); and compiled a Collection of Voyages and Travels (Lond. 1702; revised by Campbell 1744, 2 vols. fol.). — Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, 1, 1403; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 790.

## Harris, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Harris, Robert, D.D]]

             a pious and learned Puritan divine, was born in Gloucestershire, 1578, and was educated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford. He afterwards took orders, and obtained the living of Hanwell, near Banbury, Oxfordshire, where he was extremely useful in confirming the people's, minds in the Protestant faith. On the commencement of the Civil War he removed to London, and became a member of the Assembly of Divines, but appears to have taken no active part in their proceedings. He officiated at the church of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate Street, until 1648, when he was appointed president of Trinity College, which office he retained until his death in 1658. His works include The Way to True Happiness, in twenty-four sermons on the Beatitudes; and A Treatise on the New Covenant, which, with other writings, were published in his Works, revised and collected (Lond. 1654, fol.). — Hook, Eccl. Biog. 5, 546.

## Harris, Samuel Smith, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Harris, Samuel Smith, D.D., LL.D]]

             a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Autauga County, Alabama, September 14, 1841. Graduating from the University of Alabama in 1859, he was admitted to the bar in 1860. After practicing for some time, he entered the ministry of his Church, and was successively rector at Montgomery, Alabama; Columbus, Georgia; New Orleans, Louisiana, and Chicago, Illinois. He was consecrated bishop of Michigan in 1879. He died August 21, 1888. He was the author of The Relation of Christianity to Civil Society (1882). See Appletons' Cyclop. of Amer. Biography.

## Harris, Samuel, D.D[[@Headword:Harris, Samuel, D.D]]

             was born in the county of Middlesex about the year 1683. He was educated in Merchant Taylor's school, of which he was head boy in 1697, and was admitted a pensioner of Peter House, Cambridge, May 15, 1700. Upon the foundation of the chair of Modern History in the University of Cambridge by George I in 1724, Harris was appointed the first professor. He died Dec. 21,1733. He was the author of,

1. Scripture knowledge promoted by catechizing (London, 1712, 8vo): —

2. A Commentary on the Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, with an appendix of Queries concerning Divers Ancient Religious Traditions and Practices, and the sense of many texts of Scripture which seem to allude to or express them (Lond. 1735 [not' 1739, as frequently stated], 4to). In some copies this work has a different titlepage, namely, Observations, Critical and Miscellaneous on several remarkable Texts of the Old Testament, to which is added a Commentary, etc. Prefixed are three dissertations, 1. On a Gnozer or Advocate; 2. On a Dour or Generation; and, 3. On the ancient method of propounding important points by way of question. This work was published shortly after the death of the author by his widow. It exhibits much curious learning, and is several times referred to by Doddridge in his lectures.”-Kitto, Cyclopedia, 2, 236.

## Harris, Thaddeus Mason, D.D[[@Headword:Harris, Thaddeus Mason, D.D]]

             a Unitarian divine, was born in Charlestown, Mass., in 1768, graduated A.B. at Harvard in 1787, and became pastor at Dorchester in 1793. He was librarian of Harvard College from 1791 to 1793, and afterwards librarian of the Massachusetts Historical Society till his death in 1842. His most important publication is a Natural History of the Bible (1793, 12mo; again in Boston, 1821, 8vo; also published in London, with additions, under the title Dictionary of the Natural History of the Bible, 1824; new ed. by Conder, 1833, 12mo). This work received great praise for its accuracy and utility (see Horne, — Bibliographical Appendix). Dr. Harris also published Memorials of the First Church in Dorchester (Boston, 1830, 8vo): — Discourses on Freemasonry (Charlestown, 5801 [1801], 8vo). See Allibone. Dictionary of Authors, 1, 792.

## Harris, Walter, D.D[[@Headword:Harris, Walter, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Lebanon, Conn., in 1761. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1787, was ordained pastor at Dunbarton Aug. 26, 1789, and died Dec. 25, 1843. Dr. Harris published An Address before the Pastoral Convention. of New Hampshire (1834), and a number of occasional sermons. — Sprague, Annals, 2, 277.

## Harris, William Logan, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Harris, William Logan, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal bishop, was born near Mansfield, Ohio, November 14, 1817. He was converted in 1834; afterwards studied in Norwalk Seminary; was licensed to preach in 1837, and entered the Michigan Conference the same year. In 1845 he became tutor in Ohio Wesleyan University; in 1848 principal of Baldwin Institute; in 1851 principal of the preparatory department of Ohio Wesleyan University; in 1852 professor of chemistry and natural history in the same school; was elected assistant missionary secretary in 1860; served as member and secretary of the General Conference in 1858,1860, 1864, 1868, and 1872; and was elected bishop in 1872, continuing in that office until his death, September 2, 1887. In 1873 he made a missionary tour around the world; in 1880 visited the missions in Mexico, and again in 1884 and 1885; in 1881 those in South America, returning by the way of Europe in 1882. He also organized the Japanese mission. He wrote a work on The Powers of the General Conference (1859), and, conjointly with judge William J. Henry of Illinois,  a treatise on Ecclesiastical Law (1870). See Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.; Minutes of Annual Conferences (Fall), 1887, page 347.

## Harris, William, D.D[[@Headword:Harris, William, D.D]]

             an eminent English dissenting divine, is supposed to have been born at London, about 1675. He became pastor of a church at Crutched. Friars, London, in 1698. He was also for some thirty years one of the preachers of a Friday evening lecture at the Weigh-house, and succeeded Mr. Tong as lecturer at Salter's Hall. He died in 1740. “He was a concise, clear, and nervous writer; his works evince a. strong sense joined to a lively imagination, and regulated with judgment.” He was one of the continuators of Matthew Henry's Commentary (those on Philippians. and Colossians). Besides a number of occasional sermons, he wrote Funeral Discourses, in two Parts: (I), Consolations on the Death of our Friends; (II) Preparations for our own Death (Lond. 1736, 8vo): — The Life and Character of Dr. Thomas Manton (London, 1725,. 8vo): — A practical Illustration of the Book of Esther(London, 1737, 8vo), etc. — Darling, Cyclopedia Bibliographica, 1, 1406; Bogue and Bennett, History of Dissenters, 2, 372.

## Harris, William, D.D (2)[[@Headword:Harris, William, D.D (2)]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Springfield, Mass., and passed A.B, at. Harvard College in 1786. He was first licensed as a. minister in the Congregational Church, but, on perusing a compend of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, his mind and feelings were drawn to the Protestant Episcopal Church, in which he was shortly after ordained. Hethen took charge of St. Michael's Church, Marblehead, and in 1802 became rector of St. Mark's, New York. In 1811 he was chosen president of Columbia College. In 1816 he resigned his rectorship, and attended thereafter exclusively to the presidency of the college. He died Oct. 18, 1829. He published several occasional sermons. Sprague, Annals, 5, 383.

## Harrison, Elias, D.D[[@Headword:Harrison, Elias, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in New York city, January 22, 1790. He graduated from Princeton College in 1814, spent one year thereafter in the theological seminary there, was licensed by the New Brunswick Presbytery, ordained by the Baltimore Presbytery in 1817, and installed pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Alexandria, Virginia, where he labored faithfully for forty-six years. He died February 13, 1863. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 20; Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, page 154.

## Harrison, Jeptha, D.D[[@Headword:Harrison, Jeptha, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Orange, N.J., in December 1795. He graduated from Princeton College in 1820, and studied two years in the theological seminary there; was ordained in 1831; became stated supply at Fair Forest, S.C., in 1832, at Salem, Virginia, in 1835, and in 1838 became pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Memphis, Tenn., where he labored for six years with great acceptability. He afterwards preached in Newcastle, Kentucky (1844-47); Florence, Alabama (1848-50); Aberdeen, Mississippi (1851-54); Burlington, Tennessee (1855-58), and Fulton, Missouri, where he died, October 30, 1863. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Serm. 1881, page 35; Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, page 159; Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v.

## Harrison, John Christian, D.D[[@Headword:Harrison, John Christian, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, son of Reverend Samuel Harrison of the South Carolina Conference, was born in Mecklenburg County, N.C., October 1, 1809. In 1819, with his parents, he removed to Kentucky, in 1827 was converted, became a class-leader in 1828, an exhorter in 1829, a local preacher in 1830, and later in the same year united with the Kentucky Conference. His first field of labor was Rock Castle Circuit, where he remained two years. He afterwards filled the best appointments in the conference, was presiding elder twenty-one years, occupied a seat in seven general conferences, and finally died, March 11, 1878. Mr. Harrison was a wise counsellor; had a clear, logical mind; was always affable, kind, reliable, and pure-minded. and full of faith and good works. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1878, 1:24.

## Harrison, Thomas (1)[[@Headword:Harrison, Thomas (1)]]

             an eminent English Baptist preacher, and general in the time of Cromwell, was born near Nantwich, Cheshire, England. As one of the judges selected to try king Charles, he did not shrink from what he conceived to be his duty, and gave his vote for the execution. He was the warm friend of Cromwell until the latter declared himself protector. He and his wife were baptized by immersion in 1657. At the Restoration he was arrested, tried as a regicide, and executed at Charing Cross, London, November 13, 1660, his body being subjected to the most revolting treatment. See Cathcart, Bapt. Encyclop. s.v. (J.C.S.)

## Harrison, Thomas (2), D.D[[@Headword:Harrison, Thomas (2), D.D]]

             an English Independent minister, was born at Kingston-upon-Hull, Yorkshire. In his youth he removed with his parents to New England, who gave him the best education that country then afforded. He began to preach, and became chaplain to the governor of Virginia, a great enemy of Puritans. Two missionaries from England settled in Virginia, but the governor sent them out of the country. After this the Indians rose in rebellion, and murdered five hundred English persons. Those who escaped the massacre Mr. Harrison gathered into a church, but the governor became more hardened, and dismissed his chaplain, who had become too serious for him. He returned to London, where he became a popular preacher, and in 1650 succeeded Dr. Goodwin at St Dunstan's in the East. He then removed to Broombrough Hall, where he preached continually. In 1657 he went to Ireland with Henry Cromwell, son of the protector, and preached for some years at Christ Church, Dublin. When the government changed he returned to England, resided at Chester, and preached in the cathedral until silenced in 1662. He returned to Dublin in 1663, where he had a large, respectable, and flourishing congregation. He was an agreeable and instructive preacher, and when he died, in Dublin, there was a general mourning for him in the city. He left a valuable library, including a large folio System of Divinity in manuscript, and published Topica Sacra, or Spiritual Pleadings, and a Funeral Sermon for Lady Susanna Revnolds (1654). See Wilson, Dissenting Churches, 1:221.

## Harrison, William Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Harrison, William Henry, D.D]]

             was born Jan. 12, 1819, in Frederick County, Md. He entered the preparatory department of Pennsylvania College in 1838, and was graduated in 1843 with the valedictory of his class. He early developed a taste for literary research; and, while others were often engaged in recreation and amusement, he was in his room busily engaged in the investigation of some question of interest, and in the acquisition of knowledge. The one thing in which, perhaps, he excelled all others was the moral influence which he exercised over his companions. His very presence, even when he kept silent, was felt. Immediately after his graduation in college he commenced his theological studies in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg. On their completion in 1845 he was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of Maryland. He was elected assistant professor of ancient languages in: Pennsylvania College, and served for a season as general agent of the Parent Education Society. The following: year he accepted a call to the English Lutheran Church of Cincinnati, as he felt that he could be more useful and efficient in the pastoral work. Here he labored with great success till his death. His labors were unwearied and abundant. His life was regarded as a sacrifice to the cause of humanity and religion. He died of Asiatic cholera during the prevalence of the epidemic' in Cincinnati, Nov. 3, 1866, and, although comparatively a young man, he was at the time of his death the senior pastor of the city. He was a good scholar, a sound theologian, and a clear, practical, and instructive preacher. He received the doctorate from Wittenberg College in 1861. (M. L. S.)

## Harrotee Version[[@Headword:Harrotee Version]]

             SEE HINDUWEE, DIALECTS OF.

## Harrow[[@Headword:Harrow]]

             is the rendering in the Eng. Vers. of the following Hebrew words: חָרַיוֹ, charits' (lit. a cutting, hence a slice of curdled milk, “cheese,” 1Sa 17:18) ‘a tribulum or threshing (q.v.) sledge (2Sa 12:31; 1Ch 20:3); elsewhere only the verb שָׂדִד, sadad' (lit. to level off), to harrow a field (Job 39:10; “break the clods,” Isa 28:4; Hos 10:11). See Kitto, Daily Bible Illust. 3, 39, 6, 397. The form of the ancient Hebrew harrow, if any instrument properly corresponding to this term existed, is unknown. Probably it was, — as still in Egypt (Niebuhr, Trav. 1, 151), merely a board, which was dragged over the fields to level the lumps. Among the Romans it consisted of a hurtle (crates) of rods with teeth (Pliny, 18. 43; comp. Virg. Georg. 1, 94). See generally Ugolini, Comm. de re rustica vett. Hebr. 5, 21 (in his Thesaur. 29:p. 332 sq.); Paul-sen, Ackerb. p. 96. “In modern Palestine, oxen are sometimes turned in to trample the clods, and in some parts of Asia a bush of thorns is dragged over the surface; but all these processes, if used, occur (not after, but) before the seed is committed to the soil.” SEE AGRICULTURE.

## Harsa[[@Headword:Harsa]]

             SEE TEL-HARSA.

## Harsa (2)[[@Headword:Harsa (2)]]

             (Hercia, or Hersa), a mediaeval term, sometimes employed to describe any triangular candlestick for tapers, but more especially used to designate that which is employed in the offices of Tenebrse, in Holy Week. In it, at this service, are placed fourteen unbleached wax candles to represent the apostles and the three Marys, with one bleached wax candle to represent our Saviour. They are all extinguished in the course of the service, save the last named.

## Harsha[[@Headword:Harsha]]

             (Heb. Charsha', חִרְשָׁא, a Chaldaizing form, ,worker or enchanter; Sept. Α᾿ρσά and Α᾿δασάν), one of “the Nethinim whose descendants (or rather, perhaps, a place whose inhabitants) returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:52; Neh 7:54). B. C. ante 536. Schwarz (Palest. p. 116) thinks it may be identical with the ruins called by the Arabs Charsha (on Zimmerman's map, Khuras), situated south of wady Sur, about half-way between Beit-Jibrin (Eleutheropolis) on the W., — and Jedur (Gedor) on the E.

## Harsnet Samuel[[@Headword:Harsnet Samuel]]

             archbishop of York, was born at Colchester in 1561; was educated as a sizer at King's — College, Cambridge; and was subsequently elected fellow of Pembroke Hall. In 1580 he took the degree of B.A., and in 1584  that of M.A. He then applied him-self to theology, in which he soon made his mark by a sermon preached in 1584 at St. Paul's Cross (first printed at the end of three of Dr. Stewart's sermons in 1658), in which he boldly attacked the doctrine of unconditional predestination, then to some extent prevailing in the Church of England. He became successively proctor of the university in 1592, vicar of Chigwell, in Essex, in 1595, and archdeacon of Essex in 1602, but resigned all these offices on being appointed rector of Shenfield, in Essex, and of St. Margaret's, New Fish Street; London, in 1604. He became master of Pembroke College in 1605, and bishop of Chichester in 1609. He was translated to Norwich in 1619. While in the latter see, the Dissenters prevailing in the House of Commons, he was accused before the last Parliament of James I of several misdemeanors, and of Romanist tendencies. He made a defense, in which, among other points, he says, “that popery is a fire that never will be quiet; he had preached a thousand sermons, and nothing of popery can be imputed to him out of any of them. That there were divers obstacles to keep him from popery: among them, the usurpation of the pope of Rome; their religion dyed in blood; their juggling and feigned miracles, of which he wrote a book against them, and their equivocations.” He concluded by proclaiming that in his view the Church of England came nearest to the primitive Church, and that its principles were not derived from Wickliffe, Huss, or Luther, but from the four first centuries after Christ. This defense was considered valid, and in 1628 Dr. Harsnet was translated to the archbishopric of York. He died in May 1631.

Among his works we notice A Discovery of the Fraudulent Practices of John Darrell, Bachelor of Arts, etc. (Lond. 1599, 4to): — Declaration of egregious Popish Impostures, etc. (Lond. 1603, 4to), against an exorcist named Edmonds, alias Weston, a Jesuit. See Collier, Eccles. History; Strype, Memorials; Biog. Brit.; Hook, Eccles. Biography, v, 546 sq.

## Hart[[@Headword:Hart]]

             (אִיָּל, ayal', always masc., but in Psa 42:1, joined with a fem. noun to denote a hind), a stag or male deer, but used by the Hebrews also to denote all the various species of deer and antelopes, which resemble large rams. SEE DEER. The hart is reckoned among the clean animals (Deu 12:15; Deu 14:5; Deu 15:22), and seems, from the passages  quoted, as well as from 1Ki 4:23, to have been commonly killed for food. Its activity furnishes an apt comparison in Isa 35:6, though in this respect the hind was more commonly selected by the sacred writers. The proper name Ajalon is derived from ayal, and implies that harts were numerous in the neighborhood. SEE GOAT. The Heb. masc. noun ayal, which is always rendered ἔλαφος by the Sept., denotes, there can be no doubt, some species of Cervidae (deer tribe), either the Dama vulgaris, fallow-deer, or the Cervus Barbarus, the Barbary deer, the southern representative of the European stag (Celaphus), which occurs in Tunis and the coast of Barbary. We have, however, no evidence that the Barbary deer ever inhabited Palestine, though it may have done so in primitive times.

Hasselquist (Trav. p. 211) observed the fallow-deer on Mount Tabor. Sir G. Wilkinson says (Anc. Egypt. 1, 227, abridgm.), “The stag with branching horns figured at Beni Hassan is also unknown in the valley of the Nile, but it is still seen in the vicinity of the Natrona lakes, as about Tunis, though not in the desert between the river and the Red Sea.” This is doubtless the Cervus Barbarus. SEE STAG.

Most of the deer tribe are careful to conceal their calves after birth for a time. May there not be some allusion to this circumstance in Job 39:1, “Canst thou mark when the hinds do calve?” etc. Perhaps, as the Sept. uniformly renders ayal by ἔλαφος, we may incline to the belief that the Cervus Barbarus is the deer denoted. The feminine noun אִיָּלָה, ayaldh, occurs frequently in the O.T. SEE HIND.

## Hart, Ichabod Andrus[[@Headword:Hart, Ichabod Andrus]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Marshall, N.Y., February 16, 1803; graduated from Hamilton College in 1826, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1830; was agent of the American Educational Society, Central N.Y., 1831-33; pastor, 1833-56; agent of the Walworth County Institute, Illinois, 1856-60; without a charge, 1860-65; agent of the Western Tract and Book Society, 1865-67; treasurer of Wheaton College and editor of the Cynosure, 1867-73 resident at Wheaton, Illinois, from 1865 until his death, August 20, 1887.

## Hart, John Seely, LL.D[[@Headword:Hart, John Seely, LL.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Old Stockbridge, Massachusetts, January 28, 1810. He studied at Wilkesbarre Academy; graduated from Princeton College in 1830, with the highest honors of the class; the following year taught as principal of an academy at Natchez, Mississippi, and three years afterwards graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary. During the last two years of his course he also filled the position of tutor in the college. In 1834 he was elected adjunct professor of ancient languages in Princeton College, and filled that chair two years. He was licensed by the Presbytery of New Brunswick, August 4, 1835., In 1836 he resigned his professorship in the college, purchased Edgehill School, in Princeton, and in 1842 was elected principal of the Philadelphia High School, continuing there until 1859, when he became editor of the - periodicals published by the American Sunday-school Union, and in this connection began the Sunday-school Times. In 1862 he was elected principal of the New Jersey State Normal School, at Trenton, and held that position with distinguished usefulness and success until February 1871. From 1864 to 1870 he also gave courses of lectures on English literature in Princeton College, where, in 1872, he was elected professor of belles- lettres and English literature, which chair he filled two years, returning in 1874 to Philadelphia, where he was engaged in literary pursuits until his death, March 26, 1877. Dr. Hart was the author of many volumes, an enthusiast in the cause of education, a devoted Sabbath-school worker, of elegant culture, accurate scholarship. During the months preceding his last illness, he had been delivering a course of popular lectures on the works of Shakespeare. He was an humble, consistent, and devout Christian. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1877, page 29.

## Hart, Joseph[[@Headword:Hart, Joseph]]

             an English Independent minister, was born about the year 1712, of godly parents. He had a classical education, and was for many years a teacher of languages. He was long in bondage on account of his sins, but found deliverance under a sermon preached in the Moravian Chapel, Fetter-lane, London. He began to preach at the Old Meeting, St. John's Court, Bermondsey, in 1760, and afterwards settled at the Independent Chapel, Jewin Street, where his ministry was abundantly crowned, and he gathered there a prosperous Church. He would not allow either Arian or Arminiani preacher in his pulpit. He died May 24, 1768, and was interred in Bunhill Fields, where twenty thousand persons are said to have been present. His hymns will live in the Church to the end of time, especially the one beginning "Come, ye sinners, poor and needy." See Wilson, Dissenting Churches, 3:343; Gadsby, Hymn Writers.

## Hart, Levi. D.D[[@Headword:Hart, Levi. D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born April 10, 1738, at Southington, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1760, studied under Dr. Bellamy, was licensed June 2, 1761, and was ordained pastor at ‘Griswold, Conn., Nov. 4, 1762, where he labored until his death, Oct. 27, 1808. During his long career as pastor he trained many young men for the ministry. In 1784 he was made a member of Dartmouth College Corporation, and of Yale in 1791. He published several occasional sermons. — Sprague, Annals, 1, 590.

## Hart, Oliver[[@Headword:Hart, Oliver]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Warminster, Pa., July 5,1723, joined the Baptist Church in 1741, was licensed to preach in 1746, and was ordained  in 1749. In that year he became pastor of the Baptist church in Charleston, S. C., and remained in that office thirty years, with eminent success both as preacher and pastor. In the Revolution he espoused the Whig cause with great ardor, and had to flee from Charleston in 1780 to avoid falling into the hands of the British. He settled as pastor of the Baptist Church at Hopewell, N. J., where he died Dec. 31,1795. He published a Discourse on the Death of W. Tenant: — Dancing Exploded: — The Christian Temple: — A Gospel Church portrayed. — Benedict, Hist. of the Baptists, vol. 2; Sprague, Annals, 6, 47.

## Harte, Walter[[@Headword:Harte, Walter]]

             an English poet and divine, was born about 1700, and educated at Marlborough School and at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, of which he became vice-principal. He was canon of Windsor in 1751, and subsequently vicar of St. Austel and of St. Blazy, Cornwall. He died in March, 1774, leaving Poems on Several Occasions (1727): — Essay on Satire (1730): — Essay on Reason (1735): — A Fast Sermon (1740). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Harter, Friedrich Heinrich[[@Headword:Harter, Friedrich Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born August 1, 1797, at Strasburg. He studied at his native place and at different German universities, was in 1823 pastor at Ittenheim, and in 1829 at Strasburg. He exercised a considerable influence in the Church and in the school, and took a great interest in the work of foreign and home missions. He died in August 1874, leaving, besides a number of sermons, Die Augsburgische Confession (Strasburg, 1834). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol, 1:508 sq. (B.P.)

## Hartford Baptist Association[[@Headword:Hartford Baptist Association]]

             as the representative of that new Church. He died November 26, 1875. Dr. Hansell's sermons were admirably clear; sound in doctrine, graceful in construction and expression. He dwelt specially on the person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1877, page 39.

## Hartgrep[[@Headword:Hartgrep]]

             in Norse mythology, was the wife of the Danish king, Hadding, a favorite of the gods and a mighty giant. She was a powerful sorceress, feared on  account of her art, and worshipped with superstitious reverence. By her assistance her husband descended alive into the infernal regions, to combat with Hela.

## Hartley, David[[@Headword:Hartley, David]]

             an English practitioner of medicine, and a philosopher of considerable, but transitory reputation. The Scotch school of metaphysics borrowed much from his conclusions; and the long-prevalent theory of Beauty, which was elaborated in Alison's Principles of Taste, derived from them its cardinal doctrines. Dr. Hartley occupies a notable position in the history of speculation on other grounds. He presented a curious example of the partial conciliation of Des Cartes, Newton, and Locke; he inaugurated the impulse which transmuted the system of the last of these great men into the materialism of the French Encyclopedia; he preceded Bonnet, of Geneva, in applying physiological observation to psychological discussion, and thus became the precursor of Cabanis and Broussais, of Moleschott and Huxley. He was contemporary with Collier, and Berkeley, and Hume, and Reid. While the two first were undermining the philosophy of Locke by questioning the credibility of the senses, and Hume was achieving a similar result by impugning the evidences of consciousness, to be imperfectly refuted by Reid's exaggeration of the reliability of external perception, Hartley was still further invalidating the authority of Locke by proposing a purely mechanical explanation of the processes of thought. He is thus even more noteworthy for his relations to the revolutions of opinion in the 18th century than for the positive additions he is supposed to have made to the science of the human mind. He was one of the dominant spirits of that agitation of the intellectual waters, which heralded and produced the political convulsions of the last century.

At the same time, he is the link between widely separated dogmas: furnishing a bond between Des Cartes and Stewart; connecting Locke with Condillac and French sensationalism; reviving neglected positions of Aristotle, and prefiguring many of the latest manifestations of scientific materialism.  Life. — The biography of Dr. Hartley is singularly devoid of salient incidents and of general interest. He belonged to that numerous class of very worthy men who run their eminently useful career without experiencing or occasioning violent excitement of any kind. But for his philosophical productions, his epitaph might have been Vivens moriensque fefellit. He was the son of a respectable clergyman, and was born Aug. 30,1705, at Armley, Yorkshire, of which parish his father was vicar. He completed his education at Jesus College, Cambridge, and was designed for the paternal vocation. But he was induced to divert his attention to medicine, in consequence of scruples about subscribing the XXXIX Articles, for religious opinion within the bosom of the Anglican Church was much divided at the time by the recent issues of the “Bangorian Controversy.” His experience was frequently repeated in other cases in the ensuing years. He retained, however, the fervent but simple piety appropriate to his meditated profession, and never withdrew his interest from the subjects which attract the intelligent theologian. He informs us that the seeds of his own doctrine began to germinate when he was twenty- five years of age, though their elaboration was not completed till he was more than forty. His views were given to the world in 1749, in a work entitled Observations on Man, his Frame, his Duties, his Expectations. He survived its publication about eight years, and died at Bath Aug. 28, 1757, when within a fortnight of completing his fifty-third year. His life had been expended in the diligent and kindly pursuit of his calling at Newark, Bury St. Edmund's, London, and Bath.

Mackintosh and Coleridge, while presenting diverse views of Hartley's doctrine, are lavish of encomiums upon his virtues and purity of character. A very brief and very dry biography was composed by his son, with filial regard and quaint delineation. A few fragments from this recondite production will present the philosopher “in the habit and manner as he lived.” “His person was of middle size and well proportioned. His complexion fair, his features regular and handsome. His countenance open, ingenuous and animated. He was peculiarly neat in person and attire. He lived in personal intimacy with the learned men of his age,” among whom are enumerated Law, bishop of Carlisle; Butler, bishop of Durham; Warburton, bishop of Gloucester; Hoadley, successively bishop of Bangor, Hereford, and Winchester; Pope and Young; Dr. Jortin and Dr. Byrom; Hawkins, Browne, and Hooke, the forgotten historian of Rome. The list is sufficiently heterogeneous. “His mind was formed to benevolence and  universal philanthropy. His genius was penetrating and active, his industry indefatigable, his philosophical observations and attentions unremitting. His natural temper was gay, cheerful, and sociable. He was addicted to no vice in any part of his life, neither to pride, nor to sensuality, nor intemperance, nor ostentation, nor envy, nor to any sordid self-interest; but his heart was replete with every contrary virtue.”

Philosophy. — Hartley neither proclaimed nor produced any scheme of speculation, nor did he pretend that his views were characterized by any marked degree of originality. He investigated and endeavored to explain certain phenomena of the human mind, and to discover the machinery of thought. He has bequeathed a doctrine which has been in part generally adopted, and which has been frequently exaggerated by admirers who have repudiated, ignored, or been ignorant of the characteristic groundwork on which it had been erected. The source and filiations of his tenets have been indicated by him with what Sir James Mackintosh conceives to have been extravagant generosity. Hartley's acknowledgments are, however, made in ignorance of his much larger, but more remote obligations to Aristotle. “About eighteen years ago,” says he, in ‘the preface of his work, “I was informed that the Rev. Mr. Gay, then living, asserted the possibility of deducing all our intellectual pleasures and pains from association. This put me upon considering the power of association. By degrees many disquisitions foreign to the doctrine of association, or, at least, not immediately connected with it, intermixed themselves.” “I think, however, that I cannot be called a system maker, since I did not first form a system, and then suit the facts to it, but was carried on by a train of thoughts from one thing to another, frequently without any express design, or even any previous suspicion of the consequences that might arise.” Assuredly this is neither a systematic nor a philosophical method of procedure. But this easy divagation of thought explains the instability, want of consistency, and partial incoherence of Hartley's speculations. It also explains the facility and unsuspected inconsequence with which a portion of the doctrine has been separated from its accompaniments for special acceptance and development.

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

In this speculation there are three distinct but intimately connected doctrines.

1. The theory of the association of ideas.

2. The physiological and physical mode of accounting for this association and for perception by the vibrations of an elastic ether through the medullary substance of the nerves.

3. The assertion of the necessity of human actions. The last of these connects itself with the optimism of Leibnitz and the fatalism of Spinoza, through King's Origin of Evil. The second dogma was early abandoned, at least in the form in which it was presented by this author. It was not entirely novel, but it was the most original portion of Hartley's labors, and through it he mainly influenced the development of the French philosophy. It was suggested-by one of the queries in Newton's Optics, and may be traced through the animal spirits of Locke and Des Cartes, and the vortices and elastic ether of Des Cartes to the earlier philosophers, and up to Epicurus and Leucippus. It may merit renewed consideration if the physiological psychology now in prospect should gain acceptance. The doctrine of Association is regarded as being peculiarly Hartley's own. It was not altogether novel: he himself ascribes its first suggestion to Gay. It is presupposed in many suggestions of Locke, and is descended from a more remote and illustrious ancestry, which runs back to the Stagyrite —  the reputed fountain of so much error, the father of so much wisdom. It received, however, such an ingenious and extensive development from Hartley that Sir James Mackintosh rightly disregards the claims of Gay, but wrongly neglects earlier obligations.' It is largely incorporated into recent schemes of metaphysics, ethics, and aesthetics, but severed from the mechanical hypothesis which gave it its chief originality and its distinctive complexion. In this mutilated form it possesses unquestionable truth; but still it is only an imperfect explanation of a limited class of mental and moral phenomena, and is easily pressed, as it has often been pushed, to absurd and hazardous conclusions. Coleridge has. forcibly signalized its dangers, and has declared that, wherever it deviates from the simpler exposition of Aristotle, it declines into error and immoral courses.

Literature. — Hartley, Observations on Man, his Framer his Duty, his Expectations, with Notes and Additions by Herman Andrew Pistorius (Lond. 1791, 3 vols. 8vo). Al. abridgment of the original edition had been published by Dr. Priestley (Lond. 1775), with the omission of the doctrine of vibrations and vibratiuncules. It is from this mutilated presentment that the theory of Association has been principally derived. Hume, Inquiry concerning the Human Understanding, sec. 2-7; Reid, On the Intellectual Powers, Essay 2, ch. 3, ed. Hamilton — unfortunately, Sir William never supplied the notes to Reid, which he indicates by numbers: Mackintosh, On the Progress of Ethical Philosophy; Dugald Stewart, On the Progress of Metaphysical, Ethical, and Political Philosophy (Philosophical Essays, Works, edit. Sir W. Hamilton); Coleridge, Biographia Literaria. ch. 5-7 Morell, History of Modern Philosophy. (G. F. H.)

## Hartley, Robert[[@Headword:Hartley, Robert]]

             a practical philanthropist, was born in England in 1795, and removed with his father to New York in 1798. He grew up with the expectation of entering the ministry, but was prevented by feeble health, and engaged in mercantile pursuits. He devoted his life to works of charity and mercy. He was the first to expose the iniquity of the "swill milk" traffic. He visited Europe and learned the various systems there in use, and on his return formed a society for the amelioration of the condition of the poor, which commanded the admiration and support of the wisest and best men in the city. He was secretary of the Hospital for the Ruptured and Crippled, and manager of the Presbyterian Hospital, Juvenile Asylum, and various other charities. He was an elder in the Madison Square Presbyterian Church, and abounded in works of piety and usefulness. He died in New York city, March 3, 1881. (W.P.S.)

## Hartlib, Samuel[[@Headword:Hartlib, Samuel]]

             an English writer of the 17th century, was born of Polish Protestant parents. He came to England about 1640, took an active part in the theological questions of the day, and endeavored to bring about a union of the different churches. He afterwards devoted himself to the improvement of agriculture, etc. Having spent all his fortune in these attempts, he received from Cromwell a pension of £300, which was suppressed at the Restoration. He spent the latter part of his life in retirement, and perhaps in want. The exact time of his death is unknown. He wrote A Relation of that which hath been lately attempted to pro-cure Ecclesiastical Peace among Protestants (Lond. 1641). — Considerations concerning England's Reformation in Church and State (1647, 4to): — Twisse's doubting  conscience resolved (1652, 8vo); some works on Husbandry, etc. Milton addressed his Essay on Education to Hartlib. See Gentleman's Magazine, 72; Censura literaria, vol. 3; Chalmers, General Biographical Dictionary.

## Hartman, Johann Adolph[[@Headword:Hartman, Johann Adolph]]

             a learned German divine, was born at Munster in 1680. After being several years a Jesuit, he became a Protestant at Cassel in 1715, and was soon after made professor of philosophy and poetry. In 1722 he was appointed professor of history and rhetoric at Marpurg, and died there in 1744. His most esteemed works are, Hist. Hassaica: — Vitea Pontificum Romanorum Victoris II, Urbani II, Pascalis II, Gelasii II, Callisti II, Honorii II. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Hartmann, Anton Theodor[[@Headword:Hartmann, Anton Theodor]]

             a German Protestant theologian and Orientalist, was born at Dusseldorf June. 25,1774. He studied at Osnabruck, Dortmund and Göttingen. After being successively corrector of thee gymnasium of Saest in 1797, rector of the gymnasium of Herford in 1799, and professor in that of Oldenburg in 1804, he was appointed professor of theology in the University of Rostock in 1811. He died at Rostock April 21, 1838. He is especially known for his works on antiquities, and on Hebrew and Arabic literature, the principal of which are Aufkldrung u. Asien f: Bibelforscher (Oldenburg, 1806-7, 2 vols. 8vo): — Die Hebrdermin am Putztische u. als Braut (Amst. 1809- 1810, 3 vols. 8vo): — Supplementa ad J. Buxtoifii et W. Gesenii Lexic. (Rostock,. 1813, 4to): — Thesauri Linguae Hebraicae e Michna augendi (Rostock, 1825-1826, 3 parts, 4to): — LinguistischeEinleitung in d. Studiums der Bicher des A. T. (Rostock,. 1818, 8vo): — Hist. Krit. Forschungen über die Bildung, d. Zeitalter u. Plan d. fünf Bücher Moses (Rostock et Gustrow, 1831, 8vo): — Die enge Verbindung d. A. T. mit d. N. (Hamb. 1831, 8vo): — Blicke in d. Geist d. Urchristen-thums (Dusseldorf, 1802, 8vo). See Haag, La France Protestante; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 474.

## Hartmann, Christian Friedrich[[@Headword:Hartmann, Christian Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Kothen, October 12, 1767. He studied at Halle, was in 1792 con-rector, and in 1796 rector, in his native place. In 1810 he was deacon of St. Agnes, in 1815 director of all the schools, and in 1822 member of consistory. He died February 5, 1827, leaving, Uebersetzung der Propheten Nahum, Habakuk, Zephania und Obaja (Leipsic, 1791): — Comnmentatio in Epistolam Judae (Kbthen, 1793): — De Studio Religionis Christianae in Scholis Rite Instituendo (ibid. 1797-98): — Geschichte der evangelisch-lutherischen St. Agneskirche in Cothen (1799): — Die biblische Geschichte mit  praktischen Anmerkungen (1802, 2 parts). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:273; 2:135. (B.P.)

## Hartmann, Heinrich Ludwig[[@Headword:Hartmann, Heinrich Ludwig]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born January 6, 1770, was in 1810 professor at the Grimma gymnasium, and died February 13, 1831, leaving Commentatio de OEconomo Improbo, apud Lucan 16:1-13 (Leipsic, 1830). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:243; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:509. (B.P.)

## Hartmann, Joachim[[@Headword:Hartmann, Joachim]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born January 1, 1715. He studied at Rostock, where he also commenced his academical career in 1739. In 1748 he took the degree of doctor of divinity, by presenting De Actu Reprobis, Vero Redemptionis Christi Objecto, and died November 6, 1795. He published also, De Vaticinio Simeonis Luk 12:34-35 (Rostock, 1744): — Vindiciae Exegeseos Dicti 2 Petri, 2:1 (ibid. 1754): — Progr. Argumentorum ad Probandum pro impoenitentia Finali Praestitam Satisfactionem ab Uri versalitate Gratiae et Meriti Christi Desumtorum (ibid. eod.): — Jesus Nazarenus, Verus Messias (ibid. 1757): — Specimen Chronologiae Biblicae (ibid. 1771): — Progr. quo ad Institutum Greisbachii Textum N.T. Graecum Mutandi Quaedam Exponit (ibid. 1775). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:440. (B.P.)

## Hartmann, Johann Melchior[[@Headword:Hartmann, Johann Melchior]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born February 20, 1764, at Nbrdlingen. He studied at Jena and Gottingen, was called in 1793 to Marburg as professor of philosophy and Oriental languages, and died February 16, 1827, leaving, Commentatio de Geographia Africae Edrisiana (Gottingen, 1792; 2d ed. 1796): — Anfalngsgunde der hebraischen Sprache (Marburg, 1797; 2d ed. 1819): — Hebraische Chrestomathie (ibid. 1797): — Museum fur biblische und orientalische Literatur (ibid. 1807). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:116, 166, 277. (B.P.)

## Hartmann, Julius[[@Headword:Hartmann, Julius]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born June 1,1806. He served as deacon at different places in Wurtemberg, and was called in 1851 to Tuttlingen. In 1877 he was made doctor of theology, and died Dec. 9,1879, leaving, Geschichte der Reformation in Wurtemberg (1835): — Das Lebe Jesu nach den Evangelien (1837-39, 2 vols.): — Johann Brenz (1840, 2 volumes): — Alteste Katechetische der evangelischen Kirche (1841): — Erhard Schnepff der Reformator (1870). He was also one of the editors of Leben und ausgewahlte Schriften der Vdter und Begrunder der luth. Kirche, for which he wrote the life of Brenz (volume 6 of the collection, Elberfeld, 1862), and contributed to Piper's Evangelische Kalender and Herzog's Real-Encyklop. (B.P.)

## Hartwell, Jesse (1)[[@Headword:Hartwell, Jesse (1)]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Charlemont, Massachusetts, in March, 1781. He was converted at the age of sixteen, and ordained at Sandisfield, January 9, 1800. A large part of his life was spent in missionary work, under appointment from the Massachusetts Missionary Society. His tours extended beyond New England to the Black River country, N.Y., and into different sections of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Canada. He first went to Ohio in 1815, and is believed to have baptized by immersion the first convert in the Western Reserve. He died at Perry, Ohio, November 21, 1860. See Watchman and Reflector, December 20, 1860. (J.C.S.)

## Hartwell, Jesse (2), D.D[[@Headword:Hartwell, Jesse (2), D.D]]

             an eminent Baptist minister, was born at New Marlborough, Massachusetts, in 1794. He graduated with high rank from Brown University in 1819; for two years thereafter was principal of the University Grammar-school in Providence, pursuing at the same time his theological studies. He was ordained at Providence in 1821, and in 1823 went to South Carolina, and became an instructor in the Furman Theological Seminary, supplying vacant pulpits as opportunity presented. Subsequently he was settled as a clergyman in Alabama, and was an instructor in theology in what is known as Howard College, in that state. For several years he resided in Arkansas, where, as a preacher and teacher, he did good service. He became, in 1855, president of what was known as the Mt. Lebanon University, in Louisiana, and died there, September 16, 1865. (J.C.S.)

## Hartwig, John Christopher[[@Headword:Hartwig, John Christopher]]

             came to America as chaplain to a German regiment in the service of England during the first French war, as it is called. He was a member of the first Lutheran synod held in this country in 1748. His first regular charge combined several congregations in Hunterdon Co., N. J. He labored for a brief period in Pennsylvania, but the larger portion of his ministry was spent in the state of New York. He died in 1796. The manner of his death furnishes a remarkable instance of the power of the imagination. Forty years before, the impression from a dream on his birthday, that he would live just forty years longer, had become so strong that he felt persuaded the dream would be fulfilled, and his life protracted to the close of his eightieth year. On the day preceding its completion he came to the residence of the Hon. J. R. Livingston, and announced that he had come to his house to die. In the evening he conducted the family devotions, and the next morning  arose in apparent health. He breakfasted with the family, and entered freely into conversation until the approach of the hour, as he supposed, for his departure, 11 o'clock A.M. A few minutes before the time, he requested permission to retire. Mr. Livingston, unobserved by him, followed, and noticed that he was undressing. Just as the clock tolled the hour, he was in the act of removing the stock from the neck; at that moment he fell back and expired. Notwithstanding his eccentricities, he possessed many noble qualities, and his name will ever be associated with the institution in Otsego Co., N.Y., which bears his name, and of which he may be said to be the founder. The tract of land he received for his services as chaplain he bequeathed principally for the establishment of a theological and missionary institution for the instruction of pious young men for the Lutheran ministry, and for the education of Indians in the Christian religion as missionaries among their own tribes. (M. L. S.)

## Hartzheim, Caspar[[@Headword:Hartzheim, Caspar]]

             a German theologian, was born at Cologne in 1678.. He belonged to a distinguished family, entered the Jesuit order at Treves in 1698, and taught rhetoric, philosophy, and theology successively at Treves, Paderborn, Cologne, and other places. He died about 1750, leaving, Custum Novae Legis Presbyterium, etc. (Cologne, 1717): — Pietas in Salvatorem Mundi, etc. (Mayence, 1728): — Explicatio Fabularum et Superstitionum, etc. (Cologne, 1734): — Vita Nicolai de Cusa (Treves, 1730): — Solilegium Solandis Animabus Defunctorum (Cologne, 1735; in German, 1743). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Hartzheim, Joseph[[@Headword:Hartzheim, Joseph]]

             a German historian, was born at Cologne in 1694. At the age of seventeen he joined the Jesuits, was for some time professor of Oriental languages at Milan, afterwards professor of philosophy and theology at Cologne, and died May 17, 1763, leaving, De Initio Metropoleos Ecclesiosticae Colonice (Cologne, 1731, 1732): — Bibliotheca Coloniensis, etc. (ibid. 1747): — Catalogus Coloniensis (ibid. 1752): — De Edenda Collectione Conciliorum Germaniae (ibid. 1758): — Concilia Germaniae (1759-63, 5 volumes). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:662; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Harum[[@Headword:Harum]]

             (Heb. Harem', חָרֻם, elevated; Sept. Ι᾿αρείμ), the father of Aharhel, the “families” of which latter are enumerated among the posterity of Coz, of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 4:8). B.C. post 1612.

## Harumaph[[@Headword:Harumaph]]

             (Heb. Charunzaph', חֲרוּמִ, Snub-nosed; Sept. Ε᾿ρωμάφ v.r. Ε᾿ρωμάθ), “father” of Jedaiah, which latter was one of the priests who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 3:10). B.C. ante 446.

## Haruphite[[@Headword:Haruphite]]

             (Heb. Charuphi', חֲרוּפַי,with the art.; for which the Masoretic margin more correctly reads חֲרַיפַּי, Hariphite; Sept. Α᾿ρουφί v.r. Χαριφιήλ, Vulg. Haruphites), an epithet of Shephatiah, one of the brave adventurers who joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:5); so called, probably, as being a native of HARIPH. “Josabad the Gederathite,” of the preceding verse, was probably from the same place; and as he was so called from being a resident of Gedor (q.v.), it would seen that the epithet “Haruphite” was an equivalent one, as a descendant from Hareph (q.v.), the founder of Geder (1Ch 2:51).

## Haruspex[[@Headword:Haruspex]]

             a name for Etruscan soothsayers, who divined future events from the inspection of the entrails of victims; an art afterwards introduced into Rome. SEE AUGUR; SEE DIVINATION.

## Haruz[[@Headword:Haruz]]

             (Heb. Charuts', חָרוּוֹ, eager, as in Pro 12:27, etc.; Sept. Α᾿ροῦς), a citizen of Jotbah, and father of Meshullemeth, who became the wife of king Manasseh, and mother of king Amon (2Ki 21:19). B.C. ante 664.

## Harvard, John[[@Headword:Harvard, John]]

             founder of Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., was born in England, studied at Emanuel College, Cambridge, where he became A.M. in 1635, and entered into the ministry among the Dissenters. Emigrating to America, he became pastor of a Congregational society at Charlestown, Mass., where he preached but a short time, and died Sept. 14, 1638. In his will he left a legacy of nearly £800 to the high school of Cambridge. This bequest laid the foundation of the college, to which the trustees gave the name of its benefactor.

## Harvard, John (2)[[@Headword:Harvard, John (2)]]

             the founder of Harvard University, was born in England about 1608. He graduated from Emmanuel College, Cambridge, in 1631, came to New England in 1637, officiated as clergyman in the Massachusetts colony in 1638, and died at Charlestown, September 14 of the same year. He gave about £800 and his library to the establishment of the college on a strictly orthodox basis. See Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Harvest[[@Headword:Harvest]]

             (קָצַיר, katsr', i.e. reaping; θερισμός), the season of gathering grain or fruits. In general, this fell, as now in Palestine, in the middle of April or Abib (Joh 4:35), although in many parts, e.g. at Jericho (whose inhabitants were the first to present the first fruits, Mishna, Pesach, 4:8), it began as early as March (Shaw, Tray. p. 291). (See Gerdes, De tempore messis Hebraeorum, Utrecht, 1720.) Dr. Robinson says: “On the 4th and 5th of June, the people of Hebron were just beginning to gather their wheat; on the 11th and 12th, the threshing-floors on the Mount of Olives were in full operation. We had already seen the harvest in the same state of progress on the plains of Gaza on the 19th of May; while at Jericho, on the 12th of May, the threshing-floors had nearly completed their work” (Bib. Res. 2, 99, 100). On the sixteenth day of the first month, Abib or Nisan (Josephus, Ant. 3, 10, 5), a handful of ripe ears was offered before the Lord as the first-fruits; after which it was lawful to put the sickle to the corn (Lev 23:9-14). (See Schramm, De manipulo hordeaceo, Frckft. a. O. 1706.) The harvest is described as beginning with the barley, and with the festival of the Passover (Lev 23:9-14; 2Sa 21:9-10; Ruth 2, 23), and ending with the wheat (Gen 30:14; Exo 34:22), and with the festival of Pentecost (Exo 23:16).  (See Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 684.) In the most ancient times the corn was plucked up by the roots. When the sickle was used, the wheat was either cropped off under the ear, or cut close to the ground; in the former case, the straw was afterwards plucked up for use; in the latter, the stubble was left and burnt on the ground for manure (Isa 17:5; Job 24:24). The sheaves were collected into a heap, or removed to the threshing-floor (Gen 37:7; Lev 23:10-15; Rth 2:7-15; Job 24:10, Jer 9:22; Mic 4:12; Amo 2:13). In Palestine at the present day, the grain is not bound into sheaves, but is gathered into two large bundles, which are carried home on either side of the backs of animals (Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 323).

The reapers were the owners and their children, and men and women servants (Rth 2:4; Rth 2:8; Rth 2:21; Rth 2:23; Joh 4:36; James 5, 4). Refreshments were provided for them, especially drink, of which the gleaners were often allowed to partake (Rth 2:9); so in the Egyptian scenes we see reapers drinking, and the gleaners applying to share the draught. The time of harvest was a season of very great enjoyment, especially when the crops had been plentiful (Psa 126:1-6; Isa 9:3). The harvest in Scripture is likewise put for a time of destruction (Hos 6:11), according to Newcome; but according to Horsley, for a time of mercy. Of the former sense there is an example in Jer 51:33, plainly referring to the judgments of God upon Babylon. So in the oracle concerning Damascus (Isa 17:5), as Lowth observes, the king of Assyria shall sweep away the whole body of the people, as the reaper strips off the whole crop of corn, and the remnant shall be no more in proportion than the scattered ears left to the gleaner. In Joe 3:13, the last words explain the figurative language which precedes: they are ripe for excision. The same comparison is used in Rev. 14:14; 15:18, where the person referred to as executing vengeance is Jesus Christ himself, though angels assist in the execution. But harvest is also used in a good sense, as in Mat 9:37; Luk 10:2; Joh 4:35. So in Jer 8:20, “The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved;” i.e. the time in which we expected to be saved is past. The harvest, in agricultural reckoning, is considered to be the end of the season, being the time appointed for gathering in the fruits of the earth, and finishing the labors of the year. So, in Mat 13:39, our Lord says, “The harvest is the end of the world, and the reapers are the angels” In Mat 9:36, our Lord, seeing multitudes coming to hear him, remarks, “The harvest truly is plenteous;” i.e. many are willing to receive instruction. SEE AGRICULTURE.

## Harvey, Joseph, D.D[[@Headword:Harvey, Joseph, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was a native of Connecticut. While pastor of the Church at Goshen, in that state, he became deeply interested in the conversion of the Sandwich Islanders, and through his influence the first two missionaries to those islands, Messrs. Bingham and Thurston, were selected and ordained at Goshen, September 28, 1819. Dr. Harvey died at Harvey, Michigan, February 4, 1873. See Presbyterian, March 1, 1873. (W.P.S.).

## Harvey, Sir George[[@Headword:Harvey, Sir George]]

             a Scottish painter, was born at St. Ninians, near Stirling, in February 1806. He was educated in art in the Trustees' Academy at Edinburgh, and in 1826 became an associate of the Scottish Academy; in 1829 was elected a fellow, and in 1864 became its president. He received the honor of knighthood in 1867, and died at Edinburgh, January 22, 1876. His best pictures are those depicting historical episodes in religions history from a puritan or evangelical standpoint, such as Covenanters Preaching; Covenanters' Communion; John Bunyan and his Blind Daughter; Sabbath  Evening; The Quitting of the Manse. He was also equally successful in subjects not directly religious. See Encyclop. Brit. 9th ed. s.v.

## Harwood, Edward[[@Headword:Harwood, Edward]]

             a learned Unitarian minister, was born in 1729 in Lancashire. In 1754 he became master of a school at Congleton, in Cheshire, from whence he removed in 1765 to Bristol, where he was ordained over a Presbyterian congregation. In 1768 he obtained his degree of D.D. from Edinburgh, through the interest of Dr. Chandler, whose daughter he married. His character, however, was so immoral that his congregation dismissed him; on which he came to London, where he supported himself by teaching the classics and correcting the press. He died poor in 1794. His principal works are,

1. A View of the various editions of the Greek and Roman Classics (London, 4th edit., 1791, 12mo): —

2. An Introduction to the New Testament (Lond. 1773-81, 2 vols. 8vo): —

3. An edition of the Greek Testament (2 vols. 8vo): —

4. A Liberal Translation of the New Testament into polite English (or, in other words, a burlesque of the sacred Scriptures) (Lond. 1768, 2 vols. 8vo): —

5. The New Testament, collated with the most approved MSS., with select Notes (1776,2 vols. 12mo). See Gentleman's Mag. vols. 62-64; Watt, Bibl. Britannica.

## Hasadiah[[@Headword:Hasadiah]]

             (Heb. Chasadyah', חֲסִדנְיָה,favored by Jehovah; Sept. Α᾿σαδία), one of the five sons of Pedaiah. (not of Zerubbabel, who was a sixth), of the descendants of David (1Ch 3:20); probably the same otherwise called JUSHAB-HESED in the same verse (see Strong's Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels, p. 17). B.C. cir. 536.

## Hascall, Daniel[[@Headword:Hascall, Daniel]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Bennington, Vt., Feb. 24, 1782, graduated at Middlebury College in 1806, and afterwards studied theology while engaged as a teacher in Pittsfield, Mass. In 1808 he became pastor of the Baptist church in Elizabethtown, Essex Co., N. Y., where he was ordained Sept. 7th, and in 1813 he accepted a call from the Baptist Church of Hamilton, N.Y. In 1815 he began to receive pupils in theology, and after establishing the Baptist Education Society of New York in 1817, his little school was in 1820 transformed into the “Hamilton Literary and Theological Institution” (now Madison University), which was opened under his charge, and to which he afterwards exclusively devoted himself, dissolving his pastoral connection in 1828. He however left it in 1835, and gave his attention to an academy which, two years before, had been started  mainly through his agency in: Florence, Oneida Co., N. Y. In 1848 he resumed his; ministerial labors as pastor of the Baptist Church in Lebanon, N. Y. He died June 28,1852. Mr. Hascall's publications were, Elements of Theology, designed for family reading and Bible-classes; a smaller work of the same kind for Sabbath-schools; Caution against False: Philosophy, a sermon (1817); and a pamphlet entitled. Definitions of the Greek Bapto, Baptizo, etc. (1818). Sprague, Annals, 6, 547.

## Hase, Christian Gottfried[[@Headword:Hase, Christian Gottfried]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died at Brandenburg in 1766, is the author of, De Messia in Jobo (Halle, 1759): — De Stylo Amosi Propheta et Ejus Vita (1751): — Versuch sines Lehrgebaudes der hebr. Sprache (1750): — Versuch einer Auslegung des hohen Liedes Salomonis (1765). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:365; Steinschneider, Bibl. Handbuch, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hase, Theodor[[@Headword:Hase, Theodor]]

             a Reformed theologian, was born at Bremen, November 30, 1682. He studied at Marburg, was in 1707 professor of sacred philology at Hanau, in 1708 preacher at Bremen, in 1723 professor of theology there, and died February 25, 1731. He wrote, De Leviathan Jobi et Ceto Jonae: — De ὀνολατρείᾷ Christianis et Judaeis olim Objecta: — De Decreto Imperatoris Tiberii quo Christum Referre Voluit in Numerum Deorum: — Diss. 5, de Baptismo Super Mortuis, de Aquis Hieruchintinis per Elisam Conditis, de Templo Oniae Heliopolitano, de Jeschurune ad Deu 32:15, and contributed largely to the Bibliotheca Theolog. Bremensis and Museum Philologico-Theologicum. His dissertations were published at Bremen in 1731; under the title, Dissertationum et Observationum Sacrarum Sylloge. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:275, 279, 543; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:365. (B.P.)

## Hasenkamp[[@Headword:Hasenkamp]]

             the family name of several German theologians.

JOHANN GERHARD was born in Wechte, Prussia, June 12, 1736. Having become a student at the Academy of Lingen, 1753-55, he distinguished himself by an eager thirst for knowledge, and by great earnestness of religious activity. For preaching without license he was several times arrested. After eleven years' suspension he was made rector of the Gymnasium in Duisburg in 1766, and soon after married, and settled down earnestly to his work of restoring the fallen fortunes of the gymnasium. His religious tendencies always inclined him to favor pietism, and to urge the necessity of deep Christian experience. He therefore sympathized fully with. Collenbusch (q.v.) and Oetinger (q.v.). He was again: suspended as a “mystic” and disturber, but was soon restored by the higher Church authorities at Berlin. He died July 10, 1771. His autobiography, extending to 1766, and continued by his son, was published in the journal Wahrheit z. Göttseligkeit (vol. 2, 5, 6,1836). He also published Predigte and. Geschmack der drei ersten Jahrhunderte (Frankfort, 1772). His other writings are of little importance.

FRIEDRICH ARNOLD, his half-brother, born Jan. 11,. 1747, succeeded Johann as rector of Duisburg, and married his widow. Following in the footsteps of his brother, he shared his religious opinions and feelings, and wrote several pamphlets in exposition of the views of the so-called  “mystical” school of Stilling and Lavater. He also wrote against Semler and other rationalists, who fared badly under his fiery attacks. See his U. die ver-dunkelnde Aufkldrung (Duisb. 1789): — Briefe über Propheten (Duisb. 1791), etc. He died in 1795.

JOHANN HEINRICH, another brother, was born Sept.19, 1750. After helping his parents until he was sixteen years old, he began his studies, was from 1776 to 1779 rector at Emmerich, and, having been appointed pastor of a small congregation near Altona, remained there during the last thirty- five years of his life. The loneliness of his life in the solitude of his remote parish influenced his character, yet he is the most genial of the three brothers, as is seen in his Christliche Schriften (Munster, 1816-19, 2 vols.). He died July 17, 1814. Herzog, Real-Encyklop.; Pierer, Universal- Lexikon, s.v. (J. N. P.)

## Hasenmuller, Daniel[[@Headword:Hasenmuller, Daniel]]

             a German philologist, was born at Eutin, July 3, 1651. He studied at Kiel and Leipsic, was in 1682 professor of Greek at the former place, in 1688 professor of homiletics, and in 1689 of Oriental languages. He died May 29, 1691, leaving, Diss. de Linguis Orientalibus: — De Operibus Sabbathum Depellentibus: — Biblia Parva Graeca: — Janua Hebraismi Aperta: — פרקי אבות, cum Versione Latina. See Moller, Cimbria Litterata; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:3656; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v.; Steinschneider, Bibl. Handbuch, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hasenmuller, Elias[[@Headword:Hasenmuller, Elias]]

             a German Jesuit, who joined the Lutheran Church in 1587 is the author of Historia Jesuitici Ordinis (Frankfort, 1588, and later, Germ. transl. by Melchior Leporinus, ibid. 1594). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:721; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hasenuah[[@Headword:Hasenuah]]

             or rather SENUAH (סְנוּאָח, a bristling [Gesen.] or hated [Furst], with the art. הִסְּנוּאָה, has-Senuah'), the name of two Benjamites (but the name has the fem. termination).

1. (Sept. Α᾿σανουά, Eng. Vers. “Hasenuah.”) Father of Hodaviah and ancestor of Sallu, which last was;. a chief resident of Jerusalem, apparently after the Captivity (1Ch 9:7). B.C. ante 536.

2. (Sept. Α᾿σανά, Eng.Vers. “Senuah.”) Father of Judah, which latter was “second over the city,” after the return from Babylon (Neh 11:9). B.C. cir. 440.

## Hasert, Christian Adolf[[@Headword:Hasert, Christian Adolf]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died December 23, 1864, at Greifswalde, pastor, doctor, and professor of philosophy, published, Predigten uber die Epistela und freie Texte (Greifswalde, 1836-37, 2 volumes): — Ueber die Vorhersagungen Jesu von seinemia Tode und seiner Auferstehung (Berlin, 1839): — Ueber den Religionsunterricht in Volksschullehrer-Seminarien (Greifswalde, 1832). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:138, 174, 177, Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:512. (B.P.)

## Hash-Baz[[@Headword:Hash-Baz]]

             SEE MAHER-SHALAL-HASH-BAZ.

## Hashabiah[[@Headword:Hashabiah]]

             (Heb. Chashabyah', חֲשִׁבְיָה[and in 1Ch 25:3; 1Ch 26:20; 2Ch 35:9, the prolonged form Chashabya'hu, חֲשִׁבַיָהוּ], regarded by Jehovah; Sept. Α᾿σεβί, Α᾿σώβ, Α᾿σεβίας, Α᾿σαβία, etc.), the name of at least nine descendants of Levi.

1. Son of Amaziah and father of Malluch, of the family of Merari (1Ch 6:45). B.C. long ante 1014.

2. A son of Jeduthun, appointed by David over the twelfth course of Levitical singers (1Ch 25:3; 1Ch 25:19). B.C. 1014.  3. Son of Kemuel, of Hebron, appointed by David at the head of the officers to take charge of the sacred revenue west of the Jordan (1Ch 26:30; 1Ch 27:17). B.C. 1014.

4. One of the chief Levites who made voluntary offerings of victims for the renewal of the Temple services under Josiah (2Ch 35:9). B.C. 623.

5. Son of Bunni and father of Azrikam, of the family of Merari (1Ch 9:14; Neh 11:15). B.C. considerably ante 440.

6. Son of Mattaniah and father of Bani, Levites (Neh 11:22). B.C. ante 440. 7. One of the chief priests entrusted by Ezra with the bullion and other valuables for the sacred vessels at Jerusalem (Ezr 8:24). He is probably the same whose father Hilkiah is mentioned in Neh 12:21. B.C. 536.

8. A descendant of Merari, who complied with Ezra's summons for persons to perform the proper Levitical functions at Jerusalem (Ezr 8:19). B.C. 536.

9. A chief of the Levites (Neh 12:24), “ruler of the half part of Keilah,” who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 3:17), and subscribed the covenant of fidelity to Jehovah (Neh 10:11). B.C. 446-410.

## Hashabnah[[@Headword:Hashabnah]]

             (Heb. Chashabnah', חֲשִׁבְנָה, prob. for חֲשַׁבְיָה, Hashabiah; Sept. Ε᾿σαβανά,Vulg. Hasebna), one of the chief of the people who subscribed Nehemiah's covenant (Neh 10:25). B.C. cir. 410.

## Hashabniah[[@Headword:Hashabniah]]

             (Heb. Chashabneyah', חֲשַׁבְיָה, i.q. חֲשִׁבַנְיָה,Hashabnah; Sept. Α᾿σβανία, Σεβανί), the name of two men about the time of the return from Babylon.

1. Father of Hattush, which latter repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 3:10). B.C. ante 446.

2. One of the Levites appointed by Ezra to interpret the law to the people (Neh 9:5). B.C. cir. 410.

## Hashbadana[[@Headword:Hashbadana]]

             (Heb. Chashbaddanah', חִשְׁבִּדָּנָהfor חֵשֶׁב בִּדָּנָה, consideration in judging, perh. q.d. considerate judge; Sept. Α᾿σαβαδμά, Vulg. Hasbadana), one of these who stood at Ezra's left hand while he read the law to the people (Neh 8:4). B.C. cir. 410.

## Hashem[[@Headword:Hashem]]

             (Heb. Hashem', הָשֵׁם, perh. i.q. חָשֵׁם, fat; Sept. Α᾿σάμ,Vulg. Aasem), a native of Gizoh, and ancestor of two of David's heroes (1Ch 11:34; the JASHEN SEE JASHEN (q.v.) of 2Sa 23:32). B.C. ante 1014.

## Hashishim[[@Headword:Hashishim]]

             SEE ASSASSINS.

## Hashmannim[[@Headword:Hashmannim]]

             (Hebrew Chashmannim', חשְׁמִנַּים; Sept. πρέσβεις, Vulg. legati), a plur. form occurring only in the Heb. of Psa 68:31 : “Hashmannim [A. Vers. “princes”] shall come out of Egypt, Cush shall make her hands to hasten to God.” The word has usually been derived from the Arabic Mashmin, rich, hence influential or noble; but a derivation from the civil name of Hermopolis Magna in the Heptanomis, preserved in the modern Arabic Ashmunyen, “the two Ashmins,” seems more reasonable. The ancient Egyptian name is Hashmen or Hashmun, “the abode of eight;” the sound of the signs for eight, however, we take alone from the Coptic, and Brugsch reads them Sesennu (Geog. Inschr. 1, 219, 220), but hardly on conclusive grounds. If we suppose that Hashmannim is a proper name and signifies Hermopolites, the mention might be explained by the circumstance that Hermopolis Magna was the great city of the Egyptian Hermes, Thoth, the god of wisdom and the meaning might therefore be that even the wisest Egyptians should come to the Temple, as well as the distant Cushites. — Smith, s.v. We may add that the name Hasmonean, which was given to the Maccabees or Jewish princes in the interval between the O.T. and N.T.  was, it is supposed, derived from Hashmannim (Hengstenberg, Psalms, 2, 369).

## Hashmonah[[@Headword:Hashmonah]]

             (Heb. Chashmonah', חִשְׁמוֹנָה, fatness; Sept. Α᾿σσεμωνᾶ v.r. Α᾿σελμωνᾶ and Σελμωνᾶ) the thirtieth station of the Israelites during their wandering, situated not far from Mount Hor (Moseroth), it the direction of the desert (Num 33:29-30); apparently near the intersection of wady el- Jerafeh with wady el-Jeib, in the Arabah. SEE EXODE.

## Hashub[[@Headword:Hashub]]

             (Heb. Chashshub', חִשּׁוּב, intelligent; Sept Α᾿σούβ, in Neh 11:15 Α᾿σσούβ, in 1Ch 9:14 Α᾿σώβ Vulg. Hasub, in 1Ch 9:14 Hassub), the name of two or three men about the time of the return front Babylon.

1. A Levite of the family of Merari, son of Azrikam, and father of Shemaiah, which last was one of those resident in the “villages of the Netophathites,” and having general oversight over the Temple (Neh 11:15; 1Ch 9:14, in which latter passage the name is. more accurately Anglicized “Hasshub”). B.C. ante 440.

2. A person who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem opposite his house (Neh 3:21); perhaps the same with the foregoing. B.C. 446.

3. “Son” of Pahath-Moab, and one of those who re-paired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 3:11). B.C. 446. He is probably the same with one of the chief' Israelites who joined-in the sacred covenant o' Nehemiah (Neh 10:23) B.C. cir. 410.

## Hashubah[[@Headword:Hashubah]]

             (Heb. Chashubah', חֲשֻׁבָה, esteemed, a Chaldaizig form for חָשׁוּב; Sept. Α᾿σεβά,Vulg. Hasaban), one of the five sons (exclusive of Zerubbabel) of Pedai'ah, the descendant of David (1Ch 3:20); not of Zerubbabel, as at first appears (see Strong's Harmony and Expos. of the Gospels, p. 17). B.C. cir. 536.

## Hashum[[@Headword:Hashum]]

             (Heb. Chashum', חָשֻׁם, opulent; Sept. Α᾿σούμ, Α᾿σήμ, ᾿Ησαμί, ᾿Ωσύμ, ᾿Ησάμ), the name apparently of two or three men about the time of the Captivity.

1. An Israelite whose posterity (or rather,. perhaps, am place whose inhabitants), to the number of 223 males,. or 328 in all, returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel. (Ezr 2:19; Neh 7:22); some of whom afterwards. divorced their Gentile wives (Ezr 10:33). The associated names seem to indicate a locality in the northwestern part of the territory of Benjamin. B.C. ante 536.

2. One of those who stood at Ezra's left hand while he was reading the law to the people (Neh 8:4); probably the same with one of the chief of the people who subscribed Nehemiah's covenant (Neh 10:18). B.C. cir. 410.

## Hashupha[[@Headword:Hashupha]]

             (Neh 7:46). SEE HASUPHA.

## Haskell, Daniel[[@Headword:Haskell, Daniel]]

             a Congregational minister, was: born at Preston, Conn., June, 1784. He graduated at Yale College, 1802; was installed pastor in Burlington,. Vt., April 10, 1810, where he remained until 1821, when he was made president of the University of Vermont. He resigned this office in 1824, and died Aug. 9, 1848. Mr. Haskell published an ordination sermon (1814); with the assistance of J. C. Smith, A Gazetteer of the United States (1843, 8vo); Chronological View of the World (1845, 12mo); and a few occasional discourses. He also edited McCulloch's Geographical Dictionary, published by the Harpers (1843-44). — Sprague, Annals, 2, 526.

## Hasmonleans[[@Headword:Hasmonleans]]

             SEE ASMONAAN.

## Haspeya[[@Headword:Haspeya]]

             (חספיא), a river and tow of Palestine, near Lebanon, mentioned in the Talmud (Demay, 2); according to Schwarz (Palest. p. 65), identical with  the modern Arabic Koroni, near the source of the Jordan; evidently the modern Hasbeia, an important place in that region (Robinson, Researches, new ed. 3, 380).

## Hasrah[[@Headword:Hasrah]]

             (Heb. Chasrah', חִסְרָה, poverty; Sept. Ε᾿σσεπί v.r. Α᾿ράς, Vulg. Hasra), the father (or mother) of Tikbath, and grandfather of Shallum, which last was husband of Huldah the prophetess (2Ch 34:22). The parallel passage (2Ki 22:14) gives the name, prob. by transposition, in the form HARHAS ( חִרְחִסSept. Α᾿ράς,Vulg. Araas). Hasrah is said to have been “keeper of the wardrobe,” perhaps the sacerdotal vestments; if, indeed, that epithet does not rather refer to — Shallum. B.C. considerably ante 623.

## Hassan[[@Headword:Hassan]]

             SEE ASSASSINS.

Hassan

a Mohammedan teacher, was the eldest son of Ali, and the second of the twelve imams of that line. On the death of his father, in 661, he was immediately proclaimed caliph and imam in Irak; the former title he was forced to resign to Moawiyah, the latter or spiritual dignity he retained in reference to his followers. He was poisoned in 678 by a son of Moawiyah', as is supposed.

## Hasse, Freidrich Rudolf[[@Headword:Hasse, Freidrich Rudolf]]

             a German theologian, was born at Dresden June 29,1808. After studying at Leipzic and Berlin, he established himself, in 1834, at the university of the latter city as privatdocent; in 1836 he became extraordinary professor of Church History at the University of Greifswald, and in 1841 ordinary professor at the University of Bonn. Subsequently he was also appointed consistorial councilor. He died in 1862. His principal work is the excellent monograph Anselm von Canterbury (Leips. 1843- 52,2 vols.), one of the best works of this class, and which had the merit of causing amore scientific treatment of the history of scholasticism. His Geschichte des alten Bundes (Leips. 1863) is a course of lectures, and, as such, is meritorious. His Kirchengeschichte was published after his death by Koher (Leips. 1864, 3 vols.). See Krafft, F. R. Hasse (Bonn, 1865); Studiel u. Kritkien, 1867, p. 823.

## Hasse, Johann[[@Headword:Hasse, Johann]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born in- 1822. He studied at Breslau, and was professor of exegesis at the Pelplin seminary. In 1859 he was appointed vicar-general of the Culm diocese, in 1865 became a  member of the chapter, in 1867 cathedral provost, and died Sept. 8, 1869, at Hanau, on his return from the episcopal convention which had met at Fulda. (B.P.)

## Hasse, Johann Gottfried[[@Headword:Hasse, Johann Gottfried]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Weimar in 1759. He studied at Jena, was in 1786 professor of Oriental languages at Konigsberg, in 1788 professor of theology, and died April 12, 1806. He published, Libri Quartz Regum Syroheptaplaris Specimen (Jena, 1782): — Salono's Weisheit ubersetzt nmit Anmerkungen (ibid. 1784): — Idiognomik Davids, etc. (ibid. eod): — Aussichten zu kuntigen Aufklarungen uber das Alte Testament (1785): — Das andere Buch der Maccabaier neu ubersetzt (1786): — Hebr. Sprachlehre (1786-87): — De Dialectis Linguae Syriacae (1787): — Lectiones Syro-Arabico- Samaritano Ethiopicae (1788): — Magazin fur die biblisch-orientalische Literatur (1788-89): — Christus ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος (ibid. 1790): — Praktisches Handbuch der aramaischen oder syrisch-samaritanischen Sprache (1791): — Augsustu Christi Nascituri Forsan non Ignarus (ibid. 1805). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:74, 115, 200, 232, 273, 277, 280, 423, 554, 555, 617; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:365 sq. (B.P.)

## Hassel, Johann Bernhard[[@Headword:Hassel, Johann Bernhard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born February 22, 1690, at Wolfenbuttel. He studied at Helmstadt, was preacher in his native city in 1721, general superintendent there in 1726, and died February 23, 1755. His publications are but few, and without any special value for our time. See: Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hassenaah[[@Headword:Hassenaah]]

             (Neh 3:3). SEE SENAAH.

## Hassencamp, Johann Mathaus[[@Headword:Hassencamp, Johann Mathaus]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Marburg, July 28, 1743. He studied at his native place and at Gottingen, was in 1769 professor of mathematics and Oriental languages at Rinteln, and died October 6, 1797, leaving, Commentatio de Pentateucho 70 Interpretum (Marburg, 1765): — Versuch einer neuen Erklarung der 70 Wochen Daniels (1772): — Der entdeckte wahre Ursprumg der alten Bibelubersetzungen (Minden, 1775): — Annalen der Neuesten theologischen Literatur und Kirchengeschichte  (1789-96, 8 volumes). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:9, 865. (B.P.)

## Hasshub[[@Headword:Hasshub]]

             (1Ch 9:14). SEE HASHUB.

## Hassidaeans[[@Headword:Hassidaeans]]

             SEE ASSIDEAN.

## Hastings, Thomas, D.M[[@Headword:Hastings, Thomas, D.M]]

             was born at Washington, Conn., in 1784, and at twelve years removed with his father to Clinton, N.Y. From 1824 to 1832 he conducted a religious journal in Utica, and thereafter resided in New York city, engaged in  musical instruction, until his death, May 15, 1872. He published many of the most popular books of sacred music used in the country.

## Hasupha[[@Headword:Hasupha]]

             (Heb. Chasupha', חֲשׂוּפָא, uncovered; ‘Sept. Α᾿σουφά, Α᾿σειφά; Vulg. Harupha), one of the Nethinim whose descendants returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:43; Neh 7:46, in which latter passage the name is less correctly Anglicized “Hashpha”). B.C. ante 536.

## Haswell, James M., D.D[[@Headword:Haswell, James M., D.D]]

             a Baptist missionary, was born at Bennington, Vermont, February 4, 1810. He graduated from the Hamilton Theological Seminary in 1835, and soon after was appointed missionary to Burmah, where he arrived in February 1836. He was in the employ of the American Baptist Missionary Union for more than forty years, during which time he visited the United States, first in 1849, remaining a little more than three years, and again in 1867, making a stay of about nine months. His first work was among the Peguans, or, as they are now called, the Talaings, into whose language he translated the New Test., and issued from the press quite a number of tracts. He afterwards learned the Burmese language, and was for a long time recognised as a missionary among that people. He died September 13, 1876. See Amer. Bapt. Magazine, 57:180. (J.C.S.)

## Hat[[@Headword:Hat]]

             is the rendering of the Eng. Bible for the Chald. כִּרְבְּלָא(karbela', according to Gesenius from. כַּרְבֵּל, to gird or clothe, as in 1Ch 15:27), a mantle or pallium (Dan 3:21; marg. “turbans”). SEE DRESS.

## Hat-Taavah[[@Headword:Hat-Taavah]]

             SEE KIBROTH-HAT-TAAVAH.

## Hat-Temarim[[@Headword:Hat-Temarim]]

             SEE IR-HAT-TEMARIM.

## Hat-Ticon[[@Headword:Hat-Ticon]]

             SEE HAZAR-HAT-TICON.

## Hatach[[@Headword:Hatach]]

             (Heb. Hathak', הֲתָךְ, perhaps from Persic, verity; Sept. Α᾿ρχαθἃ῝ ιος,Vulg. Athach), one of the eunuchs in the palace of Xerxes, appointed to wait on Esther, whom she employed in her communications with Mordecai (Est 4:5-6; Est 4:9-10). B.C. 474.

## Hatch, Frederick W., D.D[[@Headword:Hatch, Frederick W., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was ordained deacon in 1810, and presbyter in 1813, and had charge, successively, of the parishes in Edenton, N.C., and Frederick, Maryland, after which he removed to Virginia as rector of Fredericksville parish from 1820 to 1830. While there, Thomas Jefferson was his friend and parishioner. In 1832-1836 he officiated in Christ Church, Washington, D.C., and was chaplain to the United States Senate. In the latter year he removed to Poughkeepsie, N.Y.; in 1843 to Wisconsin, taking charge of the parishes in Southport and Racine. In 1850 he went to St. Louis, Missouri, in temporary charge of Christ and St. George's churches; thence travelled to California in June 1856, laboring as a missionary in Marysville and other places. He died in Sacramento, California, January 14, 1860, aged seventy-one years. Dr. Hatch was a fine linguist, and an indefatigable worker. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1860, page 180.

## Hatchment[[@Headword:Hatchment]]

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

## Hate[[@Headword:Hate]]

             (properly שָׂנֵא, μισέω), to regard with a passion contrary to love (Jer 44:4). God's hatred is towards all sinful thoughts and ways. It is a feeling of which all holy beings are conscious in view of sin, and is wholly unlike the hatred which is mentioned in the Scriptures among the works of the flesh (Gal 5:20). SEE ANGER. When the Hebrews compared a stronger affection with a weaker one, they called the first love, and the other hatred, meaning to love in a less degree — “Jacob have I  loved, and Esau have I hated” (Rom 9:13); i.e. on Jacob have I bestowed privileges and blessings such as are the proofs of affection; I have treated him as one treats a friend whom he loves; but from Esau have I withheld these privileges and blessings, and therefore treated him as one is wont to treat those whom he dislikes. That this refers to the bestowment of temporal blessings, and the withholding of them, is clear, not only from this passage, but from comparing Mal 1:2-3; Gen 25:23; Gen 27:27-29; Gen 27:37-40. Indeed, as to hated, its meaning here is rather privative than positive. So, “If a man have two wives, — one beloved and another hated” (Deu 21:15); i.e. less beloved. When our Savior says that he who would follow him must hate father and mother, he means that even these dearest earthly friends must be loved in a subordinate degree; so, in the same sense, the follower of Christ is to hate his own life, or be willing to sacrifice it for the love and service of the Redeemer (Gen 29:30; Deu 21:16; Pro 13:24; Mat 6:24; Mat 10:37; Luk 14:26; Luk 16:13; Joh 12:25). SEE LOVE.

## Hate (2)[[@Headword:Hate (2)]]

             in Norse mythology, was the son of the giant Gyge and the brother of Skoll; both are frightful wolves, and persecute the moon and the sun. At Ragnarokr these monsters will succeed in devouring the heavenly lights. He probably emblematizes the eclipse.

## Hatfield, Edwin Francis, D.D[[@Headword:Hatfield, Edwin Francis, D.D]]

             an eminent Presbyterian minister, was born at Elizabethtown, N.J., January 9, 1807. He graduated from Middlebury College in 1829, spent two years at Andover Theological Seminary, was ordained pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church at St. Louis in 1832, in 1835 accepted a call from. the Seventh Presbyterian Church, New York city, and remained its pastor for twenty-one years, enjoying a continuous season of revival, and receiving to its membership one thousand five hundred and fifty-six persons. A colony from this church, in 1856, organized a new church in the tipper part of the city, and Dr. Hatfield became its pastor. He remained at this post until his health failed, and resigned in 1863. When he recovered his health he was appointed financial agent of the Union Theological Seminary, and afterwards acted as secretary of the Home Missionary Society. He died at Summit, N.J., September 22, 1883. From 1846 he was stated clerk of the General Assembly, an office for which he was peculiarly fitted by his methodical habits and extensive acquaintance with the history of the Church. He was elected in 1883 moderator of the General Assembly, and performed the duties of that office with great ability. He prepared the year- book of the New York Observer during the time of its publication. Among his published works are, Universalism as it Is (1841): — Memoir of Elihu W. Baldwin (1843): — St. Helena and the Cape of Good Hope (1852): — The History of Elizabeth, N.J. (1868): — The Church Hymn-book, with Tunes (1872): — The Chapel Hymn-book (1873). He spent much time and labor in preparing for publication the Minutes of the General Assembly. See N.Y. Observer, September 27, 1883. (W.P.S.)

## Hatfield, Robert Miller, D.D[[@Headword:Hatfield, Robert Miller, D.D]]

             an eminent Methodist Episcopal minister, was born February 19, 1819, at Mount Pleasant, Westchester County, N.Y. Joining the Providence Conference in 1841, he served as pastor in. the East and West until within a few years of his death, when failing health compelled him to cease. He wasa trustee of Northwestern University, and a member of the General Missionary Committee. He was a member of the General Conferences of 1860,1864,1876. 1880, and 1884. He died March 31, 1891. He was distinguished as an eloquent public speaker. See the Northwestern Christian Advocate, April 8, 1891.

## Hatfield, Thomas[[@Headword:Hatfield, Thomas]]

             an English prelate, was prebendary of Lincoln (1342) and York (1343), and was promoted to the see of Durham in 1345. He died near London, May 8, 1381. He was the principal benefactor, if not the founder, of the friary at Northallerton, in Yorkshire, for Carmelites, or White Friars. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Hathath[[@Headword:Hathath]]

             (Heb. Chathath', חֲתָת, terror, as in Job 6:21; Sept. Α᾿θάθ), son of Othniel and grandson of Kenaz, of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 4:13), consequently also grand-nephew and grandson of Caleb, son of Jephunneh (see 1Ch 4:15, and comp. Jdg 1:13). B.C. post 1612.

## Hatipha[[@Headword:Hatipha]]

             [many Hati'pha] (Hebrew Chatipha', חֲטַיפָא, captured; Sept. Α᾿τιφά, Α᾿τειφά), one of the Nethinim whose posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:54; Neh 7:56). B.C. ante 536.

## Hatita[[@Headword:Hatita]]

             [some Hati'ta] (Heb. Chatita', חֲטַיטָא, exploration; Sept. Α᾿τιτά), one of the “porters” (i.e. Levitical Temple-janitors) whose posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:42; Neh 7:45). B.C. ante 536.

## Hatsi ham-Menuchoth[[@Headword:Hatsi ham-Menuchoth]]

             (חֲצַי הִמְּנֻחוֹת, Chatsi', etc., midst of the resting-places; Sept. Ε᾿σεὶ Α᾿μμανίθ, Vulg. dimidium requietionum, Eng. Vers. “half of the  Manahethites,” marg. “half of the Menuchites,” or “Hatsiham- Menuchoth”), one of the two sons of Shobal, the “father” of Kirjath-Jearim (1Ch 2:52); whence the patronymic for his descendants, HATSI-HAMMANACHTHITES (חֲצַי חִמָּנִחְתַּי, Sept. ᾿ἣμιου τῆς Μανάθ, Vulg. dimidium requietionis, Eng.Vers. “half of the Manahethites,” or “half of the Menuchites”), inverse 54. B.C. between 1612 and 1093. SEE MENUCHITE.

## Hattem, Pontian van[[@Headword:Hattem, Pontian van]]

             SEE HATTEMISTS.

## Hattemists[[@Headword:Hattemists]]

             a Dutch sect, named from Pontianus van Hattem, a minister in Zealand towards the close of the 18th century, who imbibed the sentiments of Spinoza, and was degraded from the pastoral office. He wrote a treatise on the Heidelberg Catechism. The Verschorists (q.v.) and Hattemists resemble each other, though Van Hattem tried in vain to unite the Verschorists with his own followers. “The founders of these sects followed the doctrine of absolute decrees into its farthest logical results; they denied the difference between moral good and evil, and the corruption of human nature; from whence they further concluded that the whole of religion consisted, not in acting, but in suffering; and that all the precepts of Jesus Christ are reducible to this one-that we bear with cheerfulness and patience the events that happen to us through the divine will, and make it our constant and only study to maintain a perfect tranquility of mind. Thus far they agreed; but the Hattemists further affirmed that Christ made no expiation for the sins of men by his death, but had only suggested to us, by his mediation, that there was nothing in us that could offend the Deity: this, they say, was  Christ's manner of justifying his servants, and presenting them blameless before the tribunal of God. It was one of their distinguishing tenets that God does not punish men for their sins, but by their sins.” — See Mosheim, Ch. History cent. 17 sec. 2, pt. 2, ch. 2; Buck, Theological Dictionary, s.v.; Paquot, Memoires pour servir a l'histoire des Pays-Bas, 9, 96-98; Hoefer, Nouvelle Biog. Géneralé, 23, 539.

## Hattil[[@Headword:Hattil]]

             (Heb. Chattil', חִטַיל, waving; Sept. Α᾿ττίλ, Ε᾿ττἠλ), one of the descendants of “Solomon's servants” i.e. perhaps Gibeonitish Temple slaves), whose posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:57; Neh 7:59.) B.C. ante 536.

## Hatto[[@Headword:Hatto]]

             bishop of Basel, was born 763, made bishop in 805, and abbot of Reichenau in 806. He was employed by Charlemagne in an embassy to the Greek emperor Nicephorus, to settle the boundaries of both empires. Having, in 823, laid aside his titles and dignities, he died in 836 as a simple monk at Reichenau. Two of his works have descended to us: De visione Wettini (Visions of his disciple Wettin on those suffering in Purgatory and on the Glory of Saints, done into verses by Walafrid Strabo, and printed in Mabillon, Acta S. Benled. 4, 1, 273); 25 capita (D'Acheri, 1, 584). — Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, s.v.; Clarke, Succession of Sac. Liter. 2, 471. (J. N. P.)

## Hatto Of Vercelli[[@Headword:Hatto Of Vercelli]]

             SEE ATTO.

## Hatto or Otho I[[@Headword:Hatto or Otho I]]

             tenth archbishop of Mentz. The time and place of his birth are unknown. In 888 he succeeded Rudolf as abbot of Reichenau, then one of the richest monasteries in Germany. He was in such favor with king Arnulf — thanks to his skill and utter want of principle-that he is said to have held at the same time eleven other abbeys. In 891 he was elected archbishop of Mentz: here he built a church to St. George, having obtained the head and another part of the body of the saint from pope Formosus! In August, 895, he presided at the Council of Tribur, where the emperor and 22 bishops were present. They voted 58 canons, mostly for the repression of crime. The 8th canon gives an idea of the power Rome held even at that period over the German churches: Honoremus sanctam romanam et apostolicam sedem, ut quce nobis sacerdotalis nutter est dignitatis, debeat esse nagistra  ecclesiasticce rationis quare.... licet vix frendum ab ilia sancta sede im ponatur jugum, conferamus et pia devotione toleremus. After Louis's death, in October, 911, Hatto was retained in the council of his successor, Conrad. Having departed on a journey to Rome, March 13, 913, he died a few days after of fever, according to one account; but, according to others, he was killed at the battle of Heresburg in January, 913. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. — Géneralé, 23, 539 sq.; Mabillon, Acta Sanct. Ord. Bened. 7, 118. (J. N. P.)

## Hatto or Otho II[[@Headword:Hatto or Otho II]]

             surnamed Bonose, 15th archbishop of Mentz. He was abbot of Fulda, and, at the death of archbishop William of Saxony, March 2, 968, was appointed his successor by Emperor Otho I. Hatto died in 969. The Magdeburg Centuries state that he was eaten alive by rats as a punishment for his avarice, and because he had, during a famine, compared the poor to these animals; and he is the subject of the well-known legend of the Rat Tower on the Rhine. — See Gallia Christiana, 5, col. 456; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 541. (J. N. P.)

## Hattush[[@Headword:Hattush]]

             (Heb. Chattush', חִטּוּשׁ, prob. assembled [Furst, contender]; Sept. Α᾿ττούς, but Χεττούς in 1Ch 3:22, and v.r. Λαττούς in Ezr 8:2), the name of several men about or after the time of the return from Babylon.

1. A priest who returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (Neh 12:2). B.C. 536.

2. A descendant of David who accompanied Ezra to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:2). B.C. 459. See No. 5.

3. Son of Hashabniah, and one of those who rebuilt the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 3:10). B.C. 446. He was possibly the same with No. 2.

4. One of the priests who united in the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:4). B.C. cir. 410.

5. One of the sons of Shemaiah, among the posterity of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:22), and contemporary with the Nagge of Luk 3:25 (see Strong's Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels, p. 17). B.C. somewhat post  406. By some he is identified with No. 2 above, reading Ezr 8:2 (after the (Sept.) thus: “of the sons of David; Hattush of the sons of Shechaniah.” This, however, is not only forbidden by other chronological notices, SEE DARIUS; SEE ZERUBBABEL, but rests on the too slender support for the genuineness of the text itself in question; where, as in Ezr 8:5, we may suppose that a name is missing, or that the name Shechaniah itself has crept in from the latter verse, since it appears nowhere else as that of a family head. SEE SHECHANIAH.

## Hauber, Eberhard David[[@Headword:Hauber, Eberhard David]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born May 27, 1695. He studied at Tubingen and Altdorf, was in 1725 superintendent, member of consistory, and first preacher at Stadthagen, accepted a call in 1746 to Copenhagen as pastor of the German St. Peter's Church, and died, February 15, 1765, leaving, Exegitische und moralische Gedanken fuber die Siinde Lot's (Lemgo, 1732): — Harmonie ders Evangelisten (Ulm, 1737): — Untersuchung der Summen Geldes 1Ch 22:14 (Stadthagen, 1765). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:429; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hauber, Friedrich Albert von[[@Headword:Hauber, Friedrich Albert von]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who was born December 14, 1806, at Stuttgart, and died September 14, 1883, at Luddwigsburg, in Wurtemberg, is the author of, Die Diener der evangelischen Kirche und die Zeit (Stuttgart, 1849): — Recht und Brauch der evang.-lutherischen Kirche Wurtemberg's (1854-56, 2 volumes): — Evangelisches Hauspredigbuch (Ulm, 1862). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:514. (B.P.)

## Hauber, Johannes[[@Headword:Hauber, Johannes]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born November 9, 1572, and died at Stuttgart, October 1, 1620, doctor of theology and court-preacher. He wrote, De Remissione Peccatorum: — De Problemate Theologico: — Utrum Philosophandi Ratio ad Materias Theologicas Adhibenda. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Haudriettes[[@Headword:Haudriettes]]

             an order of Roman Catholic nuns hospitallers at Paris, founded in the reign of St. Louis, by Stephen Haudry, a secretary of that sovereign. At first it was limited to twelve poor females, but the number gradually increased, and the order was confirmed by several popes. They afterwards received the name of Nuns of the Assumption.

## Hauff[[@Headword:Hauff]]

             the name common to several Protestant theologians:

1. CARL VICTOR, was born September 2, 1752, in Wurtemberg. In 1791 he was professor and preacher, in 1814 dean at Ulm, in 1816 dean and pastor at Canustadt, and died August 18, 1832, doctor of philosophy. He published, Ueber den Gebrauch der griechischen Profanscribenten zur Erlauterung des Neuen Testaments (Leipsic, 1796): — Bemerkungen uber die Lehrart Jesu mit Rilcksicht auf judische Sprach- und Denkart (Offenbach, 1798): — Briefe den Werth der christlichen Religionsurkunde als solche betreffend (Stuttgart, 1809-14, 3 parts): — Die Authentie und der hohe Werth des Evangelium Johannis (Niuremberg, 1831). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:130, 397, 401; 2:206; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:514.

2. DANIEL FRIEDRICH, was born May 30, 1749. In 1780 he was deacon at Ludwigslust, in 1801 special superintendent at Schorndorf, Wiurtemberg, and died April 17, 1817. He wrote, Beweis fur die Unsterblichkeit der Seele aus dem Begriff der Pflicht (Ziillichau, 1794). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:473.

3. GOTTFRIED AUGUST, pastor at Waldenbuch, Wiirtemberg, who died in 1862, wrote, Offenbaurungsglaube und Kritik der biblischen Geschichtsbiucher (Stuttgart, 1843): — Behandlung der. biblischen. Geschichte des alten Testaments in Volksschulen (1850). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:514. (B.P.)

## Haug, Balthasar[[@Headword:Haug, Balthasar]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Stammford, near Calw, July 4,1731. He studied at Tubingen, entered upon his ministerial duties in 1757, and died at Stuttgart, January 3, 1792. He published, Diss. XII Postrema Commata Marci XVI Esse Genuina (Tubingen, 1753): — Der Christam Sabbath (1763-64, 3 volumes; 2d ed. 1778): — De Poesi Sacra Ebraeorum (1768): — De Motibus Terrae in Sacra Scriptura Allegatis (1783): — De Re Educatoria Primorum Christianorum (1784): — Die Alterthumer der Christen (1785). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Haug, Martin[[@Headword:Haug, Martin]]

             a German Orientalist, was born January 30, 1827, in Wirtemberg. He studied at Tubingen and Gottingen, and commenced his academical career at Bonn in 1854. In 1856 he went to Heidelberg, to assist Bunsen in his Bibelwerk. In 1859 he went to India as professor of Sanscrit, returned to Germany in 1866, and accepted in 1868 a call to Munich as professor of Sanscrit. He died June 3, 1876, leaving, Die funf Gathas (Leipsic, 1858- 60, 2 volumes): — Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings, and Religion of the Parsees (Bombay, 1862): — Ueber die Schrift und Sache der zweiten Keilschriftgattung (Gottingen, 1855): — Ueber die Pehlewisprache und den Bundehesch (1854): — Essay on the Pahlavi Language (Stuttgart, 1870): — The Book of Arda Viraf (Bombay and London, 1872-74). He edited and translated the Aitareyi Brahmana of the Rigveda, his main work (Bombay, 1863, 2 volumes). Besides, he published Ueber die ursprungliche Bedeutung des Wortes Brahma (Munich, 1868): — Brahma nd die Brahmanen (1871). (B.P.)

## Haugeans[[@Headword:Haugeans]]

             (Haugeanere). Hans Nielsen Hauge was born in Norway April 3, 1771. He had strong religious impressions in youth, which produced a gloomy state of mind. But in 1795 he passed through a change which filled him with joy. Ever after, amid all vicissitudes, he was a cheerful Christian. He soon began to preach, and made a powerful impression on the public mind. He traveled extensively in Norway and Denmark, wrote many tracts, and in 1804 established a printing office in Christians and to disseminate his sentiments. He obtained many followers, but finally, through the influence of the clergy, was punished with a heavy fine and imprisonment. After this he lived in retirement till his death in 1824. In doctrine, Hauge differed from evangelical Protestants in general in but few points: e.g. he held that the ministry is a common duty, and that specially ordained and separated ministers are unnecessary: also that Church creeds and Confessions are of no great account. He properly placed great stress upon faith and its effects, but it was in a one-sided way. Nevertheless, his labors contributed largely to the revival of evangelical religion. The party called Haugeans is still numerous in Norway: they contend against the laxness of Church discipline and against Rationalism, and have much influence with the people. See Hase, Church Hist. p. 547; Gregoire, Hist. des Sectes Relig. s.v.; Staudlin and Tschirner, Archiv. f. Kirchengeschichte, 2, 354; Hagenbach, Hist. of the Church in 18th and 19th Centuries, transl. by Hurst, 2, 389; Stud. u. Kritiken, 1849, p. 749 sq.

## Haul[[@Headword:Haul]]

             in Norse mythology, is one of the rivers of hell, which spring from the antlers. of the reindeer AEjkthyrners. Its dew flows into the spring Hwergelmer, and from this all the rivers flow.

## Haulik de Vdralja, Georg[[@Headword:Haulik de Vdralja, Georg]]

             cardinal and archbishop of Agramn, was born April 28, 1787, at Tyrnau, in Hungary. He studied at his native place and at Grau, was in 1812 keeper of the archiepiscopal archives at Buda, in 1814 notary of the consistory, in 1825 dean, in 1832 great provost of Agram, and in 1837 bishop there. In 1843 he was ennobled and appointed first archbishop. In 1856 he was made cardinal, and died May 11, 1869. His pastoral letters are published under the title, Selectiones Encyclicae Litterae et Dictiones Sacracen (Vienna, 1850-53, 3 volumes); besides he wrote Die Autoritat, als Princip der Ordnung und des Wohlergehens in Kirche, Staat und Familie (1865). (B.P.)

## Haunold, Christoph[[@Headword:Haunold, Christoph]]

             a German Jesuit and "praefectus studiorum" at Ingolstadt, was born at Altenthan, in Bavaria, in 1610, and died in 1689. He wrote, Definitio pro  Infallibilitate Ecclesiae Romanae: — Institutiones Theologiae: — Cursus Theologicus S. Theologiae Speculativae Libris IV: — Controversiae de Justitia et Jure Privatorum, etc. See Alegambe, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:404; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Haupt, Carl Gerhard[[@Headword:Haupt, Carl Gerhard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1778. For some time professor at the gymnasium at Quedlinburg, and also deacon, he was appointed in 1825 pastor primarius at St. Nicholai, and died August 22, 1833, leaving, Tabellarischer Abriss der vorzuglichsten Religionen und Religionsparteien der jetzigen Erdbewohner, etc. (Quedlinburg, 1821): — Die Religionen der Welt (Augsburg, 1836-37): — Handbuch uber die Religions-, Kirchen-, Geistliche- und Unterrichtsangelegenheiten in Preussen, (Quedlinburg, 1822-23, 3 volumes): — Reportorium der Predigtentwurfe der vorzunglichsten Kanzelredner (1836): — Biblisches Casual text Lexikon (1826; new ed. by Wohlfarth, 1852): — Casualpredigten (1828): — Christlicher Betaltar (1823): — Die Lehren der Religion, erlautert durch Beispiele caus der Bibel, aus der Weltgeschichte und dem praktischean a Leben (1829, 3 volumes): — Biblische Real- und Verbal-Encyklopadie (1823-28, 3 volumed). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:512; 2:14, 84, 123, 162, 166, 337, 363; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:515 sq. (B.P.)

## Hauptmann, Johann Gottfried[[@Headword:Hauptmann, Johann Gottfried]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born October 19, 1712, in Saxony. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1737 con-rector at Gera, in 1742 rector and professor, and died October 21, 1782, doctor of theology. He wrote, Historia Linguae Hebraeae (Leipsic, 1752): — Progr. VII ad Zachariah 9:17 (Gera, 1756): — Hebraici Sermonis Elementa cum Illius Historia (Jena, 1760): — Programm uber das Altera der Vocale (1777). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:367; Steinschneider, Bibl. Handbuch, s.v.; Meusel, Gelehrtes Deutschland; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Haur[[@Headword:Haur]]

             in Norse mythology, was one of the dwarfs created out of earth.

## Hauran[[@Headword:Hauran]]

             (Heb. Chavran', חִוְרָן; Sept. Α᾿ύρανῖτις and Ωραν῝ ιτις, the Auranitis of Josephus and others, the Hauran of the Arabs, so called prob. from the multitude of caves, חוֹר, found there, which even at the present day serve as dwellings for the inhabitants), a tract or region of Syria, south of  Damascus, east of Gaulonitis (Golan) and Bashan, and west of Trachonitis, extending from the Jabbok to the territory of Damascene-Syria; mentioned only in Eze 47:16; Eze 47:18, in defining the north-eastern border of the Promised Land. It was probably of small extent originally, but received extensive additions from the Romans under the name of Auranitis. Josephus frequently mentions Auranitis in connection with Trachonitis, Batanaea, and Gaulonitis, which with it constituted the ancient kingdom of Bashan (War, 1, 20, 4; 2, 17, 4). It formed part of that Τραχενίτιδος χώρα referred to by Luke (Luk 3:1) as subject to Philip the tetrarch (comp. Joseph. Ant. 17, 11, 4). It is bounded on the west by Gaulonitis, on the north by the wild and rocky district of Trachonitis, on the east by the mountainous region of Batanaea, and on the south by the great plain of Moab (Jer 48:21). Some Arab geographers have described the Hauran as much more extensive than here stated (Bohaed. Vit. Sal. ed. Schult. p. 70; Abulfed. Tab. Syr. s.v.); and at the present day the name is applied by those at a distance to the whole country east of Jaulan; but the inhabitants themselves define it as above. It is represented by Burckhardt (Travels in Syria, p. 51, 211, 285, 291) as a volcanic region, composed of porous tufa, pumice, and basalt, with the remains of a crater or the tell Shoba, which is on its eastern border. It produces, however, crops of corn, and has many patches of luxuriant herbage, which are frequented in summer by the Arab tribes for pasturage.

The surface is perfectly flat, and not a stone is to be seen save on the few low volcanic tells that rise up here and there like islands in a sea. It contains upwards of a hundred towns and villages, most of them now deserted, though not ruined. The buildings in many of these are remarkable the walls are of great thickness, and the roofs and doors are of stone, evidently of remote antiquity (see Porter's Five Years in Damascus, vol. 2). According to E. Smith (in Robinson's Researches, in, Apend. 1). 150-157), the modern province of Hauran is regarded by the natives as consisting of three parts, called en'ukrah, el- Lejah, and el-Jebel. The first of these terms designates the plain of Hauran as above defined, extending through its whole length, from wady el-Ajam on the north to the desert on the south. On the west of it is Jeidur, Jaulan, and Jebel Ajlun; and on the east the Lejah and Jebel Hauran. It has a gentle undulating surface, is arable throughout, and, in general, very fertile. With the rest of Hauran, it is the granary of Damascus. The soil belongs to the government, and nothing but grain is cultivated. Hardly a tree appears anywhere. The region still abounds in caves, which the old inhabitants excavated partly to serve as cisterns for the collection of water, and partly  for granaries in which to secure their grain from plunderers. Eshmiskin is considered the capital of the whole Hauran, being the residence of the chief of all its sheiks. The inhabitants of this district are chiefly Muslims, who in manners and dress resemble the Bedawin, but there is a sprinkling also of professed Christians, and latterly of the Druses (Murray's Handbook, p. 499). The second division, or el-Lejah, lying east of the Nukrah and north of the mountains, has an elevation about the same as that of the Nukrah; but it is said to be almost a complete labyrinth of passages among rocks. The Lejah is the resort of several small tribes of Bedawin, who make it their home, and who continually issue forth from their rocky fastnesses on predatory excursions, and attack, plunder, or destroy, as suits their purpose. They have had the same character from a very remote period. The third division is the mountain of Hauran, and appears from the northwest, as an isolated range, with the conical peak called Kelb and Kuleib Hauran (the dog), which is probably an extinct volcano, near its southern extremity. But from the neighborhood of Busrah it is discovered that a lower continuation extends southward as far as the eye can see. On this lower range stands the castle of Sulkhad, distinctly seen from Busrah. This mountain is perhaps the Alsadamus of Ptolemy. (See Lightfoot, Op. 1, 316; 2, 474; Reland, Palcest. p. 190; Journ. of Sac. Lit. July 1854; Graham, in Journ. Roy. Geol. Soc. 1858, p. 254; Porter, Handbook, 2, 507; Stanley, Jewish Church, 1, 213.)

## Hauranne[[@Headword:Hauranne]]

             SEE DUVERGIER.

## Hausen, Christian August[[@Headword:Hausen, Christian August]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Sangerhausen, in Thuringia, August 6, 1663. He studied at Wittenberg, was in 1690 deacon, in 1692 preacher at Dresden, and died September 20, 1733. He is best known by his continuation of Bebel's Memorabilia Historiae Ecclesiast. Recentioris, etc. (Dresden, 1731). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:379; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hausle, Johann Michael[[@Headword:Hausle, Johann Michael]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, who died at Vienna, January 16,1867, court-chaplain and professor emeritus, is known as one of the editors of Wiener Zeitschrift fur die gesanmmte katholische Theologie. The history of the Vienna University he wrote for the Freiburger Kirchen- Lexikon. Besides, he published, Der katholische Charakter der wiener Universitat (1864): — Danf die wiener Hochschule paritatisch werden? (1865). (B.P.)

## Hausmann, Nicolaus[[@Headword:Hausmann, Nicolaus]]

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

## Hausmeister, Jacob August[[@Headword:Hausmeister, Jacob August]]

             a Protestant minister of Germany, was born of Jewish parentage, at Stuttgart, October 6, 1806. At the age of nineteen he joined the Christian Church at Esslingen. Shortly afterwards he entered the Basle Missionary Institute, where he remained for about six years. In 1831 the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews called him as one of its missionaries. Before he left for London, he was ordained by dean Herwig, who had also. received him into the Church. In 1832 he, went to Strasburg as missionary, and died April 17, 1860. He published, Merkwurdige Lebens- und Bekehrungsgeschichten (Basle, 1835): — Leben und Wirken des Pastors Borling (1852): — Der Unterricht und die Pflege judischer Proselyten (Heidelberg, 1852): — Die Judenmission, an essay read before the Evangelical Alliance held at Paris; (Basle, 1856): — Die evangelische Mission unter Israel (1861). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:520 sq. (B.P.)

## Haussa Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Haussa Version Of The Scriptures]]

             Haussal is one of the most widely-extended languages of western Africa, and forms very much the medium of communication over extensive districts on both sides the rivers Niger and Chadda. The gospel according to. Matthew was translated into this language prior to the year 1841, by  the Reverend C.F. Schon, of the Church. Missionary Society. This translation was carefully revised by the help of two natives of the Haussa country, and was printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1856. Since then the following parts were put into circulation by the same society: — Genesis, Exodus, gospel of John, and the Acts. See The Bible of Every Land, page 412. For the study of the language, see Baikie, Observations on the Haussa and Fulfulda Languages (Lond. 1861); J.F. Schon, Grammar of the Haussa Language (ibid. 1862). (B.P.)

## Hautecourt, Jean Philipon De[[@Headword:Hautecourt, Jean Philipon De]]

             a Reformed theologian of Douai, was born September 5, 1646. He studied. at Saumur, was preacher there in 1671, professor of theology in 1677, but left France in 1685 an account of religious persecutions and went to Holland. He settled at Amsterdam in 1686, was professor of theology there, and died October 30, 1715. He wrote, De Mysterio Pietatis: — De Symbolo Apostolico: — De Peccato in Spiritum Sanctum: — De Primo Oraculo, Gen 3:15 : — De Lege et Evangelio ad Joh 1:27 : — Ad Historiam Daemoniaci a Christo Sancti, Marc. 1:20. See Vriemot, Series Professorum Franqueranorum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hautefage, Jean[[@Headword:Hautefage, Jean]]

             a French Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Puy Morin, near Toulouse, in 1735. He was educated by the Jesuits, but left them, and became a Jansenist. Having been ordained priest, he became vicar in a country church of the diocese of Toulouse, but his opinions being suspected, he was suspended. In 1766 he became subrector of the college of Auxerre, and canon of that city, but his Jansenistic views caused him to be again persecuted, and in 1773 he was condemned to be whipped, branded, and sent to hard labor for life. He fled, and was declared innocent by Parliament Jan. 25, 1776. During his exile Hautefage had traveled through Southern Europe in company with another abbot, Duparc de Bellegarde, preaching his doctrines everywhere. While at Lausanne in 1775 and the following years, they published (Euv-es d'Anmtotnne Arnauld (42 vols. 4to). After his return to Paris, Hautefage published an abridgment of the Institution et Instruction Chretiennes (1785, 12mo), and the 3rd part of the Nouvelles ecclesiastiques. 1761 — 1790 (1791, 4to). During the Revolution, and until his death, Feb. 18, 1816, he devoted himself to teaching. See Silvy, Eloge de M. l'abbé Hautefage (Paris, 1816, 8vo); Barbier, Dict. des Anonymes; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 574.

## Hautpoul, Paul Louis Joseph[[@Headword:Hautpoul, Paul Louis Joseph]]

             a French prelate, was born at the castle of Salette (Languedoc), August 2, 1764. He entered into holy orders while quite young, became a priest before the time of the Revolution; and was forced to seek shelter in foreign countries. He at first emigrated to Switzerland, and afterwards to Coblentz in 1792. The family Kosen Kaski engaged him for the education of their heir, upon which abbe Hautpoul directed all his attention. He returned to France in 1818, and became almoner to the duchess of Angouleme, and after that bishop of Cahors in 1828. Being weakened by age and infirmities, he had to resign in 1842, and retired to his family at Toulouse. He died in December 1849. See Hoefer, Noutv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Havecker, Johann Heinrich[[@Headword:Havecker, Johann Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1640. He studied at Helmstadt and Wittenberg, was in 1665 rector, in 1681 deacon, in 1693 pastor, and died in 1722, leaving, De Victu et Amictu Johannis Baptistae (Wittenberg, 1663): — De Mundi Ortu et Interitu (1664): — Morgen- und  Abend-Seufter (1669). He also continued and edited some works of his father-in-law, Scriver (q.v.). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Havelock, Henry[[@Headword:Havelock, Henry]]

             an eminent English soldier and Christian, was born at Bishop Wearmouth, April 5,1795. He was educated under the Rev. J. Bradley, curate of Dartford, Kent, until 1804, when he was sent to the Charterhouse. In 1814 he became a pupil of Chitty, the great special pleader of the day, to study law; but in the following year he followed his brother William into the army, and was appointed to the Rifle Brigade, then the 95th. After serving in England, Ireland, and Scotland, Havelock embarked for India in 1823. To serve in that part of the world was his own choice, for which he had qualified himself by studying Hindostanee and Persian before leaving England. During the voyage a great change passed on his religious views, and on arriving with his regiment in India, he determined to devote his attention to the spiritual welfare of his men, and to assemble them together, as opportunity afforded, for reading the Scriptures and devotional exercises, which he continued to do throughout the whole of his after  career. In 1841 he was appointed Persian interpreter to general Elphinstone, and took part in the memorable defense of Jellalabad. On the completion of the works, Havelock suggested to general Sale to assemble the garrison and give thanks to Almighty God, who had enabled them to complete the fortifications necessary for their protection. “The suggestion was approved, and the command given. ‘Let us pray,' said a well-known voice. It was Havelock's. ‘Let us pray!' and down before the presence of the great God those soldiers reverently bowed, one and all of them, whilst at the impulse of a devout and grateful heart he poured forth supplication and praise in the name of the Great High-Priest.” This incident is an illustration of Havelock's religious life during the whole of his military career. In the great Indian rebellion of 1857, he distinguished himself by a series of the most brilliant achievements in the annals of warfare; but still he was distinguished most by his personal piety, which shone resplendently amid the horrors of war. He died of dysentery at Alumbagh, Nov. 25, 1857, one day before the announcement of his elevation to the baronetcy under the title “Havelock of Lucknow,” which was inherited by his eldest son, Henry Marshman Havelock (born 1830). He wrote, History of the Ava Campaigns (London, 1827): — Memoir of the Afghan Campaign (Lond. 1841). See Brock, Biographical Sketch of Havelock (Lond. 1858, 12mo); Marshman, Memoirs of Sir Henry Havelock (Lond. 1868).

## Havemann, Michael[[@Headword:Havemann, Michael]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born November 29, 1597. He was preacher and professor at Stade, and died January 12, 1672, leaving, Hodosophia Evangelica contra Papalitum Ignem Fatuunt: — Christianismi Luminaria Magna: — Gamologia sive Tractatus de Jure Connubiorum: — Theognosia sive Theologia Antiquissima Mosca, ohetica, etica, postolica et Rabbinica: — De Christianorum in Christo Perfectione et cuma Christo Unione (transl. into German by Spener). See Witte, Diariumn Biogracphicum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Haven[[@Headword:Haven]]

             (חוֹ, choph, Gen 44:13, a sea-side or “coast,” as elsewhere rendered; מָחוֹז. machoz', a refuge, hence a harbor, Psa 107:30; λιμἠν, Act 27:12). The Phoenician part of the coast of Palestine had several fine harbors, SEE PHOENICIA, and some such were also in possession of the Hebrews: such were Caesarea and Joppa (q.v. severally), which were especially made use of for coastwise communication (1Ma 14:5; 1Ma 14:34; Josephus, Ant. 15, 9, 6). The port (מָבוֹא יָם) of Tyre (q.v.) was the most famous on the whole Mediterranean shore (Eze 27:3). A harbor is called אָקְרָאin Chaldee, also in Samaritan. SEE NAVIGATION. The Cretan harbor called Fair Havens (q.v.), Καλοἱ Λιμένες, is incidentally mentioned in the N.T. (Act 27:8). SEE CRETE.

## Haven, Erastus Otis, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Haven, Erastus Otis, D.D., LL.D]]

             a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Boston, Massachussetts, November 1, 1820, being a descendant of Richard Haven, of Puritan stock, who emigrated from the west of England, and settled in the town of Lynn, Massachusetts Bay Colony, about the year 1640. He graduated from the Wesleyan University in 1842, immediately took charge of a private academy in Sudbury, and thence went to Amenia Seminary, filling first the position of teacher of natural science, and afterwards becoming principal of the institution. In 1848 he entered upon the work of the ministry in the New York Conference, and occupied the following positions: Twenty-fourth Street (now Thirtieth Street) Church, New York city, 1848 and 1849; Red Hook Mission, N.Y., 1850 and 1851; Mulberry Street (now St. Paul's) Church, New York city, 1852. In 1853 he was elected professor of Latin in the University of Michigan, and the next year was made professor of English language, literature, and history. In 1856 he was elected editor of Zion's Herald, Boston, and filled the position with eminent acceptability for seven years.

In 1862 and the year following he was a member of the Senate of the State of Massachusetts; from 1858 to 1863 of the state board of education, and of the board of overseers of Harvard University. In the latter year he was elected president of the University of Michigan, filling that position till 1869, when he accepted the office of president, of the North-western University. Here he remained till the General Conference of 1872 elected him corresponding secretary of the  Education Society. In 1874 he was called to the chancellorship of the new university at Syracuse. In 1880 he was made a bishop, and was engaged in the duties of that office at the time of his death, which occurred at Salem, Oregon, Aug. 2, 1881. Although a fine preacher and a graceful speaker,' he attained chief prominence among the Methodists of America for his sound scholarship and his steadfast interest in the cause of education. His principal published works are The Young Man Advised (1855): — The Pillars of Truth (1866): — and a Rhetoric (1869). He contributed largely to the periodicals of the Church, and, as editor of one of the Church papers, took no small part in the discussion of many important denominational questions.

## Haven, Gilbert[[@Headword:Haven, Gilbert]]

             a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, cousin of the foregoing, was born at Maiden, Massachusetts, September 19,1821. His father, Gilbert Haven, Esq., was one of the pioneer Methodists of that place. After receiving a good common-school education he engaged in business, and early manifested such capacity as to have the most flattering offers of business connections; but feeling an ardent desire for a higher education, refused them all, prepared for college at Wesleyan University, Wilbraham, where he was converted in 1839, and in 1846 graduated at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut. He was immediately employed as teacher of ancient languages at Amenia Seminary, Dutchess County, N.Y., and in 1848 was elected principal of the institution. In 1851 he joined the New England Conference, wherein he served two years each at Northampton, Wilbraham, Westfield, Roxbury, and Cambridge. At the opening of the rebellion Mr. Haven was commissioned as chaplain of the Eighth Regiment of Massachusetts volunteers, served his time out (three months), then spent a year in extensive travel in Europe and Palestine, and as a result wrote and published his book on Great Britain and Western Europe, entitled The Pilgrim's Wallet. On his return he resumed the active ministry, and was stationed at North Russell Street, Boston, where, through his advice and influence, Grace Church was purchased. From 1867 to 1871 he was editor of Zion's Herald, in 1868 and 1872 was a delegate to the General Conference, and by the latter was elected to the bishopric, May 24, 1872. In this office he devoted himself earnestly to its arduous labors, and was ever conspicuous in the benevolent enterprises of the Church. He visited Mexico in 1873, and Africa in 1876 and 1877. His death at the home of his nativity, January 3, 1880, was remarkably  triumphant.

Bishop Haven had a very extensive knowledge of books and men, a retentive and ready memory, a wonderful conversational ability, and great popularity among his personal acquaintances. He was noted for his ardent interest in reformatory enterprises, his radical opposition to slavery, and his advocacy of political and social equality. His boldly enunciated views on these subjects gave him great reputation almost wherever the English language is spoken. He was equally conspicuous for his faithful advocacy of the central doctrines of evangelical religion. He. was a careful, successful pastor; a preacher of great simplicity, fluency, and power; and a vigorous and facile writer. His other publications are, Occasional Sermons: — Life of Father Taylor, the Sailors' Preacher: — Our Next-door Neighbor; or, A Winter in Mexico. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1880, 1:92; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.; Daniels, Memorials (Boston, 1880).

## Haven, Joseph, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Haven, Joseph, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at North Dennis, Massachusetts, January 4, 1816. He graduated from Amherst College in 1833, spent one year in the Union Theological Seminary, and graduated from Andover Theological Seminary in 1839. He was ordained November 6 of the same year pastor of the Ashland Congregational Church, Unionville, Where he remained seven. years, next was pastor of the Brookline Church four years, and was then appointed professor of moral and intellectual philosophy in Amherst College. After occupying this post for eight years he was called to a professorship in the Chicago Theological Seminary, which post he occupied until his death, May 23, 1874. He is the author of a work entitled Mental Philosophy, including the Intellect, Sensibilities, and the Will (Boston, 1858, 12mo). (W.P.S.)

## Haven, Samuel, D.D[[@Headword:Haven, Samuel, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Framingham, Massachusetts, August 4, 1727 (O.S.). After graduating in 1749 from. Harvard College, he was instructed in theology by Reverend Ebenezer Parkman. He was ordained, May 6, 1752, pastor of the First Church in Portsmouth, where he ministered until his death, March 3, 1806. Possessing unusual powers of oratory, he attained an extensive popularity. Although poor himself, he ministered to the destitute with a profuse liberality, especially during the Revolutionary struggle. As a means of usefulness he studied medicine, and  practised gratuitously among the poor. After 1799 he only preached occasionally, and the last year and a half he was incapable of performing the duties of his office. On account of his unusual pulpit talents, his friends likened him to Whitefield. His printed sermons are numerous. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:495.

## Haven, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Haven, Thomas, D.D]]

             a Unitarian minister, was born at Wrentham, Massachusetts, in 1748. He graduated at Harvard College in 1765, was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Reading, November 7, 1770, and died May 7, 1782. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8:133.

## Havens, James[[@Headword:Havens, James]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Mason Co., Ky., December 25, 1793. At eighteen he received license to preach, and in  1820 he entered the traveling ministry in the Ohio Conference. He served twelve years in circuits, and twenty-four as presiding elder. Possessing a strong constitution and vigorous intellect, he taxed them both to the utmost in remedying the defects of his early education, and in making “full proof of his ministry.” He became one of the most powerful preachers of his time, and contributed perhaps as much as any other man to build up the Church in the West, especially in Indiana, where the last forty years of his life were spent. He died in November 1864. — Minutes of Conferences, 1865, p. 190.

## Haverkamp, Sigbert[[@Headword:Haverkamp, Sigbert]]

             a Dutch scholar, was born in 1683. He was first preacher in a small village, but was called to Leyden as professor of history and Greek, and died April 25, 1742. He published, S. Fl. Tertulliani Apologeticus, etc. (Leyden, 1718): — Josephi Opera Omnia, etc. (Amsterdam, 1726, 2 volumes, fol.): — Abudami Historia Jacobitarum c. Annotatt. Jo. Nicolai (Leyden, 1740). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:102, 131, 156, 634, 912, 913; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:366; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Havernick, Heinrich Andreas Christoph[[@Headword:Havernick, Heinrich Andreas Christoph]]

             a German theologian, was born at Kroplin, in Mecklenburg, in 1805. He studied at Halle, and was one of the two students whose notes on the theological lectures of Wegscheider and Gesenius were used to institute a trial against those prominent champions of Rationalism. At the University of Berlin he closely attached himself to Hengstenberg. In 1834 he established himself as privatdocent at Rostock, and in 1841 he became ordinary professor of theology at Königsberg. He died in 1845 at New Strelitz. The exegetical works of Havernick are counted among the most learned of the orthodox school. The most important of them are Commentar. über das Buck Daniel (Hamburg, 1832): — Mélanges de theologie reforme (Geneva, 1833 sq.): — Handbuch der hist. — krit. Einleitung in das A. T. (Erlangen, 1836-39, 2 vols.; 2nd ed. by Keil, 1849- 54) Neue Krit. Untersuchungen u. das Buck Daniel (Hamb. 1838): — Commentarum Buche Ezekiel; Vorlesungen 2. d. Theologie des A. T. (ed. by Hahn, Frankf. 1848; 2nd ed. by Schultz, Frankf. 1863). Translations: Genesis Introd. to O.T. (Edinb. 1852); Introd. to the Pentateuch (Edinb. 1850).

## Havestadt, Bernhard[[@Headword:Havestadt, Bernhard]]

             a German missionary, was born at Cologne in 1715. He entered the society of the Jesuits, and devoted himself to preaching. In 1746 he was attached to the missions of Chili. He started from Hortsmar, in Westphalia, sailed from Antwerp to Lisbon, and arrived two months afterwards at Rio Janeiro, thence crossed the pampas and Andes to Chili, and reached Santiago, the capital of Chili, after a wearisome and dangerous journey of fifty-five days. He spent five years at Concepcion, thoroughly exploring the country. Having a very good knowledge of the Chilidugu dialect, he was enabled to make some few converts among the Indians. On the abolition of the Jesuit order in the Spanish states, Havestadt was arrested, June 29, 1768, and conducted to Lima, whence, by way of Panama, he returned to Europe. He died at Munster after 1778, where his Observations appeared (1751-77). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Havilah[[@Headword:Havilah]]

             (Heb. Chavilah', חֲוַילָה, signif. unknown; Sept. Εὐιλά, but Εὐειλά in Gen 10:29, Εὐιλάτ in Gen 2:11, and Εὐί in 1Ch 1:29; Vulg. Heuila, but Heuilath in Gen 2:11), the name of two or three regions; perhaps also of two men (B.C. cir. 2400).

1. A land rich in gold, bdellium, and shoham, mentioned in Gen 2:11, as flowed around (or through) by the river Pishon, in the geographical description of Paradise. Some identify this Havilah with one of those following; but others take it to be the Chwala, on the Caspian Sea,  whence that sea itself is said to have derived the Russian name of Chwalinskoy more (Sea of Chwala); and others suppose it a general name for India, in which case the river Pison, mentioned as surrounding it, would be identified with the Ganges, or even the Indus. Others again, who regard the Pishon as the Phasis, make Havilah to be Colchis, for which some think there is the distinctive name in Scripture of the Casluhim” (q.v.). In Gen 2:11-12, it is further described as the land where the best gold was fouii, and which was, besides, rich in the treasures of the bedolach and the stone shoham. That the name is derived from some natural peculiarity is evident from the presence of the article with all the terms. Whatever may be the true meaning of bedolach, be it carbuncle, crystal, bdellium, ebony, pepper, cloves, beryl, pearl, diamond, or emerald, all critics detect its presence, under one or other of these forms, in the country which they select as the Havilah most appropriate to their own theory. As little difficulty is presented by the shoham: call it onyx, sardonyx, emerald, sapphire, teryl, or sardius, it would be hard indeed if some of these precious stones could not be found in any conceivable locality to support even the most far-fetched and improbable conjecture. That Havilah is that part of India through which the Ganges flows, and, more generally, the eastern region of the earth; that it is to be found in Susiana (Hopkinson), in Ava (Buttmann), or in the Ural region (Raumer), are conclusions necessarily following upon the assumptions with regard to the Pison. Hartmann, Reland, and Rosenmüller are in favor of Colchis, the scene of the legend of the Golden Fleece. The Phasis was said to flow over golden sands, and gold was carried down by the mountain-torrents (Strabo. 11:2, § 19). The crystal (bedolach) of Scythia was renowned (Solinus, c. 20), and the emeralds (shohanz) of this country were as far superior to other emeralds as the latter were to other precious stones (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 37, 17), all which seems to prove that Havilah was Colchis. Rosenmüller argues, with much force, if the Phasis be the Pison, the land of Havilah must be Colchis, supposing that by this country the Hebrews had the idea of a Pontic or Northern India. In like manner Leclerc, having previously determined that the Pison must be the Chrysorrhoas, finds Havilah not far from Coele-Syria. Hasse (Entdeck. p. 49, 50, quoted by Rosenmüller) compares Havilah with the ‘ΨΞαια of Herodotus (4, 9), in the neighborhood of the Arimaspians, and the dragon which guarded the land of gold. Discussions about the site of Havilah will be found in all the chief Biblical commentators ancient and modern, as well as in Hottinger. (Enneas Dissert.), Huet (De Lit. Parad.), Bochart (Phaleg, 2, 28),  Michaelis (Spicilegiunz, p. 202; Supplem. p. 685), Schultess (Paradies, p. 105), Niebuhr and many other writers. The clearest and-best account of any may be derived from Kalisch — (Genesis, p. 93, 249, 287, etc.), who also gives a long list of those who have examined the subject (p. 109-102). — Smith, s.v.; Kitto, s.v. The Paradisaic Havilah cannot well be identified with either of those mentioned below, since they were evidently in or near Arabia; and the associated regions in the Edenic account are all in the neighborhood of Armenia or Ararat, near the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates. The most consistent conclusion, therefore, is that which locates the Havilah in question at the northeastern corner of Asia Minor, i.e. substantially Colchis. SEE PISON.

2. A district in Arabia Felix, deriving its name from the second son of Cush (Gen 10:7); or, according to others, from the second son of Joktan (Gen 10:29; compare 25:18). Since in the other places where the word occurs it is always used to designate a country, some doubt whether persons of this name ever existed; the more so as other names of countries (Ophir, Mizraim, Canaan, Sidon), and the collective names of tribes (Kittim, Dodanim), are freely introduced into the genealogy, which is undoubtedly arranged with partial reference to geographical distribution, as well as direct descent, SEE SHEBA; SEE DEDAN, etc. (see Kalisch, Genesis, p. 287). On this supposition it is not difficult to account for the fact that the people of Havilah appear as descendants both of the Hamites and of the Shemites. If they were originally of Shemitic extraction (and' on this point we have no data which could enable us to decide), we must suppose that by peaceful emigration or hostile invasion they overflowed into the territory occupied by Hamites, or adopted the name and habits of their neighbors in consequence of commerce or intermarriage, and are therefore mentioned twice over by reason of their local position in two distinct regions. It would depend on circumstances whether an invading or encroaching tribe gave its name to or derived its name from the tribe it dispossessed, so that whether Havilah was originally Cushite or Joktanite must be a matter of mere conjecture; but by admitting some such principle as the one mentioned we remove from the book of Genesis a number of apparent perplexities (Kalisch, Genesis p. 454). See UR. To regard the repetition of the name as due to carelessness or error is a method of explanation which does not deserve the name of criticism. See HAM.

Assuming, then, that the districts indicated in Gen 10:7; Gen 10:29, were conterminous, if not in reality identical, we have to fix on their  geographical position. Various derivations of the word have been suggested, but the most probable one, from חוֹל, sand (Bochart, Phaleg, 2, 29), is too vague to give us any assistance. Looking for preciser indications, we find in Gen 25:18 that the descendants of Ishmael “dwelt from Havilah unto Shur that is before Egypt as thou goest towards Assyria;” and in 1Sa 15:7 we read that Saul “smote the Amalekites from Havilah until thou comest to Shur that is over against Egypt.” Without entering into the question why the Amalekites are represented as possessing the country which formerly belonged to the Ishmaelites, it is clear that these verses fix the general position of Havilah as a country lying somewhere to the southward and eastward of Palestine. Further than this, the Cushite Havilah in Gen 10:7 is mentioned in connection with Seba, Sabtah, and Raamah; and the Joktanite Havilah (Gen 10:29) in connection with Ophir, Jobab, etc. Now, as all these places lay on or between the Arabian and Persian gulfs, we may infer, with tolerable certainty, that Havilah “in both instances designates the same country, extending at least from the Persian to the Arabian Gulf, and on account of its vast extent easily divided into two distinct parts” (Kalisch, Genesis p. 93). SEE SHUR.

The only method of fixing more nearly the centers of these two divisions of Havilah is to look for some trace of the name yet existing. But, although Oriental names linger with great vitality in the regions where they have arisen, yet the frequent transference of names, caused by trade or by political revolutions, renders such indication very uncertain (Von Bohlen, on Gen 10:7). We shall therefore content ourselves with mentioning that Strabo, quoting Eratosthenes, places the Χαυλοτἃ ιοι near the Nabathoei, north of the Arabian Gulf (Strabo, 16:4), and that Ptolemy (4, 7) mentions the Αύαλ῝ ιται, on the African coast, near Bab-el-Mandeb, the modern Zeylah (comp. Plin. 6, 28; Gesen. Thes. 1, 452). Niebuhr also finds two Khawlans in Yemen, one a town between Sanaa and Mecca, the other a district some miles to the southeast of Sanaa (Beschr. Arab. p. 270, 280; see further, Buschung, Erdbeschr.V, 1, 601; Michaelis, Spicileg. 1, 189; 2, 202; Forster, Geog. of Arab. 1, 40, 41, etc.). These names may very possibly be traces of the great Biblical country of Havilah. SEE ETHINOLOGY.

The district of Khawlan lies between the city of Sana and the Hijaz, i.e. in the northwestern portion of the Yemen. It took its name, according to the Arabs, from Khiawlan, a descendant of Kahtan, SEE JOKTAN, (Mardsid.  s.v.), or, as some say of Kahlan, brother of Himyer (Caussin, Essai, 1, 113, and Tab. 2). This genealogy says little more than that the name was Joktanite; and the difference between Kahtan and Kahlan may be neglected, both being descendants of the first Joktanite settler, and the whole of these early traditions pointing to a Joktanite settlement, without perhaps a distinct preservation of Joktan's name, and certainly none of a correct genealogy from him downwards.

Khawlan is a fertile territory, embracing a large part of myrrhiferous Arabia, mountainous, with plenty of water, and supporting a large population. It is a tract of Arabia better known to both ancients and moderns than the rest of the Yemen, and the eastern and central provinces. It adjoins Nejran (the district and town of that name), mentioned in the account of the expedition of AElius Gallus, and the scene of great persecutions of the Christians by Dhu-Nuwas, the last of the Tubbaas before the Abyssinian conquest of Arabia, in the year 523 of our era (compare Caussin, Essai, 1, 121 sq.).

## Havoth-Jair[[@Headword:Havoth-Jair]]

             (Heb. Chavvoth' Yair' חִוֹּת יָאַירhamlets of air [i.e. the enlightener]; Sept. ἐπαύλεις and κῶμαι Ι᾿α‹ρ, θανώθ, etc.; Vulg. vicus, or viculus, or Havoth Jair, etc.), the name of a settlement or district east of the Jordan. The word Chavvah, which occurs in the Bible in this connection only, is perhaps best explained by the similar term in modern Arabic, which denotes a small collection of huts or hovels in a country place (see the citations in Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 451; and Stanley, Sinai and Pal. App. § 84), such as constitutes an Arab village or small town. SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

(1.) The earliest notice of the Havoth-jair is in Num 32:41, in the account of the settlement of the trans-Jordanic country, where Jair, son of Manasseh, is stated to have taken some villages (A.V. “the small towns;” but there is no article in the Hebrew) of Gilead, which was allotted to his tribe, and to have named them after himself, Havvoth-jair.

(2.) In Deu 3:14 it is said that Jair “took all the tract of Argob unto the boundary of the Geshurite and the Maacathite, and called them [i.e. the places of that region] after his own name, Bashan-havoth-jair.”  (3.) In the records of Manasseh in Jos 13:30, and 1Ch 2:23 (A.V., in both “towns of Jair”), the Havvoth-jair are reckoned with other districts as making up sixty “cities” (עָרַים). II 1Ki 4:13 they are named as part of the commissariat district of Ben-geber next in order to the “sixty great cities” of-Argob, as the Eng.Vers. has it; but probably the latter designation is only added for definiteness, and refers to the same region.

(4.) No less doubtful is the number of the Havvoth-jair. In 1Ch 2:22 they are specified as twenty-three, but in Jdg 10:4, as thirty. SEE JAIR.

From these statements some have inferred that there were two separate districts called Chavvoth-Yair (see Reland, Palcest. p. 483), one in Gilead, and the other in Bashan (Porter, Damascus, 2, 270). But in order to reconcile the different passages where they are spoken of; it is only necessary to suppose that having first been captured by the original Jair when they were mere nomad hamlets, and but 23 in number, they were afterwards occupied and increased to 30 by the judge Jair, and that they were usually regarded as part of the sixty considerable places comprised within the general tract of Bashan, including Gilead. SEE ARGOB.

## Hawaiian Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Hawaiian Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Hawaiian is a dialect of the Polynesian language. spoken in the Sandwich Islands. When missionaries landed on the island of Hawaii, in 1820, they found a rude, illiterate people, whose language had never been reduced to writing. It was theirs to catch the fleeting sounds and give them permanent form on the printed page, and so energetically did they pursue their work that before two years had elapsed they had begun printing in Hawaiian. To express the proper sounds of the language five vowels and seven consonants sufficed, but nine additional consonants were employed to give expression to the foreign and Bible names with which the Hawaiians would need to become acquainted. In 1826 the gospel of Matthew was prepared for press, and in 1828 a small edition of the four gospels was printed at Rochester, N.Y., at the expense of the American Board and the American Bible Society. The entire New Test. was published at Honolulu in 1832, and a second revised edition of ten thousand copies appeared in 1837. Portions of the Old Test. were also put to press from time to time, and the complete Hawaiian Bible, appeared in 1839, only nineteen years after the arrival of the pioneer missionaries. Six years later it was estimated by Reverend Hiram Bingham, one of the translators, that twenty thousand Bibles and thirty thousand New Tests. had been issued, besides many thousand detached portions, and that the American Bible Society had contributed $42,420 towards this result. A bilingual Hawaiian and English New Test. was also prepared in 1857 by the American Bible Society, and of this more than ten thousand copies have been issued. See Bible of Every Land, page 375. For linguistic helps, comp. Andrews, A Dictionary of the Hawaiian Language (Honolulu, 1865); Alexander, A Short Synopsis of the Most Essential Points in Hawaiian Grammar (ibid. 1864); Chamisso, Ueber die hawaiische Sprache (Leipsic, 1837); Bishop, Manual of Conversation in Hawaiian and English (Honolulu, 1854); Remy, Ka Moslelo Hawaii Histoire de l'Archipel Hawaiien (iles Sandwich). Texte et Traduction (Paris, 1862). (B.P.)

## Haweis, Thomas[[@Headword:Haweis, Thomas]]

             an English theologian, was born at Truro/Cornwall) in 1734. He was first apprenticed to a druggist, but afterwards studied at Christ College, Cambridge, and took the degree of B.L. He soon after entered the Church, and became assistant of Madan, chaplain of Lock Hospital. The latter afterwards gave him the rectorship of All-Saints' (Northamptonshire); and the countess of Huntingdon gave him also the direction of several chapels she had erected, and of her seminary for theological students. He became director of the London Missionary Society at its foundation, and died Feb. 11, 1820. He published several books of practical, but not of scientific value; among them are History of the Church (Lond. 1800, 3 vols. 8vo): — Life of the Rev. William Romaine (Lond. 1798, 8vo): — State of the Evangelical Religion throughout the World (8vo): — The Evangelical Expositor, a Comment on the Bible (Lond. 1765, 2 vols. fol.: of little value): — New Translation of the New Testament (Lond. 1795, 8vo): — Communicant's Companion (Lond. 1763, 12mo; often reprinted): —  Fifteen Sermons (new ed. Oxford, 1835, 12mo). See Rose, New Genesis Biog. Dict.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 624.

## Hawes, Joel, D.D[[@Headword:Hawes, Joel, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Medway, Mass., Dec. 22,1789. His parents were poor, and his early opportunities of education were therefore limited. After his conversion in 1807, he gave all the time he could spare from his trade to study, and in 1809 he entered Brown University. During his college course he supported himself chiefly by work during term time, and by teaching school in vacation. He graduated A.B. with honor in 1813. After completing the theological course at Andover (1818), he was settled as pastor of the First Congregational Church of Hartford, in which he remained until 1862, when the Rev. G. H. Gould was installed as pastor. Dr. Hawes, however, remained as pastor emeritus, preaching frequently, as his strength would admit. He died at Gilead, Conn., June 5, 1867. His long pastorate at Hartford was eminently successful: more than 1500 persons joined the Church under his ministry. The great Christian enterprises, such as the Foreign Mission cause, Home Missions, Bible and Tract Distribution, the Christian Press, Education for the Ministry, lay near his heart, and occupied a very large share of his time and labors. His writings were chiefly practical, and include Lectures to Young Men (1828, which had an immense circulation both in America and in Great Britain): — Tribute to the Pilgrims (1830): — Memoir of Normand Smith (1839): — Letters on Universalism (18mo): Character everything for the Young (1843): — The Religion of the East (1845): — A n Offering for Home Missionaries (a volume of sermons, of which he gave 800 copies to the Home Missionary Society for distribution). — Independent, June 13, 1867; Congregationalist, June 1867.

## Hawk[[@Headword:Hawk]]

             (נֵוֹ, nets, from its swift flight; Sept. lipaa; Vulg. accipiter), an English name in an altered form of the old word fawk or falk, and in natural history representing several genera of raptorial birds; as does the Arabic naz, and no doubt, also, the Hebrew nets, a term expressive of strong and rapid flight, and therefore highly appropriate to the hawk: the similarity of the Latin name nisus is worthy of notice. The hawk is noticed as an unclean bird (Lev 11:16 : Deu 14:15), and as “stretching her wings toward the south” (Job 39:26) — an expression which has been  variously understood as referring either to the migratory habits of the bird, one species alone being an exception to the general rule in this respect (Pliny, 10:9); or to its molting, and seeking the warmth of the sun's rays in consequence (Bochart, Hieroz. 3, 9); or, lastly, to the opinion prevalent in ancient times, that it was the only bird whose keen eye could bear the direct rays of the sun (Elian, H. A. 10, 14). The hawk, though not migratory in all countries, is so in the south of Europe and in parts of Asia. It was common in Syria and the surrounding countries. In Egypt one species was regarded as sacred, and frequently appears on the ancient monuments. Western Asia and Lower Egypt, and consequently the intermediate territory of Syria and Palestine, are the habitation or transitory residence of a considerable number of species of the order Raptores, which, even including the shortest-winged, have great powers of flight, are remarkably enterprising, live to a great age, are migratory, or followers upon birds of passage, or remain in a region so abundantly stocked with pigeon and turtle-dove as Palestine, and affording such variety of ground to hunt their particular prey, abounding as it does in mountain and forest, plain, desert, marsh, river, and sea-coast. SEE NIGHT-HAWK.

Falcons, or the “noble” birds of prey used for hawking, have-for many ages been objects of great interest, and still continue to be imported from distant countries. The Falco communis, or peregrine falcon, is so generally diffused as to occur even in New Holland and South America. As a type of the genus, we may add that it has the two foremost quill-feathers of almost equal length, and that when the wings are closed they nearly reach the end of the tail. On each side of the crooked point of the bill there is an angle or prominent tooth, and from the nostrils backwards a black streak passes beneath the eye and forms a patch on each side of the throat, giving the bird and its congeners a whiskered and menacing aspect. Next we may place Falco Aroeris, the sacred hawk of Egypt, in reality the same as, or a mere variety of the peregrine. Innumerable representations of it occur in Egyptian monuments, in the character of Horhat, or bird of victory; also an emblem of Re, the Sun, and numerous other divinities (Sir J. G. Wilkinson's Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians, 2nd series). The hobby, Falco subbuteo, is no doubt a second or third species of sacred hawk, having similar whiskers. Both this bird and the tractable merlin, Falco cesalon, are used in the falconry of the inferior Moslem landowners of Asiatic Turkey. Besides these, the kestril, Falco tinnunculus, occurs in  Syria, and Falco tinnunculoides, or lesser kestril, in Egypt; and it is probable that both species visit these two territories according to the seasons. To these we may add the gerfalcon, Falco gyrfalco, which is one third larger than the peregrine: it is imported from Tartary, and sold at Constantinople, Aleppo, and Damascus. The great birds fly at antelopes, bustards, cranes, etc.; and of the genus Astur, with shorter wings than true falcons, the goshawk, Falce palumbarius, and the falcon gentil, Falco gentilis, are either imported, or taken in their nests, and used to fly at lower and aquatic game. It is among the above that the seven species of hunting hawks enumerated by Dr.. Russell must be sought; though, from the circumstance that the Arabic names of the birds alone were known to him, it is difficult to assign their scientific denominations. The smaller and less powerful hawks of the genus Nrisus are mostly in use on account of the sport they afford, being less fatiguing, as they are employed to fly at pigeons, partridges, quails, pterocles, katta, and other species of ganga. There are various other raptorial birds, not here enumerated, found in Syria, Arabia, and Egypt. SEE EAGLE; SEE GLEDE; SEE KITE; SEE OSPREY; SEE VULTURE.

The generic character of the Heb. word nets appears from the expression in Deuteronomy and Leviticus “after his kind,” as including various species of the Falconidce, with more especial allusion, perhaps, to the small diurnal birds, such as the kestrel (Falco tinninculus), the hobby (Hypotriorchis subbuteo), the gregarious lesser kestril (Tinnunculus cenchris), common about the ruins in the plain districts of Palestine, all of which were probably known to the ancient Hebrews. With respect to the passage in Job (1. c.), which appears to allude to the migratory habits of hawks, it is curious to observe that of the ten or twelve lesser raptors of Palestine, nearly all are summer migrants. The kestrel remains all the year, but T. cenchris, Micronisus gabar, Hyp. eleonorae, and F. mela nopterus, are all migrants from the south. Besides the above-named smaller hawks, the two magnificent species, F. sacer and F. lanarius, are summer visitors to Palestine. These two species of falcons, and perhaps the hobby and goshawk (Astur palumbarius), are employed by the Arabs in Syria and Palestine for the purpose of taking partridges, sand-grouse, quails, herons, gazelles, hares, etc. Dr. Russell (Nat. Hist. of Aleppo 2, 196, 2nd ed.) has given the Arabic names of several falcons, but it is probable that some at least of these names apply rather to the different sexes than to distinct  species. See a graphic description of the sport of falconry, as pursued by the Arabs of N. Africa, in the Ibis, 1, 284. No representation of such a sport occurs on the monuments of ancient Egypt (see Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 1, 221), neither is there any definite allusion to falconry in the Bible.

With regard, however, to the negative evidence supplied by the monuments of Egypt, we must be careful ere we draw a conclusion, for the camel is not represented, though we have Biblical evidence to show that this animal was used by the Egyptians as early as the time of Abraham; still, as instances of various modes of capturing fish, game, and wild animals are not infrequent on the monuments, it seems probable that the art was not known to the Egyptians. Nothing definite can be learnt from the passage in 1Sa 26:20, which speaks of” a partridge hunted on the mountains,” as this may allude to the method of taking these birds by “throw sticks,” etc. SEE PARTRIDGE. The hind or hart “panting after the water-brooks” (Psa 42:1) may appear at first sight to refer to the mode at present adopted in the East of taking gazelles, deer, and bustards with the united aid of falcon and greyhound; but, as Hengstenberg (Comment. on Psalms 1. c.) has argued, it seems pretty clear that the exhaustion spoken of is to be understood as arising, not from pursuit, but from some prevailing drought, as in Psa 63:1, “My soul thirsteth for thee in a dry land.” (See also Joe 1:20.) The poetical version of Brady and Tate,

“As pants the nart for cooling streams When heated in the chase,”

has therefore somewhat prejudged the matter. For the question as to whether falconry was known to the ancient Greeks, see Beckmann, History of Inventions (1, 198-205, Bohn's ed.). SEE FALCON.

## Hawker, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Hawker, Robert, D.D]]

             an English divine, was born at Exeter, England, in 1753, and educated at Magdalen College, Oxford. He obtained the vicarage of Charles, Plymouth. which he held until his death in 1827, with the respect and love of his people. In doctrine he was a Calvinist, with a strong Antimomian tendency. His writings are, The Poor Man's Commentary on O.T. and N.T. (last edit. Lond. 3 vols. 4to): — Sermons, Meditations, Lectures, etc., included in his Works, with a Memoir of his Life, by the Rev. J. Williams, D.D. (Lond. 1831, 10 vols. 8vo). See Burt, Observ; on Dr. Hawker's Theology; Bennett, Hist. of Dissenters (Lond. 1839), p. 344.

## Hawkins, Edward, D.D[[@Headword:Hawkins, Edward, D.D]]

             an Anglican divine, was born in Somersetshire, England, in 1789. He was educated at Merchant Taylors' School, London, and graduated with high honors from St. John's College, Oxford, in 1811. He became a fellow of Oriel, took orders in the Church, and filled several posts in the University  of Oxford with distinguished ability. In 1828 he was appointed provost of Oriel College, to which office a canonry in Rochester Cathedral and the rectory of Purleigh are annexed. He came in contact with that Catholic movement of which Oriel College is the recognised centre, and its fellows, John Henry Newman and Edward Bouvine Pusey, the leaders. He was opposed to the tractarian or "Puseyite " propaganda. His ownu position on theological questions was in the ranks of the liberal or "Broad" Church. Dr. Hawkins was Bampton lecturer in. 1840. He edited Milton's Poetical Works, with Notes, published a volume of Discourses on the 'Historical Scriptures of the Old Testament, and was from 1847 to 1861 Ireland professor of exegesis in the university. He died at Oxford, November 20, 1882. (W.P.S.)

## Hawkins, William[[@Headword:Hawkins, William]]

             an English clergyman, was born in 1722, and was educated at Pembroke College, Oxford, where he became fellow, and was made professor of poetry in 1751. He was afterwards successively prebendary of Wells, rector of Casterton, and vicar of Whitchurch, Dorsetshire. He died in 1801. He published Discourses on Scripture Mysteries, Bampton Lectures for 1787 (Oxford, 1787, 8vo); and a number of occasional sermons. — Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, 1, 1422; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 804.

## Hawks, Cicero Stephen, D.D[[@Headword:Hawks, Cicero Stephen, D.D]]

             a Lishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Newbern, N. C., in 1812. He passed A.B. at the University of North Carolina in 1830, and studied law, but never practiced. In 1834 he was ordained deacon, and in 1835 priest, in the Protestant Episcopal Church. His first parish was Trinity Church, Saugerties, N. Y. (1836); in 1837 he removed to Buffalo, N. Y., and shortly afterwards to Christ Church, St. Louis, Mo. In 1844 he was consecrated bishop of the diocese of Missouri, in which office he' labored diligently and successfully until his health gave way. He died at St. Louis April 19, 1868.

## Hawks, Francis Lister, D.D[[@Headword:Hawks, Francis Lister, D.D]]

             an eminent minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Newbern, N. C., June 10, 1798. He passed A.B. at the University of North Carolina in 1815; afterwards studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1819. In 1823 he was elected to the Legislature of N. C., and soon became  distinguished for eloquence. After a few years of very successful practice as a lawyer, he determined to enter the ministry, and became a student under Dr. Green, of Hillsboro (afterwards bishop Green). In 1827 he was ordained deacon; and in 1829 became assistant to Dr. Croswell, rector of Trinity Church, New Haven, Conn. In the same year he was called to be assistant to bishop White, then rector of St. James's Church, Philadelphia. In 1830 he was elected professor of divinity in Washington College (now Trinity), Hartford, Conn.; in 1831 he became rector of St. Stephen's, New York, and at once was recognized as among the chief pulpit orators of the city. In the same year he was called to the rectorship, of St. Thomas's Church, N. Y. In 1835 he was elected missionary bishop of the Southwest, but declined the appointment. In the same year the General Convention appointed him to collect documents on the history of the Church, and to act as conservator of the same. He spent several months in England in 1836, and returned with eighteen folio volumes of manuscript, illustrative of the planting and early history of the Protestant Episcopal Church. From these materials he prepared his Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States (vol. 1, Virginia, 1836; vol. 2, Maryland, 1839). It is greatly to be regretted that Dr. Hawks did not continue this valuable work. In 1837, in connection with the Rev. C. S. Henry, he established the New York Review, a quarterly journal of very high character, of which ten volumes were published. In 1839 he founded a school called St. Thomas's Hall, at Flushing, L. I., and made heavy outlays upon the buildings, grounds, etc., which involved him in serious financial embarrassments, ending in the ruin of the school in 1843, He was charged with extravagance, if not with dishonesty; but no one now believes the latter charge. However, he resigned his charge of St. Thomas's Church, and removed to Mississippi, where he established a school at Holly Springs. In 1844 he was elected bishop of Mississippi; objections were made on account of his troubles in connection with St. Thomas's Hall, but his vindication was so complete that the Convention adopted a resolution declaring his innocence.

Nevertheless, he declined the bishopric, and accepted the rectorship of Christ Church, New Orleans, where he remained for five years, during part of which time he served as president of the University of Louisiana. In 1849 he accepted the rectorship of the Church of the Mediator, New York, which was afterwards merged in Calvary parish, of which he remained rector until 1862. His friends raised $30,000 to clear his church of debt, and adjust certain old claims from St. Thomas's Hall; they also settled upon him a liberal salary. Here he regained his old  pre-eminence as a preacher, and at the same time devoted himself to active literal labors. In 1852 he was elected bishop of Rhode Island, but declined the office. In 1862, owing to differences of opinion between him and his parish concerning the Civil War, he resigned the rectorship of Calvary; and, after a short stay in Baltimore, he was called to take charge of the new par” ash of Our Savior in New York. His last public labor was a service at the laying of the corner stone of the new church, Sept. 4, 1866; on the 26th of that month he died. Dr. Hawks's writings include, besides Law Reports, the following: Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States (1836-39, 2 vols. 8vo): — Commentary on the Constitution and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States (1841, 8vo): — Egypt and its Monuments (N. Y. 1849, 8vo): — Auricular Confession (1849, 12mo): — Documentary History of the Prot. E. Church, containing Documents concerning the Church in Connecticut (edited in connection with W. S. Perry, N. Y. 1863-4, 2 vols. 8-o); besides several historical and juvenile books. He also contributed largely to the New York Review, the Church Record, and other periodicals. — Amer. Quarterly Church Review, 1867, art. 1; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 804.

## Hawley, Gideon[[@Headword:Hawley, Gideon]]

             a Congregational minister, was born Nov. 5, 1727 (O. S.), in Bridgeport, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1749, and, having entered the ministry, went to Stockbridge in 1752 as missionary to the Indians. In May, 1753, in company with Timothy Woodbridge, he started through the wilderness, and reached the Susquehanna at Onohoghgwage, where he planted a mission, but was compelled to leave it by the French War, May, 1756. Having returned to Boston, he went as chaplain under colonel Gridley to Crown Point; and April 10, 1758, was installed pastor over the Indians at Marshpee, where he remained until his death, Oct. 3, 1807. — Sprague, Annals, 1, 495.

## Hawthorne, James, D.D[[@Headword:Hawthorne, James, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Slabtown, Burlington County, N.J., April 1, 1803, and in early life removed to Kentucky. He studied with Reverend A.A. Shannon, of Shelbyville; graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1828; was licensed by the Presbytery of New Brunswick, February 6 of that year; and November 21, 1829, was ordained over the churches of Lawrenceburg and Upper Beussoln, in Franklin County, Ky., where he remained till April 4, 1833, after which he preached for various churches as a supply for three years. He was installed pastor of Plum-Creek and Cane Run churches in Shelby County, December 29, 1836; dismissed April 23, 1841, after which he supplied the Lawrenceburg Church about five years; next served the Church at Princeton for one year as a stated supply, and April 9, 1848, was installed as pastor there. For nearly thirty years he performed the duties of this pastorate with great earnestness and faithfulness. He was a man of spotless integrity, of a lovable disposition, cultivated in mind, Christlike in spirit. His long rides over rough roads in inclement seasons, while supplying weak congregations, had injured his health and laid the foundation for weakness in his later years. He died June 28, 1877. See Necsol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1878, page 15. (W.P.S.)

## Hawtrey, Edward Craven, D.D[[@Headword:Hawtrey, Edward Craven, D.D]]

             an English divine, was born at Burnham, Bucks, May 7, 1789. He was educated at Eton, admitted as a scholar of King's College, Cambridge, in 1807, and three years later became a fellow of that college. In .1814 he  was made assistant master of Eton College, in 1834 was appointed head master, and in 1853 was elected provost, which office he filled till his death, January 27, 1862. Dr. Hawtrey, as a member of the Roxburgh Club, was well known in literary circles, and his intimate acquaintance with books enabled him to collect a library of great value. He was an accomplished scholar in the French, German, and Italian languages. His Il Trifoglio contains translations of poems, with a few original pieces in Greek, Italian, and German; the versions are from French and English into Greek from Latin, English, and German into Italian and from English into German, all executed with surprising accuracy. His administration at Eton gave evidence of superior wisdom and judgment, vastly advancing the college in classical pre-eminence. See Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia, 1862, page 683.

## Hay[[@Headword:Hay]]

             (חָצַיר, chatsir', grass, Job 8:12; Job 40:15; Psa 104:14; leeks,- Num 11:15; also a court-yard, Isa 34:13; Isa 35:7; Greek χόρτος, fodder, i.e. grass or herbage, Mat 6:30, etc., or growing grain, Mat 13:26, etc.). We are not to suppose that this word, as used in the, Bible, denotes dried grass, as it does with us. The management of grass by the Hebrews, as food for cattle, was entirely different from  ours. Indeed, hay was not in use, straw being used as provender. The grass was cut green, as it was wanted; and the phrase mown-grass (Psa 72:6) would be more properly rendered grass that has just been fed off: So in Pro 27:25, the word translated hay means the first shoots of the grass; and the whole passage might better be rendered, “The grass appeareth, and the green herb showeth itself, and the plants of the mountains are gathered.” In Isa 15:6, hay is put for grass. In summer, when the plains are parched with drought, and every green herb is dried up, the nomads proceed northwards, or into the mountains, or to the banks of rivers; and in winter and spring, when the rains have re-clothed the plains with verdure, and filled the water-courses, they return. SEE GRASS; SEE LEEK; SEE FUEL; SEE MOWING.

## Hay, George, D.D[[@Headword:Hay, George, D.D]]

             a Scotch Roman Catholic prelate, was born of Episcopal parents, in Edinburgh, August 24, 1729. He was destined for the medical profession, but in the midst of his studies he was summoned to join the Highlaind army as surgeon, in 1745. After prince Charles' defeat, he was kept three months in Esdinburgh Castle, and then detained prisoner a year in London. By the act of indemnity he was set free. He was received into the Roman Catholic Church, December 21, 1745, by father John Seton, S.J., of Garleton, who was on a mission to Edinburgh. On September 10, 1754, he entered the Scotch College at Rome, where he completed his ecclesiastical studies and was ordained a priest. He returned to Scotland in 1759, and was sent into Banffshire, where he labored for eight years. In 1769 he was made coadjutuor to bishop Grant, vicar-apostolic of Scotland. In 1771 he appeared as an author, and began that series of doctrinal, moral, and devotional works which is still popular. In 1798 he received a second coadjutor in bishop Cameron, to replace bishop Geddes, deceased. A few years afterwards, feeling his end approach, he retired to the Seminary of Auhorties, and devoted his remaining days to devotion. He died October 15, 1811. See (N.Y.) Cath. Annual, 1880, page 75.

## Hay, Philip Courtlandt, D.D[[@Headword:Hay, Philip Courtlandt, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Newark, N.J., July 25, 1793. He was educated at Princeton and Nassau colleges; was licensed by the New Jersey Presbytery, at Paterson, in 1820, and became pastor of the Presbyterian,  Church at Mendham. Subsequently he was called to the Second Presbyterian Church of Newark, where he labored faithfully for twelve years. He died December 27, 1860. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, page 185.

## Hay, William, D.D[[@Headword:Hay, William, D.D]]

             a Scotch prelate, was born February 17, 1647, and was educated at Aberdeen. He received holy orders from bishop Scongal. and was first settled as minister aft Kilconquhar, in Fife; from here he was removed to Perth, and afterwards consecrated bishop of Moray in 1688. He died at Castlehill, near Inverness, March 17, 1707. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 155.

## Haycroft, Nathaniel, D.D[[@Headword:Haycroft, Nathaniel, D.D]]

             a distinguished English Baptist minister, was born near Exeter, February 14, 1821. He pursued his studies at Stepney College, at Edinburgh, and Glasgow; was settled first at Saffron, then at Broadmead Chapel, Bristol, where he remained eighteen years, during which time he attained to eminent distinction among the ministers of his denomination in England. Resigning his pastorate in Bristol, he accepted a call to Leicester, and died February 16, 1873. See (Lond.) Baptist Hand-book, 1874, page 274.

## Haydn, Joseph[[@Headword:Haydn, Joseph]]

             one of the greatest composers of Church music in modern times, was born March 31,1732, at Rohran, in Austria. The son of parents who were very fond of music, he showed from his earliest youth a remarkable talent for the art. He studied first with a relative in Haimburg; and from his eighth to his sixteenth year, he was in the choir of St. Stephen's Cathedral at Vienna. After this, for a time, he supported himself by giving private instruction. The first six piano-sonatas of Em. Bach fell into his hands by accident, and filled him with enthusiasm. The celebrated Italian singer Porpora, whom he accompanied on the piano in musical circles, introduced him into the highest classes of society. Encouraged from all sides, he wrote several quartettes (which, however, did not escape censure) and trios, and his first opera, Der hinkende Teufil, for which he received 24 ducats. In 1759 he received from count Morzin an appointment as musical director, and soon after contracted a marriage, which, however, remained without children, and was, in general, not a happy one. In 1760 he was appointed by prince Esterhazy as chapel-master, which position al. lowed him for thirty years to give free play to his musical genius. During this time, which was mostly spent at Eisenstadt, Hulgary, or (during winter months) in Vienna, he composed most of his symphonies, many quartettes, trios, etc., 163 compositions for the baryton (the favorite instrument of the prince), eighteen operas, the oratorio II Ritorno di Tobia (1774), fifteen masses and other ecclesiastical works, music for Giethes “Gotz von Berlichingen,” and the composition of the “Seven Words,” which in 1795 was ordered from Cadiz as an instrumental composition to be played between the lessons of the Seven Words. Dismissed from his position after the death of  prince Esterhazy (1790), but retaining his title and his salary, he went as concert director to London, where he attained the zenith of his artistic career. During his two stays in London (1790-92 and 1794-95) he wrote the operas Orfeo and Eurydicp, his 12 so-called English symphonies, quartettes, and other works. He was constantly employed as leader in concerts and societies, and was overwhelmed with marks of love and affection. After returning to Vienna, he composed, in 1797, his great oratorio The Creation, which was finished in April, 1798, and produced for the first time on March 19, 1799, in Vienna, and soon after in all the large cities of Europe, with immense applause. It remains to this day the greatest of sacred oratorios, except Handel's Messiah. In the mean while he finished his last oratorio, The four Seasons (text by Van Swieten after Thomson), which was produced for the first time April 24, 1801. He died May 31,1809. According to a list of his works, prepared by Haydn himself, they comprise 118 symphonies, 83 quartettes, 24 trios, 19 operas, 5 oratorios, 163 compositions for the baryton, 24 concerts for different instruments, 15 masses, 44 piano sonatas, 42 German and Italian hymns, 39 canons, 10 Church compositions, 13 songs in three or four parts, the harmony and thee accompaniment for 365 old Scotch airs, and several smaller pieces. In the library of the Esterhazy family at Eisealstadt, many unpublished manuscripts are said to be still extant. See Framery, Notice sur J. H. (Paris, 1810); Pohl, Mozart und Haydn in London (Vienna, 1867, 2 vols.). (A. J. S.)

## Haye, Jean De La[[@Headword:Haye, Jean De La]]

             a French Franciscan, was born at Paris, March 20, 1593. He was professor of philosophy and theology, court-preacher to queen Anne of Austria, and died Oct. 15,1661. He edited the Biblia MIagna (Paris, 1643, 5 vols.): — Biblia Maxima (1660, 19 volumes): — wrote Comment. in Genesin (3 volumes fol.): — Apparatus Evangelicus: — Comment. in Apocalypsin. See Witte, Diarium Biographicum; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:186; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikcon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hayer, Jean Nicolas Hubert[[@Headword:Hayer, Jean Nicolas Hubert]]

             a French theologian, was born at Sarrelonis, June 15, 1708. He taught theology and philosophy among the Recollets. and showed himself one of the strongest defenders of the Church in his time. He died at Paris, July 16,1780, leaving, La Spiritualite et l'Immortalite de l'Ame (Paris, 1758): — Le Regle de la Foi Vengeie (ibid. 1761): — L'Apostolicite du Ministere de l'Eglise Romaine (ibid. 1765): — Traite de l'Existence de Dieu (ibid.  1774): — La Charlatanerie des Incredules (1780). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Hayman, Christoph (2)[[@Headword:Hayman, Christoph (2)]]

             a son of the above, was born August 15, 1709. He died at Meissen in 1783, doctor and professor of theology, and superintendent, leaving, Comm. de (1746): — Versuch einer biblischen Theologie in Tabellen (eod.): — Litterae Encyclicae in 1 Epist. ad Timoth. (1753). See Meusel, Gelehrtes Deutschland; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Haymann, Christoph (1)[[@Headword:Haymann, Christoph (1)]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born October 15, 1677, at Reichenbach, Saxony. He studied at Leipsic, and died in 1731. His ascetical writings are enumerated in Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Haymo Of Feversham[[@Headword:Haymo Of Feversham]]

             an ecclesiastic of the 13th century, was born at Feversham, Kent, studied at the University of Paris, where Leland says be was "inter Aristotelicos Aristotelissimus;" became a Franciscan, served at the Church of St. Denis, and on his return to England was made provincial of his order. His eminence in counsel led to his call to Rome, where he was chosen general of the Franciscans. Pits entitles him "speculum honestatis," yet Bale makes him an inquisitor and persecutor in Greece. At the command of pope Alexander IV he corrected and emended the Roman breviary. He died at Anagni, Italy, where the pope in person came to visit him, in 1260. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 2:150.

## Haymo Of Hythe[[@Headword:Haymo Of Hythe]]

             an English prelate, was born at Hythe, Kent, and made bishop of Rochester in the twelfth year of Edward II's reign, to whom he was confessor. In his native town he founded a hospital, and enlarged the episcopal palace. In his old age he resigned his bishopric, lived on his own estate, and lied about 1355. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 2:135.

## Haymo, Haimon, Haimo, or Aimo[[@Headword:Haymo, Haimon, Haimo, or Aimo]]

             a theologian of the 9th century, the place of whose birth (about A.D. 778) is uncertain. In his youth he embraced the rule of St. Benedict in the abbey of Fulda; afterwards he studied under Alcuin, at St. Martin of Tours, with Rabanus Maurus. He then appears successively as teacher at Fulda, as abbot of Hirschfeld, in the diocese of Mentz, and finally bishop of Halberstadt (Saxony) in 841. He was present at the Council of Mentz in 847, and died March 23 (or 26), 853. His writings which are chiefly compilations from the fathers, enjoyed great reputation; they consist of, Glossae continues super Psalterium (Colon. 1523, 8vo; 1561, 8vo): — In Cantica Canticorum (Colon. 1519, fol.; Worms, 1631, 8vo, etc.): — Glossae in Isaiam (Colon. and Paris, 1531, 8vo): — Glossae in Jeremiam, Ezechielern, et Danielem (so scarce that some doubt their having been printed at all): — In duodecimo Prophetas minores (Colon. 1519, et al.): — Homiliae super Evangelia totius anni (Colon. 1531; Paris, 1533; Antw.  1559): — In Epistolas S. Pauli (now generally supposed, however, to be by St. Remy of Auxerre): — Super Apocalypsim Explanatio (Colon. and Paris, 1531, 8vo): — De Corpore et Sanguine Christi (D'Achery, Spicilegium, 1, 42): — De varietate librorum tres libri (Paris and Colon. 1531, 8vo): — Breviarium Historiae ecclesiasticae (Colon. 1531, 8vo; often reprinted). Other works have been ascribed to him by Johannes Trithemius, but it is not certain that they were by him, and, at any rate, they are now lost. His writings are collected in Migne, Patrol. Latina, vols. 116, 117, 118. See Lelong, Bibl. Sacra; Trithemius, De eccles. Script.; Hist. litter. de la France, 5, 111-126; Hoefer, Norin. iio. Géneralé. 23, 121; Clarke, Succession of Sac. Literature 2, 506; Mosheim, Ch. History, cent. 9 pt. 2,ch. 2, n. 50.

## Haynes, J.A., D.D[[@Headword:Haynes, J.A., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in King and Queen County, Virginia, December 13, 1822. He graduated from Columbian University, Washington, D.C., in 1843, was principal of Bruingtoun Academy for a year, and then entered upon a course of medical study, receiving his degree from the Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia, in 1846. Relinquishing his practice, he entered the Christian ministry, being licensed in 1853, and ordained in 1857. For a time he labored under the auspices of the State Mission Board, and then accepted an appointment as principal of the Clarke Female Seminary, at Berryville, Virginia. Subsequently he was pastor of two or three churches in Virginia, a part of the time being engaged in teaching. He died in January 1880. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. s.v. (J.C.S.)

## Haynes, Lemuel[[@Headword:Haynes, Lemuel]]

             a Congregational minister of New England, a mulatto.. He was born at West Hartford, Conn., July 18,1753, and was educated in the family of Mr. Rose, of Granville, Mass. In 1774 he enlisted in the Continental army, and in 1775 was in the expedition against Ticonderoga. Soon after this he commenced study with the Rev. Daniel Ferrand, and on Nov. 7, 1780, his credentials as a minister were granted. Soon afterwards he received a call to take charge of the Granville church. Here he labored five years with great acceptability. In 1783 he married Miss Elizabeth Babbit, a white lady of good intellect and sincere piety. Soon after this he was ordained, and went to Farmington, Conn., and thence to Vermont, and spent thirty years as pastor of a Congregational church at Rutland, whence he removed to Manchester, where he was involved in a very singular and noted trial for murder, not as accomplice, but as a defender of the accused. In 1822 he was called to the charge of the church in Granville, N. Y., an offshoot of the former in Massachusetts. Here he remained till his death in September 1834. Mr. Haynes was characterized from early life by a swift and subtle intellect, and a restless thirst for knowledge. He read Greek and Latin with critical accuracy. His wit was proverbial and refined. In Vermont he was very successful in opposing infidelity. Many anecdotes of his shrewd and sensible wit are on record. — Sherman, New England Divines, p. 267; Sprague, Annals, 2, 176.

## Haynes, Samuel, D.D[[@Headword:Haynes, Samuel, D.D]]

             an English clergyman, was educated at King's College, Cambridge, and was tutor to the earl of Salisbury, with whom he travelled, and who in 1737 presented him to the rectory of Hatfield, in Hertfordshire. In May, 1747, he was presented to the rectory of Clothal. He died June 9, 1752. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. page 270; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Hayter, Thomas[[@Headword:Hayter, Thomas]]

             an English prelate, became bishop of Norwich in 1749, bishop of London in 1761, and died January 9, 1762. He published Occasional Sermons (1732-59). See Allibonse, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Hayti[[@Headword:Hayti]]

             a name sometimes given to the second largest island in the West Indies. The more usual name is San Domingo, under which head all that is common to the whole island will be treated. Hayti proper is the western and French-speaking part of the island, which in 1808 was organized as a separate commonwealth under president Christophe, who in 1811 had himself crowned as hereditary emperor under the name of Henry I. In 1822 the French and the Spanish portions of the island were again united into one republic under general Boyer. This union lasted until 1844, when not only the Spanish portion became again an independent state, but the French part split into two, which were harassed by almost uninterrupted conflicts between the blacks and the mulattoes. The brief and beneficent administration of general Richer (1846-47) was followed by that of general Faustin Soulouque, who undertook an unfortunate campaign against the Dominicans, and in August 1849, proclaimed himself emperor, under the name of Faustin I. He was in 1858 overthrown by general Geffrard, who, as president, introduced many reforms, and was, in turn, overthrown in February, 1867, by Salnave, under whose administration the country was disturbed by uninterrupted civil wars, until his overthrow and execution, January, 1870.

The area of the republic is estimated at 10,205 square miles, the population at about 570,000. Nominally nearly the entire population belongs to the Roman Catholic Church; but, even according to Roman Catholic writers, many of the population are even today more pagan than Christian. The frightful religious and moral condition of the people is attributed by Roman Catholic writers to the habit of the French government of not establishing regular bishoprics, but of leaving the administration of ecclesiastical affairs in the hands of apostolical prefects, who had neither the influence nor the power of bishops, were more dependent upon the colonial government, and could not defend the interests of the Church and of religion against the secular power and the planters, who were chiefly intent on making the most out of slave labor. The care of the parishes was, before the beginning of the French rule, almost exclusively in the hands of the Capuchins and Dominicans. In 1703 the Capuchins left their parishes, and were succeeded by the Jesuits, who took charge of the districts from Samana to the Atrabonite, while the Dominicans assumed the administration of those from the Atrabonite to Cape Tiburon. Secular priests were left only hi the churches of Vache Island. When the Jesuits were expelled in 1768 they  were again followed by the Capuchins. During the war of independence nearly all the churches were closed, and the celebration of divine service was almost wholly suspended; but, the war being ended, the Constitution of 1807 declared the Catholic Church the only form of religion recognized by the government, and Christophe, by a decree issued in 1811, announced the establishment of one archbishopric and three bishoprics. The pope was asked to sanction this arrangement, but, owing to the death of Christophe, which occurred soon after, and to other causes, the plan was never carried out. In 1822, when the whole island was under one government, the archbishop of San Domingo appointed for the western part two vicars general, of whom the one resided at Cape Hayti, and the other at Port-au- Prince. In 1827 Pope Leo XII again conferred upon the archbishop of San Domingo the jurisdiction over the whole island; but the religious condition of the people grew worse and worse. There was an almost absolute want of priests, and the few who were to be found were mostly worthless characters, who had for immoral conduct been expelled from other dioceses. In 1842, bishop Rosati, of St. Louis, was commissioned by pope Gregory XVI to visit Hayti, and, as apostolical delegate, to conclude a Concordat with president Boyer; but this step also was thwarted by the overthrow of his administration (1843). The emperor Soulouque protected and endowed the Roman Catholic Church, but at the same time introduced religious toleration, and thus enabled Protestant missionaries to organize a few missions. In 1852 pope Pius IX sent bishop Spaccapietra to Hayti to make another effort to conclude a Concordat. The mission was again unsuccessful; and in an allocution of Dec. 19, 1853, the pope complained that the emperor and his government had a false idea concerning the Church, and that, as a great portion of the clergy were unwilling to adopt a strict rule of life, the bishop was compelled to leave the country. Negotiations with president Geffrard were more successful, and on Sept. 16, 1861, a Concordat was promulgated. According to it, one archbishopric (Port-au-Prince) and four bishoprics (Les Cayes, Cape Hayti, Gonaives, and Port de Paix) were established in 1862; the archbishop (a Frenchman, Testard du Cosquer) was appointed in 1863, but none of the four episcopal sees had been filled up to January, 1870. The number of parishes is 49. For public education very little has as yet been done. There were in 1868 about 150 public schools, with about 13,000 pupils.

The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States sustained in 1889 a bishop at Port-au-Prince, and 15 clergymen, filling 17 mission stations,  with a total of 382 communicants, 189-day scholars, and 124 Sunday school scholars. The contributions for the year were $317.55.

The English Wesleyans, who were the first Protestant body to establish a Protestant mission in Hayti, had in 1868 6 circuits, 6 chapels, 4 other preaching places, 210 members, and about 890 regular attendants, but in 1889 only 4 preachers. — Neher, Kirchl. Geogr. und Statistik, vol. 3:1869. (A. J. S.)

## Hazael[[@Headword:Hazael]]

             (Heb. Chazal', חֲזָאֵל, also חֲזָהאֵל, whom God beholds, i.e. cares for; Sept. Α᾿ ζαήλ,Vulg. Hazael, but Azael in Amo 1:4; hence Latin Azelus, Justin. 36:2), an officer of Benhadad, king of Syria, whose eventual accession to the throne of that kingdom was revealed to Elijah (1Ki 19:15), B.C. cir. 907; and who, when Elisha was at Damascus, was sent by his master, who was then ill, to consult the prophet respecting his recovery (2Ki 8:8). B.C. cir. 884. He was followed by forty camels bearing presents from the king. The answer was, that he might certainly recover. “Howbeit,” added the prophet, “the Lord hath showed me that he shall surely die.” He then looked steadfastly at Hazael till he became confused, on which the man of God wept; and when Hazael respectfully inquired the cause of this outburst, Elisha replied by describing the vivid picture then present to his mind of all the evils which the man now before him would inflict upon Israel Hazael exclaimed, “But what is thy servant, the [not a] dog, that he should do this great thing?” The prophet explained that it was as king of Syria he should do it. Hazael then returned, and delivered to his master that portion of the prophetic response, which was intended for him. But the very next day this man, cool and calculating in his cruel ambition, took a thick cloth, and, having dipped it in water, spread it over the face of the king, who, in his feebleness, and probably in his sleep, was smothered by its weight, and died what seemed to his people a natural death (2Ki 8:15). We are not to imagine that such a project as this was conceived and executed in a day, or that it was suggested by the words of Elisha. His composure at the earnest gaze of the prophet, and other circumstances show that Hazael at that moment regarded Elisha as one to whom his secret purposes were known. (See Kitto's Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.). He was soon engaged in hostilities with Ahaziah, king of Judah, and Jehoram, king of Israel, for the possession of the city of Ramoth-gilead (2Ki 8:28). The Assyrian inscriptions show that about this time a  bloody and destructive war was waged between the Assyrians on the one side, and the Syrians, Hittites, Hamathites, and Phoenicians on the other. SEE CUNIFORM INSCRIPTIONS.

Benhadad (q.v.) had recently suffered several severe defeats at the hands of the Assyrian king, and upon the accession of Hazael the war was speedily renewed. Hazael took up a position in the fastnesses of the Auti-Libanus, but was there attacked by the Assyrians, who defeated him with great loss, killing 16,000 of his warriors, and capturing more than 1100 chariots. Three years later the Assyrians once more entered Syria in force; but on this occasion Hazael submitted, and helped to furnish the invaders with supplies. After this, internal troubles appear to have occupied the attention of the Assyrians, who made no more expeditions into these parts for about a century. The Syrians rapidly recovered their losses, and towards the close of the reign of Jehu, Hazael led them against the Israelites (B.C. cir. 860), whom he “smote in all their coasts” (2Ki 10:32), thus accomplishing the prophecy of Elisha (2Ki 8:12). His main attack fell upon the eastern provinces, where he ravaged “all the land of Gilead, the Gadites, and the Reubenites, and the Manassites, from Aroer, which is by the river Arnon, even Gilead and Bashan” (2Ki 10:33). After this he seems to have held the kingdom of Israel in a species of subjection (2Ki 13:3-7; 2Ki 13:22), and towards the close of his life he even threatened the kingdom of Judah. Having taken Gath (2Ki 12:17; comp. Amo 6:2), he proceeded to attack Jerusalem, defeated the Jews in an engagement (2Ch 24:24), and was about to assault the city, when Joash induced him to retire by presenting him with “all the gold that was found in the treasures of the house of the Lord, and in the king's house” (2Ki 12:18). This able and successful, but unprincipled usurper left the throne at his death to his son Benhadad (2Ki 13:24). B.C. cir. 835. Such was the prosperity and influence of his reign that the phrase “house of Hazael” occurs in prophetical denunciation (Amo 1:4) as a designation of the kingdom of Damascene Syria. SEE DAMASCUS.

## Hazaiah[[@Headword:Hazaiah]]

             (Heb. Chazayah', חֲזָיָה., whom Jehovah beholds; Sept. Ο᾿ζία), son of Adaiah and father of Colhozeh, a descendant of Pharez (Neh 11:5). B.C. considerably ante 536.

## Hazar[[@Headword:Hazar]]

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

## Hazar addar[[@Headword:Hazar addar]]

             (Heb.' Chatsar'-Addar', אִדָּר חֲצִר, village of Addar; Sept. ἔπαυλις Α᾿ράδ, v.r. Α᾿δδαρά and Σάραδα), a place on the southern boundary of Palestine, between Kadesh-Barnea and Azmon (Num 34:4); elsewhere called simply ADAR (Jos 15:3). SEE HAZERIM. It probably lay in the desert west of Kadesh-Barnea (q.v.), perhaps at the junction of wadys El-Fukreh and El-Madurah, east of I Jebel Madurah. SEE TRIBE. Rev. J. Rowlands thought he discovered both this locality and that of the adjoining Azmon in the fountains which he calls Adeirat and Aseimet, west of wady el-Arish (Williams, Holy City, 1, 467); but the names are more correctly Kudeirat and Kusaimet, and the locality is too far west.

## Hazar-enan[[@Headword:Hazar-enan]]

             (Heb. Chatsar'-Eynan', חֲעִר עֵינָן, village of fountains, also [in Eze 47:17] HA'ZARE'NON, Chatsar'-Eynon', חֲצִר עֵינוֹןid.; Sept. Α᾿σερναϊvν or ἡ αὐλή τοῦ Αἰναν), a place on the boundary of Palestine, apparently at the north-eastern corner, between Ziphron and Shepham (Num 34:9-10), not far from the district of Hamath, in Damascene Syria (Eze 47:17; Eze 48:1). Schwarz (Palestine, p. 20, note) thinks it identical with the village DeirHanon, in the valley of the Fijeh or Amana, near Damascus; but there is no probability that this was included within the limits of Canaan. “Porter would identify Hazar-enan with Kuryetein=‘the two cities,' a village more than sixty miles east-north- east of Damascus, the chief ground for the identification apparently being  the presence at Kuryetein of ‘large fountains,' the only ones in that ‘vast region,' a circumstance with which the name of Hazar-enan well agrees (Damascus, 1, 252; 2, 358). The great distance from Damascus and the body of Palestine is the main impediment to the reception of this identification” (Smith). We must therefore seek for Hazar-enan somewhere in the well-watered tract at the northwestern foot of Mount Hermon, perhaps the present Hasbeya, near which are four springs (Ain Kunieb, A. Tinta, A. Ata, and A. Hersha). SEE HASPETA.

## Hazar-gaddah[[@Headword:Hazar-gaddah]]

             (Heb. Chatsar'-Gaddah', גִּדָּה חֲצִר, village of fortune; Sept. Α᾿σεργαδδά v.r. Σερείμ), a city on the southern border of Judah, mentioned between Moladah and Heshmon (Jos 15:27). Modern writers (see Reland, Palest. p. 707), following the suggestion of Jerome (Onomast. s.v.; who, as suggested by Schwarz, Palestine, p. 100, has probably confounded this place with En-Gedi), have sought for it near the Dead Sea; but the associated names appear to locate it nearer midway towards the Mediterranean. SEE HAZERIM. Mr. Grove suggests (Smith, Dict. s.v.) that it is possibly the modern ruined site marked as Jurrah on Van de Velde's Map, west of el-Melh (Moladah), “by the change so frequent in the East (?) of D. to R.” SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF.

## Hazar-gaddah (2)[[@Headword:Hazar-gaddah (2)]]

             Tristram (Bible Places, page 20) coincides in the location "at Jurrah or el- Ghurra, a group of ruins on a high marl peak with steep sides, very near el-Milh, on the road to Beersheba," and so Lieut. Conder ( Quar. Statement of the "Pal. Explor. Fund," January 1875, page 25). But more recently the latter suggests (Tent Work, 2:337) Judeideh, the position of which he does not indicate.

## Hazar-hatticon[[@Headword:Hazar-hatticon]]

             (Hebrew Chatsar' hat-Tikodn', חֲצִר הִתַּיכוֹן, hamlet of the midway, q.d. middle village; Sept. confusedly Εῦσὰν καὶ τοῦ Εῦνάν, αὐλὴ τοῦ Σαυνάν, Vulg. dongus Tichon), a place on the northern boundary of Palestine, near Hamath, and in the confines of Hauran (Eze 47:16); apparently, therefore, on the northern brow of Mount Hermon, which may have given origin to the name as a point of division between Coele-Syria and Damascene Syria. It is possibly only an epithet of the HAZOR SEE HAZOR (q.v.) of Naphtali.

## Hazar-shual[[@Headword:Hazar-shual]]

             (Hebrew Chatsar'-Shual', שׁוּעָל חֲצִר, village of the jackal; Sept. Α᾿σαρσουλά,Ε᾿σερσουάλ and Α᾿σερσωάλ), a city on the southern border of Judah (Jos 15:28; Neh 11:26, where it is mentioned  between Beth-palet and Beer-sheba), afterwards included in the territory of Simeon (Jos 19:3; 1Ch 4:28, where it is mentioned between Moladah and Balah); hence probably midway between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean. SEE HAZERIM. Van de Velde, on his Map, conjectures the site to be that of the ruins Samweh, which he locates nearly half way between Beer-sheba and Moladah. But SEE SHEMA.

## Hazar-shual (2)[[@Headword:Hazar-shual (2)]]

             The location of this place at Saiweh. is acquiesced in by Tristram (Bible Places, page 20), Lieut. Conder ( Quar. Statement of the "Pal. Explor. Fund," January 1875, page 21), but not by the latter.finally (Tent Work, 2:337), nor by Trelawney Saunders (Map of the O.T.), who with less probability locates Jeshua (Neh 11:26) there. It is laid down on the Ordnance Map as Khurbet Saweh, four and a half miles northwest of Tell-Milh, and described in the accompanying Memoirs (3:409) as "a prominent hill-top, crowned with ruins, consisting of foundations and heaps of stones. The hill is surrounded by a wall built of large blocks of flint conglomerate. Other ruins of a similar kind exist in the valley beneath."

## Hazar-susah[[@Headword:Hazar-susah]]

             (Hebrew Chatsar'-Susah', סוּסָה חֲצִר, village of the horse, Jos 19:5; Sept. Α᾿σερσουσίμ,Vulg. Hasersusa), or HA'ZAR-SUSIM (Chatsar' Susim', חֲצִר סוּסַים, village of horses, 1Ch 4:31; Sept. ἣμισυ Σωσίμ,Vulg. Hasersusim), a city of the tribe of Simeon, mentioned between Beth-marcaboth and Beth-lebaoth or Beth-birei; doubtless, as thought by Schwarz (Palest. p. 124), the same as SANSANNAH, in the south border of Judah (Jos 15:31), one of Solomon's “chariot-cities” (2Ch 1:14). SEE HAZERIM.

It is true that “neither it nor its companion, BETH-MARCABOTH, the house of chariots,' is named in the list of the towns of Judah in chap. 15, but they are included in those of Simeon in 1Ch 4:31, with the express statement that they existed before and up to the time of David” (Smith). Stanley suggests, “In Bethmarkaboth, ‘the house of chariots,' and Hazar- su. sim, ‘the village of horses,' we recognize the depots and stations for the horses and chariots, such as those which in Solomon's time went to and fro between Egypt and Palestine” (Sin. and Pal. p. 160). “It is doubtful whether there was any such communication between those countries as early as the time of Joshua; but may not the rich grassy plains around Beersheba (Robinson, Bib. Res. 1, 203) have been used at certain seasons by the ancient tribes of Southern Palestine for pasturing their war and chariot horses, just as the grassy plains of Jaulan are used at the present day by the Druse chiefs of Lebanon, and the Turkish cavalry and artillery at Damascus?” (Kitto). “Still it is somewhat difficult to ascribe to so early a date the names of places situated as these were in the Bedouin country, where a chariot must have been unknown, and where even horses seem carefully excluded from the possessions of the inhabitants-' camels, sheep, oxen, and ‘asses' (1Sa 27:9).”

## Hazarmaveth[[@Headword:Hazarmaveth]]

             (Hebrew CHATSAR- MA'VET, חֲצִרְמָוֶת, court of death; Sept. Σαρμώθ and Α᾿ραμώθ, Vulg. Asarmoth), the name of the third son of Joktan, or, rather, of a district of Arabia Felix settled by him (Gen 10:26; 1Ch 1:20); supposed to be preserved in the modern province of  Hadramaut, situated on the Indian Ocean, and abounding in frankincense, myrrh, and aloe; but (as intimated in the ominous name) noted for the insalubrity of the climate (Abulfeda, Arabia, p. 45; Niebuhr, Beschrieb. der Arab. p. 283; Ritter, Erdk. 11, 3,609). It was known also to the classical writers (Χατραμωτεῖται, 16, 768; Χατραμμῖται or Χατραμωνῖται, PtoL 6:7, 25: Atramitae, Dimon. Perieq. 957; Χατραμωτίτης, Steph. Byz. p. 755). This identification of the locality rests not only on the occurrence of the name, but is supported by the proved fact that Joktan settled in the Yemen, along the south coast of Arabia, by the physical characteristics of the inhabitants of this region, and by the identification of the names of several others of the sons of Joktan. The province of Hadramaut is situated east of the modern Yemen (anciently, as shown in the article ARABIA SEE ARABIA , the limits of the latter province embraced almost the whole of the south of the peninsula), extending to the districts of Shihr and Mahreh. Its capital is Shibam, a very ancient city, of which the native writers give curious accounts, and its chief ports are Mirbat, Zafari, SEE SEPHAR, and Kishim, whence a great trade was carried on in ancient times with India and Africa. Hadramaut itself is generally cultivated, in contrast with the contiguous sandy deserts (called El-Ahkaf, where lived the gigantic race of Ad), is partly mountainous, with watered valleys, and is still celebrated for its frankincense (El-idrisi, ed. Jomard, 1, 54; Niebuhr, Descrip. p 245), exporting also gum-arabic, myrrh, dragon's blood, and aloes, the latter, however, being chiefly from Socotra, which is under the rule of the sheik of Keshim (Niebuhr, 1. c. sq.). The early kings of Hadramaut were Joktanites, distinct from the descendants of Yaarub, the progenitor of the Joktanite Arabs generally; and it is hence to be inferred that they were separately descended from Hazarmaveth. They maintained their independence against the powerful kings of limver until the latter were subdued at the Abyssinian invasion (ibn-Khaldfin, ap. Caussin, Essai, 1, 135 sq.). The modern people, although mixed with other races, are strongly characterized by fierce, fanatical, and restless dispositions. They are enterprising merchants, well known for their trading and travelling propensities.

## Hazazon-tamar[[@Headword:Hazazon-tamar]]

             (2Ch 20:2). SEE HAZEZON-TAMAR.

## Hazel[[@Headword:Hazel]]

             (לוּז, lûz, of doubtful etymology [see Luz]; Sept. καρυϊvνη, Vulgate tamygdalinus), apparently a nut bearing tree, which occurs in Gen 30:37, where it indicates one of the kinds of rod from which Jacob peeled the bark, and which he placed in the water-troughs of the cattle. Authorities are divided between the hazel or walnut and the almond-tree, as representing the lûz; in favor of the former we have Kimchi, Jarchi, Luther, and others; while the Vulgate, Saadias, and Gesenius adopt the latter view. The rendering in the Sept. is equally applicable to either. On the one hand is adduced the fact that in the Arabic we have louz, which is indeed the same word, and denotes the almond. Thus Abu'l-Fadli, as quoted by Celsius (Hierobot. 1, 254), says, “Louz est arbor nota, et magna, foliis mollibus. Species duae, hortensis et silvestris. Hortensis quoque duse sunt species, dulcis et amara;” where reference is evidently made to the sweet and bitter almond. Other Arab authors also describe the almond under the name of louz. But this name was well known to the Hebrews as indicating the almond; for R. Saadias, in Ab. Esra's Comment., as quoted by Celsius (p. 253), remarks: “Lus est amygdalus, quia ita eam appellant Arabes; nam hne duse linguae, et Syriaca, ejusdem sunt familiae.” It is also alleged that there is another word in the Hebrew language, egoz (אגֵוֹז), which is applicable to the hazel or walnut. SEE NUT. The strongest argument on the other side arises from the circumstance of another word, shaked (שָׁקֵד), having reference to the almond; it is supposed, however, that the latter applies to the fruit exclusively, and the word munder discussion to the tree; Rosenmüller identifies the shaked with the cultivated, and lûz with the wild almond-tree. SEE FRUIT.

The almond is diffused by culture from China to Spain, and is found to bear fruit well on both sides of the Mediterranean; but there is no region where it thrives better than Syria, or where it is so truly at home. Accordingly, when Jacob was sending a present of those productions of Canaan which were likely to be acceptable to an Egyptian grandee, “the best fruits of the land,” besides balm, and myrrh, and honey, he bade his sons take “nuts and almonds” (Gen 43:11); and the original name of that place so endeared to his memory as Bethel, originally called Luz, was probably derived from some well-known tree of this species. To this day “Jordan  almonds” is the recognized market-name for the best samples of this fruit, in common with Tafilat dates, Eleme figs, etc. The name, however, is little more than a tradition. The best “Jordan almonds” come from Malaga. SEE ALMOND.

## Hazelelponi[[@Headword:Hazelelponi]]

             or rather ZELELPONI (צְלֶלְפּוֹנַי, shade looking upon me [or protection of the presence, sc. rod;: Furst], with the article, הִצְּלֶלְפּוֹנַי, hats- Tselelponi', strictly, perhaps, rather an epithet, the Zelelponite, q. d. overshadowed; Sept. Ε᾿σηλελφών,Vulg. Aselelphuni), the sister of Jezreel and others, of the descendants of Hezron, son of Judah (1Ch 4:3). B.C. cir. 1612.

## Hazelius, Ernest L., D.D[[@Headword:Hazelius, Ernest L., D.D]]

             a Lutheran professor, was born at Neusalz, province of Silesia, Prussia, September 6, 1777. He was educated at his native place, Kleinwelke, and Barby, studying theology at Neisky in a Moravian institution, and was licensed to preach by the authorities of that Church. In 1800 he was appointed teacher of the classics in the Moravian Seminary at Nazareth, Pa., where he remained eight years, having during that period been appointed head teacher and professor of theology in the theological department. Joining the Lutheran Church, he taught, in 1809, a private classical school, and then became pastor of the united congregations of New Germantown, German Valley, and Spruce Run; also conducting a classical school at New Germantown. In 1815 the Hartwick Seminary went into operation, and he was appointed professor of Christian theology and principal of the classical department. For fifteen years he served this institution, acting also as pastor of the village church. In 1830 he became professor of Oriental and Biblical literature and German language in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, but resigned in 1833 to take charge of the Theological Seminary of the synod of South Carolina, holding that position from January 1, 1834, until his death, February 20, 1853. Among his published writings are, Life of Luther: — Life of Stilling: — Augsburg Confession, with Annotations: — Materials for Catechization on Passages of Scripture: — History of the Lutheran Church in America. For some time he was editor of the Evangelical Magazine, published at Gettysburg. He was a most accurate classical scholar, and a very successful teacher. See Pennsylvania College Book, 1882, page 157.

## Hazelius, Ernest Lewis, D.D[[@Headword:Hazelius, Ernest Lewis, D.D]]

             was born in Neusalz. Prussia, Sept. 6, 1777. He was descended from a long line of Lutheran ministers. His theological studies were pursued at Niesky, a Moravian institution under the superintendence of bishop Anders. In 1800 he was appointed teacher of the classics in the Moravian Seminary at Nazareth, Pa. The position he accepted in opposition to the wishes of his friends, and at once embarked for America. In this institution he labored with efficiency for eight years, and was advanced to be head teacher and professor of theology. Differing from his brethren in their views of church government and discipline, he concluded to change his ecclesiastical relations, and to unite with the Lutheran Church, in whose service his fathers had so long lived and labored. In 1809 he removed to Philadelphia, and for a time had charge of a private classical school. For several years he labored as a, pastor in New Jersey, and in 1815 was elected professor of theology in Hartwick Seminary, and principal of the classical department. In 1830 he was chosen professor of Biblical and Oriental literature, and of the German language, in the seminary at Gettysburg, Pa.; and in 1834 he accepted the appointment of professor in the theological seminary of the Synod of South Carolina. All these positions he filled with ability and great satisfaction to the Church. He died Feb. 20,1853. As a scholar he occupied a high rank. The doctorate he received simultaneously from Union and Columbia Colleges, N. Y. His attainments in literature were varied and extensive. He published Life of Luther (1813) Materials for Catechization (1823): — Augsburg Confession, with Annotations: — History o' the Christian Church (1842):  — Hist. of the American Lutheran Church (1842): — Life of J. H. Stilling (1831). (M. L. S.)

## Hazer[[@Headword:Hazer]]

             (חָצֵר, Chatser', from חָצִר, to surround or enclose), a word which is of not unfrequent occurrence in the Bible in the sense of a “court” or quadrangle to a palace or other building, but which topographically seems generally employed for the “villages” of people in a roving and unsettled life, the semi-permanent collections of dwellings described by travelers among the modern Arabs as consisting of rough stone walls covered with the tent-cloths, and thus holding a middle position between the tent of the wanderer-so transitory as to furnish an image of the sudden termination of life (Isa 38:12) —and the settled, permanent town. SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

As a proper name it appears in the A.V.

1. In the plural, HAZERIT, and HAZEROTH, for which see below.

2. In the slightly different form of HAZOR.

3. In composition with other words, giving a special designation to the particular “village” intended. When thus in union with another word the name is HAZAR SEE HAZAR (q.v.). It should not be overlooked that the places so named are all in the wilderness itself, or else quite on the confines of civilized country.

## Hazerim[[@Headword:Hazerim]]

             [many Haze'rim] (Hebrew Chatserim', חֲצֵטַים, villages; Sept. Α᾿σηρώθ, Vulg. flaserim), the name of a place, or perh. rather a general designation of the temporary villages in which the nomade AVITES resided, especially between Gaza and “the river of Egypt” or el-Arish (Deuteronomy 2, 23). Schwarz suggests (Palestine, p. 93) that these “Hazerim” may be a general designation of the many towns by the name of HAZOR and HAZAR found in this region; if so, these probably all lay near each other; and it is a singular fact that the sites of at least two of them, Hazar-gaddah and Hazar-susah, seem to have been immediately adjoining one another.

## Hazeroth[[@Headword:Hazeroth]]

             [many Haze'roth] (Heb. Chatseroth', חֲצֵרוֹת, villages; Sept. Α᾿σηρώθ, but Αὐλών in Deu 1:1), the sixteenth station of the Israelites, their third after leaving Sinai, and either four or five days' march from that mountain towards Canaan (Num 11:35; Num 12:16; Num 33:17-18; Deu 1:1; comp. Num 10:33). It was also the first place after Sinai where the camp remained for a number of days. Here Aaron and Miriam attempted to excite a rebellion against Moses; and here the guilty Miriam was smitten with leprosy (Numbers 12). Burckhardt suggested (Travels, p. 495) that it is to be found in Ain el-Iludhera, near the usual route from Sinai to the eastern arm of the Red Sea; an identification that has generally been acquiesced in by subsequent travelers. It is described by Dr. Robinson as a fountain of tolerably good water, the only perennial one in that region, with several low palm-trees around it; he also remarks that the identification of this spot with Hazeroth is important as showing the route of the Israelites from Sinai to the Arabab, which, if it passed through this place, must have continued down the valley to the Red Sea, and could not have diverged through the high western plateau of the wilderness (Researches, 1, 223). SEE EXODE.

Its distance from Sinai accords with the Scripture narrative, and would seem to warrant us in identifying it with Hazeroth. There is some difficulty, however, in the position. The country around the fountain is exceedingly rugged, and the approaches to it difficult. It does not seem a suitable place for a large camp. Dr. Wilson mentions an undulating plain about fifteen miles north of Sinai, and running ‘a long way to the eastward,' called el-Hadherah; and here he would locate Hazeroth (Lands of the Bible, 1, 256). Stanley thinks that the fountain called el-'Ain, some distance north of the fountain of Hudherah, ought rather to be regarded as the site of Hazeroth, because ‘Ain is the most important spring in this region,' and must therefore have attracted around it any nomadic settlements, such as are implied in the name Hazeroth, and such as that of Israel might have been' (Sinai and Pal. p. 82). The approach to ‘Ain is easy; the glens around it possess some good pastures; and the road from it to the AElanitic Gulf, along whose shore the Israelites appear to have marched, is open through the sublime ravine of Wetir. Still, those familiar with the East know with what tenacity old names cling to old sites; and it seems in the highest degree probable that the old name Hazeroth is retained in Hudherah. But probably the name may have been given to a wide district (Porter; Handbook for Sinai and Pal. 1,  37 sq.). Schwarz, however (Palest. p. 212), regards the site as that of Ais el-Kudeirah, a large fountain of sweet running water at some distance beyond the ridge which bounds the western edge of the interior plateau of the desert et-Tih (Robinson's Researches, 1, 280); a position far too northward.

## Hazezon-tamar[[@Headword:Hazezon-tamar]]

             (Hebrew Chatsalson'-Tamar', חִצֲצן תָּמָר, Gen 14:7; Sept. Α᾿σασονθαμάρ), or HAZ'AZON-TA'MAR (Heb. [precisely the converse of the rendering in the A.V.] Chatsetson'-Tamar', תָּמָר חִצְצוֹן, 2Ch 20:2; Sept. Α᾿σασὰν Θαμάρ), the name under which, at a very early period in the history of Palestine, and in a document believed by many to be the oldest of all these early records, we first hear of the place which afterwards became EN-GEDI SEE EN-GEDI (q.v.). The Amorites were dwelling at Hazazon-Tamar when the four kings made their incursion, and fought their successful battle with the five (Gen 14:7). The name occurs only once again-in the records of the reign of Hezekiah (2Ch 20:2) — when he is warned of the approach of the horde of Ammonites, Moabites, Mehunim, and men of Mount Seir, whom he afterwards so completely destroyed, and who were no doubt pursuing thus far exactly the same route as the Assyrians had done a thousand years before them. Here the explanation, “which is En-gedi,” is added. The existence of the earlier appellation, after En-gedi had been so long in use, is a remarkable instance of the tenacity of these old Oriental names, of which more modern instances are frequent. SEE ACCHO; SEE BETHSAIDA, etc. Schwarz, however, unnecessarily supposes (Palest. p. 21) the two passages to refer to different localities, the earlier of which he assigns (on Talmudical evidence) to ZOAR (q.v.).

Hazazon-tamar is interpreted in Hebrew to mean the “pruning or felling of the palm” (Gesen. Thes. p. 512), or perhaps better, “a row of palm-trees” (Fürst, Lex. s.v.). Jerome (Quaest. in Genesis) renders it urbspalmarum. This interpretation of the name is borne out by the ancient reputation of the palms of En-gedi (Sir 24:14, and the citations from Pliny, given under that name). The Samaritan Version has פלוג כדי=the Vallky of Cadi, possibly a corruption of En-gedi. The Targums have En-gedi. Perhaps this was the “city of palm trees” (Ir hat-temar-im) out of which the Kenites, the tribe of Moses's father-in-law, went up into the wilderness of Judah, after  the conquest of the country (Jdg 1:16). If this were so, the allusion of Balaam to the Kenite (Num 24:21) —is at once explained. Standing as he was on one of the lofty points of the highlands opposite Jericho, the western shore of the Dead Sea as far as En-gedi would be before him, and the cliff, in the clefts of which the Kenites had fixed their secure “nest,” would be a prominent object in the view. This has been alluded to by Prof. Stanley (Sinai and Pal. 1). 225, n. 4). De Saulcy (Narrative, 1, 149) and Schwarz (Palestine, p. 109) think that a trace of the ancient name is preserved in the tract and wady el-Husasah (Robinson's Researches, 2, 243, 244), a little north of Ain-Jidy.

## Haziel[[@Headword:Haziel]]

             (Heb. Chaziel', חֲזַיאֵל, vision of God; Sept. Αζιήλ v.r. Ι᾿ειήλ), a “son” of the Gershonite Shimei, and chief of the family of Laadan (1Ch 23:9). B.C. 1014.

## Hazo[[@Headword:Hazo]]

             (Heb. Chazo', חֲזוֹ, perhaps for חָזוֹת, vision; Sept. Α᾿ζαῦ,Vulg. Azau), one of the sons of Nahor by Milcah (Gen 22:22). B.C. cir. 2040. The only clew to the locality settled by him is to be found in the identification of Chesed, and the other sons of Nahor; and hence he must, in all likelihood, be placed in Ur of the Chaldees, or the adjacent countries. Bunsen (Bibelwerk, I, 2, 49) suggests Chazene by the Euphrates (Stephan. Byzant.), in Mesopotamia, or the Chazene (Χαζηνή) in Assyria (Strabo, 16, p. 736),

## Hazor[[@Headword:Hazor]]

             (Heb. Chatsor', חָצוֹר, village SEE HAZER-; Sept. Α᾿σώρ, but ἡ αὐλή) in Jer 49:28; Jer 49:30; Jer 49:33), the name of several places. SEE EN-HAZOR; SEE BAALHAZOR; SEE HAZOR-HADATTAH; SEE HAZERIM.

1. A city near the waters of lake Merom (Huleh), the seat of Jabin, a powerful Canaanitish king, as appears from the summons sent by him to all the neighboring kings to assist him against the Israelites (Jos 11:15). He and his confederates were, however, defeated and slain by Joshua, and the city burned to the ground (Jos 11:10-13; Josephus, Ant. 5, 5, 1): being the only one of those northern cities which was burned by Joshua, doubtless because it was too strong and important to leave  standing in his rear. It was the principal city of the whole of North Palestine, “the head of all those kingdoms” (Jos 10:10; see Jerome, Onomast. s.v. Asor). Like the other strong places of that part, it stood on an eminence (תֵּל, Jos 11:13, A.V. “strength”), but the district around must-have been on the whole flat, and suitable for the maneuvers of the “very many” chariots and horses which formed part of the forces of the king of Hazor and his confederates (Jos 11:4; Jos 11:6; Jos 11:9; Jdg 4:3). But by the time of Deborah and Barak the Canaanites had recovered part of the territory then lost, had rebuilt Hazor, and were ruled by a king with the ancient royal name of Jabin, under whose power the Israelites were, in punishment for their sins, reduced. From this yoke they were delivered by Deborah and Barak, after which Hazor remained in quiet possession of the Israelites, and belonged to the tribe of Naphtali (Jos 19:36; Jdg 4:2; 1Sa 12:9). Solomon did not overlook so important a post, and the fortification of Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer, the points of defense for the entrance from Syria and Assyria, the plain of Esdraelon, and the great maritime lowland respectively, was one of the chief pretexts for his levy of taxes (1Ki 9:15).. Later still it is mentioned in the list of the towns and districts whose inhabitants were carried off to Assyria by Tiglath-Pileser (2Ki 15:29; Josephus, Ant. 9:11, 1). We encounter it once more in 1Ma 11:67, where Jonathan, after encamping for the night at the “water of Gennesar,” advances to the “plain of Asor” (Josephus, Ant. 13, 5, 7; the Greek text of the Maccabees has prefixed an n from the preceding word πεδίον; A.V. “Nasor”) to meet Demetrius, who was in possession of Kadesh (11, 63; Josephus as above). SEE NASOR. Raumer queries whether it may not have been the ancient town of Naason, which king Baldwin IV passed on his way from Tiberias to Saphet (Will. Tyr. p. 1014); and his reason for this conjecture is that the Vulgate gives Naason for the Asor (Α᾿σώρ) of Tobit 1, 1 (Raumer, Palastinza.s. 114, n.). SEE ASOR.

The name Hazor still lingers in several places around the upper valley of the Jordan (Robinson, B. R. 3, 63, 81, 401). There is one Hazury on a commanding site above Caesarea Philippi, and close to the great castle of Subeibeh. Here Keith (Land of Israel, p. 374) and Stanley (Sin. and Pal. p. 389) would place the ancient capital of Canaan. But the territory of Naphtali hardly extended so far eastward. Another Hasur is in the plain, a few miles west of the site of Dan; but neither does this site quite accord with the Scripture notices (Porter's Damascus, 1, 304; Van de Velde,  Memoir, p. 318). Schwarz (Palest. p. 91) thinks a village which he calls Azur, between Banias and Meshdel (el-Mejel), may be the ancient Hazor; he probably refers to the Ain el-Hazury marked on Zimmerman's Map a little north-east of Banias, which, however, is too far east. There is a place marked as Azur on Zimmerman's Map, a little north-east of Kedes (Kadesh), which unquestionably lay in Naphtali; but M. De Saulcy (Narrat. 2, 406) denies that this can have been the Hazor of Jabin (which he distinguishes from the Hazor of Solomon), and in a long argument (p. 400- 405) he contends that it was situated on the site of some extensive ruins, which he reports at a place called indefinitely el-Khan, on the hills skirting the north-easterly shore of the lake el-Huleh, in the direction of Banias. Van de Velde (Memoir, p. 318) likewise thinks the Hazor of Joshua different from that of Judges (although both were ruled by a Jabin, evidently a hereditary title), and inclines to regard En-Hazor (Jos 19:37) as identical with the latter, and with a ruined Hazur in the middle of Galilee (about two hours from Bint Jebeil); while he seems to acquiesce in the identification of the eastern Hazor with a Hazur (Porter, Danascus, 1, 304) or Kasr Autar (Seetzen), or, as he himself calls it, Tell Haze, covered with remains, and jutting out from Merj Ayun towards the Huleh plain. The Hazor of Jos 19:36, he believes to be Tell Hazur, southeast of Ramah. All this, however, is vague and confused. Mr. Thomson, who visited this region in 1843, believed Hazor may be identified with the present castle of Hunin, north of the Huleh (Biblioth. Sacra, 1846, p. 202).

The editor (Dr. Robinson), however, thinks the arguments adduced more plausible than sound (ib. p. 212), and advocates the opinion of Rev. E. Smith, that Tell Khureibeh, at the south end of the plain of Kedes, is better entitled to be regarded as the site of Hazor (Bibliotheca Sacra, 1847, p. 403). Accordingly, in the new ed. of his Researches, after noticing and rejecting several other sites proposed (3, 63, 81, 402), he at length fixes upon this as best agreeing with the ancient notices of this city (ib. p. 365). There are, as the name Khureibeh, “ruins,” implies, some ancient ruins on the tell, but they are those of a village. There are still other ruins of an ancient town which occupy a commanding site on the south bank of wady Hendâj, overlooking the valley and lake of Merom, and about six miles south of Kedesh, which is a not improbable site for the ancient Hazor (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 3, 363, 365); and the plain beneath it, stretching to the shore of the lake, might take the name of the city Asur, as Josephus seems to indicate ‘(1. c.). Ritter (Erdk. 15, 260) — accepts the Hazury proposed by Burckhardt (Trav. p. 44); apparently the inconsiderable ruin  on the rocky declivity above Banias (Robinson, Res. new ed. 3, 402). Captain Wilson prefers the isolated Tell Harah, covered with ruins, about two miles southeast of Kedesh (Jour. Sac. Lit. 1866, p. 245). But none of these last cited places retain the ancient name. Finally, Dr. Thomson is confident (Land and Book, 1, 439) that the true spot is Hazere (the above Hazur of Van de Velde, east of a more northern Ramah), in the center of the mountainous region overhanging lake Huleh on the northwest, containing numerous ancient remains, and locally connected by tradition with the Israelitish victory; although Dr. Robinson (incorrectly) objects to this site (Bib. Res. new ed. 3:63) that it is too far from the lake, and within the territory of Asher.

2. A city in the south of Judah (but probably not one of those assigned to Simeon, since it is not named in the list, Jos 19:1-9), mentioned between Kedesh (Kadesh-Barnea) and Ithant (Jos 15:23, where the Vat. MS. of the Sept. unites with the following name, Α᾿σοριωνάν, Alex. MS. omits, Vulg. Asor). We may reasonably conjecture that this was the central town of that name, the other Hazors of the same connection (HazorHadattah, and Kerioth-Hezron or Hazor-Amam) being probably so called for distinction' sake; and in that case we may perhaps locate it at a ruined site marked on Van de Velde's Map as Tayibeh (the et-Taiyib of Robinson, Res. 3 Appendix, p. 114), on a tell around the south-west base of which runs the wady ed-Dheib, emptying into the Dead Sea. See Nos. 3 and 4.

3. HAZOR-HADATTAH (for so the Heb. חָצוֹר חֲדִתָּה, i.e. New Hazor, should be understood; since there is no copula between the words, and the sense in Jos 15:32 requires this condensation; Sept. omits, Vulg. Asor nova), a city in the south of Judah (but not the extreme Simeonite portion), mentioned between Bealoth and Kerioth (Jos 15:25); probably, as suggested in Keil and Delitzsch's Commentary, ad loc. (Edinb. ed. p. 160), the ruined site el-Hudhairah of Robinson's Researches (3, Append. p. 114), south of Hebron, in the immediate vicinity of el-Beyudh (the Beiyudh of Van de Veldes Map, about half way between Kerioth and Arad). See Nos. 2. and 4.

4. HAZOR-AMAM (to be so joined for the same reasons as in No. 2), probably identified with Kerioth-Herzon (in the Heb. the four names stand הַיא חָצוֹר אֲמָם קְרַיּוֹת חֶצְרוֹן, villages of Chetsron which is Chatsor Amam; Sept. αἱ πόλεις Α᾿σερών [v.r. Α᾿σερώμ], αὕτη ἐστὶ Α᾿σω῎ρ καὶ  Αμάμ, [v.r. Α᾿σερωμάμ]; Vulg. Carioth, Hesron, haec est Asor, Amam), a town in the south of Judah (but apparently not in the Simeonite territory), mentioned between Bealoth and Shema (Jos 15:24-26); no doubt (if thus combined) the modern el-Khureyetein, as suggested by Robinson (Researches, 3, Append. p. 114). SEE KERIOTH.

5. (Vat. MS. of Sept. omits; Vulg. Asor.) A city inhabited by the Benjamites after the Captivity, mentioned between Ananiah and Ramah (Neh 11:33); possibly the modern Gazur, a short distance east of Jaffa (for others of the associated names, although likewise within the ancient territory of Dan, are also assigned to Benjamin), since Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. Asor) mention a Hazor in the vicinity of Ascalon, although they assign it to Judah, and confound it with those in the south of that tribe (Robinson's Researches, 2, 370, note). From the places mentioned with it, as Anathoth, Nob, Ramah, etc., it would seem to have lain north of Jerusalem, and at no great distance there from. Schwarz thinks it is called Chasor (חסר) in the Talmudical writers (Palest. p. 162). Robinson suggests the identity of Hazor and the modern Tell Asur, a ruin on a little hill about six miles north of Bethel (Bib. Res. i1, 264, note). This, however, appears to be too far from Ramah. Tobler mentions a ruin called Khurbet Arsur, near Ramah, a little to the west, the situation of which would answer better to Hazor (Topogr. 2, 400; Van de Velde, Memoir, p. — 319). The place in question is probably the same with the BAAL-HAZOR SEE BAAL-HAZOR (q.v.) of 2Sa 13:23.

6. A region of Arabia, spoken of as an important place, in the vicinity of Kedar, in the prophetic denunciations of desolation upon both by Nebuchadnezzar (Jer 49:28-33). It can hardly be Petra, as supposed by Vitringa (on Isaiah, i, p. 624), nor the Asor placed by Eusebius 8 miles west of Philadelphia (Hitzig, Jesaias, p. 196), but probably is a designation of the confines of Arabia with south-eastern Palestine, inhabited by nomade tribes dwelling in mere encampments. SEE HAZAR.

## Hazor (2)[[@Headword:Hazor (2)]]

             Of the places thus simply designated, the latest authorities make the following identifications:

1. HAZOR OF NAPHTALI (Jos 11:1; Jos 11:10-11; Jos 11:13; Jos 12:19; Jos 19:36; Jdg 4:2; Jdg 4:17; 1Sa 12:9; 1Ki 9:15; 2Ki 15:29) is identified by Grove (in Smith's Atlas) with Tell Huraweh, south-east of Kedesh, and by Trelawney Saunders (Map of the O.T.) with Khurbet Harrah (evidently the same locality), which is set down on the Ordinance Map one and three quarter miles north-west of Lake Huleh, and described in the accompanying Memoirs (1:237) as "an important ruin on a hill-top. There are considerable remains of walls of good-sized masonry and foundations, with caves, and two rock-cut tombs, with loculi. A few stones are moulded, probably door-posts or architraves. There are a number of cisterns. The principal remains are on the top and the eastern slope of the hill. A zigzag pathway formerly led down to the great spring of 'Ain el- Mellaheh." This is the location proposed by Wilson and advocated by Guerin. Lieut. Conder, on the other hand, suggests (Tent Work, 2:337) Hadireh, which occurs in a Jebel and Merj of that name, one and a half miles west of el-Khureibeh (Robinson's site for Hazor), lying two and a half miles south of Kedesh, and three and a half west of Lake Huleb.

Grove and Conder, however, both seem to distinguish two Hazors in the above passages, and they locate the second at Hazzur, a rock-cut tomb in Khurbet Hazireh (ten miles west of Kedesh), where are "foundations of walls, built with large, well-dressed stones, a few small columns and broken pieces mixed up with the ruins; eight rock-cut cisterns, one rock- cut birkeh [pool], and two rock-cut tombs" (Memoirs, 1:239; comp. page 223). They seem, moreover, to identify this with EN-HAZOR SEE EN- HAZOR (q.v.), although there is no spring there now, as there is at 'Ain el- Khurbeh, where Saunders locates the latter. This last geographer places Edrei at Hazireh, but it should rather be identified with Khureibeh, and Hazzfir and Hazireh will thus be left to represent a single Hazor, as the names respectively indicate. En-Hazor may then be appropriately assigned separately to Khurbet Hazuir, half a mile north-west of a hill of the same name, and consisting of "heaps of stones and cisterns" (Memoirs, 1:396), laid down five miles north-west of Yakfik, with several springs in the vicinity ('Ain elTahit, one and a half miles west, sufficiently copious to supply three mills; and 'Ain el-Mansufrah and 'Ain el-Diah, one mile south).  But the specific name, 'Ain Hazur, does not occur on the Ordnance Map, although several travellers speak of it here, and Tristram even says (Bible Places, page273). “This is the only Ain-Hazur."

2. HAZOR OF BENJAMIN AFTER THE CAPTIVITY (Neh 11:33) is identified by Grove with Yasur, near Ashdod, which is out of the region indicated. It has usually been made the same with BAAL-HAZOR (q.v.), which Conder and Saunders reasonably Slocate at Tell Asur, four and a half miles north-east of Beitin (Bethel), "a sacred place among the peasantry, though no Mukam exists. There is a group of fine oaks on the hilltop, sacred, apparently, to a certain Sheik Hadherah (the proper Arabic form of Hazor). The Rijal el-Asawir, or 'Men of 'Asur,' said to be companions of the Prophet, are also invoked by the Moslems. This appears to be a probable survival of the ancient caltus of Baal on this lofty summit. Here Ginrin found ancient cisterns cut in the rock, and vaulted houses still standing. In the middle of the plateau was a wely, dedicated to sheik Hassan, on the site of an old church, now destroyed, of which some ruins remain, especially four fragments of columns lying on great slabs which were once the pavement of the church; besides these a capital, on which was formerly sculptured a cross of square form" (Memoirs, 2:371).

Lieut. Conder, however, suggests a separate location from this for the Hazor of the post-exilian history at Hazzur (Tent Work, 2:119), one mile east of Neby Samwil; a ruined site (Memoirs, 3:43), four miles north-west of Jerusalem, with tombs, cisterns, and spring ('Ain Malahah) adjoining.

3. HAZOR OF JUDAH (Jos 15:23) is combined by Saunders with the name following (contrary to the Heb. text, which has יְdisconnective between) into the compound Hazor-Ithnan, and located at en-Tora, which he lays down a short distance south-east of Beersheba.

## Hazor-Hadattah[[@Headword:Hazor-Hadattah]]

             (Jos 15:25) is identified by Tristram (Bible Places, page 18) with "the ruins called aldaddah, a watch-tower on the edge of a bluff on the high ground at the head of the Zuweirah valley, southwest of the Dead Sea." This point is beyond the bounds of the Ordnance Map, but is situated in the same direction as the el-Hutdeirah, with which we have identified the place, and where Saunders locates an imaginary Hazor-Kinah (adopting the suggestion of Tristram, Bible Places, page 16) and also Jagur (q.v.). SEE JUDAH.

## Hazzurim[[@Headword:Hazzurim]]

             SEE HELKATH-HAZZURIB.

## He-Ass[[@Headword:He-Ass]]

             חֲמוֹר, chanmor' (Gen 12:16; elsewhere simply “ass”), the general designation of the donkey (Exo 13:13, etc.) for carrying burdens (Exodus 42:26) and ploughing (Isa 30:24),being regarded as a patient (Gen 49:14) and contented animal for riding in time of peace (2Sa 19:27; Zec 9:9); different from the proud (Ecc 10:9) and warlike horse (Isaiah 20:16). As a beast of  burden, it was eaten only in times of famine (2Ki 6:25). SEE ASS'S HEAD.

The prohibition of the use of horses to Israel caused the ass to be held in higher estimation than it holds in our times. It was, at least down to the days of Solomon, the principal beast of burden. But we must not attribute this election wholly to the absence or scarcity of the horse, for in Western Asia the ass is still largely used for the saddle. Though inferior in dignity to the horse, he is still, in his native regions, a very superior animal to the poor, weather-beaten, stunted, half-starved beast of our commons. Chardin and others describe the Arabian ass as a really elegant creature. The coat is smooth and clean, the carriage is erect and proud; the limbs are clean, well formed, and muscular, and are well thrown out in walking or galloping. Asses of this Arab breed are used exclusively for the saddle, and are imported into Syria and Persia, where they are highly valued, especially by the mollahs or lawyers, the sheiks or religious teachers, and elderly persons of the opulent classes. They are fed and dressed with the same care as horses, the headgear is highly ornamented, and the saddle is covered with a fine carpet. They are active, spirited, and yet sufficiently docile. Other breeds are equally useful in the more humble labors of ploughing and carrying burdens. White asses, distinguished not only by their color, but by their stature and symmetry, are frequently seen in Western Asia, and are always more highly esteemed than those of more ordinary hue. The editor of the Pictorial Bible says that these “are usually in every respect the finest of their species, and their owners certainly take more pride in them than in any other of their asses. They sell at a much higher price; and those hackney ass-men who make a livelihood by hiring out their asses to persons who want a ride, always expect better pay for the white ass than for any of the others.” After describing their more highly ornamented trappings, he observes, “But, above all, their white hides are fantastically streaked and spotted with the red stains of the henna plant, a barbarous kind of ornament which the Western Asiatics are fond of applying to their own beards, and to the manes and tails of their white horses.” SEE HORSE.

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

## He-Goat[[@Headword:He-Goat]]

             (prop. עִתּוּר, attud', so called as being adult; also צָפַתר, tsaphir', so called from leaping, 2Ch 29:21; Ezr 8:35; Dan 8:5; Dan 8:8 [Ezr 6:17]; תִּיַשׁ, ta'yish, a buck, Gen 30:35; Gen 32:14; 2Ch 17:11; Pro 30:31). SEE GOAT.

## Hea[[@Headword:Hea]]

             One of the most important of all the Assyrian gods, as he combines in his numerous titles the attributes of several classic deities. His Accadian name was En-ki, or the "Lord of the World" (earth), and his Assyrian name read phonetically Ea or Hea. He unites in his offices the attributes of Pluto (Hades), of Poseidon (Neptune), and of Hermes (Wisdom). Hea, as the representative of the Greek Poseidon, was "Lord of the Abyss," sar abzu, and was spoken of as Hea "who dwells in the great deep." In a list of his titles he is called "Lord of the Madndu or Sailors," and it was Hea who taught Hasis Arda how to build the ark or ship (elapu) in which he sailed over the flood. In this character of the god of water and ocean he was associated with a female deity, Bahu, the "Void," who may be identified with the bohu of Gen 1:2. Hea held dominion over a large number of spirits who dwelt in the abzu, or the deep. In the character of the Greek Pluto, or lord of Hades, Hea himself seldom figured, but his consort, Nin- ki-gal, the "Lady of the Great Land," appears very frequently. Hea, as lord of Hades, had the name of Nin-a-zu, and his wife was called Nin-ki-gal. But it was in the character of the god of wisdom, the "god who knows all things," that He figured most prominently, Nin-ni-mi-ki, "Lord of Wisdom," or, as the Accadian expressed it, the "Lord of the Bright Eye." It was He alone who could deliver man from the various spells and curses with which the complicated system of Chaldeean magic beset him. He also delivered Ishtar from the power of Nin-ki-gal, in the legend of her descent into Hades. Hea had for his female consort, in his character of "Lord of Wisdom," the goddess Dav-kina, the female deification of the earth, who was probably only another form of Nin-ki-gal, and resembles the classic Persephone or Proserpine; though perhaps Nin-ki-gal and Dav-kina may be better identified with Persephone and Ceres (Demeter), the "Mother and Daughter" of the Greeks.

## Heacock, Grosvenor Williams, D.D[[@Headword:Heacock, Grosvenor Williams, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Buffalo, N.Y., August 3, 1822. He graduated from Western Reserve College in 1840, and from the Auburn Theological Seminary in 1843; was ordained pastor of the Lafayette Street Presbyterian Church in his native city, October 20, 1845, and retained that position until his death, May 6, 1877. He was greatly esteemed and beloved. See Genesis Cat. of Auburn Theol. Sem. 1883, page 264.

## Head[[@Headword:Head]]

             (properly ראֹשׁ, rosh, κεφαλή), the topmost part of the human body.

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

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

2. The second is the Mongolian variety.

3. Ethiopian.

4. Malay and South Sea Islanders.

5: American. The description of their peculiarities may be found in Prichard's Researches into the Physical History of Man 1:2 nd ed. 1, 167 sq. The reader may also consult Lawrence's Lectures on the Natural History of Man; J. Muller's Handbuch der Physiologie. But the most recent, if not the best work on the subject before us is Prichard's Natural History of Man (1843), a work which comprises and reviews, in the spirit of a sound philosophy, all that has hitherto been written and discovered on the origin, physical structure, and propagation over the earth of the race of man. In this invaluable work full details may be found of the methods of studying the human head of which we have spoken, and of some others, not less interesting in themselves, nor less valuable in their results (see particularly p. 116 sq.).

II. Scriptural References. — This part of the human body has generally been considered as the abode of intelligence, while the heart, or the parts placed near it, have been accounted the place where the affections lie (Gen 3:15; Psa 3:3; Ecc 2:14). The head and the heart are sometimes taken for the entire person (Isa 1:5). Even the head alone, as being the chief member, frequently stands for the man (Pro 10:6). The head also denotes sovereignty (1Co 11:3). Covering the head, and cutting off the hair, were signs of mourning  and tokens of distress, which were enhanced by throwing ashes on the head, together with sackcloth (Amo 8:10; Job 1:20; Lev 21:5; Deu 14:1; 2Sa 13:10; Est 4:1); while anointing the head was practiced on festive occasions, and considered an emblem of felicity (Ecc 9:8; Psa 23:5; Luk 7:46). SEE ANOINT.

It was not unusual to swear by the head (Mat 5:36). — Kitto, s.v. The phrase to lift up the head of any one, is to exalt him (Psa 3:3; Psa 110:7); and to return or give back upon one's head, is to be requited, recompensed (Psa 7:16; Joe 3:4; Eze 9:10; Eze 11:21; Eze 16:43; Eze 17:19; Eze 22:31). So, your blood be on your own heads (Act 18:6); the guilt of your destruction rests upon yourselves (2Sa 1:16; 1Ki 2:33; 1Ki 2:37). The term head is used to signify the chief, one to whom others are subordinate; the prince of a people or state (Jdg 10:18; Jdg 11:8; 1Sa 15:17; Psa 18:43; Isa 7:8-9); of a family, the head, chief, patriarch (Exo 6:14; Num 7:2; 1Ch 5:24); of a husband in relation to a wife (Gen 3:16; 1Co 11:3; Eph 5:23). So of Christ the head in relation to his Church, which is his body, and its members his members (1Co 12:27; 1Co 11:3; Eph 1:22; Eph 4:15; Eph 5:23; Col 1:18; Col 2:10; Col 2:19); of God in relation to Christ (1Co 11:3). Head is also used for what is highest, uppermost: the top, summit of a mountain (Gen 8:5; Exo 17:9-10; Exo 19:20). The mountain of the Lord's house shall be established at the head of the mountains, and shall be higher than the hills, i.e. it shall be a prince among the mountains (Isaiah 2, 2). Four heads of rivers, i.e. four rivers into which the waters divide themselves (Genesis 2, 10). Head stone of-the corner (Psa 118:22), either the highest, forming the top or coping of the corner; or lowest, which forms the foundation of the building. SEE CORNER.

III. Hair of the Head (פֶּרִע) was by the Hebrews worn thick and full as an ornament of the person (comp. Eze 8:3; Jer 7:29); a bald head, besides exposing one to the suspicion of leprosy (Lev 13:43 sq.), was always a cause of mortification (2Ki 2:23; Isa 3:17; Isa 3:24; comp. Sueton. Caes. 45; Domit. 18; Homer, Iliad, 2, 219; Hariri, 10, p. 99, ed. Sacy); among the priestly order it therefore amounted to a positive disqualification (Lev 21:20; Mishna, Bechoroth, 7, 2); among the Egyptians, on the contrary, the hair was regularly shorn (Gen 41:14), and only allowed to go uncut in seasons of mourning (Herod. 2, 36). Hair so long as to descend to the shoulders, however,  seems only in early times to have been the habit, in the male sex, with youth (2Sa 14:6; Joseph. Ant. 8, 7, 3; Horace, Od. 2, 5, 21; 3:20, 14). Men cropped it from time to time with shears (מוֹרָה תִּעִר; comp. Eze 44:20, and the κόμη μικρἀ of the Babylonians, Strabo 16:746). SEE NAZARITE. Among the late Jews long hair in men was esteemed a weakness (1Co 11:14; comp. Plutarch, Quaest. Romans 14; Clem. Alex. Paed. 3, 106; Epiphaii. Haer. 68, 6; Jerome ad Ezech. 44); but it was otherwise in Sparta (Aristot. Rhet. 1, 9; Herod. 1, 82; Xenoph. Lac. 11, 3; comp. Aristoph. An. 1287 sq.); and to the priests any curtailment of it was forbidden (Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 118; for the long hair on the Persepolitan remains, see Niebuhr, Trav. 2. 128; and for that of the Asiatic priests in general, see Movers, Phonic. 1, 682: on the Assyrian monuments it is always, in the case of natives at least, represented as long and elaborately curled; see Layard, passim). Only in cases of religious vows did males suffer it to grow uncut (Act 18:18; see Kuinol, ad loc.). Females, on the contrary, set great value upon the hair (1 Corinthians 1. c.; compare Son 4:1; Luk 7:38; Joh 11:2 [Rev 9:8]; Philostr. Ep. 26; Plutarch, De vit. cere al. 3; Harmer, 3:319; Rosenmüller, Morgenl. 6, 108; Kype, Observ. 2, 220). There were various modes of putting up the hair (Eze 44:20; comp. Herod. 4:175,191); and it was a statute that men should not cut off the earlocks (הִזָּקָן פְּאִת, Lev 19:27; A.V. “round the corners of the head”). Women, especially, were wont to curl the hair (Isa 3:24; see Gesen. ad loc.; comp. Serv. ad — En. 12, 98), and to braid it (2Ki 9:30; Jdt 10:3; 1Pe 3:3; 1Ti 2:9; comp. Joseph. War, 4, 9, 10; Homer, II. 1, 330; 14:175; Harmer, 2, 381: to go with disheveled hair [passis crinibus] was a mark of grief, 3Ma 1:9; comp. Luk 7:38; Lightfoot,Opp. p. 1081; but rustic maidens often let the hair fall in loose tresses [דִלָּה, Son 7:6; comp. Anacr. 29, 7], merely bound with a ribbon), or even to interweave it with gems or other finery (Iliad, 17, 52), and in later times to ornament it most elaborately (see Lightfoot, Opp. p. 498; Hartmann, Hebr. 2, 208 sq.). SEE HEAD-DRESS.

Even men sometimes appeared with curls (Joseph. Ant. 14, 9, 4; comp. War, 4, 9,10; Philo, Opp. 2, 479; Plutarch, Lycurg. 22), which, however, was generally disapproved (Philo, Opp. 2,.306, 479; Cicero, Sext. 8; Artemid. 2, 6; Martial, 2, 36; Phocyl. Sentent. 194 sq.; Clement Alexand. Pced. 3, p. 101). Combs are nowhere mentioned in the O.T. (other nations knew them, Ovid, Fast. 1, 405; Petron. Sat. 126; Apul. Asin. 2, p. 213; comp. Iliad, 14, 176), although  they, as well as hairpins, are referred to in the Talmud (Hartmann, p. 224 sq.). Hair-powder was unknown to the ancients. On the other hand, they used to anoint the hair with costly oils (Psa 23:5; Psa 133:2; Mat 6:17; Luk 7:46; Joseph. Ant. 19:4, 1; as also non-Jewish nations, Plutarch, Pracepta cozjug. 29; Horace, 0. 2, 11, 16; 3:29, 2; Ovid, Ars Am. 1, 505; Tibul. 1, 751; Suetonius, Cces. 67; Apud. Metam. 2, 30, Bip.), and gave it a brilliant luster by a mixture of gold-dust in these unguents (Joseph. Ant. 8, 7, 3; comp. Lamprid. Commod. 17), as the hair of Orientals is generally black (Son 4:1; Son 5:11 : David's rufous hair is named as peculiar, 1Sa 16:12). A common method of dressing the hair among many ancient nations (Pliny, 15:24; 23:32, 46; 26:93; 28:51; Athen. 12:542; Val. Max. 2, 1, 5; Diod. Sic. 5, 28; but not among the Greeks, Plutarch, Apopht. reg. p. 19, Tauchn.), and one highly esteemed by modern Orientals, namely, to stain it reddish-yellow by means of henna, SEE CAMPHIRE, although perhaps not unknown to the Hebrewesses (see Son 7:5), as an imitation of the generally prized golden locks (flavi crines) of antiquity (Iliad, 1, 197; 2, 642; Virg. En. 4, 549; Ovid, Fast. 2, 763; Stat. Achil. 1, 162; Petron. Sat. 105; Apul. — Metam. 2, 25, Bip.; see Brouckhus. ad Tibull. 1, 6, 8), was a practice that does not appear to have anciently prevailed in the East; and modern Arabs are only accustomed to dye the hair when gray (Niebuhr, Trav. 1, 303). False hair has been incorrectly inferred from the Mishna (Shabb. 6, 5), although used among the Medians (comp. Xenoph. Cyr. 1, 3, 2, κόμαι πρόσθετοι), and occasionally by old men (Ovid, Ars Am. 3, 16), or for some special purpose (Polyb. 102, 78; Petron. Sat. 110; Juven. Sat. 6, 120: Josephus condemns its use, περιθετὴ κόμη, Life, 11); but wigs, although common in ancient Egypt (see Wilkinson, Anc. Ey. 2, 325, 326, 329), are unknown in the modern East (see Nikolai, Ueb. d. falschen Haare u. Periicken in alt. u. n. Zeit. Berl. 1801; Heindorf, on Horat. Satir. p. 183; Beroald, on Apul. Met. p. 244; Fabric. Bibliogr. Antiq. p. 847). See generally Schwebel, De vett. in capillis ornandis studio (Onold. 1768). On the treatment of the hair in mourning, SEE GRIEF. See Junius, De coma, c. animad. Gruteri (Amst. 1708); Salmasius, De ccesarie viror. et coma mulier. (L. B. 1644) Henning, De capillis vett. (Magdeb. 1678). SEE HAIR.

## Head of the Church[[@Headword:Head of the Church]]

             a title which properly belongs only to Christ (Eph 5:23), as the Supreme Governor of the whole body of the faithful. It is applied to the sovereign of Great Britain as the ruler of the temporalities of the Church. “Some have imagined (the members of the Romish Church, for instance) that the Christian world is ‘permanently,' and from generation to generation, subject to some one spiritual ruler (whether an individual man or a Church), the delegate, representative, and vicegerent of Christ, whose authority should be binding on the conscience of all, and decisive on every point of faith.” But, had such been our Lord's design, he could not possibly have failed, when promising his disciples “another Comforter, who should abide with them forever,” to refer them to the man or body of men who should, in perpetual succession, be the depository of this divine consolation and supremacy. It is also incredible, had such been our Lord's purpose, that he himself should be perpetually spoken of and alluded to as the Head of his Church, without any reference to any supreme head on earth as fully representing him, and bearing universal rule in his name. It is clear,. therefore, that the Christian Church universal has no spiritual head on earth (Eden, Churchman's Dictionary, s.v.). SEE POPE; SEE PAPACY; SEE PRIMACY.

## Head-band[[@Headword:Head-band]]

             (only in pl. קַשֻׁרַים, ishshurim', from קָשִׁר, to gird), rather a-girdle or belt, probably for the waist, as a female ornament (Isa 3:20; “attire,” Jer 2:32). SEE HEAD-DRESS.

## Head-dress[[@Headword:Head-dress]]

             The Hebrews do not appear to have regarded a covering for the head as an essential article of every-day dress. SEE HEADBAND. The earliest notice we have-of such a thing is in connection with the sacerdotal vestments, and in this case it is described as an ornamental appendage “for glory and for beauty” (Exo 28:40). SEE MITER. The absence of any allusion to a head-dress in passages where we should expect to meet with it, as in the trial of jealousy (Num 5:18), and the regulations regarding the leper (Lev 13:45), in both of which the “uncovering of the head” refers undoubtedly to the hair, leads to the inference that it was not ordinarily worn in the Mosaic age; and this is confirmed by the practice, frequently alluded to, of covering the head with the mantle. Even in after times it seems to have been reserved especially for purposes of ornament: thus the tsaniph' (צָנַי) is noticed as being worn by the nobles (Job 29:14), ladies (Isa 3:23), and kings (Isa 62:3), while the peer' (פְּאֵר) was an article of holiday dress (Isa 61:3, Auth. Vers. “beauty;” Eze 24:17; Eze 24:23). and was worn at weddings (Isa 61:10): the use of the μίτρα was restricted to similar occasions (Jdt 16:8; Baruch 5, 2). The former of these terms undoubtedly describes a kind of turban. its primary sense (צָנִ, “to roll around”) expresses the folds of linen wound round the head, and its form probably resembled that of the high-priest's mitsne'pheth (a word derived from the same root, and identical in meaning, for in Zec 3:5, tsaniph=mitsnepheth), as described by Josephus (Ant. 3:7, 3). The renderings of the term in the A.V., “hood”- (Isa 3:23), “diadem” (Job 29:14; Isa 62:3), “miter” (Zec 3:5), do not convey the right idea of its-meaning. The other term, peer, primarily means an ornament, and is so rendered in the A.V. (Isa 61:10; see also Isa 61:3, “beauty”), and is specifically applied to the headdress from its ornamental character. SEE DIADEM.

It is uncertain what the term properly describes: the modern turban consists of two parts, the kauk, a stiff, round cap occasionally rising to a considerable height, and the shash, a long piece of muslin wound about it (Russell, Aleppo, 1, 104): Josephus's account of the high-priest's head-dress implies a similar construction, for he says that it was made of thick bands of linen doubled round many times and sewn together, the whole covered by a piece of fine linen to conceal the seams. Saalschütz (Archceöl. 1, 27, note) suggests that the tsaniph and the peer represent the shash and the kauk, the latter rising high above the other, and so the most prominent and striking feature. In favor of this explanation it may be remarked that the peer is more particularly connected with the migbaah, the high cap of the ordinary priests, in Exo 39:28, while the tsaniph, as we have seen, resembled the high-priest's miter, in which the cap was concealed by the linen folds. The objection, however, to this explanation is that the etymological force of peer is not brought out: may not that term have applied to the jewels and other ornaments with which the turban is frequently decorated (Russell, 1, 106). The term used for putting on either the tsaniph or the peer is חָבִשׁto bind round” (Exo 29:9; Lev 8:13): hence the words in Eze 16:10, “I girded thee about with fine linen,” are to be understood of the turban; and by the use of the same term Jon 2:5 represents the weeds wrapped as a turban round his head. The turban, as now worn in the East, varies very much in shape (Russell's Aleppo, 1, 102). It appears that frequently the robes supplied the place of a headdress, being so ample that they might be thrown over the head at pleasure: the radid and the tsaiph, at all events, were so used, SEE DRESS, and the veil served a similar purpose. SEE VEIL.

The ordinary head-dress of the Bedouin consists of the keffyeh, a square handkerchief, generally of red and yellow cotton, or cotton and silk, folded so that three of the corners hang down over the back and shoulders, leaving the face exposed, and bound round the head by a cord (Burckhardt, Notes, 1, 48). It is not improbable that a similar covering was used by the Hebrews on certain occasions: the “kerchief” in Eze 13:18 has been so understood by some writers (Harmer, Observations, 2, 393), though the word more probably refers to a species of veil; and the σιμιλίνθιον τὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς  φόρημα), was applicable to the purposes of a head-dress. SEE HANDKERCHIEF. Neither of these cases, however, supplies positive evidence on the point, and the general absence of allusions leads to the inference that the head was usually uncovered, as is still the case in many parts of Arabia (Wellsted, Travels, 1, 73). The introduction of the Greek hat (πέτασος) by Jason, as an article of dress adapted to the gymnasium, was regarded as a national dishonor (2Ma 4:12): in shape and material the petasus very much resembled the common felt hats of this country (Smith, Dict. of Ant. s.v. Pileus). SEE BONNET.

The monuments and paintings in the tombs of Egypt supply us with numerous forms of headdresses; and there is no doubt that many of these were the prevailing costume at the period when the Israelites sojourned there. Among the ruins of Persepolis are found numerous sculptures which give the shape of various coverings for the head used by men. The care bestowed upon this part of the toilet among the Assyrians and Babylonians is abundantly illustrated in the volumes of Botta and Layard. “The Assyrian head-dress is described in Eze 23:15, under the terms סְרוּחֵי טַבוּלַים‘exceeding in dyed attire;' it is doubtful, however, whether tebulim describes the colored material of the head-dress (tiarae a coloribus quibus tinctae sint); another sense has been assigned to it more appropriate to the description of a turban (fasciis obvolvit, Geseniuti Thesaurus, p. 542). The associated term seruchey expresses the flowing character of the Eastern headdress, as it falls down over the back (Layard, Nineveh, 2, 308). The word rendered ‘hats' in Dan 3:21 (כִּרְבְּלָא) properly applies to a cloak”

The שְׁבַיסַים., shebisim' (Isa 3:18), rendered in our version “cauls,” or, as in the margin, “networks,” were most probably some kind of reticulated head-dresses, and so the word is understood in the Talmud. SEE CAUL.

A very peculiar kind of head-dress worn in some parts of Palestine, especially by the Druses of Mount Lebanon, and thought to be referred to by the קֶרֶן, ke'ren, or “horn” of 1Sa 2:1, is the tantura.' It is made of gold or silver, frequently of other metal either gilt or silver-plated, and sometimes of mere wood. The more costly ones are highly ornamented, and occasionally set with jewels; but the length and position of them is that upon which the traveler looks with the greatest interest, as illustrating and explaining a familiar expression of Scripture. The young, the rich, and the vain wear the tantura of great length, standing straight up from the top of the forehead; whereas the humble, the poor, and the aged place it upon the side of the head, much shorter, and spreading at the end like a trumpet. SEE HORN.

For other forms of royal headdresses, SEE CROWN, for military ones, SEE HELMET.

## Headdi[[@Headword:Headdi]]

             SEE HEDDA.

## Headstone[[@Headword:Headstone]]

             a monument placed at the head of a grave, as a memorial of the departed. Anciently, the cross in some form or other was invariably used, either simply, with floriated ends, within a circle, or in some other obvious form. During the 15th century the cruciform shape was displaced by other forms less Christian, neither artistic nor ornamental.

## Heal[[@Headword:Heal]]

             (properly רָפָא, θεραπεύω) is used in Scripture in the wider sense of curing in general, as applied to diseases, and even to inanimate objects. It occurs also in the special sense of restoring from apostasy. SEE DISEASE; SEE CURE.

## Healing[[@Headword:Healing]]

             Touching, i.e., stroking the patient's face with both hands, to remove the scrofula, significantly called the king's evil, was practiced by the kings of France as early as Clovis or Philip I, kings of Hungary, and English sovereigns, from Edward the Confessor to queen Anne, who touched Dr. Johnson. Bradwardine says that crowds resorted to the kings of England, France, and Germany. Solemn prayer and the sign of the cross, first laid aside by James I, were used. Henry II and Edward I practiced the touch. The ceremonial took place on a progress, on Good Friday, monthly, quarterly, or at Michaelmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide, and in 1683 from All-Saints till a week before Christmas, and from Christmas till March 1. The first form of service was drawn up in the reign of Henry VII. The gospel (Mar 16:14) was read while the king laid on his hands, and during another (Joh 1:1), at the words "the light," an angel, noble, or medal with St. Michael stamped on it was attached by a white ribbon round the neck of the patient, who had to produce a certificate of his malady, Signed by the parish priest and churchwardens, and was examined by the king's surgeon-in-waiting. The faculty of healing was popularly attributed also to the ninth son of a ninth son, or the seventh son of the seventh son.

## Healing-box[[@Headword:Healing-box]]

             used for holding the chrism in extreme unction. Healing-coin, a piece of money anciently given by kings to those persons who were "touched" for the cure of the king's evil. The coin was pierced and worn round the neck with a string or ribbon.

## Healing-oil[[@Headword:Healing-oil]]

             the sacred unction, made of oil of olives and balm, for use in the sacrament of extreme unction.

## Healing-pyx[[@Headword:Healing-pyx]]

             the box containing the sacred oil for anointing the sick. SEE PYX.

## Heap[[@Headword:Heap]]

             The Hebrew word גָּרַישׁ, gadish', rendered “‘tomb” in Job 21:32, and “heap” in the margin, properly signifies a stack, a heap, hence a tomb, tuzmulus, a sepulchral mound that was made by a pile of earth or stones. The ancient tumuli were heaps of earth or stone, and probably such a pile was usually made over a grave as a monument. Travelers in the East have often seen heaps of stones covering over or marking the place of graves. The Hebrew phrase גִּל אֲבָנַים גָּרֹלgal abanim' gadol', rendered “a great heap of stones,” refers to the heaps or tumuli which were raised over those whose death was either infamous or attended with some very remarkable circumstances. Such was the monument raised over the grave of Achan (Jos 7:26); and over that of the king of Ai (Jos 8:29). The burying of Absalom was distinguished by a similar erection, as a monument of his disgrace to future ages (2Sa 18:17). The same word גִּל, gal, is commonly used in reference to the heaps or ruins of walls and cities (Job 8:17; Isa 25:2; Jer 9:10). Modern travelers abundantly testify to the accurate fulfillment of Scripture prophecy in relation to the sites of numerous ancient cities, particularly of such as were doomed to become desolate heaps (Bastow). SEE PILLAR; SEE STONE. Other Heb. terms translated heap are: חֹמֶר, cho'mer, a pile (Exo 8:14, elsewhere a HOMER, as a measure); מְעַי, mei', a heap of rubbish (Isa 17:1); נֵד‘, ned, a mound (Isa 17:11; poet. of waves, Exo 15:8; Jos 3:13; Jos 3:16; Psa 33:7; Psa 78:13); עֲרֵמָה, aremah', a pile (e.g. of rubbish, Nehemiah 3:34; of grain, Son 7:3; of sheaves, Rth 3:7; Neh 13:15; Hag 2:16, etc.); תֵּל, tel, a hill (Jos 11:13; espec. a mound of rubbish, Deu 12:17; Jos 8:28; Jer 49:2, etc.); with others of a more miscellaneous signification. SEE MOUND.

## Hearers[[@Headword:Hearers]]

             (audientes), a name given to a class of catechumens in the early Church who were admitted to hear sermons and scriptures read in the church, but were not allowed to share in the prayers. The Apostolical Constitutions (lib. 8, c. 5) orders the deacon to dismiss them with the words Ne quis audientium, ne quis infidelium (“Let none of the hearers, let none of the unbelievers, be present”), before the proper liturgy began. See Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. 8 c. 4 bk. 10 ch. 2 bk. 18 ch. 1.

## Hearing The Word Of God[[@Headword:Hearing The Word Of God]]

             is an ordinance of divine appointment (Rom 10:17; Pro 8:4-5; Mar 4:24). Public reading of the Scriptures was a part of synagogue worship (Act 13:15; Act 15:21), and was the practice of the Christians in primitive times. Under the former dispensation there was a public hearing of the law at stated seasons (Deu 31:10; Deu 31:13; Neh 8:2-3). It seems, therefore, that it is a duty incumbent on us to hear, and, if sensible of our ignorance, we shall also consider it our privilege.

(1) As to the manner of hearing, it should be constantly (Pro 8:34; Jam 1:24-25); attentively (Luke 21:48; Act 10:33; Luk 4:20; Luk 4:22); with reverence (Psa 89:7); with faith (Heb 4:2); with an endeavor to retain what we hear (Heb 2:1; Psa 119:11); with an humble, docile disposition (Luk 10:42); with prayer (Luke 18).

(2) The advantages of hearing .are information (2Ti 3:16); conviction (1Co 14:24-25; Acts 2); conversion (Psa 11:7; Act 4:4); confirmation (Act 14:22; Act 16:5); consolation (Php 1:25; Isa 40:1-2; Isa 35:3-4). SEE PREACHING.

## Hearse or Herse[[@Headword:Hearse or Herse]]

             (from Lat. herpix, Low Lat. hercia, French herze, a harrow). The Low Latin hercia also signified a candelabrum, shaped like a harrow, which was placed at the head of a grave, a coffin, or a cenotaph. In the Middle Ages the name hearse was applied to a canopy (in Italian, catafalco), which was placed over the coffins of the distinguished dead, while they were kept in the church previous to interment. Hearses were also frequently prepared to receive the bodies of the dead in churches, at stations along the route, where they were being borne to a distance for final interment. Hearses were often made with great magnificence. They were frequently adorned with illustrations of the last judgment, and other subjects taken from the Scriptures. Candles were set in sockets in great numbers, and were kept burning as long as the corpse, remained in the hearse. The name hearse was also applied to a frame of wood or of metal that was placed over some of the reclining statues which were so frequently put over the tombs of distinguished persons. Over this hearse a pall was frequently hung. The modern use of the word hearse is confined to a framework or a wagon to bear the dead to the grave. The hearse varies greatly in form and ornamentation in different countries. — Diez, Etymologisches Wörterbuch (Bonn, 1861); Parker, Dict. of Architecture (Oxford, 1850); Migne, Dictionnaire des Origines (Paris, 1864). (G. F. C.)

## Heart[[@Headword:Heart]]

             in the Biblical sense (καρδία; לֵבor לֵבָב, often exchanged for קֶרֶב, in a more extended sense, as in Psa 39:3-4; Psa 109:22; 1Sa 25:37, the whole region of the chest, with its contents; see Delitzsch, System of Biblical Psychology, § 12, 13. According to Hupfeld, חֵלֶב, in Psa 17:10, and Psa 73:7, means simply the heart, which is not very likely).

1. In the Biblical point of view, human life, in all its operations, is centered in the heart. The heart is the central organ of the physical circulation; hence the necessity for strengthening the body as a support for the heart (סָעִד לֵב, Gen 18:5; Jdg 19:5; Psa 104:15); and the exhaustion of physical power is called a drying up of the heart (Psa 102:5; Psa 22:15, etc.). So, also, is the heart the center of spiritual activity; for all spiritual aims, whether belonging to the intellectual, moral, or pathological spheres, are elaborated in the heart, and again carried out by the heart. In fact, the whole life of the soul, in the lower and sensual, as well as in the higher spheres, has its origin in the heart (Pro 4:23, For out of it are the issues of life”). In order to follow this train of thought, and to establish in a clearer light the Biblical view of the heart, it will be best to consider the relation the heart bears to the soul (ψυχή, נֶפֶשׁ). This is one of the difficult questions in Biblical psychology; Olshausen (in the Abh. de naturae humanae trichotomia, opusc. theol. p. 159) says, “Omnium longe difficillimum est accurate definire quidnam discrimen in N.T. inter ψυχήν et καρδίαν, intercedat.” Nevertheless, the task is facilitated by the fact that there is essential agreement on this point in the anthropologies of the Old and New Testament.

(1) We first note that, while, as before said, the heart is the center of all the functions of the soul's life, the terms “heart” and “soul” are often used interchangeably in Scripture. Thus, in Deu 6:5 (compare Mat 22:37; Mar 12:30; Mar 12:33; Luk 10:27), and Deu 26:16, we are commanded to love God and obey his commandments with all our heart and all our soul (compare 1Ch 28:9); the union of the faithful, in Act 4:12, is designated as ην ἡ καρδία καἱ ἡ ψυχὴ μία. (In these passages, as in others, for instance, Deu 11:18; Deu 30:2; Jer 32:41, there is, moreover, to be noticed that the heart is always named first.) Thus the indecision and division of the inner life can be designated either by δίψυχος (Jam 1:8) or by καρδία δισσή. It is said of both ἁγνιζειν καρδίας (Jam 4:8) and ἁγνίζειν ψυχάς (1Pe 1:22); also שָׁפִךְ נָפְשׁוֹ(Psa 42:5; comp. Job 30:16) and שָׁפִךְ לַבּוֹ (Lam 2:10; Psa 62:9), the self-impelling to the love of God applies as well to the soul (Psalms 103) as to the קְכַבַים, of which the  heart is the center, etc. But in the majority of passages, where either the heart or the soul are separately spoken of, the term “heart” can either not be exchanged at. all for the term “soul,” or else only with some modification in the meaning.

(2) Note also the following fundamental distinction: The soul is the bearer of the personality (i.e. of the ego, the proper self) of man, in virtue of the indwelling spirit (Pro 20:27; 1Co 2:11), but yet is not itself the person of man; the heart, on the contrary (the חִדנְרֵי בֶטֶן, Pro 20:27), is the place where the process of self-consciousness is developed, in which the soul finds itself, and thus becomes conscious of its actions and impressions as its own (“in corde actiones animae humanae ad ipsam redeunt,” as is concisely and correctly said by Roos in his Fundam. psychol. ex s. scr., 1769, p. 99). Accordingly the soul, not the heart, is spoken of when the 8:39; Luk 16:15; Pro 17:3; Psa 7:10; Psa 17:3; Jer 11:20). Therefore also man is designated according to his heart in all that relates to habitual moral qualities; thus we read of a wise heart (1Ki 5:12; Pro 10:8, etc.), a pure heart (Psa 41:12; Mat 5:8; 1Ti 1:5; 2Ti 2:22), an upright and righteous heart (Gen 20:5-6; Psa 11:2; Psa 78:72; Psa 101:2), a single heart (Eph 5:5; Col 3:22), a pious and good heart (Luk 8:15), a lowly heart (Mat 11:29), etc. In all these places it would be difficult to introduce נֶפֶשׁor ψυχή:

(2) We must also observe that the original divine rule of conduct for man was implanted in his heart, and therefore the heart is the seat of the συνείδησις, or conscience, which has a mission to proclaim that rule (Rom 2:15). All subsequent divine revelations were also directed to the heart (Deu 6:6); so the law demands that God should be loved with the whole heart, and then, as though by radiation from this center, with the whole soul (comp. Deu 11:18; Psa 119:11, etc.). The teaching of wisdom also enters the heart, and from thence spreads its healing and vivifying influence through the whole organism (Pro 4:21-23). The prophetic consolations must speak to the heart (Isa 40:2), in contradistinction from such consolations as do not reach the bottom of human nature; thus also in Mat 13:9; Luk 8:15, we find the heart described as the ground on which the seed of the divine Word is to be — sowed. That which becomes assimilated to the heart constitutes the θησαυρὸς τῆς καρδίας (Mat 12:35).  This, however, may not only be ἀγαθός, but also πονηρὀς; for the human heart is not only a recipient of divine principles of life, but also of evil.

(3) In opposition to the superficial doctrine which makes man in regard to morals an indifferent being, Scripture presents to us the doctrine of the natural wickedness of the human heart, the יֵצֶר לֵב(Gen 8:21), or, more completely, מִחְשְׁבֵתּ לֵב יֵצֵר (Gen 6:5; compare 1Ch 28:9), and considers sin as having penetrated the center of life, from whence it contaminates its whole course. “How can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh” (Mat 12:34; comp. Ecc 8:11; Psa 73:7); and those things which come out of the heart defile the man (Mat 15:18). The heart is described as “deceitful (or, more properly, עָקבֹ, crooked, the opposite of יָשָׁרstraight) above all things, and desperately wicked” (אָנוּשׁ) (Jer 17:9); so that God alone can thoroughly sound the depths of its wickedness (compare 1Jn 3:20). Hence the prayer in Psa 139:23. In this natural state of insusceptibility for good the heart is called uncircumcised, עָרֵל(Num 26:41; compare Deu 10:16; Eze 44:9). Man, frightened at the manifestation of divine holiness, may take within himself the resolution of fulfilling the divine commands (Deu 5:24); yet the divine voice complains (Deu 5:29), “Oh that there were such a heart in them that they would fear me!” etc. Therefore the whole Revelation has for its object to change the heart of man; and its whole aim is to destroy, by virtue of its divine efficacy, the insusceptibility (“stupiditas, qua centrum animse laborat,” as Roos expresses it, p. 153) and the antagonism of the heart, and to substitute for them the fear of God in the heart (Jer 32:40), so that the law may be admitted (Jer 31:33). This is the effect of the operations of the Holy Spirit, whose workings, as shown in the O.T., point to the regeneration of the heart in redemption (Eze 36:26 sq.; Eze 11:19), transforming the prophets to new creatures by means of a change of heart (1Sa 10:6; 1Sa 10:9), and implanting a willingness to obey God's law in the pious (Psa 51:12-14).

(4) On the part of man, the process of salvation begins in the heart by the faith awakened by the testimony of revelation; which, as giving a new direction to the inner life, belongs entirely to the sphere of the heart, and is described as a fastening (according to the original meaning of הֶאֵַמין), a  strengthening (האמיוֹ, Psa 27:14; Psa 31:24), a supporting of the heart (comp. particularly Psa 112:7) on the ground which is God himself, the צוּד לֵבָב (Psa 73:26). The N.T. says in the same manner: καρδίᾷ πιστεύεται (Rom 10:9-10), πιστεύειν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας; faith is a μὴ διακρίνεσδαι ἐν καρδίᾷ (Mar 1:23). God purifies the heart by faith in Christ (Act 15:9), for by the sprinkling of the blood of atonement the heart is rid of the bad conscience (Heb 10:22; compare 1Jn 3:19-21), and the love of God is shed in it by the Holy Ghost (Rom 5:5). The same spirit also seals in the heart the assurance of being a child of God (2Co 1:22); the heart becomes the abode of Christ (Eph 3:16), is preserved in Christ (Col 3:15; Php 4:7), and strengthened in sanctification (1Th 3:13, etc.).

When, on the contrary, man rejects the testimony of revelation, the heart becomes hardened, turns to stone (הַקַשָׁה, Psa 96:8; Pro 28:14; אַמֵּוֹ. 2Ch 36:13; חַזֵּק, Exo 4:21; כַּבֵּד, 1Sa 6:6), for which we find it also said that the heart is shut (Isa 44:18), made fat (Isa 6:10; compare Psa 119:70). In the N. Test. we find πωρώσις καρδίας (Mar 3:5; Eph 4:18); σκληροκαρδία (Mat 19:8, etc.). The most important passage in this respect is Isa 6:10, where we find it particularly stated how the unsusceptible heart renders one unable to see the work of God, to hear his Word, and how this inability reacts on the heart, and renders its state incurable.

3. Finally, the question of the position the heart, as center of the spiritual life of the soul, holds in regard to the heart, considered as the center of the organic (physical) life, cannot be fully treated except in a thorough investigation of the relations between the body and soul in general. We will only remark here that the Scriptures not only draw a parallel between the body and the soul, by virtue of which the bodily actions are considered as symbols of the spiritual, but also establish the position that the soul, which is the bearer of the personality, is the same which directs also the life and actions; and thus the bodily organs, in their higher functions, become its adjuncts. Now, in view of the well-known fact that emotions and sufferings affect the physical economy for example, that the pulsations of the heart are affected by them--no one will consider it a mere figure of speech when the Psalmist says, “My heart was hot within me” (Psa 39:3), or  Jeremiah speaks of “a burning fire shut up in his bones” (Jer 20:9; comp. Jer 4:19; Jer 23:9).

But there is one point worthy of special attention in Biblical anthropology, namely, the specific relation the Bible establishes between certain parts of the bodily organism and particular actions (see what Delitzsch, Biblical Psychology, § 12, 13, deduces from the Biblical signification of the

רִחֲמַים, the liver, the kidneys), and then the part attributed to the heart in knowledge and will, considered aside from the head and brain. It is well known that all antiquity agreed with the Biblical views in these respects. In regard to Homer's doctrine, see Nagelsbach's Homer. Theologie, p. 332 sq. We may also on this point recall the expressions cordatus, recordari, vecors, excors, etc. (see especially Cicero, Tusc. 1, 9, 18, and Plato, Phaed. c. 45, and-the commentators on these passages). As Delitzsch correctly observes, the spiritual signification of the heart cannot be traced back to t from the mere fact of its being the central organ of the circulation. The manner in which that writer has made use of the phenomena of somnambulism to explain this is deserving of due notice, yet physiology has thus far been unable to throw any light on the subject. — Oehler, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 15 sq.

4. The heart expresses the middle of anything: “Tyre is in the heart,” in the midst, “of the sea” (Eze 27:4). “We will not fear, though the mountains be carried into the heart of the sea” (Psa 46:2). “As Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth” (Mat 12:40). Moses, speaking to the Israelites, says, “And the mountain burnt with fire, unto the heart of heaven;” the flame rose as high as the clouds.

To “say in one's heart” is a Hebrew expression for thinking (Psa 10:6; Psa 14:1). SEE SOUL.

5. Of special religious importance are the following practical uses of the word:

Hardness of heart is “that state in which a sinner is inclined to and actually goes on in rebellion against God. This state evidences itself by light views of the evil of sin; partial acknowledgment and confession of it; frequent commission of it; pride and conceit; ingratitude; unconcern about the Word and ordinances of God; inattention to divine providences; stifling  convictions of conscience; shunning reproof; presumption, and general ignorance of divine things.”

Keeping the heart is “a duty enjoined in the sacred Scriptures. It consists, says Flavel, in the diligent and constant use and improvement of all holy means and duties to preserve the soul from sin, and maintain communion with God; and this, he properly observes, supposes a previous work of sanctification, which hath set the heart right by giving it a new bent and inclination.

1. It includes frequent observation of the frame of the heart (Psa 77:6).

2. Deep humiliation for heart evils and disorders (2Ch 32:26).

3. Earnest supplication for heart purifying and rectifying grace (Psa 19:12).

4. A constant holy jealousy over our hearts (Pro 27:14).

5. It includes the realizing of God's presence with us, and setting him before us (Psa 16:8; Gen 17:1).

This is,

1. The hardest work; heart work is hard work indeed.

2. Constant work (Exo 17:12). 3. The most important work (Pro 23:26).

This is a duty which should be attended to if we consider it in connection with,

1. The honor of God (Isa 66:3).

2. The sincerity of our profession (2Ki 10:31; Eze 32:31-32).

3. The beauty of our conversation (Pro 12:26; Psa 45:1).

4. The comfort of our souls (2Co 13:5).

5. The improvement of our graces (Psa 63:5-6).

6. The stability of our souls in the hour of temptation (1Co 16:13).

The seasons in which we should more particularly keep our hearts are,

1. The time of our prosperity (Deu 6:10; Deu 6:12).

2. Under afflictions (Heb 7:5-6).

3. The time of Sion's troubles (Psa 46:1; Psa 46:4).

4. In the time of great and threatening danger (Isa 26:20-21).

5. Under great wants (Php 4:6-7).

6. In the time of duty (Lev 10:3).

7. Under injuries received (Rom 12:17, etc.).

8. In the critical hour of temptation (Mat 26:41).

9. Under dark and doubting seasons (Heb 12:8; Isaiah 1, 10).

10. In time of opposition and suffering (1Pe 4:12-13).

11. The time of sickness and death (Jer 49:11).

The means to be made use of to keep our hearts are,

1. Watchfulness (Mar 13:37).

2. Examination (Pro 4:26).

3. Prayer (Luk 18:1).

4. Reading God's Word (Joh 5:39).

5. Dependence on divine grace (Psa 86:11). See Flavel, On Keeping the Heart; Jamieson, Sermons on the Heart.”

## Heart-burial[[@Headword:Heart-burial]]

             The heart was often buried apart from the body in the place it loved well in life, as Devorgilla founded Sweet Heart Abbey in memory of the heart- burial of her husband. Richard I's heart was buried at Rouen. Robert Bruce desired his heart to be taken to the Holy Land in lieu of his pilgrimage, and lord James Douglas carried it round his neck in a silver case, hung by a silken cord. He threw it forward in advance of his men at the great battle of Salano, and covered it with his body.

## Hearth[[@Headword:Hearth]]

             is the representative in the Eng. Version of several Heb. words. אָח, ach (Sept. ἐσχάρα,Vulg. arula), a large pot, like a brazier (Gesenius, Thes. p. 69), a portable furnace in which fire was kept in the king's winter apartment (Jer 36:22-23). At the present day the Orientals sometimes make use of such stoves instead of fireplaces for warming  rooms; they are called in Persian and Turkish tannur. They have the form of a large pitcher, and are placed in a cavity sunk in the middle of the apartment. When the fire has done burning, a frame like a table is placed over the pot, and the whole is then covered with a carpet; and those who wish to warm themselves sit upon the floor, and thrust their feet and legs, and even the lower part of their bodies, under the carpet. כַּיּוֹר, kiyôr', a fire-pan or small basin for holding fire (Zec 12:6; elsewhere for roasting in, 1Sa 2:14; or generally for washing, “laver,” Exo 30:18, etc.). מוֹקֵד, moked', a burning (as rendered in Isa 23:14), hence a Jigot as fuel (“hearth,” Psa 102:4); and from the same root יָקוּד, yakûd' (literally kindled), a burning mass upon a hearth (Isa 30:14). The Heb. word עֻגּוּת, uggoth'; Sept. ἐγκρυφίαι, refers to cakes baked in the ashes (Gen 18:6).' These cakes serve in the East at the present day for ordinary food, especially upon journeys and in haste. By the hearth we are to understand, according to the present usage in the East, that a fire is made in the middle of the room, and, when the bread is ready for baking, a corner of the hearth is swept, the bread is laid upon it, and covered with ashes and embers; in a quarter of an hour they turn it. Sometimes they use convex plates of iron (Arabic tajen, whence the Gr. τήγανον), which are most common in Persia and among the nomadic tribes, as being the easiest way of baking and done with the least expense, for the bread is extremely thin and soon prepared. See BREAD. This iron plate is either laid on, or supported on legs above the vessel sunk in the ground, which forms the oven. SEE OVEN. (Burckhardt, Notes on Bed. 1, 58; P. della Valle, Viaggi, 1, 436; Harmer, Obs. 1, 477, and note; Rauwolff, Travels, ap. Ray, 2, 163; Shaw, Travels, p. 231; Niebuhr, Descr. de l'Arabie, p. 45; Schleusner, Lex. Vet. Test. s.v. τήγανον; Gesenius, s.v. עֻגָּה p. 997). SEE FIRE.

## Heat[[@Headword:Heat]]

             (usually חֹם,'chom, הִמָּה, chammah', or חֵמָה chemah'), besides its ordinary meaning, has several peculiar uses in Scripture. In Isa 49:10, and Rev 7:16, there is a reference to the burning wind of the desert, the simoom or samiel, described by travelers as exceedingly pestilential and fatal. It is highly probable that this was the instrument with which God destroyed the army of Sennacherib (2Ki 19:7; 2Ki 19:35). Its effects are evidently alluded to in Psa 103:15-16, and in Jer 4:11. Thevenot mentions such a wind, which in q658 suffocated 20,000 men in one night, and another which in 1655 suffocated 4000 persons. It sometimes burns up the corn when near its maturity, and hence the image of “corn blasted before it be grown up,” used in 2Ki 19:26. Its effect is not only to render the air extremely hot and scorching, but to fill it with poisonous and suffocating vapors. The most violent storms that Judaea was subject to came from the deserts of Arabia. “Out of the south cometh the whirlwind,” says Job (Job 37:9); “And there came a great wind from the wilderness” (Job 1:19). Zec 9:14 : “And Jehovah shall appear over them, and his arrow shall go forth as the lightning; and the Lord Jehovah shall sound the trumpet, and shall march in the whirlwinds of the south.” The 91st Psalm, which speaks of divine protection, describes the plague as arrows, and in those winds there are observed flashes of fire. In Num 13:3, the place in which the plague was inflicted upon the Israelites is for that reason called Taberah, i.e. a burning. A plague is called דֶּבֶר, deber', as a desert is called מַדנְבָּר, midbar', because those winds came from the desert, and are real plagues. This hot wind, when used as a symbol, signifies the fire of persecution, or else some prodigious wars which destroy men. For wind signifies war; and scorching heat signifies persecution and destruction. So in Mat 13:6; Mat 13:21, and Luk 8:6-13, heat is tribulation, temptation, or persecution; and in 1Pe 4:12, burning tends to temptation. A gentle  heat of the sun, according to the Oriental interpreters, signifies the favor and bounty of the prince; but great heat denotes punishment. Hence the burning of the heavens is a portent explained in Livy (3, 5) of slaughter. Thus in Psa 121:6 : “The sun shall not smite thee by day, nor the moon by night,” is in the next place explained thus, “Jehovah shall preserve thee from all evil; he shall preserve thy soul.” SEE FIRE.

## Heath[[@Headword:Heath]]

             (עִרְעָר, arar', Jer 17:6; Sept. ἀγριομυρίκη, Vulg. myricce; or עֲרוֹעֵר, aroem ‘, Jer 48:6; Sept. ὄνος ἄγριος, perh. by reading עָרוֹד, a wild ass; Vulg. myricae) has been variously translated, as myrica, tamarisk; tamarin which is an Indian tree, the tamarind; retama, that is. the broom; and also, as in the French and English versions, bruiere, heath, which is, perhaps, the most incorrect of all, though Hasselquist mentions finding heath near Jericho, in Syria. Gesenius, however, renders it ruins in the latter of the above passages (as in Isa 17:2), and needy in the former (as in Psa 102:18). As far as the context is concerned, some of the plants named, as the retain and tamarisk, would answer very well, SEE TAMIARISK; but the Arabic name, arar, is applied to a totally different plant, a species of juniper, as has been clearly shown by Celsius (Hierobot. 2, 195), who states that Arias Montanus is the only one who has so translated the Hebrew in the first of the passages in question (Jer 17:6): “For he shall be like the heath in the desert, and shall not see when good cometh, but shall inhabit the parched places in the wilderness, in a salt land, and not inhabited.” Both the Heb. words are from the root עָרִר, “to be naked.” in allusion to the bare nature of the rocks on which the juniper often grows (comp. Psa 102:17, הָעִרְעָר תְּפַלִּת, “the prayer of the destitute,” or ill-clad). Several species of juniper are no doubt found in Syria and Palestine. SEE CEDAR; SEE JUNIPER.

Dr. Robinson met with some in proceeding from Hebron to wady Musa, near the romantic pass of Nemela: “On the rocks above we found the juniper- tree, Arabic ar'ar; its berries have the appearance and taste of the common juniper, except that there is more of the aroma of the pine. These trees were ten or fifteen feet in height, and hung upon the rocks even to the summits of the cliffs and needles” (Bibl. Researches, 2, 506). In proceeding S.E. he states: “Large trees of the juniper become quite common in the wadys and on the rocks.” It is mentioned in the same situations by other travelers, and is no doubt common enough, particularly  in wild, uncultivated, and often inaccessible situations, and is thus suitable to Jer 48:6 : “Flee, save your lives, and be like the heath in the wilderness.” This appears to be the Juniperus Sabina, or savin, with small scale-like leaves, which are pressed close to the stem, and which is described as being a gloomy-looking bush inhabiting the most sterile soil (see English Cyclop. Hist. 3:311); a character which is obviously well suited to the naked or destitute tree spoken of by the prophet. Rosenmüller's explanation of the Hebrew word, which is also adopted by Maurer, “qui destitutus versatur” (Schol. ad Jer 17:6), is very unsatisfactory. Not to mention the tameness of the comparison, it is evidently contradicted by the antithesis in Jer 17:8 : “Cursed is he that trusteth in man he shall be like the juniper that grows on the bare rocks of the desert: Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord he shall be as a tree planted by the waters.” The contrast between the shrub of the arid desert and the tree growing by the waters is very striking; but Rosenmüller's interpretation appears to us to spoil the whole. Even more unsatisfactory is Michaelis (Supp. Lex. Heb. p. 1971), who thinks “Guinea-hens” (Numida meleagris) are intended! Gesenius (Thes. p. 1073 4) understands these two Heb. terms to denote “parietinse, aedificia eversa” (ruins); but it is more in accordance with the scriptural passages to suppose that some tree is intended, which explanation, moreover, has the sanction of the Sept. and Vulgate, and of the modern use of a kindred Arabic word. — Smith. Modern travelers do not mention the species; but those which have been named as growing in Palestine are the Phoenician juniper, the common savin, and the brown-berried juniper. The first of these is a tree of about twenty feet high, growing with its branches in a pyramidal form. Rosenmüller states that “Forskal found it frequently in the sandy heaths about Suez. The caravans use it for fuel.” The species best known in America are the common red cedar (Jun. Virginiana) and the Bermuda cedar, from which the wood of lead pencils is manufactured. They all have long, narrow, prickly leaves, and bear a soft, pulpy berry, from which a carminative oil is extracted. The wood is light, highly odorous, and very durable. SEE JUNIPER.

## Heath, Asa[[@Headword:Heath, Asa]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Hillsdale, N. Y., July 31,1776. His parents were Congregationalists. At thirteen he was converted, under the ministry of the Rev. F. Garrettson (q.v.). He began to preach in 1797 on Cambridge Circuit, N. York, under the direction of the Rev. Sylvester  Hutchinson. In 1798 he was stationed at Pomfret, Conn., with Daniel Ostrander. In 1799 he was sent to the province of Maine, and stationed on the Kennebec Circuit, embracing all the territory from Waterville to the Canada line, making more than two hundred miles travel to reach all the appointments. In 1800 Portland was his field of labor; 1801, Readfield; 1802, Falmouth; 1804-5, Scarboro'; in 1806- he located in consequence of bodily infirmities. In 1818 he re-entered the traveling connection, and was appointed presiding elder of Portland district, which position- he occupied for three years; 1821, Scarboro'; 1822, Kenmiebec; in 1823 he again located, and removed to Monmouth, Me.; in 1827 he re-entered the traveling ministry again, and held an effective relation to the Conference fifteen years. In 1842 he became superannuate, and this relation continued until Sept. 1, 1860, when he died in peace. As a preacher, he was sound in doctrine, clear in exposition, simple yet forcible in illustration, and impressive in delivery. — Zian's Herald, Oct. 5, 1860.

## Heath, Nicholas[[@Headword:Heath, Nicholas]]

             an English prelate, was born in London, and educated at Christ College, Cambridge. He became successively archdeacon of Stafford, bishop of Rochester (1540), of Worcester (1554), archbishop of York (1555), and chancellor of England under the reign of Mary. He was deprived of his  offices because he refused to take the. oath of supremacy under Elizabeth, and died at Cobham in 1560. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Heathcote, Ralph, D.D[[@Headword:Heathcote, Ralph, D.D]]

             an English divine, was born in 1721, and died May 28, 1795. He was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge; took orders, and in 1748 was made vicar of Barkby, near Leicester; assistant preacher of Lincoln's Inn in 1753; succeeded his father as vicar of Sileby in 1765; became rector of Sawtry- all-Saints, Huntingdonshire, in 1766; a prebend in the collegiate church in Southwell in 1768: and in 1788 vicar-general of Southwell Church. Besides works on other subjects, he wrote Cursory Animadversions upon the Middletonian Controversy in general (1752): — Remarks upon Dr. Chapman's Charge (1752) A Letter to Rev. T. Fothergill (1753): — Sketch of Lord Bolingbroke's Philosophy (1785, 8vo): — The Use of Reason asserted in Matters of Religion (1755, 8vo; and a defense of the same, in 1756, 8vo): — Discourse on the Being of God, against Atheists, in two Sermons (being the only ones of his twenty-four Boyle sermons which he published, 1763, 4to). Dr. Heathcote wrote several articles for the first edition of the General Biographical Dictionary, and assisted Nichols in editing a new edition of the same, published in 1784, 12 vols. 8vo. — Alibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 814; Rose, New Genesis Biog. Dict. 8:241; Gentleman's Magazine, 65, 66, 71. (J. W. M.)

## Heathen[[@Headword:Heathen]]

             The Hebrew word גּוֹי, goy (plur. גּוֹיַם, Egyim'), together with its Greek equivalent ἔθνς (ἔθνη), has been somewhat arbitrarily rendered “nations,” “gentiles,” and “heathen” in the A.V. It will be interesting to trace the manner in which a term, primarily and essentially general in its signification, acquired that more restricted sense which was afterwards attached to it. Its development is parallel with that of the Hebrew people, and its meaning at any period may be taken as significant of their relative position with regard to the surrounding nations.

1. While as yet the Jewish nation had no political existence, gôyim denoted generally the nations of the world, especially including the immediate descendants of Abraham (Gen 18:18; compare Gal 3:16). The latter, as they grew in numbers and importance, were distinguished in a most marked manner from the nations by whom they were surrounded, and were provided with a code of laws and a religious ritual which made the distinction still more peculiar. They were essentially a separate people (Lev 20:23); separate in habits, morals, and religion, and bound to maintain their separate character by denunciations of the most terrible judgments (Lev 26:14-38; Deuteronomy 28). On their march through the desert they encountered the most obstinate resistance from Amalek, “chief of the gôyim” (Num 24:20), in whose sight the deliverance from Egypt was achieved (Lev 26:45). During the conquest of Canaan, and the subsequent wars of extermination which the Israelites for several generations carried on against their enemies, the seven nations of the Canaanites, Amorites, Hittites, Hivites, Jebusites, Perizzites, and Girgashites (Exo 34:24), together with the remnants of them who were left to prove Israel (Jos 23:13; Jdg 3:1; Psa 78:55), and teach them war (Jdg 3:2), received the especial appellation of goyim. With these the Israelites were forbidden to associate (Jos 23:7); intermarriages were prohibited (Jos 23:12; 1Ki 11:2); and, as a warning against disobedience, the fate of the nations of Canaan was constantly kept before their eyes (Lev 18:24-25; Deu 18:12). They are ever associated with the worship of false gods and the foul practices of idolaters (Leviticus 18, 20), and these constituted their chief distinctions, as goyim, from the worshippers of the one God, the people of Jehovah (Num 15:41; Deu 28:10). This distinction was maintained in its full force during the early  times of the monarchy (2Sa 7:23; 1Ki 11:4-8; 1Ki 14:24; Psa 106:35). It was from among the gôyim, the degraded tribes who submitted to their arms, that the Israelites were permitted to purchase their bond-servants (Lev 25:44-45), and this special enactment seems to have had the effect of giving to a national tradition the force and sanction of a law (comp. Gen 21:15). In later times this regulation was strictly adhered to. To the words of Ecc 2:7, “I bought men-servants and maid-servants,” the Targum adds, “of the children of Ham, and the rest of the foreign nations.” Not only were the Israelites forbidden to intermarry with these gôyim, but the latter were virtually excluded from the possibility of becoming naturalized. An Ammonite or Moabite was shut out from the congregation of Jehovah even to the tenth generation (Deu 23:3), while an Edomite or Egyptian was admitted in the third (Deu 23:7-8). The necessity of maintaining a separation so broadly marked is ever more and more manifest as we follow the Israelites through their history, and observe their constantly recurring tendency to idolatry. Offence and punishment followed each other with all the regularity of cause and effect (Jdg 2:12; Jdg 3:6-8, etc.).

2. But, even in early Jewish times, the term goyim received by anticipation a significance of wider range than the national experience (Lev 26:33; Lev 26:38; Deu 30:1), and, as the latter was gradually developed during the prosperous times of the monarchy, the gôyim were the surrounding nations generally, with whom the Israelites were brought into contact by the extension of their commerce, and whose idolatrous practices they readily adopted (Eze 23:30; Amo 5:26). Later still, it is applied to the Babylonians who took Jerusalem (Neh 5:8; Psa 79:1; Psa 79:6; Psa 79:10), to the destroyers of Moab (Isa 16:8), and to the several nations among whom the Jews were scattered during the Captivity.

(Psa 106:47; Jer 46:28; Lam 1:3, etc.), the practice of idolatry still being their characteristic distinction (Isa 36:18; Jer 10:2-3; Jer 14:22). This signification it retained after the return from Babylon, though it was used in a more limited sense as denoting the mixed race of colonists who settled in Palestine during the Captivity (Neh 5:17), and who are described as fearing Jehovah while serving their own gods (2Ki 17:29-33; Ezr 6:21).  Tracing the synonymous term ἔθνη through the apocryphal writings, we find that it is applied to the nations around Palestine (1Ma 1:11), including the Syrians and Philistines of the army of Gorgias (1Ma 3:41; 1Ma 4:7; 1Ma 4:11; 1Ma 4:14), as well as the people of Ptolemais, Tyre, and Sidon (1 Maccabees 5, 9, 10, 15). They were image-worshippers (1Ma 3:48; Wis 15:15), whose customs and fashions the Jews seem still to have had an unconquerable propensity to imitate, but on whom they were bound by national tradition to take vengeance (1Ma 2:68; 1Es 8:85). Following the customs of the goyim at this period denoted the neglect or concealment of circumcision (1Ma 1:15), disregard of sacrifices, profanation of the Sabbath, eating of swine's flesh and meat offered to idols (2Ma 6:6-9; 2Ma 6:18; 2Ma 15:1-2), and adoption of the Greek national games (2Ma 4:12; 2Ma 4:14). In all points Judaism and heathenism are strongly contrasted. The “barbarous multitude” in 2 Macc. 2, 21 are opposed to those who played the man for Judaism, and the distinction now becomes an ecclesiastical one (comp. Mat 18:17). In 2Es 3:33-34, the “gentes” are defined as those “qui habitant in saeculo” (comp. Mat 6:32; Luk 12:30).

As the Greek influence became more extensively felt in Asia Minor, and the Greek language was generally used, Hellenism and heathenism became convertible terms, and a Greek was synonymous with a foreigner of any nation. This is singularly evident in the Syriac of 2 Maccabees 5, 9, 10, 13; comp. Joh 7:35; 1Co 10:32; 2Ma 11:2.

In the N.T., again, we find various shades of meaning attached to ἔθνη. In its narrowest sense it is opposed to “those of the circumcision” (Act 10:45; comp. Esther 14:15, where ἀλλότριος.= ἀπερίτμητος), and is contrasted with Israel, the people of Jehovah (Luk 2:32), thus representing the Hebrew גּוֹיַם. at one stage of its history. But, like goyim, it also denotes the people of the earth generally (Act 22:26; Gal 3:14). In Mat 6:7, ἐθνικός is applied to an idolater.

But, in addition to its significance as an ethnographical term, goyim had a moral sense which must not be overlooked. In Psa 9:5; Psa 9:15; Psa 9:17 (comp. Eze 7:21) the word stands in parallelism with רָשָׁע, rasha', the wicked, as distinguished by his moral obliquity (see Hupfeld on Psa 1:1); and in Eze 7:17 the people thus designated are described as “forgetters of God,” that know not Jehovah (Jer 10:25). Again, in Psa 59:5, it is to some extent commensurate in meaning with אָוֶן בֹּגְדֵי, “iniquitous transgressors;” and in these passages, as well as in Psa 10:15, it has a deeper significance than that of a merely national distinction, although the latter idea is never entirely lost sight of.

In later Jewish literature a technical definition of the word is laid down which is certainly not of universal application. Elias Levita (quoted by Eisenmenger, Entdecktes denthum, 1, 665) explains the sing goy as denoting one who is not of Israelitish birth. This can only have reference to its after signification; in the O.T. the singular is never used of an individual, but is a collective term, applied equally to the Israelites (Jos 3:17) as to the nations of Canaan (Lev 20:23), and denotes simply a body politic. Another distinction, equally unsupported, is made between גּוֹיַם, gôyim, and אֻמּים, ummim, the former being defined as the nations who had served Israel, while the latter were those who had not (Jalkut Chadash, fol. 20, note 20; Eisenmenger, 1, 667). Abarbanel, on Joe 3:2, applies the former to both Christians and Turks, or Ishmaelites, while in Sepher Juchasin (fol. 148, Colossians 2) the Christians alone are distinguished by this appellation. Eisenmenger gives some curious examples of the disabilities under which a goy labored. One who kept Sabbaths was judged deserving of death (2, 206), and the study of the law was prohibited to him under the same penalty, but on the latter point the doctors are at issue (2, 209). SEE GENTILE.

3. In modern use, the word heathen (probably a corruption of ἐθνικός, ethnicus, of which it is a translation; or derived from heath, that is, people who live in the wilderness, as pagan from pagus, a village) is applied to all nations that are strangers to revealed religion, that is to say, to all except Christians, Jews, and Mohammedans. It is nearly synonymous with Gentiles (q.v.) and Pagams (q.v.). At the time of the Crusades the Moslems were also called heathen; but as they receive the doctrine of the one God from the O.T., they are not properly so called. On the relation of the heathen to Judaism, see above, and also the article GENTILES SEE GENTILES . See also the same article (vol. 3:p. 789) for their relation to Christianity at its origin. We add the following statements:

“The old Oriental forms of heathenism, the religion of the Chinese (Confucius, about 550 B.C.), the Brahminism, and the later Buddhism of the Hindus (perhaps 1000 B.C.), the religion of the Persians (Zoroaster, 700 B.C.), and the Egyptians (‘the religion of enigma'), have only a remote and indirect concern with the introduction of Christianity. But they form to  some extent the historical basis of the Western religions; and the Persian dualism, especially, was not without influence on the earlier sects (the Gnostic and the Manichbean) of the Christian Church. The flower of paganism appears in the two great nations of classic antiquity, Greece and Rome. With the language, morality, literature, and religion of these nations the apostles came directly into contact, and through the whole first age the Church moves on the basis of these nationalities. These, together with the Jews, were the chosen nations of the ancient world, and shared the earth among them. The Jews were chosen for things eternal, to keep the sanctuary of the true religion. The Greeks prepared the elements of natural culture, of science and art, for the use of the Church. The Romans developed the idea of law, and organized the civilized world in a universal empire, ready to serve the spiritual universality of the Gospel. ‘Both Greeks and Romans were unconscious servants of Jesus Christ, ‘the unknown God.' These three nations, by nature at bitter enmity among themselves, joined hands in the superscription on the cross, where the holy name and the royal title of the Redeemer stood written, by the command of the heathen Pilate, ‘in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin' (Schaff, History of the Christian Church, 1, 44).

4. As to the religion of heathenism, it is “a wild growth on the soil of fallen human nature, a darkening of the original consciousness of God's deification of the rational and irrational creature, and a corresponding corruption of the moral sense, giving the sanction of religion to natural and unnatural vices. Even the religion of Greece, which, as an artistic product of the imagination. has been justly styled the religion of beauty, is deformed by this moral distortion. It utterly lacks the true conception of sin, and consequently the true conception of holiness. It regards sin not as a perverseness of will and an offence against the gods, but as a folly of the understanding, and an offence against men, often even proceeding from the gods themselves; for ‘infatuation is a daughter of Jove.' Then these gods themselves are mere men, in whom Homer and the popular faith saw and worshipped the weaknesses and vices' of the Grecian character, as well as its virtues, in immensely magnified forms. They have bodies and senses, like mortals, only in colossal proportions. They eat and drink, though only nectar and ambrosia. They are limited, like men, to time and space. Though sometimes honored with the attributes of omnipotence and omniscience, yet they are subject to. an iron fate, fall under delusion, and reproach each other with folly. Their heavenly happiness is disturbed by all the troubles of  earthly life. Jupiter threatens his fellows with blows and death, and makes Olympus tremble when he shakes his dark locks in anger. The gentle Venus bleeds from a spear-wound on her finger. Mars is felled with a stone by Diomedes. Neptune and Apollo have to serve for hire, and are cheated. The gods are involved by their marriages in perpetual jealousies and quarrels. Though called holy and just, they are full of envy and wrath, hatred and lust, and provoke each other to lying and cruelty, perjury and adultery. Notwithstanding this essential apostasy from truth and holiness, heathenism was religion, a groping after ‘the unknown God.' By its superstition it betrayed the need of faith. Its polytheism rested on a dim monotheistic background; it subjected all the gods to Jupiter, and Jupiter himself to a mysterious fate.

It had at bottom the feeling of dependence on higher powers, and reverence for divine things. It preserved the memory of a golden age and of a fall. It had the voice of conscience and a sense, obscure though it was, of guilt. It felt the need of reconciliation with deity, and sought that reconciliation by prayer, penance, and sacrifice. Many of its religious traditions and usages were faint echoes of the primal religion; and its mythological dreams of the mingling of the gods with men, of demigods, of Prometheus delivered by Hercules from his helpless sufferings, were unconscious prophecies and fleshy anticipations of Christian truths. This alone explains the great readiness with which heathens embraced the Gospel, to the shame of the Jews. These elements of truth, morality, and piety in heathenism may be ascribed to three sources. In the first place, man, even in his fallen state, retains some traces of the divine image, a consciousness of God, however weak, conscience, and a deep longing for union with the Godhead, for truth and for righteousness. In this view we may, with Tertullian, call the beautiful and true sentences of the classics, of a Socrates, a Plato, an Aristotle, of Pindar, Sophocles, Plutarch, Cicero, Virgil, Seneca, ‘the testimonies of a soul constitutionally Christian,' of a nature predestined to Christianity. Secondly, some account must be made of traditions and recollections, however faint, coming down from the general primal revelations to Adam and Noah. But the third and most important source of the heathen anticipations of truth is the all-ruling providence of God, who has never left himself without a witness.

Particularly must we consider the influence of the divine Logos before his incarnation, the tutor of mankind, the original light of reason, shining in the darkness and lighting every man, the sower scattering in the soil of heathendom the seeds of truth, beauty, and virtue” (Schaff, History of the Christian Church, § 12).  The question of the salvation of the heathen has been a subject of much discussion. “The great body of the Jews, from the earliest ages, denied salvation to the heathen on the principle extra ecclesiam non dari salutem. But this is entirely opposed both to the Old Testament and to the spirit of Christianity. Even Mohammed did not go to this degree of exclusiveness. Nor did the more ancient Grecian fathers deny salvation to the heathen, although they philosophized about it after their manner. E.g. Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria held that the Λὀγος exerted an agency upon the heathen by means of reason, and that the heathen philosophers were called, justified, and saved by philosophy. But afterwards, especially after the 3rd century, when the false Jewish notions respecting the Church were introduced into the West, and the maxim was adopted, Extra ecclesiam non dari salutem (which was the case after the age of Augustine), they then began to deny the salvation of the heathen, though there were always some who judged more favorably. Thus Zwingle, Curio, and others believed that God would pardon the heathen on account of Christ, although in this life they had no knowledge of his merits. See the historical account in Beykert's Diss. De salute gentium (Strasburg, 1777), and a short statement of the opinions of others in Morus, p. 128, 129, where he justly recommends to our imitation the exemplary modesty of the apostles when speaking on this point. The whole subject was investigated anew on occasion of the violent attack which Hofstede, a preacher in Holland, made upon the Belisaire of Marmontel. This gave rise to Eberhard's Apologie de Socrates. Compare also Tollner, Beweis dass Gött die Menschen auch durch seine Offenbarung in der Naturzur Seligkeit führe” (Knapp, Christian Theology, § 121). “The truth seems to be this, that none of the heathens will be condemned for not believing the Gospel, but they are liable to condemnation for the breach of God's natural law; nevertheless, if there be any of them in whom there is a prevailing love to the Divine Being, there seems reason to believe that, for the sake of Christ, though to them unknown, they may be accepted by God; and so much the rather, as the ancient Jews, and even the apostles, during the time of our Savior's abode on earth, seem to have had but little notion of those doctrines which those who deny the salvability of the heathen are most apt to imagine to be fundamental. Comp. Rom 2:10; Rom 2:26; Act 10:34-35; Mat 8:11-12; 1Jn 2:2” (Doddridge, Lectures on Divinity, lect. 172).

The question is very ably treated in an article on “The true Theory of Missions” in the Bibliotheca Sacra, July 1858. The writer states that the extreme evangelical theory, which assumes the certain damnation of all who have  not learned the name and faith of Christ, is “the accepted theory of the Romish Church, and of a part of the Protestant Church, perhaps of the majority of the latter.” He adds in a note the following: “The Presbyterian Confession of Faith (chap. 10:§ 4) uses language of remarkable boldness on this point, saying, ‘Others not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the Word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come to Christ, and therefore cannot be saved; much less can men not professing the Christian religion be saved in any other way whatever, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature and the law of that religion they do profess; and to assert and maintain that they may is very pernicious and to be detested.' This is sufficiently positive, especially as it contradicts both our Savior and the apostle Paul. It represents heathen who live according to their light as ‘much less' able to be saved than men who hear the Gospel and reject it, thus directly contradicting our Savior, who declared that those who rejected his words would receive a heavier condemnation than even the depraved, unrepentant inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, or Tyre and Sidon (Mat 11:20-24). The ‘Confession of Faith' declares the salvation of conscientious heathen to be ‘much less' possible than that of unbelieving hearers of the Gospel; while Christ asserts that even the most flagrant sinners of the heathen shall find it ‘more tolerable' in the Day of Judgment than such unbelievers. Equally at variance with the ‘Confession of Faith' is the declaration of Paul in Rom 2:14; Rom 2:26-27, in which he shows how those ‘having not the law may be a law unto themselves,' and how their ‘uncircumcision shall be counted for circumcision…' “The facts of human history and the declarations of the Bible alike declare that mercy is a prominent attribute of the divine character, and that this world is for some reason, known or unknown, under its care.

We cannot, therefore, resist the conviction — it is an affirmation of the moral sense of all men that, guilty though the human race may be, and deserving of destruction, yet every man lives under a dispensation of mercy, and has an opportunity for salvation. To assert gravely, then, that the heathen who have never heard of Christ are shut out from all possible hope of pardon, and are riot in a salvable position in their present circumstances, is to offend the moral sense of the thoughtful men as well as that of the common multitude. It is worse than denying that an atonement has been made for all mankind, and restricting it to the elect alone; for that doctrine, however theoretically untrue, is saved from much of its practical evil by our inability to point out the elect in advance, so that  our hopes are not cut off for any particular man. But this theory points to actual masses of men, to the entire population of whole countries, and dooms them to a necessary perdition with no present hope of pardon; and it extends this judgment backwards to generations in the past who are represented as having had no share in that mercy which we have such reason to believe to be universal in its offers. Such a theory practically denies the divine grace by suspending its exercise, so far as the heathen (the majority of the human race) are concerned, upon the action of those already enlightened. It declares that there is no possible mercy for the heathen unless Christians choose to carry the Gospel to them. Does it seem rational, or in harmony with the universality and freedom of God's grace, that the only possibility of salvation for the mass of mankind should be suspended, not on anything within their control, but on the conduct of men on the opposite side of the globe?

By such representations the minds of men are shocked, and a reaction takes place, which is unfavorable not only to the cause of missions, but to evangelical religion as well. They are led to think of evangelical religion as a severe, gloomy, remorseless system, which represents God as without mercy, or which confines that mercy within an exceedingly narrow compass. By describing the salvation of pagans as absolutely impossible, an influence is exerted in favor of universalism and infidelity.” The writer further asserts that no passage in the Bible asserts this theory, nor does any doctrine of the Bible imply it. John Wesley's views on this subject are given in his sermon on Living Without God, from which we extract the following: “I have no authority from the Word of God to ‘judge those that are without,' nor do I conceive that any man has a right to sentence all the heathen and Mohammedan world to damnation” (Works, N. Y. ed. 2, 485). Again, the Minutes of Aug. 8, 1770, declare that “he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, according to the light he has, is accepted of God.” For this Wesley was attacked by Shirley and others, and defended by Fletcher, in his First Check to Antinonmianisms (New York edit.), 1, 41. See, besides the works above cited, Watson, Theolog. Institutes, 2, 445; Whately, Future State, p. 207; Constant, De la Religion (Bruxelles, 1824); Rougemont, Le Peuple Primitif (Paris, 1855-57, 3 vols. 8vo); Presence, Hist. des Trois Premiers Siecles de l'Eglise, vol. 1; translated under the title The Religions before Christ (Edinb. 1862, 8vo); Sepp, Das Heidenthum (Regesb. 1853, 3 vols.); Maurice, Religions of the World (Boson, 1854,18mo); Trench, Hulsean Lectures for 1846 (Philadel. 1850,12mo); Wuttke, Gesch. des Heidenthumis, etc. (Bresl. 1853, 8vo); Hardwick,  Christ and other Masters (1855, 2 vols. 8vo); Schaff, Apostol. Church, p. 139 sq.; Scholten, Gesch. d. Religion u. Philosophie (Elberf. 1868, 8vo); Pfleiderer, Die Religion, ihre Wesen und ihre Geschichte (Leipsic, 1869, 2 vols. 8vo); Döllinger, The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ, trans. by Darnell (Lond. 1862,2 vols. 8vo); N. British Review, December, 1867, art. 1; Baring-Gould, Origin and Development of Religious Belief (Lond. 186970, 2 vols. 8vo).

## Heathenism[[@Headword:Heathenism]]

             SEE PAGANISM.

## Heave-offering[[@Headword:Heave-offering]]

             (תְּרוּמָה, terumiah', from רוּם, to be high; Sept. usually ἀφαίρεμα), a term including all that the Israelites voluntarily (Exo 25:2 sq.; Exo 35:24; Exo 36:3) or according to' a precept (Exo 30:15; Lev 7:14; Num 15:19 sq.; Num 18:27 sq.; Num 21:29 sq.; comp. Eze 45:13) contributed of their own property to Jehovah (not as an offering in the usual sense, but) as a present (Isa 40:20), to be applied to the regular cultus, i.e. for the establishment and maintenance of the sanctuary and its accessories (Exo 25:2 sq.; Exo 30:13 sq.; Exo 25:5 sq., Exo 25:21; Exo 25:24; Exo 26:3; Exo 26:6; Ezr 8:25, etc.), or for the support of the priests (Exo 29:28; Num 18:8 sq. Num 18:5; Num 18:9). Prescribed contributions were, in addition to the annual temple-tax SEE TEMPLE, chiefly that share of the booty taken in war which be' longed to the priests (Num 21:29 sq.), the yearly first-fruits (Num 15:19 sq.; comp. 2Sa 1:21), and the tenths which the Levites were required to make over to the priests out of the natural tithes paid to them (Num 18:25 sq.; what the Levites retained for their own use not being thus styled). The term תְּרוּמָהseems to stand in a narrower sense in Neh 10:37; Neh 12:44; Neh 13:3, SEE FIRSTLING, and the Talmudists so call only the agricultural first-fruits appropriate to human use, together with the Levitical tenths (see the tract Terumoth in the Mishna, 1, 6). Heave-offerings are coupled with first fruits in Eze 20:40, and with tithes in Mal 3:8. In Eze 45:1; Eze 48:8; Ezekiel cf., Eze 12:20 sq., the same word is applied to that portion of the Holy Land which is represented as set apart for the maintenance of the sanctuary and the priests. For the care of all such contributions, as well as for voluntary offerings and tithes in general, a special class of officers was (from the time of king Hezekiah) detailed, of whom a higher priest had the superintendence (2Ch 21:11-12; 2Ch 21:14; Neh 12:44; Neh 13:5). Heave-offerings could be used or consumed only by the priests and  their children (Num 18:19; Lev 22:10). Latei regulations are detailed in the Talmudical tract Terumolth. SEE WAVE-OFFERING.

## Heave-shoulder[[@Headword:Heave-shoulder]]

             (שׁוֹק תְּרוּמָה, Sept. βραχίων ἀφαιρέματος.) is the name applied to the (right) shoulder that fell to the priests in the presentation of animals as a thank-offering (Lev 7:34; Numbers vi. 20; 18:18), which could be eaten only by such of their families as were in a ceremonially clean state (Lev 10:14). SEE OFFERING.

## Heaven[[@Headword:Heaven]]

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

A. Terrestrially and Figuratively regarded. — Wherever the scene of a prophetic vision is laid, heaven signifies symbolically the ruling power or government; that is, the whole assembly of the ruling powers, which, in respect to the subjects on earth, are a political heaven, being over and ruling the subjects, as the natural heaven stands over and rules the earth. Thus, according to the subject, is the term to be limited; and therefore Artemidorus, writing in the times of the Roman emperors, makes Italy to be the heaven: “As heaven,” says he, “is the abode of gods, so is Italy of kings.” The Chinese call their monarch Tiencu, the son of heaven, meaning thereby the most powerful monarch. And thus, in Mat 24:30, heaven is synonymous to powers and glory; and when Jesus says, “The powers of the heaven shall be shaken,” it is easy to conceive that he meant that the kingdoms of the world should be overthrown to submit to his kingdom. Any government is a world; and therefore, in Isa 51:15-16, heaven and earth signify apolitical universe, a kingdom or polity. In Isa 65:17, a new heaven and a new earth signify a new government, new kingdom, new people. SEE HEAVEN AND EARTH.

B. Physically treated. —

I. Definitions and Distinctions. — The ancient Hebrews, for want of a single term like the κόσμος and the mundus of the Greeks and the Latins used the phrase heaven and earth (as in Gen 1:1; Jer 23:24; and Act 17:24, where “H. and E.”= “the world and all things therein”) to indicate the universe, or (as Barrow, Sermons on the Creed, Works [Oxford ed.], 4:556, expresses it) “those two regions, superior and inferior, into which the whole system of things is divided, together with all the beings that do reside in them, or do belong unto them, or are comprehended by them” (compare Pearson, On the Creed, who, on art. 1 [“Maker of H. and E.”], adduces the Rabbinical names of a triple division of the universe, making the sea, יָם, distinct from the יָשׁוּב, ἡ οἰκουμένη. Compare also the Nicene Creed, where another- division occurs of the universe into “things visible and invisible”). Deducting from this aggregate the idea expressed by “earth” SEE EARTH; SEE GEOGRAPHY, we get a residue of signification which exactly embraces “heaven.” Barrow (l. c.) well defines it as “all the superior region encompassing the globe of the earth, and from it on all sides extended to a distance inconceivably vast and spacious, with all its parts, and furniture, and inhabitants not only such things in it as are visible and material, but also those which are immaterial and invisible (Col 1:16).”

1. Wetstein (in a learned note on 2Co 12:2) and Eisenmenger (Entdecktes Judenthunm, 1, 460) state the Rabbinical opinion as asserting seven heavens. For the substance of Wetstein's note, see Stanley, Corinthiun, 1. c. This number arises confessedly from' the mystic: value of the numeral seven; “omnis septenarius dilectus est in saeculumine superis.” According to Rabbi Abia, there were six antechambers, as it were, or steps to the seventh heaven, which was the “ταμεῖον in quo Rex habitat”-the very presence-chamber of the divine King himself. Compare Origen, Contra Celsum, 6, 289, and Clemens Alex. Stromlata, 4, 636; 5, 692. In the last of these passages the prophet Zephaniah is mentioned, after some apocryphal tradition; to have been caught up into “the fifth heaven, the dwelling-place of the angels, in a glory sevenfold greater than the brightness of the sun.” In the Rabbinical point of view, the superb throne of king Solomon, with the six steps leading up to it was a symbol of the highest heaven with the throne of the Eternal, above the six inferior heavens (1Ki 10:18-20). These gradations of the celestial regions are probably meant in Amo 9:6, where, however, the entire creation is beautifully described by “the stories [or steps of the heaven,” for the empyreal heaven; “the troop [or globular aggregate, the terra firma; see A. Lapide, ad loc.] of the earth,” and “the waters of the sea” [including the atmosphere, whence the waters are “poured out upon the face of the  earth”]. As for the threesald division of the celestial regions mentioned in the text, Meyer thinks it to be a fiction of the learned Grotius, on the ground of the Rabbinical seven heavens. But this- censure is premature; for

(1) it is very doubtful whether this hebdomadal division is as old as Paul's time;

(2) it is certain that the Rabbinical doctors are not unanimous about the number seven. Rabbi Judah (Chagiga, fol. 12:2, and Aboth Nathan, 37) says there are “two heavens,” after Deu 10:14. This agrees with Grotius's statement, if we combine his nubiferum (רקיע) and astriferumi (שׁמים) into one region of physical heavens (as indeed Moses does himself in Gen 1:14-15; Gen 1:17; Gen 1:20), and reserve his angeliferum for the שמי השמים “the heaven of heavens,” the supernal region of spiritual beings, Milton's “Empyrean” (P. L. 7:sub fin.). See bishop Pearson's note, On the Creed (ed. Chevallier), p. 91. The learned note of De Wette on 2Co 12:2 is also worth consulting.

(3) The Targum on 2Ch 6:18 (as quoted by Dr. Gill, Comment. 2 Corinth. 1. c.), expressly mentions the triple distinction of supreme, middle, and lower heavens. Indeed, there is an accumulation of the threefold classification. Thus, in Tseror lansamsor, fol. 1, 4, and 3:2,3, and 82, 2, three worlds are mentioned. The doctors of the Cabbala also hold the opinion of three worlds, Zohar, Numbers fol. 66, 3. And of the highest world there is further a tripartite division, of angels, עוֹלָם הִמִּלְאָכַים; of souls, נְפָשׁוֹת; and of spirits, הָרוּחַים עוֹלָם. See Buxtorf's Lex Rabbin. col. 1620, who refers to D. Kimchi on Psa 19:9. Paul, besides the well-known 2Co 12:2, refers again, only less pointedly, to a plurality of heavens, as in Eph 4:10. See Olshausen (ed. Clark) on the former passage.

2. Accordingly, Barrow (p. 558, with whom compare Grotius and Drusius on 2Co 12:2) ascribes to the Jews the notion that there are three heavens: Coelum nubiferum, or the firmament; Ccelum astriferum, the starry heavens; Coelum angeliferum, or “the heaven of heavens,” where the angels reside, “the third heaven” of Paul. This same notion prevails in the fathers. Thus St. Gregory of Nyssa (Hexaem. , 42) describes the first of these heavens as the limited space of the denser air (τὸν ὅρον τοῦ παχυμερεστέπου ἀἐρος), within which arrange the clouds, the  winds, and the birds; the second is the region in which wander the planets and the stars (ἐνῳ δὲ πλανῆ ται τῶν ἀστέρων διαπορεύοται), hence aptly called by Hesychius κατηστρισμένον, locum stelliferum; while the third is the very summit of the visible creation (τὸ ο῏υν ἀκρότατον τοῦ αἰσθηροῦ κόσμου), Paul's third heaven, higher than the aerial and stellar world, cognizable [not by the eye, but] by the mind alone (ἐν στασίμ῎ῳ καὶ νοητῇ φύσει γενόμενος), which Damascene calls the heaven of heavens, the prime heaven beyond all others (οὐρανὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὸ πρῶτος οὐρανός, Orthod. Fid. lib. 2, c. 6:p. 83); or, according to St. Basil (In Jesaiarm, visione 2, tom. 1, 813), the throne of God (θρόνος θεοῦ), and to Justin Martyr (Quaest. et Resp. ad Graecos, ad ult. Quaest. p. 236), the house and throne of God (οϊvκος καὶ θρόνος τοῦ θεοῦ).

II. Scripture Passages arranged according to these Distintions. — This latter division of the celestial regions is very convenient and quite Biblical.

(I.) Under the first head, caelum nubiferum, the following phrases naturally fall —

(a) “Fowl,” or “fowls of the heaven, of the air,” see Gen 2:19; Gen 7:3; Gen 7:23; Gen 9:2; Deu 4:17; Deu 28:26; 1Ki 21:24; Job 12:7; Job 28:21; Job 35:11; Psa 8:8; Psa 79:2; Psa 104:12; Jer 7:33 et passim; Eze 29:5 et passim; Dan 2:38; Hos 2:18; Hos 4:3; Hos 7:12; Zep 1:3; Mar 4:3 (τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ); Luk 8:5; Luk 9:58; Luk 13:19; Act 10:12; Act 11:6 in all which passages the same original words in the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek Scriptures (שָׁמִיַן שָׁמִיַם. οὐρανίο) are with equal propriety rendered indifferently “air” and “heaven” — similarly we read of “the path of the eagle in the air” (Pro 30:19); of “the eagles of heaven” (Lam 4:19); of “the stork of the heaven” (Jer 8:7); and of” birds of heaven” in general (Ecc 10:20; Jer 4:25). In addition to these zoological terms, we have meteorological facts included under the same original words; e.g.

(b) “The dew of heaven” (Gen 27:28; Gen 27:39; Deu 33:28; Dan 4:15 et passim; Haggai 10 Zec 8:12):

(c) “The clouds of heaven” (1Ki 18:45; Psa 147:8; Dan 7:13; Mat 24:30; Mat 26:64; Mar 14:62):

(d) The frost of heaven (Job 38:29):

(e) The winds of heaven (1 Kings 18:55; Psa 78:26; Dan 8:8; Dan 11:4; Zec 2:6; Zec 6:5 [see margin]; Mat 24:31; Mar 13:27):

(f) The rain of heaven (Gen 8:2; Deu 11:11; Deu 28:12; Jer 14:22; Act 14:17 [οὐρανόθεν ὑετούς]; Jam 5:18; Rev 18:6):

(g) Lightning, with thunder (Job 37:3-4; Luk 17:24).

(II.) Celum astriferum. The vast spaces of which astronomy takes cognizance are frequently referred to: e.g.

(a) in the phrase “host of heaven,” in Deu 17:3; Jer 8:2; Mat 24:29 [δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν]; a sense which is obviously not to be confounded with another signification of the same phrase, as in Luk 2:13 SEE ANGELS

(b) Lights of heaven (Gen 1:14-16; Eze 32:8):

(c) Stars of heaven (Gen 22:17; Gen 26:4; Exo 32:13; Deu 1:10; Deu 10:22; Deu 28:62; Jdg 5:20; Neh 9:23; Isa 13:10, Nah 3:16; Heb 11:12).

(III.) Calum angeliferums. It would exceed our limits if we were to collect the descriptive phrases which revelation has given us of heaven in its sublimest sense, we content ourselves with indicating one or two of the most obvious:

(a) The heaven of heavens (Deu 10:14; 1Ki 8:27; 2Ch 2:6; 2Ch 2:18; Neh 9:6 Psa 115:16; Psa 148:4 :

(b) The third heavens (2Co 12:2):

(c) The high and lofty [place] (Isa 47:15): (d) The highest (Mat 21:9; Mar 11:10; Luk 2:14, compared with Psalm 168:1). This heavenly sublimity was graciously brought down to Jewish apprehension in the sacred symbol of their Tabernacle and Temple, which they reverenced (especially in the adytum of “the Holy of Holies”) as “the place where God's honor dwelt” (Psa 26:8), and amidst the sculptured types of his celestial retinue, in the cherubim of the mercy-seat (2Ki 19:15; Psa 80:1 : Isa 37:16).  III. Meaning of the Terms used in the Original. —

1. By far the most frequent designation of heaven in the Hebrew Scriptures is שָׁמִיַם, shama'yim, which the older lexicographers [see Cocceius, Lex. s.v.] regarded as the dual, but which Gesenius and Fürst have restored to the dignity, which St. Jerome gave it, of the plural of an obsolete noun, שָׁמִי as (גּוֹרַם. plur. omf גּוֹי and מִיַם from מִי). According to these recent scholars, the idea expressed by the word is height, elevation (Gesenius, Thes. p. 1453; Furst, Hebr. Wort. 2, 467). In this respect of: its essential meaning it resembles the Greek obpavoi [from the radical 6 p, denoting height] (Pott, Etymol. Forsch. 1, 123, ed. 1). Pott's rendering of this root op, by “sich erheben,” reminds us of our own beautiful word heaven, which thus enters into brotherhood of signification with the grand idea of the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek.. Professor Bosworth, in his Anglo-Sax. Dict. under the verb hebban, to raise or elevate, gives the kindred words of the whole Teutonic family, and deduces there from the noun heofon or heofen, in the sense of heaven. — And although the primary notion of the Latin caelum (akin to κοῖλος and our hollow) is the less sublime one of a covered or vaulted space, yet the loftier sense of elevation has prevailed, both in the original (see White and Riddle, s.v. Caelum) and in the derived languages (comp. French ciel, and the English word ceiling)

2. Closely allied in meaning, though unconnected in origin with שָׁמִיַם, is the oft-recurring מָרוֹם, mardm'. This word is never Englished heaven, but “heights,” or “high place,” or “high places.” There can, however, be no doubt of its celestial signification (and that in the grandest degree) in such passages as Psa 68:18 [Hebr. 19]; 93:4; 102:19 [or in the Hebr. Bib. 20, where ַמְּרוֹם קָדנְשׁו ֹ is equal to the מַשָּׁמִיַםof the parallel clause]; similarly, Job 31:2; Isa 57:15; Jer 25:30. Dr. Kalisch (Genesis, Introd. p. 21) says “It was a common belief among all ancient nations that at the summit of the shadow of the earth, or on the top of the highest mountain of the earth, which reaches with its crest into heaven the gods have their palace or hall of assembly,” and he instances “the Babylonian Albordsh, the chief abode of Ormuzd, among the heights of the Caucasus; and the Hindoo Meru; and the Chinese Kulkun (or Kaen-lun); and the Greek Olympus (and Atlas); and the Arabian Caf; and the Parsee Tireh.” He, however, while strongly and indeed most properly censuring the identification of Mount Meru with Mount Moriah (which had hastily been conjectured from “the accidental resemblance of the names”), deems  it improbable that the Israelites should have entertained, like other ancient nations, the notion of local height for the abode of him whose “glory the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain;” and this he supposes on the ground that such a notion “rests essentially on polytheistic ideas.” Surely the learned commentator is premature in both these statements.

(1.) No such improbability, in fact, unhappily, can be predicated of the Israelites, who in ancient times (notwithstanding the divine prohibitions) exhibited a constant tendency, to the ritual of their בָּמוֹת, or “high places.” Gesenius makes a more correct statement when he says [Hebr. Lex. by Robinson, p. 138], “The Hebrews, like most other ancient nations, supposed that sacred rites performed on high places were particularly acceptable to the Deity.. Hence they were accustomed to offer sacrifices upon mountains and hills, both to idols and to God himself (1Sa 9:12 sq.; 1 Chronicles 13:29 sq.; 1Ki 3:4; 2Ki 12:2-3; Isa 45:7); and also to build there chapels, fanes, tabernacles (בָּתְּי הִבָּמוֹת, 1Ki 13:32; 2Ki 17:29), with their priests and other ministers of the sacred rites (כֹּהֲנֵי הִבָּמוֹת, 1Ki 12:32; 2Ki 17:32). So tenacious of this ancient custom were not only the ten tribes, but also all the Jews, that, even after the building of Solomon's Temple, in spite of the express law of Deuteronomy 12, they continued to erect such chapels on the mountains around Jerusalem.”

(2.) Neither from the character of Jehovah, as the God of Israel, can the improbability be maintained, as if it were of the essence of polytheism only to localize Deity on mountain heights. “The high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy,” in the proclamation which he is pleased to make of his own style, does not limit his abode to celestial sublimities; in one of the finest passages of even Isaiah's poetry, God claims as one of the stations of his glory the shrine of “a contrite and humble spirit” (Isa 57:15). His loftiest attributes, therefore, are not compromised, nor is the amplitude of his omnipresence compressed by an earthly residence. Accordingly, the same Jehovah who “walketh on the high places, בִּמוֹת, of the earth” (Amo 4:13); who “treadeth on the fastnesses, בָּמוֹת, of the sea” (Job 9:8); and “who ascendeth above the heights, בָּמוֹת, of the clouds,” was pleased to consecrate Zion as his dwelling-place (Psa 87:2), and his rest (Psa 132:13-14). Hence we find the same word, מָרוֹם, which is often descriptive of the sublimest  heaven, used of Zion, which Ezekiel calls “the mountain of the height of Israel,” הִר מְרוֹם יַשְׂרָאֵל (Eze 17:23; Eze 20:40; Eze 34:14).

3. גִּלְגֵּל, galgal'. This word, which literally meaning a wheel, admirably expresses rotatory movement, is actually rendered “heaven” in the A.V. of Psa 77:18 : “The voice of thy thunder was in the heaven,” בִּגִּלְגִּל[Sept. ἐν τῷ τροχῷ; Vulg. in rota]. Luther's version agrees with the A. Vers. in Himmel; and Dathe renders per orbem, which is ambiguous, being as expressive, to say the least, of the globe of the earth as of the circle of heaven. The Targum (in Walton, vol. iii) on the passage gives; בּגלגלא(il rota), which is as indeterminate as the original, as the Syriac also seems to be. De Wette (and after him Justus Olshausen, Die Ps erklärt, 1. c.) renders the phrase “in the whirlwind.” Maurer, who disapproves of this rendering, explains the phrase “rotated.” But, amidst the uncertainty of the versions, we are disposed to think that it was not without good reason that our translators, in departing from the previous version (see Psalter, ad loc., which has, “the voice of thy thunder was heard round about”), deliberately rendered the passage in the heaven, as if the גלגלwere the correlative of תֵּבֵל, both being poetic words, and both together equalled the heaven and the earth. In Jam 3:6, the remarkable phrase, τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως, the course, circuit, or wheel of nature, is akin to our גלגל. (The Syriac renders the τροχόν by the same word, which occurs in the psalm as the equivalent of גִּלְגּל, Schaaf's Lex. Syr.; and of the same indefiniteness of signification.) That the general sense “heaven” best expresses the force of Psa 77:18, is rendered probable, moreover, by the description which Josephus gives (Ant. 2, 16, 3) of the destruction of Pharaoh's host in the Red Sea, the subject of that part of the psalm, “Showers of rain descended from heaven, ἀπ, οὐρανοῦ, with dreadful thunders and lightning, and flashes of fire; thunderbolts were darted upon them, nor were there ‘any indications of God's wrath upon men wanting on that dark and dismal night.”

4. As the words we have reviewed indicate the height and rotation of the heavens, so the two we have yet to examine exhibit another characteristic of equal prominence, the breadth and expanse of the celestial regions. These are שִׁחִק, shach'ak (generally used in the plural) and רָקַיע. They occur together in Job 37:18 : “Hast thou with him spread out (תִּרַקַיע) the sky or expanse of heaven?” — (לַשְׁחָקַים, where לis the sign of the  objective). We must examine them separately. The root שָׁחִקis explained by Gesenius to grind to powder, and then to expand by rubbing or beating. Meier (Hebr. Wurzelw. — b. p. 446) compares it with the Arabic shachaka, to make fine, to attenuate (whence the noun shachim, a thin cloud). With him agrees Furst (Hebrew. — b. 2, 433). The Heb. subst. is therefore well adapted to designate the sky region of heaven with its cloud dust, whether fine or dense. Accordingly, the meaning of the word in its various passages curiously oscillates between sky and cloud. When Moses, in Deu 33:26, lauds Jehovah's “riding in his excellence on the sky;” and when, in 2Sa 22:12, and repeated in Psa 18:11 (12), David speaks of “the thick clouds of the skies;” when Job (Job 37:18) asks, “Hast thou with him spread out the sky?” when the Psalmist (Psa 77:17 [18 ]) speaks of “the skies sending out a sound,” and the prophet (Isa 45:8), figuratively, of their “pouring down righteousness;” when, finally, Jer 51:9, by a frequently occurring simile [comp. Rev 18:5, ἠκολοῦθησαν αὐτῆς αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἄχρι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ], describes the judgment of Babylon as “lifted up even to the skies,” in every instance our word שְׁחָקיםin the plural is employed. The same word in the same form is translated “clouds” in Job 35:5; Job 36:28; Job 37:21; Job 38:37; in Psa 36:5 (6); 57, 10 (11); Psa 68:34 (35) [margin, “heavens”]; Psa 78:23; in Pro 3:20; Pro 8:28. The prevalent sense of this word, we thus see, is a meteorological one, and falls under our first head of caelum nubiferum: its connection with the other two heads is much slighter. It bears probably an astronomical sense in Psa 89:37 (38), where “the faithful witness in heaven” seems to be in apposition to the sun and the moon (Bellarmine, ad loc.), although some suppose the expression to mean the rainbow, “the witness” of God's covenant with Noah; Gen 9:13 sq. (see J. Olshausen, ad loc.). This is perhaps the only instance of its falling under the class caelum astriferum; nor have we a much more frequent reference to the higher sense of the coehln angeliferum (Psa 89:6 containing the only explicit allusion to this sense) unless, with Gesenius, Thes. s.v. we refer Psalm 58:35 also to it. More probably in Deu 33:26 (where it is parallel with שָׁמִיַם, and in the highly poetical passages of Isa 45:8, and Jer 51:9, our word שְׁחָקַיםmay be best regarded as designating the empyreal heavens.

5. We have already noticed the connection between שְׁחָקַיםand our only remaining word רָקַיע, raki'a, from their being associated by the sacred writer in the same sentence (Job 37:18); it tends to corroborate this connection that, on comparing Gen 1:6 (and seven other passages in the same chapter) with Deu 33:26, we find רָקַיעof the former sentence, and שְׁחָקַיםof the latter, both rendered by the Sept. οτερέωμα and firmamentum in the Vulg., whence the word “firmament” passed into our A.V. This word is now a well-understood term in astronomy, synonymous with sky or else the general heavens, undivested by the discoveries of science of the special signification which it bore in the ancient astronomy. SEE FIRMAMENT.

For a clear exposition of all the Scripture passages which bear on the subject, we may refer the reader to professor Dawson's Archaia, especially chap. 8, and to Dr. M'Caul on The Mosaic Record of Creation (or, what is substantially the same treatise in a more accessible form, his Notes on the First Chapter of Genesis, sec. 9:p. 32-44). We must be content here, in reference to our term רָקַיעִ, to observe that, when we regard its origin (from the root רָקִע, to spread out or expand by beating; Gesen. s.v.; Fuller, Misc. Sacr. 1, 6; Furst, Hebr. — w. — b. s.v.), and its connection with, and illustration by, such words as שְׁחָקַים, clouds, and the verbs טָפִח(Isa 48:13, “My right hand hath spread out the heavens”) and נָטָה(Isa 40:22, ‘‘Who stretcheth out the heavens like a curtain” [literally, like fineness], “and spreadeth them out as a tent”), we are astonished at certain rationalistic attempts to control the meaning of an intelligible term, which fits in easily and consistently with the nature of things, by a few poetical metaphors, that are themselves capable of a consistent sense when lcell subordinate to the plainer passages of prose. The fuller expression is רְקַיִע הִשָּׁמִיַם(Gen 1:14 sq.). That Moses understood it to mean a solid expanse is clear from his representing it as the barrier between the upper and lower waters (Gen 1:6 sq.), i.e. as separating the reservoir of the celestial ocean (Psa 104:3; Psa 29:3) from the waters of the earth, or those on which the earth was supposed to float (Psa 136:6). Through its open lattices (אֲיֻבּוֹת, Gen 7:11; 2Ki 7:2; 2Ki 7:19; compare κόσκινον, Aristophanes, Nub. 373) or doors (דַּלָתִיַם, Psa 78:23) the dew, and snow, and hail are poured upon the earth (Job 38:22; Job 38:37, where we have the curious expression “bottles of heaven,” “utres caeli”). This firm vault, which Job describes as being “strong as a molten looking-glass”  (Job 37:18), is transparent, like pellucid sapphire, and splendid as crystal (Dan 12:3; Exo 24:10; Eze 1:22; Rev 4:6), over which rests the throne of God (Isa 66:1; Eze 1:26), and which is opened for the descent of angels, or for prophetic visions (Gen 28:17; Eze 1:1; Act 7:56; Act 10:11). In it, like gems or golden lamps, the stars are fixed to give light to the earth, and regulate the seasons (Gen 1:14-19); and the whole magnificent, immeasurable structure (Jer 31:37) is supported by the mountains as its pillars, or strong foundations (Psa 18:7; 2Sa 22:8; Job 24:11). Similarly the Greeks believed in an οὐρανὸς πολύχαλκος (Hom. II. 5, 504), or σιδήρεος (Horn. Od. 15, 328), or ἀδάματος (Orph. Hymn. ad Coelum), which the philosophers called οτερέμνιον or κρυσταλλοειδές (Empedocles, ap. Plut. de Phil. plac. 2, 11; Artemid. ap. Sen. Nat. Quaest. 7, 13; quoted by Gesenius, s.v.). It is clear that very many of the above notions were metaphors resulting from the simple primitive conception, and that later writers among the Hebrews had arrived at more scientific views, although, of course, they retained much of the old phraseology, and are fluctuating and undecided in their terms. ‘Elsewhere, for instance, the heavens are likened to a curtain (Psa 104:2; Isa 40:22). SEE COSMOGONY.

IV. Metaphorical Application of the Visible Heavens. — A door opened in heaven is the beginning of a new revelation. To ascend up into heaven signifies to be in full power. Thus is the symbol to be understood in Isa 14:13-14, where the king of Babylon says, “I will ascend into heaven; I will exalt my throne above the stars of God.” To descend from heaven signifies, symbolically, to act by a commission from heaven. Thus our Savior uses the word “descending” (Joh 1:51) in speaking of the angels acting by divine commission, at the command of the Son of man. To fall from heaven signifies to lose power and authority, to be deprived of the power to govern, to revolt or apostatize.

The heaven opened. The natural heaven, being the symbol of the governing part of the political world, a new face in the natural, represents a new face in the political. Or the heaven may be said to be opened when the day appears, and consequently shut when night' comes on, as appears from Virgil (AEn. 10, 1), “The gates of heaven unfold,” etc. Thus the Scripture, in a poetical manner, speaks of the doors of heaven (Psa 78:23); of the heaven being shut (1Ki 8:35); and in Eze 1:1, the heaven is said to be opened.  Midst of heaven may be the air, or the region between heaven and earth; or the middle station between the corrupted earth and the throne of God in heaven. In this sense, the air is the proper place where God's threatenings and judgments should be denounced. Thus, in 1Ch 21:16, it is said that David saw the angel of the Lord stand between the earth and the heaven as he was just going to destroy Jerusalem with the pestilence. The angel's hovering there was to show that there was room to pray for mercy, just as God was going to inflict the punishment: it had not as yet done any execution.

C. Spiritual and Everlasting Sense, i.e. the state and place of blessedness in the life to come. Of the nature of this blessedness it is not possible that we should form any adequate conception, and, consequently, that any precise information respecting it should be given to us. Man, indeed, usually conceives the joys of heaven to be the same as, or at least to resemble, the pleasures of this world; and each one hopes to obtain with certainty, and to enjoy in full measure beyond the grave, that which he holds most dear upon earth-those favorite employments or particular delights which he ardently longs for here, but which he can seldom or never enjoy in this world, or in the enjoyment of which he is never fully satisfied. But one who reflects soberly on the subject will readily see that the happiness of heaven must be a very different thing from earthly happiness. In this world the highest pleasures of which our nature is capable satiate by their continuance, and soon lose the power of giving positive enjoyment. This alone is sufficient to show that the bliss of the future world must be of an entirely different kind from what is called earthly joy and happiness, if we are to be there truly happy, and happy brever. But since we can have no distinct conception of those joys which never have been and never will be experienced by us here in their full extent, we have, of course, no words in human language to express them, and cannot therefore expect any clear description of them even in the holy Scriptures. Hence the Bible describes this happiness sometimes in general terms, designating its greatness (as in Rom 8:18-22; 2Co 4:17-18), and sometimes by various figurative images and modes of speech, borrowed from everything which we know to be attractive and desirable.

The greater part of these images were already common among the Jewish contemporaries of Christ; but Christ and his apostles employed them in a purer sense than the great multitude of the Jews. The Orientals are rich in  such figures. They were employed by Mohammed, who carried them, as his manner was, to an extravagant excess, but who at the same time said expressly that they were mere figures, although many of his followers afterwards understood them literally, as has been often done in a similar way by many Christians.

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

a. Among the literal appellations we find ζωή, ζωὴ ηἰθ῎νιος, which, according to Hebrew usage, signify “a happy life,” or “eternal well-being,” and are the words rendered “life,” “eternal life,” and “life everlasting” in the A. Vers. (e.g. Mat 7:14; Mat 19:16; Mat 19:29; Mat 25:46): δόξα, δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ, ‘‘glory,” “the glory of God” (Rom 2:7; Rom 2:10; Rom 5:2); and εἰρηνη, ,” peace” (Rom 2:10). Also αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης, “an eternal weight of glory” (2Co 4:17); and σωτηρία, σωτηρία αἰώνιος, “salvation,” “eternal salvation” (Heb 5:9), etc.

b. Among the figurative representations we may place the word “heaven” itself. The abode of departed spirits, to us who live upon the earth, and while we remain here, is invisible and inaccessible, beyond the bounds of the visible world, and entirely separated from it. There they live in the highest well being, and in a nearer connection with God and Christ than here below. This place and state cannot be designated by any more fit and brief expression than that which is found in almost every language, namely, “heaven” — a word in its primary and material signification denoting the region of the skies, or the visible heavens. This word, in Heb. שָׁמִיַם, in Gr. οὐρανός, is therefore frequently employed by the sacred writers, as above exemplified. It is there that the highest sanctuary or temple of God is situated, i.e. it is there that the omnipresent God most gloriously reveals himself. This, too, is the abode of (rod's highest spiritual creation. Thither Christ was transported: he calls it the house of his Father, and says that he has therein prepared an abode for his followers (Joh 14:2).

This place, this “heaven,” was never conceived of in ancient times, as it has been by some modern writers, as a particular planet or world, but as the wide expanse of heaven, high above the atmosphere or starry heavens; hence it is sometimes called the third heaven, as being neither the atmosphere nor the starry heavens.  Another figurative name is “Paradise,” taken from the abode of our first parents in their state of innocence, and transferred to the abode of the blessed (Luk 23:43; 2Co 12:4; Rev 2:7; Rev 22:2).

Again, this place is called “the heavenly Jerusalem” (Gal 4:26; Heb 12:22; Rev 3:12), because the earthly Jerusalem was the capital city of the Jews, the royal residence, and the seat of divine worship; the “kingdom of heaven” (Mat 25:1; Jam 2:5); the “heavenly kingdom” (2Ti 4:18); the “eternal kingdom” (2Pe 1:11). It is also called an “eternal inheritance” (1Pe 1:4; Heb 9:15), meaning the possession and full enjoyment of happiness, typified by the residence of the ancient Hebrews in Palestine. The blessed are said “to sit down at table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,” that is, to be a sharer with the saints of old in the joys of salvation; “to be in Abraham's bosom” (Luk 16:22; Mat 8:11), that is, to sit near or next to Abraham [see BOSOM]; “to reign with Christ” (2Ti 2:11), i.e. to be distinguished, honored, and happy as he is to enjoy regal felicities, to enjoy “a Sabbath,” or “rest” (Heb 4:10-11), indicating the happiness of pious Christians both in this life and in the life to come.

All that we can with certainty know or infer from Scripture or reason respecting the blessedness of the life to come may be arranged under the following particulars:

I. We shall hereafter be entirely freed from the sufferings and adversities of this life.

II. Our future blessedness will involve a continuance of the real happiness of this life.

I. The entire exemption from suffering, and all that causes suffering here, is expressed in Scripture by words which denote rest, repose, refreshment, after performing labor and enduring affliction. But all the terms which are employed to express this condition define (in the original) the promised “rest” as rest after labor, and exemption from toil and grief, and not the absence of employment, not inactivity or indolence (2Th 1:7; Heb 4:9; Heb 4:11; Rev 14:13; compare 7:17). This deliverance from the evils of our present life includes,  1. Deliverance from this earthly body, the seat of the lower principles of our nature and of our sinful corruption, and the source of so many evils and sufferings (2Co 6:1-2; 1Co 15:42-50).

2. Entire separation from the society of wicked and evil-disposed persons, who in various ways injure the righteous man and embitter his life on earth (2Ti 4:18). It is hence accounted a part of the felicity even of Christ himself in heaven to be “separate from sinners” (Heb 7:26).

3. Upon this earth everything is inconstant and subject to perpetual change, and nothing is capable of completely satisfying our expectations and desires. But in the world to come it will be different. The bliss of the saints will continue without interruption or change, without fear of termination, and without satiety (Luk 20:36; 2Co 4:16; 2Co 4:18; 1Pe 1:4; 1Pe 5:10; 1Jn 3:2 sq.).

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

On this point almost all philosophers are, for the above reasons, agreed — even those who will admit of no positive punishments in the world to come. But, for want of accurate knowledge of the state of things in the future world, we can say nothing definite and certain as to the nature of the positive rewards. In the doctrine of the New Testament, however, positive rewards are considered most obviously as belonging to our future felicity, and as constituting a principal part of it; for it always represents the joys of  heaven as resulting strictly from the favor of God, and as being undeserved by those on whom they are bestowed. Hence there must be something more added to the natural good consequences of our actions here performed. But on this subject we know nothing more in general than this, that God will so appoint and order our circumstances, and make such arrangements, that the principal faculties of our souls, reason and affection, will be heightened and developed, so that we shall continually obtain more pure and distinct knowledge of the truth, and make continual advances in holiness.

We may remark that in this life God has very wisely allotted various capacities, powers, and talents, in different ways and degrees, to different men, according to the various ends for which he designs them, and the business on which he employs them. Now there is not the least reason to suppose that God will abolish this variety in the future world; it will rather continue there in all its extent. We must suppose, then, that there will be, even in the heavenly world, a diversity of tastes, of labors, and of employments, and that to one person this, to another that field, in the boundless kingdom of truth and of useful occupation, will be assigned for his cultivation, according to his peculiar powers, qualifications, and tastes. A presentiment of this truth is contained in the idea, which was widely diffused throughout the ancient world, viz. that the manes will continue to prosecute in the future life the employments to which they had been here accustomed. At least such arrangements will doubtless be made by God in the future life that each individual will there develop more and more the germs implanted within him by the hand of the Creator; and will be able, more fully than he ever could do here, to satisfy the wants of his intellectual nature, and thus to make continual progress in the knowledge of everything worthy of being known, of which he could only learn the simplest elements in this world; and he will be able to do this in such a way that the increase of knowledge will not be detrimental to piety, as it often proves on earth, but rather promotive of it. To the sincere and ardent searcher after truth it is a rejoicing and consoling thought that-he will be able hereafter to perfect that knowledge which here has so many deficiencies (1Co 13:9).

But there is danger of going too far on this point, and of falling into strange misconceptions. Various as the tastes and wants of men in the future world will doubtless be, they will still be in many respects different from what they are here, because the whole sphere of action, and the  objects by which we shall there be surrounded, will be different. We shall there have a changed and more perfect body, and by this single circumstance shall be freed at once from many of the wants and inclinations which have their seat in the earthly body. This will also contribute much to rectify, enlarge, and perfect our knowledge. Many things which seem to us very important and essential during this our state of infancy upon earth will hereafter doubtless appear in a different light: we shall look upon them as trifles and children's play, and employ ourselves in more important occupations, the utility and interest of which we have never before imagined.

Some theologians have supposed that the saints in heaven may be taught by immediate divine revelations (lumen gloriae), especially those who may enter the abodes of the blessed without knowledge, or with only a small measure of it; e.g. children and others who have died in ignorance, for which they themselves were not to blame. On this subject nothing is definitely taught in the Scriptures, but both Scripture and reason warrant us in believing that provision will be made for all such persons in the world to come. A principal part of our future happiness will consist, according to the Christian doctrine, in the enlarging and correcting of our knowledge respecting God, his nature, attributes, and works, and in the salutary application of this knowledge to our own moral benefit, to the increase of our faith, love, and obedience. There has been some controversy among theologians with regard to the vision of God (visio Dei intuitiva, sensitiva, beatifica, comprehensiva). The question is whether the saints will hereafter behold God with the eyes of the mind, i.e. merely know him with the understanding.

But in the Scriptures God is always represented as a being invisible by the bodily eye (ἀόρατος), as, indeed, every spirit is. The texts of Scripture which speak of seeing God have been misunderstood: they signify, sometimes, the more distinct knowledge of God, as we speak of knowing by seeing, of seeing with the eyes of the mind (Joh 1:18; 1Jn 3:2; 1Jn 4:12; comp. 5:20; 1Ti 6:16); and Paul uses βλέπειν and γινώσκειν as synonymous (1Co 13:12-13; comp. 5:10). Again, they express the idea of felicity, the enjoyment of God's favor, the being thought worthy of his friendship, etc. Still more frequently are both of these meanings comprehended under the phrase to see God. The image is taken from Oriental princes, to see whose face and to be in whose presence was esteemed a great favor (Matthew 5, 8; Heb 7:14).  “Without holiness, οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν Κύριον.” The opposite of this is to be removed from God and from his face. But Christ is always represented as one who will be personally visible to us, and whose personal, familiar intercourse and guidance we shall enjoy. Herein Christ himself places a chief part of the joy of the saints (John 14, 17, etc.); and the apostles often describe the blessedness of the pious by the phrase being with Christ. To his guidance has God entrusted the human race, in heaven and on earth. And Paul says (2Co 4:6), we see “the brightness of the divine glory in the face of Christ;” he is “the visible representative of the invisible God” (Col 1:15).

According to the representations contained in the holy Scriptures, the saints will dwell together in the future world, and form, as- it were, a kingdom or state of God (Luke 16; Luk 20:38; Rom 8:10; Rev 7:9; Heb 12:22). They will there partake of a common felicity. Their enjoyment will doubtless be very much heightened by friendship, and by their confiding intercourse with each other. We must, however, separate all earthly imperfections from our conceptions of this heavenly society. But that we shall there recognize our former friends, and shall be again associated with them, was uniformly believed by all antiquity. And when we call to mind the affectionate manner in which Christ soothed his disciples by the assurance that they should hereafter see him again, should be with him, and enjoy personal intercourse and friendship with him in that place to which he was going (Joh 14:3; comp. 1Pe 1:8), we may gather just grounds for this belief. Paul, indeed, says expressly that we shall be with Christ, in company with our friends who died before us (αυα χαιᾷ αᾷρολ, 1Th 4:17); and this presupposes that we shall recognize them, and have intercourse with them, as with Christ himself. SEE ETERNAL LIFE.

## Heaven And Earth[[@Headword:Heaven And Earth]]

             is an expression for the whole creation (Gen 1:1). In prophetic language the phase often signifies the political state or condition of persons of different ranks in this world. The heaven of the political world is the sovereignty thereof, whose host and stars are the powers that rule, namely, kings, princes, counselors, and magistrates. The earth is the peasantry, plebeians, or common race of men, who possess no power, but are ruled by superiors. Of such a heaven and earth we may understand mention to be made in Haggai 2:6; 7:21, 22, and referred to in Heb 12:26.  Such modes of speaking were used in Oriental poetry and philosophy, which made a heaven and earth in everything, that is, a superior and inferior in every part of nature; and we learn from Maimonides, quoted by Mede, that the Arabians in his time, when they would express that a man was fallen into some great calamity, said, “His heaven has fallen to the earth,” meaning his superiority or prosperity is much diminished. “To look for new heavens and a new earth” (2Pe 3:13) may mean to look for a new order of the present world.

## Hebard, Elijah[[@Headword:Hebard, Elijah]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister. He was born at Coxsackie, N. Y., Sept. 8,1788; was converted at thirteen; entered the New York Conference in May, 1811; in 1819 was appointed to New Haven; in 1820 and 21 to New York; in 1834 was transferred to Genesee Conference, and stationed at Rochester; was presiding elder on Ontario District in 1837-40; in 1846 he superannuated; and died at Geneva, N. Y., Jan. 25, 1858. He was a diligent student, a sound theologian, and a good scholar in Greek and Hebrew. — Minutes of Conferences, 7, 205.

## Hebdomadarii[[@Headword:Hebdomadarii]]

             a name anciently applied to monks from their weekly service. Hebdomas Magna (the great week); an appellation given anciently to the week before Easter, which was observed with great solemnity. The use of this term is thus accounted for by Chrysostom: "It was called the great week, not because it consisted of longer days or more in number than other weeks, but because at this time great things were wrought for us by our Lord.. For in this week the ancient tyranny of the devil was dissolved, death was extinct, the strong man was bound, his goods were spoiled, sin was abolished, the curse was destroyed, paradise was opened, heaven became accessible, men and angels were joined together, the middle wall of partition was broken down, the barriers were taken out of the way, the God of peace made peace between things in heaven and things on earth." See Chrysostom, Hom. in Psalms 145 sive de Hebdomade Magna; Bingham, Antiq. book 21, chapter 1, sec. 24.

## Hebdome[[@Headword:Hebdome]]

             (ἐβδόμη, the seventh day of the month), a festival observed by the ancient Greeks in honor of Apollo, on the seventh day of every month, because one of them was the birthday of that god. The chief place of these observances was Athens. Hymns were sung to Apollo, and the people walked in procession, carrying sprigs of laurel in their hands.

## Hebe[[@Headword:Hebe]]

             in Greek mythology, was the daughter of Jupiter and Juno, the goddess of youth and loveliness. She is often confounded with Hygea or the goddess of health, but the latter may be recognized by her long, modest dress; Hebe, on the contrary, appears with a light apron, and half naked. Not seldom the eagle of Jupiter is found at her side. She was married to Hercules, and bore him two sons, Alexiares and Anicetus. Although she was a daughter of the supreme deities, she appears in a subordinate relation, for she not only serves all gods at the table, but harnessed the horses of Juno, when the latter advanced with Minerva against the Trojans.

## Hebenstreit, Johann Christian[[@Headword:Hebenstreit, Johann Christian]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born April 27, 1686. He studied at Leipsic, and commenced his academical career there in 1715. In 1731 he was professor of Hebrew, in 1732 doctor of divinity, in 1740 professor of theology, and died December 6, 1756, leaving, De βάκχοις ad Illustr. Ezech. 8:17 (Leipsic, 1713): — De Judaeo Roma Exule, ex Actor. 14:1 sq. (ibid. 1714): — De Sertis Convivalibus ad Ezech. 8:6 (ibid. eod.): — De Pentecoste Veterum (ibid. 1715): — Diss. 1-9 in Prophetam Malachian (ibid. 1731-46): — De Maacha, a Regia Remota, ad 1 Reg. 15:13 (ibid. 1734): — De Discrepantia et Consensu Psalmi 18 et 2Sa 22:38 (ibid. 1736): — De Ossibuss Regis Edom Combustis, Amos 11:8 (ibid. eod.): — De Pane Super Aquam Mittendo, Coheleth 11:1 (ibid. 1737): — De Es. 63:19 non Divellendo a Seguete Capite (ibid. eod.): — De Erigendis Capitibus in Adventu Messiae, ad Psa 24:9 sq. (ibid. 1741): — De Sabbatho ante Mosaicam Legem Existente (ibid. 1748): — De Eliakimo, Christi Typo, Psa 22:15; Rev 3:6 (ibid. eod.): — Problema Exegetica ad Rev 2:4 : — Quid sit ἡ ἀγαπὴ ἡ πρώτη ab Angelo Ephesino Omissa? (ibid. 1750): — De Nomine Christi ἀμήν, Rev 3:14 (ibid. 1751): — De Salomonis idololatria ad 1 Reg. 10:4-8 (ibid. 1755). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:231, 618; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.).

## Hebenstreit, Johann Friedrich[[@Headword:Hebenstreit, Johann Friedrich]]

             a German theologian, son of Johann Paul, was doctor of theology at Leipsic in 1726, and died superintendent at Buttstadt, Thuringia, between 1760 and 1770. He wrote, De Magorum Messiam Exosculantium Nomnine, Pattia et Statu (Jena, 1709): — De Juda Ischarioth (Wittenberg, 1712): — Schediasma Historico-Philologicum de Variis Christianorum Nominibus (1713 ): — De καλῷ στρατιωτῷ seu Episcopo Milite (Leipsic, 1726): — De Hostibus καλοῦ στρατιωτοῦ (eod.): — De Haeresi Carpocratianorum (1712). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:567, 640. (B.P.)

## Hebenstreiti Johann Paul[[@Headword:Hebenstreiti Johann Paul]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born June 25, 1664, at Neustadton-the-Orla. He studied at Jena, where he also commenced his academical career. In 1697 the university at Altdorf honored him with the  doctorate of divinity, and in 1710 he was professor of theology at Jena. He died May 6, 1718, leaving, Theologia Naturalis (Jena, 1693): — De Theologis Multiplici Calumnia Apetitis (eod.): — De Praedestinatione: — De Epiphania et Epiphaniis: — De Sponso in Nuptiis Canae Galilaea: — De Eremitis seu Anachoretis: — De Johanne Eremita: — De Augustanae Cosfessionis Nomine et Causis: — De Canonibus, ut Vulgo Dicuntur, Apostolicis (1695): — De Theologiae Exegeticae Natura et Constitutione: — De Theologies Exegeticae Fine: — De Scripturae S. Sensu (1697): — De Summa Scripturae Sacrae Auctoritate: — De Peccato Originali (1698): — Systema Theologicum (1707): — De Duarum Christi Naturarum Communuicatione (1710). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Heber[[@Headword:Heber]]

             the name of seven men, with a difference of orthography in the original. SEE EBER.

1. EBER (Heb. E'ber, עֵבֶר, one of the other side, i.e. of the river, q. d. immigrant; Sept. ῞Εβερ and ῎Εβερ, Vulg. Heber), son of Salah, who became the father of Peleg at the age of 34 years, and died at the age of 464 (Gen 10:24; Gen 11:14; 1Ch 1:25). His name occurs in the genealogy of Christ (Luk 3:35, Ε᾿βέρ, “Heber”). B.C. 2448-1984. There is a degree of interest connected with him from the notion, which the Jews themselves entertain, that the name of Hebrews, applied to them, was derived from this alleged ancestor of Abraham. No historical ground appears why this name should be derived from him rather than from any other personage that occurs in the catalogue of Shem's descendants; but there are so much stronger objections to every other hypothesis, that this, perhaps, is still the most probable of any which have yet been started. (See Gesenius, Geschichte der Heb. Sprache und Schrift, p. 11.) Hence “the children of Eber” (בְּנֵי עֵבֶר, Gen 10:21), and simply in poetry  Eber (עֵבֶר, Num 24:24; Sept. ῾Εβραῖοι, Vulg. Hebraei), i.q. HEBREWS (עַבְרַים). Several other persons of this (Heb.) name occur, but no others are anywhere Anglicized “Heber.”

2. “EBER” (same Heb. word as above; Sept. ῎Ιωβήδ, Vulg. Heber), the last-named of the seven chiefs of the Gadites in Bashan (1Ch 5:13, where the name is Anglicized “Heber”). B.C. between 1612 and 1093.

3. “EBER” (same Hebrew word as above; Sept. ᾿Ωβήδ, Vulg. feber), apparently one of the sons of Shashak, and a chief of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:22, where the name is Anglicized” Heber”). B.C. ante 598.

4. “HEBER” (Che'ber, חֶבֶר, conmunity, as in Hos 6:9; Pro 21:9; or a spell, as in Deu 18:11; Isa 47:9; Isa 47:12; Sept. Χόβορ, Χοβέρ, Χάβερ), son of Beriah, and grandson of Asher (Gen 46:17; 1Ch 7:31-32). B.C. apparently ante 1873. His descendants are called HEBERITES (Heb. Chebri', חֶבְרַי, Sept. Χοβερί, Num 26:45, where the name of the progenitor is written חֵבֶר).

5. “HEBER” (same Heb. word as last, Sept. Χάβερ, Vulg. Haber), “a descendant of Hobab, which latter was son of Jethro, and brother of the wife of Moses. His wife was the Jael who slew Sisera (B.C. 1409), and he is called Heber the Kenite (Jdg 4:11; Jdg 4:17; Jdg 5:24), which seems to have been a name for the whole family (Jdg 1:16). Heber appears to have lived separate from the rest of the Kenites, leading a patriarchal life amid his tents and flocks. He must have been a person of some consequence, from its being stated that there was peace between the house of Heber and the powerful king Jabin. At the time the history brings him under our notice, his camp was in the plain of Zaanaim, near Kedesh, in Naphtali” SEE JAKL; SEE KENITE.

6. “HEBER” (same Heb. word as last, Sept. Α᾿βάρ), apparently a son of Mered (of Judah) by Jehudijah, and “father” of Socho (1Ch 4:18). B.C. post 1612. SEE MERED.  7. “HEBER” (same Heb. word as last, Sept. Α᾿βέρ), one of the “sons” of Elpaal, and a chief of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:17). B.C. apparently cir. 598.

## Heber, Reginald[[@Headword:Heber, Reginald]]

             bishop of Calcutta, was born at Malpas, Cheshire, April 21, 1783. He gave early indications of poetical talent. At thirteen he was placed in the school of a clergyman near London; in November 1800, he was entered at Brasenose College, Oxford, and in the same year he gained the prize for Latin verse. In the spring of 1803 he wrote his prize poem, Palestine, which has obtained a permanent place in English literature. In 1804 he became a fellow of All Souls. About the middle of 1805, in company with Mr. John Thornton, he set out on a Continental tour, and spent a year traveling through Russia, the Crimea, Hungary, Austria, and Prussia. In 1807 he took orders, and was instituted by his brother Richard to the family living at Hodnet. Here, as he himself described, he was in a “half- way situation between a parson and a squire.” “While discharging the duties of his parish with great fidelity, he was ardently devoted to the pursuits of literature. He was a frequent contributor to the Quarterly Review from its commencement.

In 1812 he commenced the preparation of a Dictionary of the Bible, on which he labored with much delight; but other duties compelled him to suspend this work, and no part of it was ever published. In the same year he published a small volume of Hymns adapted to the Weekly Church Service (new ed. London, 1838, 12mo). The composition of his Hymns, with a view of improving the psalmody and devotional poetry used in churches, was also a favorite recreation. He was an elegant versifier, and continued to indulge his poetical talents even while engaged in visiting his diocese in India. He had a great distaste for controversial theology, and only once was engaged in a discussion of this kind, in reply to what he conceived were the unwarrantable imputations of a writer in the British Critic. His political views were those of the High Church and Tory party, but quite devoid of bitterness. In 1815 he was appointed Bampton lecturer, and the subject he selected was The Personality and Office of the Christian Comforter (2nd ed. Lond. 1818, 8vo). In 1817, Dr. Luxmore, the bishop of St. Asaph, appointed Heber to a stall in that cathedral, at the request of his father-in-law the dean. In 1819 he edited the works of bishop Jeremy Taylor (15 vols. 8vo, with Life of Taylor). In April, 1822, he was elected preacher of Lincoln's Inn, for which he had formerly been an unsuccessful candidate.” In December of  that year, the see of Calcutta, vacated by the death of bishop Middleton, was offered to him, “Twice the offer was declined on account of his wife and child, but immediately after the second refusal he wrote (Jan. 12. 1823) stating his willingness to go to India. He congratulated himself upon the fact that no worldly motives led him to this decision.

The prospects of usefulness in so grand a field as India overbore all pecuniary considerations, and they had no influence in determining his conduct when the proposition of going to that country was first made to him. Besides, he had often expressed his liking for such a sphere of action, and he had a lurking fondness for all which belongs to India or Asia.” On the 22nd of April he saw Hodnet for the last time, and, after having been consecrated, he embarked for his diocese on the 16th of June 1823. The diocese of Calcutta extended at this time over the whole of India, and embraced Ceylon, the Mauritius, and Australasia. In India the field of the bishop's labors was three times larger than Great Britain and Ireland. The number of chaplains who constituted his staff at Bengal was fixed at twenty-eight, but this number was never completed, and of the number who were appointed several were on furlough. The bishop had no council to assist him, was required to act on his own responsibility, and to write almost every official document with his own hand. On the 15th of June 1824, bishop Heber began the visitation of his vast diocese. He visited nearly every station of importance in the upper provinces of Bengal and north of Bombay, and after an absence from Calcutta of about eleven months, during which he had seldom slept out of his cabin or tent, he arrived at Bombay. The journal which he kept during his visitation (published under the title Narrative of a Journey in Upper India, Lond. 1829, 3 vols. 8vo, since reprinted in Murray's Home and Colonial Library) shows the extent of his observations on general subjects, and the graphic power which he possessed of describing the novel scenes in which he was placed. From April to August he remained at Bombay to investigate and superintend the interests of the western portion of his diocese. On the 15th of August he sailed for Ceylon, and after remaining there some time he proceeded to Calcutta, which he reached on the 21st of October.

If it had been possible to have educated his children in India, he was now prepared, he states, to end his days among the objects of his solicitude. In February, 1826, he left Calcutta for Madras to visit the southern provinces. On the 1st of April he arrived at Trichinopoli, and on the 3rd, after investigating the state of the mission and confirming fifteen natives, on whom he bestowed the episcopal benediction in the Tamul language, he retired to use a cold bath, in which  he was found dead about half an hour afterwards. Within less than three weeks he would have completed his forty-third year. The candor, modesty, and simplicity of bishop Heber's manners, his unwearied earnestness, and his mild and steady zeal, combined with his talents and attainments, had inspired veneration and respect not only among the European, but the native population of India” (English Cyclopaedia, s.v.). In theology he was an Arminian. His whole life, after his elevation to the episcopate, was devoted to its great duties. He had a profound faith in the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and of their adaptation to the heathen. His heart daily breathed the most earnest wishes for the diffusion of its precious blessings. His tastes and pursuits were all subordinated to that grand object, and, had he been spared to the usual term of life, there is no doubt that a career, begun in the spirit and prosecuted on the system of itinerancy he had adopted, would have yielded a rich harvest of spiritual fruit to the Lord of his vineyard. Besides the works above mentioned, he published Parish Sermons (Lond. 1844, 5th ed. 2 vols. 8vo). His Poetical Works are printed in various editions. See Life of Heber, by his Widow (Lond. 1830, 2 vols. 4to); Robinson, Last Days of Heber (1830, 8vo); Memoir of Heber, abridged from the large ed. (Boston, 1856.12mo); Krohn, H.'s Leben u. Nachrichten über Indien (Berlin, 1831, 2 vols.); Quarterly Review (London), 43, 366; Edinburgh Review, 52, 431; Villemain, Revue des deux Mondes, Dec. 15,1857; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 19, 606.

## Heberite[[@Headword:Heberite]]

             (Num 26:45). SEE HEBER, 4.

## Hebrew[[@Headword:Hebrew]]

             (Heb. Ibri עַבְרַי, plur. עַבְרַים or עַבְרַיַּים Exo 3:18; fem. עַבְרַיָּה, “Hebrewess,” plur. עַכְרַיּות Greek Ε᾿βραῖος), a designation of the people of Israel, used first of their progenitor Abraham (Gen 14:13; Sept. τῷ περάτῃ). This name is never in Scripture applied to the Israelites except when the speaker is a foreigner (Gen 39:14; Gen 39:17; Gen 41:12; Exo 1:16; Exo 2:6; 1Sa 4:6; 1Sa 4:9, etc.), or when Israelites speak of themselves to one of another nation (Gen 40:15; Exo 1:19; Jon 1:9, etc.), or when they are contrasted with other peoples (Gen 43:32; Exo 1:3; Exo 1:7; Exo 1:15; Deu 15:12; 1Sa 13:3; 1Sa 13:7). See Gesenius, Thes. Heb. s.v. (The only apparent exception is Jer 34:9; but here there is probably such an implied  contrast between the Jews and other peoples as would bring the usage under the last case.) By the Greek and Latin writers this is the name by which the descendants of Jacob are designated when they are not called Jews (Pausan. 5. 5,2; 6:24, 6; Plut. Sympos. 4, 6, 1; Tacit. Hist. 5, 1); and Josephus, who affects classical peculiarities, constantly uses it. In the N.T. we find the same contrast between Hebrews and foreigners (Act 6:1; Php 3:5): the Hebrew language is distinguished from all others (Luk 23:38; Joh 5:2; Joh 19:13; Act 21:40; Act 26:14; Rev 9:11); while in 2Co 11:22 the word is used as only second to Israelite in the expression of national peculiarity. On these facts two opposing hypotheses have been raised; the one that Israelite or Jew was the name by which the nation designated itself (just as the Welsh call themselves Cymry, though in speaking of themselves to a Saxon they would probably use the name Welsh); the other is that “Hebrew” is a national name, merely indicative of the people as a people, while Israelite is a sacred or religious name appropriate to them as the chosen people of God. This latter opinion Gesenius dismisses as “without foundation” (Lexicon by Robinson, s.v.), but it has received the deliberate sanction of Ewald (Ausführl. Lehrb. der Heb. Spr. p. 18, 5th ed.).

Derivation of the Name. —

I. From Abram, Abraei, and by euphony Hebrcei (August., Ambrose). Displaying, as it does, the utmost ignorance of the language, this derivation was never extensively adopted, and was even retracted by Augustine (Retract. 16). The euphony alleged by Ambrose is quite imperceptible, and there is no parallel in the Lat. meridie =medidie.

II. According to the sacred writer, עברי, Hebrew, is a derivative from עבר, Eber, the ancestor of Abraham; at least the same persons who are called Hebrews are called בני עבר, sons of Eber (Gen 10:21); and עברEber (Num 24:24); and this is tantamount to a derivation of the name Hebrew from Eber. In support of this, it may be urged that עברלis the proper form which a patronymic from עברwould assume; according to the analogy of מואבי, a Moabite דני, a Danite, כלבי, a Calebite, etc. (Hiller, Onomast. Sac. c. 14:p. 231 sq.). What adds much force to this argument is the evident antithesis in Gen 14:13, between אברם העבריand ממרא האמרי; the former of these is as evidently a patronymic as the latter. This view is supported by Josephus,  Suidas, Bochart, Vatablus, Drusius,Vossius, Buxtorf, Hottinger, Leusden, Whiston, and Bauer. Theodoret (Quaest. in Genesis 61) urges against it that the Hebrews were not the only descendants of Eber, and, therefore, could not appropriate his name; and the objection has often been repeated. To meet it, recourse has been had to the suggestion, first adduced, we believe, by Ibni Ezra (Comment. ad Jon. 1, 9), that the descendants of Abraham retained the name Hebrew from Eber, because they alone of his descendants retained the faith which he held. This may be, but we are hardly entitled to assume it in order to account for the fact before us. It is better to throw the onus probandi on the objector, and to demand of him, in our ignorance of what determined the use of such patronymics in one line of descent and not in others, that he should show cause why it is inconceivable that Abraham might have a good and sufficient reason for wishing to perpetuate the memory of his descent from Eber, which did not apply to the other descendants of that patriarch. Why might not one race of the descendants of Eber call themselves by pre-eminence sons of Eber, just as one race of the descendants of Abraham called themselves by preeminence sons of Abraham. But Eber, it is objected, is a name of no note in the history; we know nothing of him to entitle him to be selected as the person after whom a people should call themselves. But is our ignorance to be the measure of the knowledge of Abraham and his descendants on such a point? Because we know nothing to distinguish Eber, does it follow that they knew nothing? Certain it is that he was of sufficient importance to reflect a glory on his father Shem, whose highest designation is “the father of all the children of Eber” (Gen 10:21); and certain it is that his name lingered for many generations in the region where he resided, for it was as “Eber” that the Mesopotamian prophet knew the descendants of Jacob, and spoke of them when they first made their appearance in warlike force on the borders of the promised land (Num 24:24).

On the other hand, it is contended that the passage Gen 10:21 is not so much genealogical as ethnographical; and in this view it seems that the words are intended to contrast Shem with Ham and Japhet, and especially with the former. Now Babel is plainly fixed as the extreme east limit of the posterity of Ham (Genesis 10), from whose land Nimrod went out into Assyria (Genesis 11, margin of A. Vers.): in the next place, Egypt (Genesis 13) is mentioned as the western limit of the same great race; and these two extremes having been ascertained, the historian proceeds (Gen 13:15-18) to fill  up his ethnographic sketch with the intermediate tribes of the Canaanites. In short, in Genesis 6-20 we have indications of three geographical points which distinguish the posterity of Ham, viz. Egypt, Palestine, and Babylon. At the last-mentioned city, at the river Euphrates, their proper occupancy, unaffected by the exceptional movement of Asshur, terminated, and at the same point that of the descendants of Shem began. Accordingly, the sharpest contrast that could be devised is obtained by generally classing these latter nations as those beyond the river Euphrates; and the words “father of all the children of Eber,” i.e. father of the nations to the east of the Euphrates, find an intelligible place in the context.

It must also be confessed that in the genealogical scheme in Gen 11:10-26, it does not appear that the Jews thought of Eber as a source primary, or even secondary of the national descent. The genealogy neither starts from him, nor in its uniform sequence does it rest upon him with any emphasis. There is nothing to distinguish Eber above Arphaxad, Peleg, or Serug. Like them, he is but a link in the chain by which Shem is connected with Abraham. Indeed, the tendency of the Iraelitish retrospect is to stop at Jacob. It is with Jacob that their history as a nation begins: beyond Jacob they held their ancestry in common with the Edomites; beyond Isaac they were in danger of being confounded with the Ishmaelites. The predominant figure of the emphatically Hebrew Abraham might tempt them beyond those points of affinity with other races, so distasteful, so anti-national; but it is almost inconceivable that they would voluntarily originate and perpetuate an appellation of themselves which landed them on a platform of ancestry where they met the whole population of Arabia (Gen 10:25; Gen 10:30).

III. Hence others (as Jerome, Theodoret, Origen, Chrysostom, Arias Montanus, R. Bechai, Paul Burg., Munster, Grotius, Scaliger, Selden, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, and Eichhorn) prefer tracing עברי to the verb עָבִר, to pass over, or the noun עֵבֶר, the region or country beyond,. By those who favor the former etymology, “Hebrew” is regarded s equivalent to “the man who passed over;” by those who favor the latter, it is taken to mean “the man from the region beyond;” and under both suppositions it is held to be applied by the Canaanites to Abraham as having crossed the Euphrates, or come; from the region beyond the Euphrates to Canaan. Of' these etymologies the former is now generally abandoned; it is felt that the supposition that the crossing: of the Euphrates was such an unparalleled  achievement as to fix on him who accomplished it a name that should descend to his posterity, and become a national appellation, is somewhat too violent to be maintained; and, besides, as the verb עבר signifies to pass from this side to that, not from that side to this, it would not be the term applied by the people of Canaan to designate the act of one who had come from the other side of the Euphrates to them. The other etymology has more in its favor. It is that sanctioned by the Greek translators (Sept. ὁ περάτης, Aq. περαϊvτης); it is in accordance with the usage of the phrase עֲבֶר הִנָּהָר, which was employed to designate the region beyond the Euphrates (Jos 24:2-3; 2Sa 10:16; 1Ch 19:16); and it is not improbable that Abraham, coming among the Canaanites from beyond the Euphrates, might be designated by them “the man from the region beyond,” just as Europeans might call an American “a transatlantic.” But, though Bleek very confidently pronounces this view “without doubt the right one” (Einleitung ins A. T. p. 72), it is open to serious, if not fatal objections.

1. There is no instance of עבר by itself denoting the region beyond the Euphrates, or any other river; the phrase invariably used is עבר הנהר. Rosenmüller following Hyde (Histor. Relig. Vet. Pers. p. 51), seeks to supply this desiderated instance by taking עבר as epexegetically of אשור in Num 24:24 — ” affligant Assyriam et totam transfluvialem regionem.” But the learned writer has in his zeal overlooked the second ענו, which quite precludes his exegesis. Knobel avoids this error by simply taking אשור=Assyria, and עבר=Mesopotamia; but in this case it is the proper name עבר, Eber, and not the preposition עבר, trans, which is in question.

2. If עברי was the proper designation of those who lived on the other side of the Euphrates, we should find that name applied to such as continued to dwell there, not to a race descended from one who had left that region never to return.

3. Though Abraham, as having been originally a transfluvian, might be so called by the Canaanites, it is improbable that they should have extended this name to his posterity, to whom it in no sense applied. No one would think of continuing the term “transatlantic” to persons born in. Britain on the ground that a remote ancestor had come from across the Atlantic to settle in that country! As to the sanction which this etymology derives from  the Sept., no great weight can be attached to that when we remember how often these translators have erred in this way; and also that they have given ιπαιοᾷχ as the rendering of בני עברin Num 24:24; “Plus vice simplici hallucinati sunt interpretes Graeci eorum ut nobis standum cadendumve non sit autoritate” (Carpzov, Crit. Sac. V. T. p. 171). We may add that the authority of the Sept. and Aquila on such a point is urged with a bad grace by those who treat with contempt the etymologies of the Hebrew text as resting on mere Jewish tradition; if a Jewish tradition of the time of Moses is subject to suspicion, afortiori is one of the age of Ptolemy Lagi and of Alexandrian origin. Ewald pronounces this derivation “quite uncertain.” 4. This derivation is open to the strong objection that Hebrew nouns ending in יare either patronymics or gentilic nouns (Buxtorf, Leusden). This is a technical objection which-though fatal to the περάτης, or appellative derivation as traced back to the verb-does not apply to the same as referred to the noun עבר. The analogy of Galli, Angli, Hispani, derived from Gallia, Anglia, Hispania (Leusden), is a complete blunder in ethnography; and, at any rate, it would confirm rather than destroy the derivation from the noun.

IV. Parkhurst, whose works occasionally present suggestions worth consideration, has advanced the opinion that עבריis a derivation from the verb עברin the sense of passing through or from place to place (compare Gen 18:5; Exo 32:27; Eze 35:7; 2Ch 30:10, etc.); so that its meaning would be a sojourner or passer through, as distinct from a settler in the land. This undoubtedly exactly describes the condition of Abraham and his immediate descendants, and might very naturally be assumed by them as a designation; for, as the apostle says, “they confessed they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth” (Heb 11:13). In this case the statement in Gen 10:21; Num 24:24, must be understood as referring to the posterity of Eber generally, and not to the Hebrews specially or exclusively. The most serious objection to Parkhurst's suggestion arises from the form of the word עברי. A word from עבר, to convey the meaning of transitor, or one passing through, we should expect to find in the form עוֹבֵיor עֹבֵר.

On the whole. the derivation of Ibri (Hebrew) from Eber seems to have most in its favor and least against it. (See on this side Augustine, De Civit. Dei, 6, 11; Buxtorf, Diss. 3, 27; Bochart, Phaleg, 2, 14; Hottinger, Thes.  Phil. p. 4; Leusden, Phil. Heb. Diss. 21; Morinus, De Ling. Primcev. p. 64; Pfeiffer, Diff. Script. Locc., Opp. p. 49; Carpzov, Crit. Sac. p. 165; Hezel, Gesch. d. Hebr. Spr. sec. 4; Ewald, Asfiihrl. Lehrbuch der Heb. Gram. p. 19, 5th edit.; Geschichte des V. Israel, 1, 334; Havernick, Introd. to the O.T. p. 125; Baumgarten, Theol. Comment. sum Pent. ad loc. On the other side, see Theodoret, Quaest. in Genesis 16; Chrysostom, Hom. 35 in Genesis; Selden, De Diis Syris, p. 13; Walton, Proleg. p. 15 sq., in Dathes edit. p. 68; Gussetius, Comment. Ling. Heb. Diss. Proem. p, 7; Michaelis, Spicileg. Geogr. Heb. Ext. 2, 66; Gesenius, Gesoh. der Heb. Spr. p. 11; Grammar, sec. 2.) SEE JEW.

## Hebrew Language[[@Headword:Hebrew Language]]

             the language of the Hebrew people, and of the Old-Testament Scriptures, with the exception of the few chapters written in Chaldee. SEE CHALDEE LANGUAGE. The importance of this subject in a religious and especially an exegetical aspect justifies a somewhat copious treatment of it here. (See Ewald's Hebrew Grammar, § 1-18, 135-160.)  In the Bible this language is nowhere designated by the name Hebrew, but this is not surprising when we consider how rarely that name is employed to designate the nation. SEE HEBREW. If we except the terms “lip of Canaan” (שׂפת כנען) in Isa 19:18 -where the diction is of an elevated character, and is so far no evidence that this designation was the one commonly employed-the only name by which the Hebrew language is mentioned in the Old Testament is “Jewish” ( יהודית used adverbially, Judaiae, in Jewish, 2Ki 18:26; 2Ki 18:28; Isa 36:11; Isa 36:13; 2Ch 32:18 [in Neh 13:24, perhaps the Aramaic is meant]), where the feminine may be explained as an abstract of the last formation, according to Ewald's Hebrews Gram. § 344,457, or as referring to the usual gender of לשׁוןunderstood. In a strict sense, however, “Jewish” denotes the idiom of the kingdom of Judah, which became the predominant one after the deportation of the ten tribes. It is in the Greek writings of the later Jews that “Hebrew” is first applied to the language, as in the ἑβραϊστί of the prologue to Ecclesiasticus, and in the γλῶσσα τῶν ῾Εβραίων of Josephus. (The ἑβραϊvς διάλεκτος of the New Testament. is used in contradistinction to the idiom of the Hellenist Jews, and does not mean the ancient Hebrew language, but the then vernacular Aramaic dialect of Palestine.) Our title to use the designation Hebrew language is therefore founded on the fact that the nation which spoke this idiom was properly distinguished by the ethnographical name of Hebrews.

The Hebrew language belongs to the class of languages called Shemitic-so called because spoken chiefly by nations enumerated in Scripture among the descendants of Shem. The Sanskrit, Persian, Greek, Latin, with the Germanic and Celtic languages, are the principal members of another large class or group of languages, to which have been affixed the various names of Japhetic, Indo-European, Indo-Germanic, and Aryan. This latter class embraces most of the languages of Europe, including of course our own. The student, therefore, who, besides mastering his own language, has passed through a course of Greek, Latin, French, and German (and few of our students, except with a professional view, extend their linguistic studies farther), has not, after all his labor, got beyond the limits of the same class of languages to which his mother tongue belongs, and of which it forms one of the most important members. But when he passes to the study of the Hebrew language he enters a new field, he observes new phenomena, he traces the operation of new laws.  I. Characteristics of the Shemitic Languages, and in particular of the Hebrew. —

1. With respect to sounds, the chief peculiarities are the four following:

(1.) The predominance of guttural sounds. The Hebrew has four or (we may say) five guttural sounds, descending from the slender and scarcely perceptible throat breathing represented by the first letter of the alphabet (א) through the decided aspirate ה, to the strong חand gurgling ע. To these we must add רwhich partakes largely of the guttural character. Nor were these sounds sparingly employed; on the contrary, they were in more frequent use than any other class of letters. In the Hebrew dictionary the four gutturals occupy considerably more than a fourth part of the whole volume, the remaining eighteen letters occupying considerably less than three fourths. This predominance of guttural sounds must have given a very marked character to the ancient Hebrew, as it does still to the modem Arabic.

(2.) The use of the very strong letters ט, צ, ק, which may be represented by tt or ts, q, in pronouncing which the organ is more compressed and the sound given forth with greater vehemence. These letters, especially the last two, are also in frequent use.

When the Greeks borrowed their alphabet from the Phoenicians, they softened or dropped these strong letters (ט being softened into θ, and צ, ק being dropped except as marks of number), and changed the guttural letters into the vowels α, ε, η, ο

(3.) The Shemitic languages do not admit, like the Indo-European, of an accumulation or grouping of consonants around a single vowel sound. In such words as craft, crush, grind, strong, stretch, we find four, five, and six consonants clustering around a single vowel.' The Shemitic languages reject such groupings, usually interposing a vowel sound more or less distinct after each consonant. It is only at the end of a word that two consonants may stand together without any intermediate vowel sound; and even in that case various expedients are employed to dispense with a combination which is evidently not in accordance with the genius of the language.

(4.) The vowels, although thus copiously introduced, are nevertheless kept in strict subordination to the consonants; so much so that it is only in rare  and exceptional cases that any word or syllable begins with a vowel. In Hebrew we have no such syllables as ab, ag, ad, in which the initial sound is a pure vowel; but only ba, ga, da. If Sir H. Rawlinson is correct, it would appear that the Assyrian language differed from the other Shemitic languages in this particular. In his syllabic alphabet a considerable number of the syllables begin with a vowel.

If we endeavor to calculate the effect of the foregoing peculiarities on the character of the language, we cannot avoid the conclusion that the Shemitic languages are of a more primitive type than the European-much less matured, polished, compacted-the natural utterance of a mind vehement and passionate, impulsive rather than calmly deliberative.

2. With respect to roots and words, the Shemitic languages are distinguished in a very marked manner:

(1.) By the three-letter root. This is one of the most striking characteristics of these languages, as it does not appear that there is any language not belonging to this class in the formation of whose roots the same law has been at work. It is very difficult to ascertain the origin of this singular phenomenon. It may possibly be regarded as a kind of equivalent for the compound roots of other languages (which are altogether wanting in the Shemitic); an original two-letter root being enlarged and expanded into a greater or less number of three-letter roots, for the purpose of giving expression to the various modifications and shades of the primitive root idea. The attempt has indeed been made, and with no small measure of success, to point out and specify the two-letter roots from which the existing three-letter roots have been derived; but it has been properly remarked that such an investigation carries us quite away from the Shemitic province. When we reach the two letter root we have left behind us the Shemitic languages altogether, and drawn forth a new language, which might be regarded, did we not know that the most ancient is not always the most simple, as the one primeval language of mankind. By “three-letter roots” We mean those having three consonants forming a dissyllable, and we must except from our remarks those containing the so- called weak letters, which assimilate themselves very strongly to the monosyllabic roots of primitive verbs in the Indo-European group of languages. See PHILOLOGY, COMPARATIVE.

(2.) The consideration of the Hebrew three-letter root, and its possible growth out of a more original two-letter root, leads on to the notice of  another prominent feature of the Shemitic languages, viz. the further growth and expansion of the three-letter root itself into a variety of what are called conjugational forms, expressing intensity, reflexiveness, causation, etc. A similar formation may be traced in all languages; in some non-Shemitic languages, as the Turkish, it is very largely and regularly developed (Max Miller, Lectures on Science of Language, p. 318, etc.). In English we have examples in such verbs as sit and set, lie and lay, set being the causative of sit, lay of lie; or we may say sit is the reflexive of set, and lie of lay. So in Latin sedo and sedeo, jacio andja. ceo, etc., in which latter root the conjugational formation is still farther developed into jacto and jactito. But what in these languages is fragmentary and occasional, in Hebrew and the cognate languages is carried out and expanded with fullness and regularity, and consequently occupies a large space in the Shemitic grammar. The conjugations are of three sorts:

(a) Those expressing intensity, repetition, etc., which are usually distinguished by some change within the root;

(b) those expressing reflexiveness, causation, etc., which are usually distinguished by some addition to the root;

(c) the passives, distinguished by the presence of the u or o sound in the first syllable.

(3.) Another prominent distinction of the Shemitic languages is the extent to which modifications of the root idea are indicated, not by additions to the root, but by changes within the root. “The Shemitic roots,” says Bopp (Comparative Grammar of the Indo European Tongues, i, 99), “on account of their construction, possess the most surprising capacity for indicating the secondary ideas of grammar by the mere internal molding of the root, while the Sanskrit roots at the first grammatical movement are compelled to assume external additions.” These internal changes are principally of two sorts:

(a) Vowel changes. Nothing is more remarkable in the Shemitic languages than the significance of their vowel sounds; the sharp a sound, formed by opening the mouth wide, being associated as a symbol with the idea of activity, while the e and o sounds are the symbols of rest and passiveness. In the Arabic verb this characteristic is very marked, many of the roots appearing under three forms, each having a different vowel, and the signification being modified in  accordance with the nature of that vowel. The same law appears in the formation of the passives. Thus katala-pass. kutela.

(b) Doubling of consonants, usually of the middle letter of the root. By means of this most simple and natural device, the Shemitic languages express intensity or repetition of action, and also such qualities as prompt to repeated action, as righteous, merciful, etc. By comparing this usage with the expression of the corresponding ideas in our own language, we observe at once the difference in the genius of the two languages. We say merciful, sinful, i.e. full of mercy, full of sin. Not so the Shemitic. What we express formally by means of an added root, the Shemitic indicates by a sign, by simply laying additional stress on one of the root letters. And thus again the observation made under the head sound recurs, viz. that in the formation of the Shemitic languages the dominant influence was that of instinctive feeling, passion, imagination- the hand of nature appearing everywhere, the voice of nature heard in every utterance: in this, how widely separated from the artificial and highly organized languages of the Indo-European family (Adelung, Mithridates, 1, 361).

(4.) The influence of the imagination on the structure of the Shemitic languages is further disclosed in the view which they present of nature and of time. To these languages a neuter gender is unknown. All nature viewed by the Shemitic eye appears instinct with life. The heavens declare God's glory; the earth showeth his handiwork. The trees of the field clap their hands and sing for joy. This, though the impassioned utterance of the Hebrew poet, expresses a common national feeling, which finds embodiment even in the structure of the national language. Of inanimate nature the Hebrew knows nothing: he sees life everywhere. His language therefore rejects the neuter gender, and classes all objects, even those which we regard as inanimate, as masculine or feminine, according as they appear to his imagination to be endowed with male or female attributes. As his imagination thus endowed the lower forms of nature with living properties, so, on the other hand, under the same influence, he clothed with material and sensible form the abstract, the spiritual, even the divine. In Hebrew the abstract is constantly expressed by the concrete-the mental quality by the bodily member which was regarded as its fittest representative. Thus hand or arm stands for strength; א, nostril, means also anger; the shining of the face stands for favor and acceptance, the falling of the face for displeasure. So also to say often means to think; to  speak with one mouth stands for to be of the same sentiment.

The verb to go is employed to describe mental as well as bodily progress. One's course of life is his way, the path of his feet. Nor only in its description of nature, but also in its mode of indicating time, do we observe the same predominant influence. The Shemitic tense system, especially as it appears in Hebrew, is extremely simple and primitive. It is not threefold like ours, distributing time into past, present, and future, but twofold. The two so- called tenses or rather states of the verb correspond to the division of nouns into abstract and concrete. The verbal idea is conceived of either in its realization or in its non-realization, whether actual or ideal. That which lies before the mind as realized, whether in the actual past, present, or future, the Hebrew describes by means of the so-called preterit tense; that which he conceives of as yet to be realized or in process of realization, whether in the actual past, present, or future, he describes by means of the so-called future tense. Hence the use of the future in certain combinations as a historical tense, and of the so-called preterit in certain combinations as a prophetic tense. Into the details of the tense usages which branch out from this primitive idea we cannot now enter. It is in the structural laws of the Hebrew language that its influence is most strongly marked: in the Aramsean it is almost lost. (See Ewald, Lehrbuch, § 134 a; Journal of Sacred Literature for Oct. 1849.)

(5.) The influence of the imagination upon the structure of the Shemitic languages may also be traced in the absence of not a few grammatical forms which we find in other languages. Much that is definitely expressed in more highly developed languages is left in the Shemitic languages, and especially in the Hebrew, to be caught up by the hearer or reader. In this respect there is an analogy between the language itself and the mode in which it was originally represented in writing. Of the language as written, the vowel sounds formed no part. The reader must supply these mentally as he goes along. So with the language itself. It has not a separate and distinct expression for every shade and turn of thought. Much is left to be filled in by the hearer or the reader, and this usually without occasioning any serious inconvenience or difficulty. The Shemitic languages, however, do not all stand on the same level in this respect. In the Syriac, and still more in the Arabic, the expression of thought is usually more complete and precise than in Hebrew, though often for that very reason less animated and impressive. A principal defect in these languages, and especially in the Hebrew, is the fewness of the particles. The extreme simplicity of the  verbal formation also occasions to the European student difficulties which can be surmounted only by a very careful study of the principles by which the verb-usages are governed.

In this respect the Hebrew occupies a middle position between those languages which consist almost entirely of roots with a very scanty grammatical development, and the Indo-European class of languages in which the attempt is made to give definite expression even to the most delicate shades of thought. The Greek, says Paul, seeks after wisdom: he reasons, compares, analyzes. The Jew requires a sign-something to strike the imagination and carry conviction to the heart at once without any formal and lengthened argument. The Greek language, therefore, in its most perfect form, was the offspring of reason and taste; the Hebrew, of imagination and intuition. The Shemites have been the quarriers whose great rough blocks the Japhethites have cut, and polished, and fitted one to another. The former, therefore, are the teachers of the world in religion, the latter in philosophy. This peculiar character of the Shemitic mind is very strongly impressed upon the language.

A national language being an embodiment and picture of the national mind, there is thus thrown around the otherwise laborious and uninteresting study of grammar, even in its earliest stages, an attractive power and value which would not otherwise belong to it. It was the same mind that found expression in the Hebrew language, which gave birth, under the influence of divine inspiration, to the sublime revelations of the Old Testament Scriptures. And it would be easy to trace an analogy between these revelations and the language in which they have been conveyed to us. It is curious to find that even the divinest thoughts and names of the Old Testament connect themselves with questions in Hebrew grammar. Thus, when we investigate the nature and use of the Hebrew plural, and discover from a multitude of examples that it is employed not only to denote plurality, but likewise extension, whether in space or time, as in the Hebrew words for life, youth, old age, etc., and also whatever seems bulky before the mind, we are unwittingly led on to one of the most important questions in the criticism of the Old Testament, viz. the origin of the plural form of the divine name אלהים (Elohim), in our version rendered God. Or, again, when we study the difficult question of the tenses, and endeavor to determine the exact import and force of each, we speedily discover that the grammatical investigation we are pursuing is one of unspeakable moment, for it involves the right apprehension of that most sacred name of  God which the Jew still refuses to take upon his lips, the four-letter name יהוה, Jehovah (q.v.).

3. In the syntax and general structure of the Shemitic languages and writings we trace the operation of the same principles, the same tendencies of mind which manifest themselves in the structure of words. In this respect the Hebrew language exhibits a more simple and primitive type than any of the sister tongues. The simplicity of the Hebrew composition is very obvious even to the reader of the English Bible, or to the scholar who compares the Greek Testament, the style of which is formed on the model of the Old Testament, with the classical Greek writers. We observe at once that there is no such thing as the building up of a lengthened period, consisting of several propositions duly subordinated and compacted so as to form a harmonious and impressive whole. Hebrew composition consists rather of a succession of co-ordinate propositions, each of which is for the moment uppermost in the view of the speaker or writer, until it is superseded by that which follows. This results at once from the character of the Shemitic mind, which was more remarkable for rapid movements and vivid glances than for large and comprehensive grasp. Such a mind would give forth its thoughts in a rapid succession of independent utterances rather than in sustained and elaborated composition. It is a consequence of the same mental peculiarity that the highest poetry of the Shemitic nations is lyrical.

The Hebrew composition is also extremely pictorial in its character-not the poetry only, but also the prose. In the history the past is not described, it is painted. It is not the ear that hears, it is rather the eye that sees. The course of events is made to pass before the eye; the transactions are all acted over again. The past is not a fixed landscape, but a moving panorama. The reader of the English Bible must have remarked the constant use of the word behold, which indicates that the writer is himself, and wishes to make his reader also, a spectator of the transactions he describes. The use of the tenses in the Hebrew historical writings is especially remarkable. To the young student of Hebrew the constant use of the future tense in the description of the past appears perhaps the most striking peculiarity of the language. But the singular phenomenon admits of an easy explanation. It was because the Hebrew viewed and described the transactions of the past, not as all past and done, but as in actual process and progress of evolvement, that he makes such frequent use of the so-called future. In imagination he quits his own point of time, and lives over the past. With his  reader he sails down the stream of time, and traces with open eye the winding course of history. It is impossible always to reproduce exactly in English this peculiarity of the Hebrew Bible.

Further, in writing even of the commonest actions, as that one went, spoke, saw, etc., the Hebrew is not usually satisfied with the simple statement that the thing was done, he must describe also the process of doing. We are so familiar with the style of our English Bibles that we do not at once perceive the pictorial character of such expressions as these, recurring in every page: he arose and went; he opened his lips and spake; he put forth his hand and took; he lifted up his eyes and saw; he lifted up his voice and wept. But what we do not consciously perceive we often unconsciously feel; and doubtless it is this painting of events which is the source of part at least of the charm with which the Scripture narrative is invested to all pure and simple minds.

The same effect is also produced by the symbolical way of representing mental states and processes which distinguishes the Hebrew writers. Such expressions as to bend or incline the ear for “to hear attentively,” to stiffen the neck for “to be stubborn and rebellious,” to uncover the ear for “to reveal,” are in frequent use. Even the acts of the Divine Mind are depicted in a similar way. In the study especially of the Old Testament we must keep this point carefully in view, lest we should err by giving to a symbolical expression a literal interpretation. Thus, when we read (Exo 33:11) that “the Lord spake unto Moses face to face as a man speaketh unto his friend,” we must remember that it was a Hebrew who wrote these words, one who was accustomed to depict to himself and others the spiritual under material symbols, and thus we shall be guarded against irreverently attaching to them a meaning which they were never intended to bear. But, though such modes of expression are open to misapprehension by us whose minds are formed in so very different a mould, nevertheless, when rightly understood, they have the effect of giving us a more clear and vivid impression of the spiritual ideas which they embody than could be conveyed to us by any other mode of representation or expression.

The simplicity and naturalness of the language further appears in the prominence which is constantly given to the word or words embodying the leading idea in a sentence or period. Thus the noun stands before the adjective, the predicate stands before the subject, unless the latter be especially emphatic, in which case it is not only put first, but may stand by  itself as a nominative absolute without any syntactical connection with the rest of the sentence.

The constant use of the oratio directa is also to be specially noted, as an indication of the primitive character of the language. The Hebrew historian does not usually inform us that such and such a person said such and such things; he actually, as it were, produces the parties and makes them speak for themselves. To this device (if it may be so called) the Bible history owes much of its freshness and power of exciting and sustaining the interest of its readers. No other history could be so often read without losing its power to interest and charm.

Lastly, in a primitive language, formed under the predominating influence of imagination and emotion, we may expect to meet with many elliptical expressions, and also with many redundancies. Not a little which we think it necessary formally to express in words, the Hebrew allowed to be gathered from the context; and, conversely, the Hebrew gave expression to not a little which we omit. For example, nothing is more common in Hebrew than the omission of the verb to be in its various forms; and, on the other hand, a very striking characteristic of the Hebrew style is the constant use of the forms וְהָיָה וִיְהַי, and it came to pass and it shall come to pass, which, in translating into English, may be altogether omitted without any serious loss. In the Hebrew prose, also, we often meet with traces of that echoing of thought and expression which forms one of the principal characteristics of the poetic style; as in Gen 6:22, “And Noah did according to all that God commanded him-so did he;” and similar passages, in which we seem to have two different forms of recording the same fact combined into one, thus: “And Noah did according to all that God commanded him;” “According to all that the Lord commanded him, so did he.”

II. History of the Hebrew Language. —

1. Its Origin. — The extant historical notices on this point carry us back to the age of Abraham, but no further. The best evidences which we possess as to the form of the Hebrew language prior to its first historical period tend to show that Abraham, on his entrance into Canaan, found the language then prevailing among almost all the different tribes inhabiting that country to be in at least dialectical affinity with his own. This is gathered from the following facts: that nearly all the names of places and  persons relating to those tribes admit of Hebrew etymologies; that, amid all the accounts of the intercourse of the Hebrews with the nations of Canaan, we find no hint of a diversity of idiom; and that even the comparatively recent remains of the Phoenician and Punic languages bear a manifest affinity to the Hebrew. But whether the Hebrew language, as seen in the earliest books of the Old Test., is the very dialect which Abraham brought with him into Canaan, or whether it was the common tongue of the Canaanitish nations, which Abraham only adopted from them, and which was afterwards developed to greater fullness under the peculiar moral and political influences to which his posterity were exposed, are questions which, in the absence of conclusive arguments, are generally discussed with some dogmatical prepossessions. Almost all those who support the first view contend also that Hebrew was the primitive language of mankind. S. Morinus (Ling. Princaev.) and Loscher (De Causis Ling. Hebr.) are among the best champions of this opinion; but Havernick has more recently advocated it with such modifications as make it more acceptable (Einleit. in das Alte Test. 1, 1, 148 sq.). The principal argument on which they depend is that, as the most important proper names in the first part of Genesis (as Cain, Seth, and others) are evidently founded on Hebrew etymologies, the essential connection of these names with their etymological origins involves the historical credibility of the records themselves, and leaves no room for any other conclusion than that the Hebrew language is coeval with the earliest history of man. The evidence on the other side is scanty, but not without weight.

(1.) In Deu 26:5, Abraham is called a Syrian or Aramean (אֲרִמַּי), from which we naturally conclude that Syriac was his mother tongue, especially when we find,

(2.) from Gen 31:47, that Syriac or Chaldee was the language spoken by Laban, the grandson of Nahor, Abraham's brother. Moreover, it has been remarked

(3.) that in Isa 19:18, the Hebrew is actually called the language of Canaan; and

(4.) that the language itself furnishes internal evidence of its Palestinian origin in the word יָם, sea, which' means also the west, and has this meaning in the very earliest documents.

(5.) Finally, Jewish tradition, whatever weight may be attached to it, points to the same conclusion (Gesenius, Geschichte, sect. 6:4).

If we inquire further how it was that the Canaanites, of the race of Ham, spoke a language so closely allied to the languages spoken by the principal members of the Shemitic family of nations, we shall soon discover that the solution of this difficulty is impossible with our present means of information; it lies beyond the historic period. It may be that long before the migration of Abraham a Shemitic race occupied Palestine; and that, as Abraham adopted the language of the Canaanites, so the Canaanites themselves had in like manner adopted the language of that earlier race whom they gradually dispossessed, and eventually extirpated or absorbed. However this may be, leaving speculation for fact, is it not possible to discover a wise purpose in the selection of the language of Tyre and Sidon — the great commercial cities of antiquity as the language in which was to be embodied the most wonderful revelation of himself and of his law which God made to the ancient world? When we remember the constant intercourse which was maintained by the Phoenicians with the most distant regions both of the East and of the West, it is impossible to doubt that the sacred books of the Hebrews, written in a language almost identical with the Phoenician, must have exercised a more important influence on the Gentile world than is usually acknowledged.

Of course the Canaanitish language, when adopted by the Hebrews, did not remain unchanged. Having become the instrument of the Hebrew mind, and being employed in the expression of new and very peculiar ideas, it must have been modified considerably thereby. How far may possibly be yet ascertained, should accident or the successful zeal of some explorer bring to light the more ancient monuments of the Phoenician nation, which may still have survived the entombment of centuries.

2. Influences modifying the Form of the Hebrew Language, and the Style of the Hebrew Writings. —

(1.) Time.

The history of the Hebrew language, as far as we can trace its course by the changes in the diction of the documents in which it is preserved, may here be conveniently divided into that of the period preceding and that of the period succeeding the Exile. If it be a matter of surprise that the thousand years which intervened between Moses and the Captivity should  not have produced sufficient change in the language to warrant its history during that time being distributed into subordinate divisions, the following considerations may excuse this arrangement. It is one of the signal characteristics of the Hebrew language, as seen in all the books prior to the Exile, that, notwithstanding the existence of some isolated but important archaisms, such as in the form of the pronoun, etc. (the best collection of which may be seen in Havernick, c. p. 183 sq.), it preserves an unparalleled general uniformity of structure.

The extent to which this uniformity prevails may be estimated either by the fact that it has furnished many modern scholars, who reason from the analogies discovered in the changes in other languages in a given period, with an argument to show that the Pentateuch could not have been written at so remote a date as is generally believed (Gesenius, Gesch. der Hebr. Sprache, § 8), or by the conclusion, a fortiori, which Havernick, whose express object is to vindicate its received antiquity, candidly concedes, that “the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah are the earliest in which the language differs sensibly from that in the historical portions of the Pentateuch” (Einleit. 1, 180). — Even those critics who endeavor to bring down the Pentateuch as a whole to a comparatively late date allow that a portion at least of its contents is to be assigned to the age of Moses (Ewald, Lehrbuch, sec. 2, c): and thus, unless it can be shown that this most ancient portion bears in its language and style the stamp of high antiquity, and is distinguished in a very marked manner from the other portions of the Pentateuch (which has not been shown), the phenomenon still remains un-explained. But, indeed, the phenomenon is by no means unexampled. It does not stand alone. — It is said, for example, that the Chinese language displays the same tenacity and aversion to change still more decidedly, the books of the great teacher Confucius being written in language not essentially different from that of his commentators fifteen hundred years later. So we are informed by a writer of the 15th century that the Greeks, at least the more cultivated class, even in his day spoke the language of Aristophanes and Euripides, maintaining the ancient standard of elegance and purity (Gibbon, 8:106).

Or, to take another example more closely related to the Hebrew, it is well known that the written Arabic of the present day does not differ greatly from that of the first centuries after Mohammed. In each of the cases just mentioned, it is probable that the language was as it were stereotyped by becoming the language of books held in highest esteem and reverence, diligently studied by the learned, frequently committed to memory, and adopted as a model of style by succeeding writers. Now, may not the  sacred writings of the Mosaic age have had a similar influence on the written Hebrew of the following ages, which continued undisturbed till the Captivity, or even later? We know how greatly the translations of the Bible into English and German have affected the language and literature of England and Germany ever since they were given to the world. But among a people like the ancient Hebrews, living to a certain extent apart from other nations, with a literature of no great extent, and a learned class specially engaged in the study and transcription of the sacred writings, we may well suppose that the influence of these writings upon the form of the national language must have been much more decided and permanent. The learned men would naturally adopt in their compositions the language of the books which had been their study from youth, and large portions of which they were probably able to repeat from memory. Thus the language of these old books, though it might differ in some respects from that spoken by the common people, would naturally become the language of the learned and of books, especially of those books on sacred subjects, such as have alone come down to us from ancient Israel. In explanation of the fact under discussion, appeal has also been made (a) to the permanence of Eastern customs, and (b) to the simple structure of the Hebrew language, which rendered it less liable to change than other more largely developed languages (see Ewald, Heb. Gram. § 7). It has also been remarked that some of the peculiarities of the early writings may be concealed from view by the uniformity of the system of punctuation adopted and applied to the Scriptures by the Hebrew grammarians.

In the canonical books belonging to the first period the Hebrew language thus appears in a state of mature development. Although it still preserves the charms of freshness and simplicity, yet it has attained great regularity of formation, and such a precision of syntactical arrangement as insures both energy and distinctness. Some common notions of its laxity and indefiniteness have no other foundation than the very inadequate scholarship of the persons who form them. A clearer insight into the organism of language absolutely, joined to such a study of the cognate Syro-Arabian idioms as would reveal the secret, but no less certain, laws of its syntactical coherence, would show them to what degree the simplicity of Hebrew is compatible with grammatical precision. One of the most remarkable features in the language of this period is the difference which distinguishes the diction of poetry from that of prose. This difference consists in the use of unusual words and flexions (many of which are  considered to be Aramaisms or archaisms, although in this case these terms are nearly identical), and in a harmonic arrangement of thoughts, as seen both in the parallelism of members in a single verse, and in the strophic order of larger portions, the delicate art of which Ewald has traced with pre-eminent success in his Poetische Biicher des Alte Bundes, vol. 1.

The Babylonian Captivity is assigned as the commencement of that decline and corruption which mark the second period in the history of the Hebrew language; but the Assyrian deportation of the ten tribes, in the year B.C. 720, was probably the first means of bringing the Aramaic idiom into injurious proximity with it. The Exile, however, forms the epoch at which the language shows evident signs of that encroachment of the Aramaic on its integrity, which afterwards ended in its complete extinction. The diction of the different books of this period discovers various grades of this Aramaic influence, and in some cases approaches so nearly to the type of the first period that it has been ascribed to mere imitation.

The writings which belong to the second age-that subsequent to the Babylonian Captivity-accordingly differ very considerably from those which belong to the first; the influence of the Chaldee language, acquired by the Jewish exiles in the land of their captivity, having gradually corrupted the national tongue. The historical books belonging to this age are the books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. In the prophets who prophesied during and after the Captivity, with the exception of Daniel, the Chaldee impress is by no means so strong as we might anticipate, they having evidently formed their style on that of the older prophets. It is important, however, to observe that the presence of what appears to be a Chaldaism is not always the indication of a later age. Chaldee words and forms occasionally appear even in the most ancient Hebrew compositions, especially the poetical, the poet delighting in archaic and rare words, and substituting these for the more usual and commonplace. But between the Chaldaic archaisms and the Chaldeisms of the later Scriptures there is this marked distinction, that the former are only occasional, and lie scattered on the surface; the latter are frequent, and give a peculiar color and character to the whole language.

A still more corrupt form of the language appears in the Mishna and other later Jewish writings, in which the foreign element is much more decided and prominent.

(2.) Place. — Under this head is embraced the question as to the existence of different dialects of the ancient Hebrew. Was the Hebrew language, as spoken by the several tribes of Israel, of uniform mould and character? or did it branch out into various dialects corresponding to the leading divisions of the nation? In attempting to answer this question, there is no direct historical testimony of which we can avail ourselves. From Neh 13:23-24, we learn nothing more than that the language of Ashdod differed from that of the Jews after their return from captivity, which is only what we might have anticipated. The notices in Jdg 12:6; Jdg 18:3, which are more to the purpose, refer rather to a difference in pronunciation than in the form of the language. Notwithstanding it seems primafacie probable (a) that the language of the trans-Jordanic tribes was in course of time modified to a greater or less extent by the close contact of these tribes with the Syrians of the north and the Arab tribes of the great eastern desert; and (b) that a similar dialectic difference would gradually be developed in the language of Ephraim and the other northern tribes to the west of the Jordan, especially after the political separation of these tribes from the tribe of Judah and the family of David. Possibly in the Jewish language of 2Ki 18:28 we may discover the trace of some such difference of dialect; for we can scarcely suppose the name Jewish to have been introduced in the very brief period which intervened between the taking of Samaria and the transaction in the record of which it occurs; and, if in use before the taking of Samaria and the captivity of the ten tribes, it must have been restricted to the form of the Hebrew language prevailing in Judea, which, being thus distinguished in name from the language of the northern tribes, was probably distinguished in other respects also. It is not improbable that some of the linguistic peculiarities of the separate books of Scripture are to be accounted for on this hypothesis.

3. When the Hebrew Language ceased to be a living Language. — The Jewish tradition, credited by Kimchi,. is to the effect that the Hebrew language ceased to be spoken by the body of the people during their captivity in Babylon; and this is the opinion of many Christian scholars also, among whom are Buxtorf and Walton.. Others, as Pfeiffer and Loscher, argue that it is quite unreasonable, considering the duration and other circumstances of the Exile, to suppose that the Jews did not retain the partial use of their native tongue for some time after their return to Palestine, and lose it by slow degrees at last. There can be no doubt that  the Hebrew was never spoken in its purity after the return from captivity; but that it ceased altogether to be the language of the people after that period, and was retained only as the language of books and of the learned, has not been established. The principal evidence relied on by those who hold this opinion is derived from Neh 8:8 : “So they read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading.” Distinctly, מְפֹרָשׁ, i.e. says Hengstenberg, “with the addition of a translation” (Genuineness of Daniel, ch. 3, sec. 5). But, though this gloss has some support in Jewish tradition, it is at variance both with Hebrew and with Chaldee usage מְפֹרָשׁ means made clear or distinct, as is evident from Num 15:34 (the meaning of מְפָרֵשׁ, in Ezr 4:18, is disputed); and it וִיַקְרְאוּ מְפֹרָשׁ can scarcely be otherwise rendered than “they real distinctly” (see the Lexicons of Cocceius, Gesenius, and Furst; Buxtorf and Gussetius render by explanate, explicate). This, indeed, is evident from the context; for if we should render with Hengstenberg, “They read it with the addition of a translation,” to what purpose the clause which follows, “and gave the sense,” etc? At the same time, though this passage does not furnish sufficient evidence to prove that in the time of Nehemiah Hebrew had ceased to be the language of every-day life, it does seem to point to the conclusion that at that time it had considerably degenerated from its ancient purity, so that the common people had some difficulty in understanding the language of their ancient sacred books. Still we believe that the Hebrew element predominated, and, instead of describing, with Walton (Prolegomena 3, sec. 24), the language of the Jews on their return from exile as “Chaldee with a certain admixture of Hebrew,” we should rather describe it as Hebrew with a large admixture of Chaldee. Only on this hypothesis does it appear possible satisfactorily to account for the fact that Hebrew continued even after this period to be the language of prophets and preachers, historians and poets, while there is no trace of any similar use of the Chaldee among the Jews of Palestine (compare also Neh 13:24).

At what time Chaldee became the dominant element in the national language it is impossible to determine. All political influences favored its ascendency, and with these concurred the influence of that large portion of the nation still resident in the East, and maintaining constant intercourse with a Chaldee-speaking population. To these influences we cannot wonder that the Hebrew, notwithstanding the sacred associations  connected with it, by-and-by succumbed. On the coins of the Maccabees, indeed, the ancient language still appears; but we cannot conclude from this circumstance that it maintained its position as a living language down to the Maccabean period (Ronan, Langues Semitiques, p. 137). The fragments of the popular language which we find in the New Testament are all Aramaean, and ever since the Hebrew has been preserved and cultivated as the language of the learned and of books, and not of common life. On the history of the post-Biblical Hebrew we do not now enter.

III. Of the Written Hebrew. — The Shemitic nations: have been the teachers of the world in religion; by the invention of the alphabet they may likewise lay claim to the honor of having laid the foundation of the world's literature. The Shemitic alphabet, as is well known, has no signs for the pure vowel sounds. All the letters are consonants; some, however, are so weak as easily to pass into vowels, and these letters we accordingly find in use, especially in the later Scriptures, as vowel marks. Two interesting questions here present themselves: 1. As to the age and origin of the characters or letters which appear in all extant Hebrew MSS. and in our printed Hebrew Bibles; and, 2. As to the origin and authority of the punctuation by which the vowel sounds are indicated.

1. On the former of these questions there are two conclusions which may be relied on as certain:

(1.) That the present square characters were not in use among the Jews previous to the Babylonian Captivity. The Jewish tradition is that they were introduced or reintroduced by Ezra (Gesenius, Geschichte, p. 150; Lightfoot, Horae Hebraicae, Mat 5:18).

(2.) That the square characters have been in use since the beginning of our era (Hupfeld in Stud. und Krit. for 1830, p. 288). But between these two limits several centuries intervene; is it mot possible to approximate more closely to the date of their introduction? The only fact to which appeal can be made with this view is- this, that on the coins of the Maccabees the square characters do not appear; but whether we are entitled to conclude from this that these characters had not then come into use in Judaea is very doubtful (Gesenius, Geschichte, sect. 43, 3). The probability is that the introduction of these characters, called by the Jewish doctors Assyrian, and generally admitted to be of Aramaean origin, had some connection with the introduction of the Aramaean language, and that the change from the  ancient written characters, like that from the ancient language, was not accomplished at once, but gradually. It is possible that in the intensity of national feeling awakened during the Maccabean struggle, there was a reaction in favor of the ancient language and writing.

The earliest monuments of Hebrew writing which we possess are these genuine coins of the Maccabees, which date from the year B.C. 143. The character in which their inscriptions are expressed bears a very near resemblance to the Samaritan alphabet, and both are evidently derived from the Phoenician alphabet. The Talmud also, and Origen and Jerome, both attest the fact that an ancient Hebrew character had fallen into disuse; and by stating that the Samaritans employed it, and by giving some descriptions of its form, they distinctly prove that the ancient character spoken of was essentially the same as that on the Armenian coins. It is therefore considered to be established beyond a doubt that, before the exile, the Hebrews used this ancient character (the Talmud even calls it the “Hebrew”). The Talmud, and Origen, and Jerome ascribe the change to Ezra; and those who, like Gesenius, admit this tradition to be true in a limited sense, reconcile it with the late use of the ancient letters on the coins, by appealing to the parallel use of the Kufic characters on the Mohammedan coins, for several centuries after the Nishi was employed for writing, or by supposing that the Maccabees had a mercantile interest in imitating the coinage of the Phoenicians. The other opinion is that, as the square Hebrew character has not, to all appearance, been developed directly out of the ancient stiff Phoenician type, but out of an alphabet bearing near affinity to that found in the Palmyrene inscriptions, a combination of this palaeographical fact with the intercourse which took place between the Jews and the Syrians under the Seleucidae, renders it probable that the square character was first adopted at some inconsiderable but indefinable time before the Christian sera. Either of these theories is compatible with the supposition that the square character underwent many successive modifications in the next centuries, before it attained its full calligraphical perfection. The passage in Mat 5:18 is considered to prove that the copies of the law were already written in the square character, as the yod of the ancient alphabet is as large a letter as the aleph; and the Talmud and Jerome speak as if the Hebrew MSS. of the Old Testament were, in their time, already provided with the final letters, the Taggin, the point on the broken horizontal stroke of ח, and other calligraphical minutia.  The characters in use before the Babylonian exile have been preserved by the Samaritans even to the present day without material change (Gesenius, Monum. Phoen. sect. 51, 1; comp. on this subject also Kopp, Bilder und Schriftemz, 2, sect. 165-167; Ewald, Lehibuich, sect. 77; Gesenius, Geschichte der Hebrsischen Sprache ü. Schrift, sect. 41-43).

2. As to the origin and authority of the punctuation, the controversy which raged so fiercely in the 17th century may be said now to have ceased; and the views of Ludovicus Cappellus, from the adoption of which the Buxtorfs anticipated the most dangerous consequences now meet with almost universal acquiescence. The two following conclusions may now be regarded as established:

(1.) That the present punctuation did not form an original part of the inspired record, but was introduced by the Jewish doctors long after that record had been closed, for the purpose of preserving, as far as possible, the true pronunciation of the language; and

(2.) That the present pointed text, notwithstanding its comparative regency, presents us with the closest possible approximation to the language which the sacred writers actually used. It would be tedious to go over the evidence by which these positions are established. Those who wish to do so will find the fullest information in the great work of Ludovicus. Cappellus, entitled Arcanum Punctationis Revelatum, with the reply of the younger Buxtorf. Keeping these conclusions in view in interpreting the Hebrew Scriptures, we shall be careful neither, on the one hand, to neglect the traditional text, nor, on the other hand, servilely to adhere to it when a change of the points would give a better sense to any passage.

The origin of the vowel points is to be ascribed to the effort which the Jewish learned men made to preserve the pronunciation of their sacred language at a time when its extinction as a living tongue endangered the loss of the traditional memory of its sound. Every kind of evidence renders it probable that these signs for the pronunciation were first introduced about the 7th century of the Christian era, that is, after the completion of the Talmud, and that the minute and complex system which we possess was gradually developed from a few indispensable signs to its present elaborateness. The existence of the present complete system can, however, be traced back to the 11th century. The skilful investigation of Hupfeld (in the Studien und Kritiken for 1830, p. 549 sq.) has proved that the vowel-  points were unknown to Jerome and the Talmud; but, as far as regards the former, we are able to make a high estimate of the degree to which the traditionary pronunciation, prior to the use of the points, accorded with our Masoretic signs; for Jerome describes a pronunciation which agrees wonderfully well with our own vocalization. We are thus called on to avail ourselves thankfully of the Masoretic punctuation, on the double ground that it represents the Jewish traditional pronunciation, and that the Hebrew language, unless when read according to its laws, does not enter into its full dialectical harmony with its Syro-Arabian sisters. SEE MASSORAH.

Although it may be superfluous to enforce the general advantages, not to say indispensable necessity, of a sound scholar-like study of the Hebrew language to the theological student, yet it may be allowable to enumerate some of those particular reasons, incident to the present time, which urgently demand an increased attention to this study. First, the English- speaking race have an ancient honorable name to retain. Selden, Castell, Lightfoot, Pocock, Walton, Spencer, and Hyde, were once contemporary ornaments of its literature. We daily see their names mentioned with deference in the writings of German scholars; but we are forcibly struck with the fact that, since that period, Great Britain has hardly, with the exception of Lowth and Kennicott, produced a single Syro-Arabian scholar whose labors have signally advanced Biblical philology; while America, although possessing some well-qualified teachers, has produced but little that is original in this direction. Secondly, the bold inquiries of the German theologians will force themselves on our notice. It is impossible for us to ignore their existence, for the works containing them are now speedily circulated among us in an English dress. These investigations are conducted in a split of philological and historical criticism which has never yet been brought to bear, with such force, on the most important Biblical questions. The wounds which they deal to the ancient traditions cannot be healed by reference to commentators whose generation knew nothing of our doubts and difficulties. The cure must be sympathetic; it must be effected by the same weapon that caused the wound. If the monstrous disproportion which books relating to ecclesiastical antiquity bear, in almost every theological bookseller's catalogue, over those relating to Biblical philology, be an evidence of the degree to which these studies have fallen into neglect, and if the few books in which an acquaintance with Hebrew is necessary, which do appear, are a fair proof of our present ability to meet the Germans with their own weapons, then there is indeed  an urgent necessity that theological students should prepare for the increased demands of the future.

III. History of Hebrew Learning. — It is not till the closing part of the 9th century that we find, even among the Jews themselves, any attempts at the formal study of their ancient tongue. In the Talmudic writings, indeed, grammatical remarks frequently occur, and of these some indicate an acute and accurate perception of the usages of the language; but they are introduced incidentally, and are to be traced rather to a sort of living sense of the language than to any scientific study of its structure or laws. What the Jews of the Talmudic period knew themselves of the Hebrew they communicated to Origen and Jerome, both of whom devoted themselves with much zeal to the study of that language, and the latter of whom especially became proficient in all that his masters could teach him concerning both its vocabulary and its grammar (Eusebius, Hist. Eccles.; Jerome, Adv. Rufin. 1, 363; Epist. ad Damas.; Praef ad Jobun, ad Paralipom. etc.; Carpzov, Crit. Sac. 6 § 2). As represented by Jerome, the Church was quite on a par with the synagogue in acquaintance with the language of the ancient Scriptures; but how imperfect that was in many respects may be seen from the strange etymologies, which even Jerome adduces as explanatory of words, and from his statement that from the want of vowels in Hebrew “the Jews pronounce the same words with different sounds and accents, pro voluntate lectorun ac varietate regionum” (Ep. ad Evangelums).

Stimulated by the example of the Arabians, the Jews began, towards the end of the 9th century, to bestow careful study on the grammar of their ancient tongue; and with this advantage over the Arabian grammarians, that they did not, like them, confine their attention to one language, but took into account the whole of the Shemitic tongues. An African Jew, Jehuda ben-Karish, who lived about A.D. 880, led the way in this direction; but it was reserved for Saadia ben-Joseph of Fayum, gaon (or spiritual head) of the Jews at Sora in Babylonia, and who died A.D. 942, to compose the first formal treatise on points of Hebrew grammar and philology. To him we are indebted for the Arabic version of the O.T., of which portions are still extant, SEE ARABIC VERSIONS; and though his other works, his commentaries on the O.T., and his grammatical works, have not come down to us, we know of their existence from, and have still some of their contents in, the citations of later writers. He was followed by R. Jehuda ben-David Chajug, a native of Fez, who flourished in the 11th  century, whose services have procured for him the honorable designation of “chief of grammarians.” From him the succession of Jewish grammarians embraces the following names [for details, see separate articles].

Re Salomo Isaaki (רשׁי, Rashi), a native of Troyes in France, d. ab. 1105; Abu'l Walid Mervan ibn-Ganach, a. physician at Cordova, d. 1120; Moses Gikatilla, ab. 1100: Ibll-Esra, d. 1194; the Kimchis, especially Moses and: David, who flourished in the 13th century; Isaak benMose (Ephodaeus, so called from the title of his work מִעֲשֵׂה אֵפוֹד); Solomon Jarchi wrote a grammar, in which he sets forth the seven conjugations of verbs as: now usually given; Abraham de Balmez of Lecci; and Elias Levita (1472-1549). The earliest efforts in Hebrew lexicography with which we are acquainted is the little work of Saadia Gaon, in which he explains seventy Hebrew words; a codex containing this is in the Bodleian library at Oxford, from which it has been printed by Dukes in the Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenländer, 5, 1, 115 sq. In the same codex is another small lexicographical work by Jehuda ben-Karish, in which Hebrew words are explained from the Talmud, the Arabic, and other languages; excerpts from this are given in Eichhorn's Biblioth. der Bibl. Litt. 3, 951-980. More copious works are those of Ben-Ganach, where the: Hebrew words are explained in Arabic; of R. Menahem. ibn-Saruk, whose work has been printed with an English translation by Herschell Philipowski (Lond. 1854); of R. Salomo Parchon (about 1160), specimens of whose work have been given by De Rossi in his collection of Various Readings, and in a separate work entitled Lexicon Heb. select, quo ex antiquo et inedito R. Parchonis Lexico novas et diversas rariorum et difficiliorum vocum. significationes sistit, J. B. De Rossi (Parm. 1805); of David Kimchi, in the second part of his Michlol, entitled: סֵפֵר הִשָׁרָשַׁים. (often printed; best edition by Biesen-thal and Leberecht, 2 vols. Berl. 1838-47); and of Elias. Levita (Tishbi, Bas. 1527, and with a Latin translation by Fagius, 4to, 1541). The Concordance of Isaac Nathan (1437) also belongs to this period.

The study of the Hebrew language among Christians, which had only casually and at intervals occupied the attention of ecclesiastics during the Middle Ages, received an impulse from the revived interest in Biblical exegesis produced by the Reformation. Something had: been done to facilitate the study of Oriental literature and to call attention to it by the MSS., Hebrew and Arabic, which the emperor Frederick II brought into Europe after the fourth crusade in 1228 (Cuspinian, De Caesaribus, p. 419; Boxhorn, Hist. Univ. p. 779); and a few men-such as Raymund  Martini, a native of Catalonia (born 1236), Paulus Bugensis, Libertas Cominetus, who is said to have known and used fourteen languages,. etc. appeared as lights in the otherwise beclouded firmament of Biblical learning. But it was not until the beginning of the 16th century that any general interest was awakened in the Christian Church for the study of Hebrew literature. In 1506 appeared the grammar and lexicon of Reuchlin, which may be regarded as the first successful attempt to open the gate of Hebrew learning to the Christian world; for though the work of Conrad. Pellican, Del odo legendi et intelligendi Hebraea (Basel, 1503), had the precedence in point of time, it was too imperfect to exert much influence in favor of Hebrews studies. A few years later, Santes Pagnini, a Dominican of Lucca, issued his Institutionum Hebraicarun. Libb. 4 (Lyons, 1526), and his Thesaurus Ling. Sanct. (ibid.. 1529); but the former of these works is inferior to the Grammar of Reuchlin, and the latter is a mere collection of excerpts from David Kimchi's Book of Roots, often erroneously understood. No name of any importance occurs in the history of Hebrew philology after this till we come to those of Sebastian Münster and the Buxtorfs. The former translated the grammatical works of Elias Levita, and from these chiefly he constructed his own Dictionarum Hebr., adj. Chald. vocabulis (Basel, 1523), and his Opus Grammaticum ex variis Elianis libris concinnatum (Bas. 1542). The latter rendered most important service to the cause of Hebrew learning. SEE BUXTORF.

The grammars and lexicons of the older Buxtorf were for many years the principal helps to the study of Hebrew in the Christian Church, and one of them, his Lexicon Chald. Talmud. et Rabbinicum (Basel, 1640), is still indispensable to the student who would thoroughly explore the Hebrew language and literature. The names also of Forster and Schindler may be mentioned as marking an epoch in the history of these studies. Previous to them scholars had followed almost slavishly in the track of rabbinical teaching. By them, however, an attempt was made to gather materials from a wider field. Firster, in his Dict. Hebr. Nov. (Basel, 1557), sought to determine the meaning of the words from the comparison of the different passages of Scripture in which they occur, and of allied words, words having two consonants in common, or two consonants of the same organ. Schindler added to this the comparison of different Shemitic dialects for the illustration of the Hebrew in his Lex. Pentaglotton (Han. 1612). The example thus set was carried forward by Samuel Bohle, a Rostock professor (Dissertt. pro formali Signif. S. S. eruenda, 1637), though by his fondness for metaphysical methods and conceits he was often betrayed into  mere trifling; by Christian Nolde, professor at Copenhagen (Concordant. particularum Ebraeo. Chald. V. T. Hamb. 1679); by Joh. Cocceius (Coch), professor at Leyden (Lex. et Comment. serm. Hebr. Lond. 1669); by Castell (Lex. Heptaglot. Lond. 1669); by De Dieu in his commentaries on the O.Test.; and by Hottinger in his Etymologicuma Orient. sive Lex harmonicum heptaglot. (Frankf. 1661). Sol. Glass also, in his Philologia Sacra, 1636, rendered important service to Hebrew learning and O. — T. exegesis.

Meanwhile a new school of Hebrew philology had arisen under the leading of Jakob Alting and Johann Andr. Danz. The former in his Fundamenta punctationis linguae sanctae sive Grammat. Hebr. (Gron. 1654), and the latter in his Nucifrangibulum (Jena, 1686), and other works, endeavored to show that the phenomena which the Hebrew exhibited in a grammatical respect, the flexions, etc., had their basis in essential properties of the language, and could be rationally evolved from principles. Peculiar to them is the “systema morarum,” a highly artificial method of determining the placing of long or short vowels, according to the number of norae appertaining to each or to the consonant following, a method which led to endless niceties, and no small amount of learned trifling. The fundamental principle, however, which Alting and Danz asserted is a true one, and their assertion of it was not without fruits. Nearly contemporary with them was Jacques Gousset, professor at Gröningen, who devoted much time and labor to the preparation of a work entitled Commentarii Ling. Heb. (Amst. 1702), in which he follows strictly the method of deducing the meanings of the Hebrew words from the Hebrew itself, rejecting all aid from rabbins, versions, or dialects. The chief merit of Gousset and his followers, of whom the principal is Chr. Stock (Clavis Ling. Sanct. V. et N. Ti. Lips. 1725), consists in the close attention they paid to the usus loquendi of Scripture, and Havernick thinks that adequate justice has not been done to Gousset's services in this respect (Introd. to O.T. p. 221. Eng. trans.).

Hitherto not much attention had been paid to etymology as a source for determining the meaning of Hebrew words. This defect was in part remedied by Caspar Neumann and Valentin Loscher, the former of whom in different treatises, the latter in his treatise De Causis Ling. Heb. (Frankf. and Leipsic, 1706), set forth the principle that the Hebrew roots are biliterae, that these are the “characteres significationis,” as Neumann called them, or the “semina vocum,” as they were designated by Loscher, and that from them the triliterals, of which the Hebrew is chiefly composed, were  formed. They contended also that the fundamental meaning of the biliterals is to be ascertained from the meaning of the letters composing each, and for this purpose they assigned to each letter what the former called “significatio hieroglyphica,” and the latter “valor logicus.” This last is the most dubious part of their system; but, as a whole, their views are worthy of respect and consideration (see Hupfeld, De emendanda lexicog. Semlit. ratione, p. 3).

A great advance was made in the beginning of the 18th century by the rise almost simultaneously of two rival schools of Hebrew philology-the Dutch school, headed by Albert Schultens, and the school of Halle, founded by the Michaelis family. In the former the predominating tendency was towards the almost exclusive use of the Arabic for the illustration of Hebrew grammar and lexicography. Schultens himself was a thorough Arabic scholar, and he carried his principle of appealing to that source for the elucidation of the Hebrew to an extent which betrayed him into many mistakes and extravagances; nevertheless, to his labors Hebrew philology owes an imperishable debt of obligation. Besides his commentaries on Job and Proverbs, which are full of grammatical and lexicographical disquisition, he wrote Origines Hebraeae seu Heb. Ling. antiquissima natura et indoles ex Arabiae penetralibus revocata (Frankfort, 1723), and Institutiones adfundamenta Ling. Heb. (Leyd. 1737). To this school belongs Schroder, professor at Gröningen, who published in 1776 a Hebrew grammar of great excellence, and which has passed through many editions, under the same title as the second of the works of Schultens above noted; and Robertson, professor at Edinburgh (Grammatica Hebr. Edinb. 1783, 2nd ed.). Both these works excel that of Schultens in clearness and simplicity, and in neither is the Arabic theory so exclusively adhered to. Venema, as a commentator, was also one of the luminaries of this school.

The school of Halle was founded by Johann Heinrich and Christian Benedikt Michaelis, but its principal ornament in its earlier stage was the son of the latter, John David, professor at Göttingen. SEE MICHAELIS.

The principle of this school was to combine the use of all the sources of elucidation for the Hebrew-the cognate dialects, especially the Aramaic, the versions, the rabbinical writings, etymology, and the Hebrew itself as exhibited in the sacred writings. The valuable edition of the Hebrew Bible, with exegetical notes, the conjoint work of J. H. and Christ. B. Michaelis, some grammatical essays by the latter, and the Hebrische Grammatik  (Halle, 1744), the Supplementa ad lexica Hebraica (6 parts, Gött. 1785- 92), and several smaller essays of John David, comprise the principal contributions of this illustrious family to Hebrew learning. To their school belong the majority of more recent German Hebraists Moser (Lex. Man. Heb. et Chald. Ulm, 1795),Vater (Heb. Sprachlehre, Lpz. 1797), Hartmann (Anfangsgriinde der Heb. Sprache, Marburg, 1798), Jahn (Grammatica Ling. Heb. 1809), and the facile princeps of the whole, Gesenius (Hebr. Deutsches Handwörterbuch, Lpz. 1810-12, and later; Heb. Grammatik, Halle, 1813, and often since; Geschichte der Heb. Spr. und Schrift, 1815, and since; Ausführliches Gram. — Krit. Lehrgebaude der Heb. Spr. 1817; Lexicon Manuale, 1833, and later; Thesaurus Phil. Crit. Ling. Hebr. et Chald. Lpz. 1835-1858). SEE GESENIUS.

Gesenius has been followed closely by Moses Stuart in his Grammar of the Hebrew Language, of which many editions have appeared. Under the Halle school may also be ranked Joh. Simonis (Onomast. Vet. Test. Halle, 1741; Lexicon Man. Heb. et Chald. 1756; re-edited by Eichhorn in 1793, and with valuable improvements by Winer in 1828); but, though a pupil of Michaelis, Simonis shows a strong leaning towards the school of Schultens.

Among recent Hebraists the name of Lee (Grammai of the Heb. Lang. in a Series of Lectures, Lond. 3rd edit. 1844; Lexicon Heb. Chald. and Engl. 1840), Ewald (Krit. Gramm. der Heb. Spr. Ausfuhrlich bearbeitet, Lpz. 1827; 7th ed. 1863, under the title of Ausführliches Lehrb. der Heb. Spr. des A. B.), and Hupfeld (Exercitationes Ethiopiae, 1825; De emend. Lexicogr. Sem. ratione Comment 1827; Ueber Theorie der Heb. Gr. in the Theol. Studien und Kritiken for 1828; Aus: Hebr. Gram. 1841), are the most prominent. Each of these pursues an independent course, but all of them incline more or less to the school of Alting and Danz. Lee avows that the aim of his grammatical investigations is to “study the language as it is, that is, as its own analogy collected from itself and its cognate dialects exhibits it” (Grammar, Pref. p. 4, new ed. 1844). Ewald has combined with his philosophical analysis of the language, as it exists in its own documents, a more extended use of the cognate dialects; he contends that, to do justice to the Hebrew, one must first be at home in all the branches of Shemitic literature, and that it is by combining these with the old Hebrew that the latter is to be called from the dead, and piece by piece endowed with life (Grammatik, Pref. p. 9). Hupfeld's method is eclectic, and does not differ from that of Gesenius, except that it assigns a larger influence to the  philosophic element, and aims more at basing the grammar of the language on first principles analytically determined; by him also the Japhetic languages have been called in to cast light on the Shemitic, a course to which Gesenius too, after formally repudiating it, came in his later works to incline.

Among the Jews, the study of Hebrew literature has been much fettered by rabbinical and traditional prejudices. Many able grammarians, however, of this school have appeared since the beginning of the 16th century, among whom the names of the brothers David and Moses Provengale, Lonzano Norzi, Ben-Melech, Süsskind, and Lombroso are especially to be mentioned. A more liberal impulse was communicated by Solomon Cohen (1709-62), but Mendelssohn was the first to introduce the results and methods of Christian research among his nation. First (Lehrgeb. d. Aram. Idiome mit Bezug auf' die Indo-Germ. Spr. I. Chald. Gram. 1835; Charuze Peninim, 1836; Concordantice Libr. Vet. Test. 1840; Hebr. and Chald. Handworterbuch über der A. T. 2 vols. 1857) seeks to combine the historical with the analytical method, taking note of all the phenomena of the Hebrew itself, illustrating these from the cognate tongues, and those of the Indo-Germanic class, and at the same time endeavoring on philosophic grounds to separate the accidental from the necessary, the radical from the ramified, the germ from the stem, the stem from the branches, so as to arrive at the laws which actually rule the language. All his works are of the highest value. Mr. Horwitz has also published an excellent Heb. Grammar (Lond. 1835). We especially notice the philosophical method pursued by Nordheimer (Heb. Grammar, N. Y. 1838-42, 2 vols. 8vo). The latest Jewish production in English is Kalisch's Hebrew Gramm. (Lond. 1863, 8vo).

See generally Wolf, Biblioth. Hebr. (1715-53); Loscher, De Causis Ling. Ebr. (1706); Hezel, Gesch. der Hebr. Spr. and Litter. (1776); Gesenius, Gesch. d. Hebr. Spr. (1815); Delitzsch, Jeshurun, Isagoge in Gramm. et Lexicogr. linguce Hebr. (1838); Fiirst, Biblioth. Judaica, passim; also his appendix on Jewish Lexicography to his Lex. Hebr. — Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, per. 2, § 16; per. 3:§ 27; Bibliograph. Handbuchfür Hebr. Sprachk. (Lpz. 1859, 8vo). SEE SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.

Hebrew Language (ADDENDUM FROM VOLUME 12):

The central position which this "sacred tongue" occupies in Biblical literature justifies us in supplementing the article in volume 4 by a somewhat detailed exposition of some of its leading lexical and' grammatical peculiarities, and in doing so we take the occasion to call attention to some features and linguistic principles not usually apprehended. 'These illustrate the natural simplicity no less than the profound philosophy of the language.

I. Root Meanings. —

1. It has generally been assumed that verbs are the only primitives in Hebrew, and hence the lexicons have constantly referred all words, to some verbal root. But it seems more reasonable to analogy and more consonant with fact to admit a few primitive nouns, such as אָב,father; אָח, brother; מִיַם, water, etc. Accordingly we find יָרָה scarcely used, except in Hiph. as a denominative from יָד, hand, in the sense of stretching out the hand, e.g. in prayer or praise.

2. A more important fact, admitted by most lexicographers, and denied of late by only a few scholars,\* is that all the roots primarily seem to designate some physical act, or condition, appreciable by the senses. This may be true of other languages, in the primitive forms, but it is eminently characteristic of the Hebrew. Not only were the people who used it a constitutionally poetic race, affected by and reflecting every shadow of the  imagination, but their originally nomadic habits made them keenly sensitive to every accident and influence of Bedawin life. They had specific terms for pitching and striking their tents חָנָה and נָסֵע, respectively), for turning out of the road to stop at a house (גּוּר), and lodging over night (לַין), etc. They were on the constant lookout for an enemy (צָפָה), and they had a term for one of a hostile tribe (אֹיֵב as opposed to שֹׁלֵם), in distinction from personal enmity (ָֹשנֵא) or individual opposition (צָרִר). The nice shades of climactic signification, which are very imperfectly developed even in the best Hebrew lexicons, are shown with graphic clearness in terms for anger: אָנִ, to breathe hard with the first excitement; חָרָה, to glow with the rising passion; חֵמָה, the flush of the hot blood; זָעִם, to froth with intense fury, etc. Attention to the ostensible sign of a root will enable us to note the steps of transition from a primitive to a derivative signification e.g. הָגָה, to mutter to one's self in a brown study; hence to murmur in grudge, or meditate with pleasure. The constant usage of terms in a figurative sense, with an eye to their literal import, makes every word and phrase a picture, and renders even the prosiest utterances highly poetical.

\*We look with some distrust upon the fashion, prevalent in certain quarters, of seeking Hebrew etymous. in the radicals found among the cuneiform disclosures. The dialects of the Assyrian, "Accadian," and early Babylonian are yet in too crude a state of classification and investigation to bear out much reliance upon them for such purposes, and it is doubtful if they ever will be largely available for trustworthy comparison, except in a very general manner, and for obscure roots.

3. Hebrew synonyms, as thus appears, have received less attention than they deserve. The lexicographers, especially Gesenius, have occasionally traced distinctions in the use of words, and have freely compared many cognate roots, resolving most of them to certain supposed essential ideas, but this last has helped very little towards a practical discrimination of their real meaning and prevalent application, and no general system of comparing verbs closely resembling each other has been instituted. Yet it is certain that in Hebrew, as in all other primitive languages, real synonyms are very rare, and in no other tongue, perhaps, are terms more distinctively employed, especially in the physical relations of life, however vaguely they may often have to be construed in their figurative and metaphysical applications. For example, the words relating to the senses are nicely  correlated to each other, and finely shaded off in comparative strength. Thus שָׁמִעis to hear simply, the sound entering one's ears whether he will or not. But עָנָה is to pay attention to what is heard, as by look or gesture; hence to answer, as expected of one giving heed to another; and finally to speak, i.e., in reply to words or thoughts merely implied. Still advancing,

הֶאֵַזין, a denominative from אֹזֶן, the ear (probably a primitive, for the root אָזִן does not occur), is to give ear, i.e., turn the ear in the direction of the sound, or listen, but not very intently. Finally,  הַקְשַׁיב is to prick up the ears, i.e., use the hand for increasing the volume of sound, or hearken earnestly. So likewise רָאָה is to see simply, without any special effort, ἰδεῖν; but חָזָה is to behold, or gaze intently at some striking object, as in a vision, ὁράω or θεωρέω; and הַבַּיט is to look at closely, for the purpose of scrutiny or discovery, σκοπέω; while other terms are of special and narrow import, as הַשׁקַי, to view, i.e., bring into the field of vision; שׁוּר, to peep, as from a lurking-place; צָפָה, to watch, as an enemy. In addressing, קָרָא is simply to call out the name of a person spoken to or of; while אָמִר is to say something, the words being added; and דַּבֵּר s to speak, the language not being given; but שַיֵּעִ is to halloo, or cry out for help; צָעִק (less strongly, זָעִק) to shriek from distress or danger; אָנִק to groan in pain or sorrow; and הָלִל merely to talk loud, out of folly or (Piel) in praise. Among pleasant emotions שֹמִח is to be glad simply, as evinced bv a quiet and satisfied demeanor; but עָלִז or עָלִו ֹ is to exult with demonstrative expressions; and רָנִן to triumph with shouts of joy. Among unpleasant emotions יָרֵא is to fear, simply in a general sense; but בָּהִל is to palpitate with sudden alarm (Niph. to' be panic-stricken); פָּחִד is to be frightened by some object of terror; עָרִו ֹis to dread an impending cause of anxiety; חָרִד to shudder on the surface; רָעִד to quake in the interior; while גַּיל and חַיל are merely to spin round under the influence of any violent feeling, whether cringing through fear, writhing in pain, or jumping for joy (especially the former word). כָּשִׁל is to be weak in the ankles, hence, to totter, stumble, etc.; but כַּרֵע is to bend the knees, hence, to bow or fall; while רָבִוֹ is to crouch on the haunches, like an animal in repose. For terms denoting forever, there is עוֹלָם, the vanishing point, whether forward or backward; hence time out of mind, everlastingly; עִד,  the terminus, a fixed point beyond which one cannot pass; and נֶצִח, the goal or shining mark set up as far ahead as one can well see; while תָּמַיד simply denotes continuity Of negatives there is לאֹ, not, the direct denial, οὐκ; אִל, far from it, the softer or deprecative disclaimer, μή; אִיַן, by no means, the peremptory exclusive; and בִּל, not at all, the absolute contradiction, οὐ μή, omnino. So in meteorology, עָב is a misty scud- cloud, so called from obscuring the landscape; עָנָן is a black thunder- cloud, so called from veiling the heavens; and שִׁחִק is a light fleece-cloud, so called from its resemblance to dust diffused in the sky. In brigandage מִאֲרָב is an ambush for a surprise; while סֵתֶר is a covert for security; מִחֲבֵא a hiding-place for secrecy; and סֹךְ or סֻכָּה. merely a lair of wild beast, as screened by interlaced twigs. In orography and geography generally, Hebrew words are used with great precision. SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

II. Vocalization. — Syllabification is very simple in Hebrew, as the letters (all regarded as consonants) are the basis of articulation, and each (with the frequent exception of the qumiescents) has its own vowel (expressed or implied) following. The pronunciation, indeed, is not certain, as Hebrew ceased to be a living tongue after the Babylonian exile; but the sounds of the letters probably survive in the cognate Oriental languages, especially the Arabic, and the vowels supplied by the Masoretes doubtless represent those traditionally handed down to their own times. The latter form an ingenious and apparently complicated but really simple and natural series, of which the written signs are sufficiently distinct and philosophical. The intricate chain of vowel-changes arising in declension is remarkable for its strict conformity to the laws of the vocal organs, and euphony is its fundamental principle. The tone usually rests on the final syllable, as being in general the most significant of grammatical relations, and hence an increment, as carrying the accent, has a constant tendency to shorten the preceding part of the word. The oblique forms of nouns and verbs, including the suffixed pronouns, are thus literally constructed, and the balance is preserved by abbreviating the beginning. In this system two features are of prime and universal influence, namely, the sernivocal character of the gutturals (inducing a series of peculiarities in their pointing), and the necessity of the tone for either a long closed or a short open syllable. By observing the effect of these principles and a few  conventional form-signs, the grammar is wonderfully simplified and clarified.

III. Doctrine of the so-called "Tenses." —

1. The "Praeter" and the "Future." These are now well understood not to denote primarily time, but some other less palpable relation. The absence of a present tense is, we may remark in passing, really logical, for the present moment is but the dividing line between the past and the future, and shifts its position every instant. Ewald suggested the names "Perfect" and "Imperfect" in lieu of Praeter and Future, maintaining that the former denotes a completed act, and the latter an inchoate; and some later grammarians, including Driver, in his ingenious monograph on the subject, have hastily adopted this nomenclature. But besides the inexactness of these terms in themselves, and the liability of confounding such a use with that of the corresponding tenses in English, and still more in Greek and Latin, they will be found to be essentially erroneous. As a matter of fact, in most cases, these two verb-forms indisputably designate the two relations of time anterior and posterior; and the consummation or incipiency of the act or state is comparatively rare as an important shade of the thought. In very many, indeed, a majority of cases, such a rendering would be absurd. For example, that remarkable and pregnant announcement by Jehovah of his divine self-existence, אֶהְיֶה אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר, I will be what I will be (A.V. "I am that I am," Exo 3:14), becomes the flattest nonsense if translated "I begin to be what I begin to be." Surely this cannot be the essential conception of the tense-form in question.

The true distinction is rather. that the Pr-ster marks an actor state as a matter of fact, or something intended to be stated as such, while the Future denotes a conception, or something meant to be so stated. They are respectively the objective and the subjective points of view, the actual and the imaginary, the absolute and the conditional, the indicative and the subjunctive, the independent and the relative. Out of this fundamental distinction grow all the subordinate ones, especially the past, as representing the only real facts, and the future, as being yet but a fancy. A completed act or state, as unfait accompli. of course thus comes in naturally under the Praeter, and an inchoate one, as yet conceptual in part, falls appropriately under the Future. The use of either as "a customary Present"' is but a device of grammarians in order to bring them into accord with the vague signification of that tense in other languages, especially the English.  Continued or permanent action or condition is expressed in Hebrew by the participle, which is in itself always timeless. When a prophet expresses his vaticinations in the Praeter (as notably in Isaiah 53), his conceptions become to him realities. and he states the future as if it were already a fact. When, on the other hand, a historian uses the Future for his narration is (which less frequently occurs), he means thereby to mark the events as viewed in a subordinate relation. either' to his own mind (optative) or to some other events (subjunctive). The term אֶהְיֶה, therefore, in the above passage, indicates God's revealed attributes and character as a theme of human apprehension, while יְהָֹוה signifies his simple self-existence. The repetition "I conceive myself to be what I conceive myself to be," or "I am conceived to be what I am conceived to be," would then, like Pilate's phrase, "What I have written I have written," express the permanence and truthfulness of that conception. God's absolute essence is objectively incommunicable.

It would be easy to exemplify the distinction of the independent and the qualified, as represented by the two so-called" tenses" respectively, Thus, to take the first instances in Genesis: הָיְתָה (Gen 1:2) is not the mere copula, but emphasizes the fact of a change having taken place in the earth; whereas יַהְיֶה and יַצְמִח (Gen 2:5), express the idea that no growth had yet been visible or observed; and יעֲלֶה and וְהַשְׁקָה (Gen 2:6) denote the appearance of a mist, which answered these purposes. So we may render יַפָּרֵד וְהָיָה (Gen 2:10), "was divided as it were, so as to form; יַתְבּשָׁשׁוּ (Gen 2:25), "felt no shame of themselves mutually." Very often in poetry the same thought is expressed in the successive hemistichs in these two forms successively, for the sake of variety; first objectively or absolutely, and then subjectively or relatively; or vice versa. The convenient subterfuge of employing the present tense in English to render these obliterates the nice shade of meaning conveyed by the original, and largely destroys its beauty and effect. A slight paraphrase is needed to bring out the delicate turn of thought. Generally some form of the Subjunctive or Potential will suffice to reproduce the graphic power of the Future. But in many (if not most) cases a real difference is intended. Thus יֶהְגֶּה (Psa 1:2) denotes an interior characteristic of the saint, whereas the preceding Prieters refer to his outward deportment. So even in Psa 2:1-2, רָגְשׁו ּand יוֹסְדוּ state the violence of the wicked as an act, and the parallel Futures as of purpose.

2. "Paragogic" and "Apocopate" Forms. — The most important of the additions included under the former of these terms is the הappended to verbs (sometimes likewise to nouns) for the purpose of prolonging their sound, and thus naturally increasing their emphasis. With the Praeter this is chiefly limited to the third person, as this alone is truly objective. With the Future, on the contrary, it is more appropriate in the first and second persons, giving the former an earnest or thorough significance, and softening the latter into a beseeching tone, an effect likewise produced when used with the Imperative.

Apocopation consists in throwing off in the Future and Imperative the loosely cemented הfinal of verbs, and in dropping out the יcharacteristic of Hiphil. It imparts a curt or peremptory stress to the shortened form, and thus serves to distinguish the jussive from the predictive use of the third person Future. The tendency to apocopation with "vav conversive" in the Future arises from it bringing the tone forward, in consequence of the close connection with the preceding context, and especially, it would seem, on account of the particle, which (as we shall see presently) that form appears to have originally included.

3. "Vav Conversive." — This peculiarity, which the Hebrew alone of all the Shemitic tongues exhibits, has been a sore puzzle to linguists, and only in recent times has received an intelligible explanation. It will serve as a crucial test of the foregoing theory of the tense meanings. Its most usual and decided form, namely, with the Future, demands our first attention. The fact that in this case the vav is pointed with Pattach and the Dagesh shows the assimilation of some older consonant; in fact, there seems to have been originally some particle like an adverb more closely pointing the sequence than the simple "vav conjunctive" would have done, very much like the puerile phrase of simple story-tellers, who string each incident to the preceding by "and then." The Hebrew historian sets out with a genuine Praeter (either expressed or implied), to indicate that he is stating matters of fact, but he continues his narrative with "vav conversive " and a Future to denote a consecutive series,: the latter member members of which he conceives and represents as depending upon the others. It is this dependent and conceptual relation that requires a Future. The incidents — are all facts — (as the particle implied in the pointing intimates), but not isolated or independent tacts. They may or they may not be logically or causally connected, but they are viewed by the writer as historically following each  other, and he designedly overlooks anything between them. After completing such a series, more or less extended, the writer begins a fresh series with another Praeter, and continues it for awhile with "vav conversive" again. The whole history is thus divided off in a kind of paragraph style, and the close continuity of the subordinate statements is maintained in each paragraph. If he had used Praeters with or without "vav connective" throughout, the incidents would have been merely the disjecta membra of history, without any positive bond of unity. The style would have been, as we say, comparatively incoherent. The explanation of "vav conversive" with the Praeter is more difficult. From the absence of any special pointing, and the less frequency of its use, we are entitled to infer its comparative unimportance. In fact, it seems to be a kind of imitation, by way of converse, of the "vav conversive" of the Future. A writer sets out with a Future (in form or effect), and continues the conceptual series by the Preeter; to indicate that he has now mentally transported himself into the region of fancy, and is describing things from that vivid impression. It thus resembles the "historic present” of many languages, in which a narrator views the scenes recounted as if actually taking place under his eye.

It can now be readily seen, in the light of the above explanation of these two "tenses” how in poetical passages (and all, Hebrew is more or less poetical), the Praeter and the Future (either simple or transformed by vav) may often be beautifully interchanged, according as the writer, for variety's sake, wishes to represent the same scene in adjoining hemistichs as either actual or conceptual; and this closer or more loose method of consecution, by means of simple vav or vav conversive, gives him a wider and nicer play of conception and expression. These are among the delicate shades of meaning which it is almost impossible to transfer to a version. For example, David says (Psa 3:6), "To Jehovah should I call (אֶקְרָא) [as I often have done], then he has heard me (וִיִּעֲנְנַי) ;" i.e., in plain prose, Whenever I call he hears me, but in poetic fervor, When I think of myself as calling, I immediately know myself as heard.

IV. Agglutinative Modes of Declension and Construction. —

1. By Prefixes. — Of these ב, ה, ו, כ, and ל are strictly inseparable, but like מ and שׁ, they probably represent original particles, as the Arabic article el-(which assimilates, as by a Dagesh, with the "solar letters") indicates. Whether the characteristic נ of Niphal, and the ה of its infinitive  as well as of Hiphil, Hophal, etc., had a similar origin is difficult to decide. The preformatives of the Future may be more readily traced to the full forms of the personal pronouns.

2. By Sufformatives and Affixes. — The personal endings of the tenses, as well as the suffixes, are clearly fragments, somewhat modified, of the pronouns which they represent. The דּ directive is probably an enclitic fragment of the article as a demonstrative. The feminine ending ה was a softened form, like ה paragogic. The old constructive termination of masculine nouns was for both numbers, and the dual and plural absolute were intensive additions, like the decimal increase of the cardinal numbers. The frequent interchange of gender in the plural (notably in נָשַׁים, אָבות, etc.) proves that this was a later or comparatively unimportant variation. The feminine, as the weaker, takes the place of the neuter in Greek and Latin to express the abstract.

3. By Juxtaposition. — Here we may enumerate three classes of amalgamation:

(a) compounds, which are rare in Hebrew, except: in proper names, and in cases of union by Makkeph (corresponding to our hyphen only in removing the principal tone);

(b) ellipsis, by which connecting particles are dropped as unnecessary, especially in the terse style of poetry; and

(c) interchange of the various parts of speech, which, as in English, allows nouns, particles, etc., to be freely used as adjectives, adverbs, etc., and conversely.

V. Emphatic Position of Words. — Here the natural order, in contradistinction from the artificial arrangement of the Latin, and the purely grammatical of the English prevails. As with foreigners and children speaking a new language, the most important words come first (of course, after connectives, negatives, interrogatives, etc., which qualify the whole clause). Hence the predicate, as being of greater extension, precedes, and the subject or the adjective, which are but an accident of the verb or the noun, follows; except when special emphasis requires a different position, or when poetry in the parallel hemistichs calls for a pleasing variety. In this respect the Hebrew more closely resembles the Greek, which often resorts to the same expedient of emphasizing by a position near the head of the  clause, like our "nominative independent." These nice shades of emphasis are difficult to render smoothly and adequately, but it might be done far more accurately than in our Authorized Version, which is habitually negligent in this respect. For the prosodiac arrangement, SEE POETRY, HEBREW.

## Hebrew Of The Hebrews[[@Headword:Hebrew Of The Hebrews]]

             (Ε᾿βραῖος ἐξ ῾Εβραίων, emphatically a Hebrew, one who was so by both parents, and that by a long series of ancestors, without admixture of Gentile or even proselyte blood. In this way the Hebrews formed a superlative of intensity-as “holy of holies,” i.e. the most holy place; “vanity of vanities,” i.e. exceedingly vain; “heaven of heavens,” i.e. the highest heaven. Hence Paul, when speaking of the ground of precedence which he might claim above the false teachers at Philippi, says that “he is a Hebrew of the Hebrews” (Php 3:5), i.e. one of full Hebrew descent, and acquainted with the Hebrew language. Although he was born at Tarsus, he was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel in Jerusalem (Act 22:3). To this same fact he seems to appeal again in a similar case, “Are they Hebrews? so am I” (2Co 11:22). He was a genuine Hebrew man in every important respect (Act 21:39-40).

## Hebrew Version Of The New Testament[[@Headword:Hebrew Version Of The New Testament]]

             If we may believe tradition, translations of parts of the New Test. already existed at a very early period. But as there is no certain information concerning such a version into the language of the Old-Test. Scriptures, the history of this work can only be traced back to the year 1537, when the gospel of Matthew was published in Hebrew by Sebastian Munster (q.v.). Great attention was excited by this book at the time of its appearance, on account of an ancient tradition which prevailed in the Church, that Matthew originally wrote his gospel in Hebrew. It was very evident, however, that Munster's publication, תורת המשיח, had no pretension to be regarded as the text of the sacred original, nor even as an ancient version, for the language in which it was written was not the SyroChaldaic, current in Palestine at the time of our Lord, but the rabbinical Hebrew in use among the Jews of the 12th century.

It was, moreover, full of solecisms and barbarisms, and bore indubitable marks of having been translated either directly from the Vulgate, or from an Italian version thereof. In an apology for this work, dedicated to Henry VIII of England, Munster states that the MS. from which he printed was defective in several passages, and that he was compelled to supply the omissions as best he could from his own resources. It passed through several editions, and a Hebrew version of the epistle to the Hebrews was appended to it. Another edition of the same translation of Matthew, but printed from a more complete and correct MS. (Recens Judceorum Penetralibus Erutum), brought for the purpose from Italy, was published by Tillet, bishop of St. Brieux, at Paris, in 1555, with a Latin version by Mercer. (Ad Vulgatam quoad Fieri Potuit Accomodata). The latter was published again by Dr. Herbst, under the title, Des Schemtob ben-Schaphrnut hebr. Uebersetzung des Evang. Matthaei nach dei Drucken des S. Munster und J. du Tillet-Mercier (Gottingen, 1879). In this edition the editor proves that the author of this version was none else than Shem-Tob Isaac ben-Schaphrut (q.v.), who translated this gospel for polemical purposes. Passing over the other translations of parts of the gospels, we mention the version of the four gospels into Biblical Hebrew,  made by Giovanni Batista Giona (q.v.), a converted Jew, and professor of Hebrew at Rome. He dedicated it to pope Clement IX, and it was published at Rome in 1668, at the expense of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide. But this translation, as professor Delitzsch remarks, fuilfilled less than might be expected from a man born at Safet, in Upper Galilee, who, besides, was a Jewish scholar. The first translation of the entire New Test. into Hebrew was made by Elias Hutter (q.v.), and published at Nuremberg in 1600 in his Polyglot Test.

According to the judgment of professor Delitzsch, it is of great value, and is still worth consulting, because in many places it is very correct. A revised edition was published in London in 1661, under the superintendence of W. Robertson; but the greater part of this edition was consumed in the fire of London in 1666. A Corrected New Testament in Hebrew was published at London in 1798 by the Reverend R. Caddock, but it proved not to be acceptable to the Jews, for whose benefit it was published, and a new translation became a desideratum. In the meantime Dr. Buchanan brought from India a translation of the New Test., executed in Travancore, among the Jews of that country, the translator being a learned Jew. The MS. was written in the small rabbinical or Jerusalem character; the style was elegant and flowing, and tolerably faithful to the text. Dr. Buchanan deposited the MS. in the university library at Cambridge, after it had been transcribed by Mr. Yeates, of Cambridge, into the square Hebrew character. A copy was presented to the London Society for the Conversion of the Jews, and it was at one time thought that it would greatly promote the object of the society to print and circulate the production of a Jew, evidently master of his own ancient language.

After much deliberation, however, a more strictly literal translation was still deemed desirable, and accordingly, in 1816, Mr. Frey and other learned He braists executed, under the patronage of the Jews' Society, a new edition of the New Test. In 1818 this new edition left the society's press, and was speedily followed by another issue. The British and Foreign Bible Society assisted materially in this work by purchasing at various times to a large amount. After this version had been in circulation for some time, complaints from Hebrew readers in various parts of the world were laid before the Jews' Society Committee, concerning the rendering of certain passages. To insure minute accuracy, the committee- determined on a thorough revision.

They consulted some of the most eminent men in Europe, and professor Gesenius was recommended to them as the first Hebrew scholar of the age. To him, therefore, the version was confided, with a request of a critique upon it, and suggestions as to  alterations. Gesenius went carefully through the work as far as the Acts, and likewise through the book of Revelation. Numerous other engagements, however, compelled him to resign the task. The work, together with Gesenius's notes, was then transferred by the Jews' Committee to Dr. Joachim Neumann (q.v.), a converted Hebrew, lecturer on Hebrew at the University of Breslau. Dr. Neumann commenced thle work anew, and his revision, when completed, was acknowledged to bear the stamp of diligence, accuracy, zeal, and profound scholarship. The limited funds of the society, however, prevented the publication of this valuable' revision, and thus it remained for some time in MS. At this very period, the publisher of the Polyglot Bible (Mr. Bagster), requiring a Hebrew version of the New Test. for the Polyglot, applied to the Jews' Society for the critical emendations they had been amassing: the important notes of Gesenius and Neumann were in consequence handed to Mr. Bagster, and were incorporated in the new version executed for the Polyglot by Mr. Greenfield, and published in 1831.

In comparing this edition of Greenfield with the second of the Jews' Society, published in 1821, the student will easily perceive that there has not been made a very great progress in the work of translation, and that neither could stand the test of criticism. The Jews' Society resolved, therefore, on a revision of the edition of 1821. A committee, consisting of Dr. M'Caul, the Reverend M.S. Alexander (afterwards bishop of Jerusalem), the Reverend J.C. Reichardt, and Mr. S. Hoga (the well-known translator of Bunyans's Pilgrim's Progress into Hebrew), was intrusted with the revision, which was commenced November 14, 1836, and finished February 8, 1838. The printing was commenced in December 1837, and was finished in September 1838. Duly considering and appreciating the labors of their predecessors, they endeavored to conform the Hebrew text as closely as possible to the Greek, following in most dubious cases the reading of the authorized English version; and were much pleased to find that, in very many cases, even the collocation of the Greek words furnished the best and most elegant collocation of the Hebrew.

They diligently consulted the Syriac, Vulgate, German, Dutch, and French versions, but in difficulties were generally guided by the Syriac. Their desire was, as far as possible, to furnish a literal translation, remembering that it was the word of the living God which they wished to communicate. They arrived at purity of style, but always preferred perspicuity to elegance. When the revision was finished, the MS. was read through by each person privately, and then by all together, confronting it again with the Greek text. Some alterations  were then suggested, and even in the reading of the proof-sheets various little amendments were made. This new edition of 1838, although a great improvement upon the former, proved by no means to be the ultimatum. In the year 1856 a new revision of the work was decided upon, and to the Reverend C. Reichardt (q.v.), together with Dr. R. Biesenthal, the task of revision was given.

The edition of 1838 was carefully examined, and April 12, 1865, the work was completed. In 1866 the new. edition, with vowels and accents, was published, which redounds to the honor of both revisers and the society. But this edition, in spite of the great amount of labor bestowed and the money spent upon it, proved itself not to be the complete desideratum, especially in view of the criticism concerning the text as well as the accents, which professor Delitzsch published in his Hebrew edition of St. Paul's epistle to the Romans. Considerations like these, especially the desire of realizing a hope cherished for about forty years, induced professor Delitzsch to undertake a new version of the New Test., on the basis of the Codex Sinaiticus. This edition was published by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1877. In 1878 professor Delitzsch published a second edition of his translation, taking for his basis the Textus Receptus of the Elzevir edition of 1624, respecting the exigencies of textual criticism in all the more important cases by bracketed readings. Thus a single parenthesis, (), indicated a passage with weak support, although from an early date; the same with a star, (\*), indicated an important varying reading; a double parenthesis, (()), indicated a late addition to the text; and brackets, [ , indicated words well supported by ancient testimony, but lacking in the received text. This edition also sold rapidly, and the third edition, again revised, appeared in 1880, with a slightly larger page and type. A fourth edition was published in 1881, and so also a in 1883. It should be observed that during all this time the translator had the constant help of many learned friends, especially of Dr. J.H.R. Biesenthal, who had traversed the same ground himself, and of the author of the work on Hebrew tenses, Reverend S.R. Driver of Oxford. See Delitzsch, The Hebrew New Testament of the British and Foreign Bible Society (Leipsic, 1883). (B.P.)

## Hebrews, The[[@Headword:Hebrews, The]]

             (Act 6:1), i.e. Hebrew-speaking Jews, in contrast with those speaking the Greek language. SEE HELLENIST.

## Hebrews, the Epistle to the[[@Headword:Hebrews, the Epistle to the]]

             the last of the Pauline Epistles, according to the arrangement of the Received Text of the New Testament.

I. Its Canonicity. — The universal Church, by allowing it a place among the holy Scriptures, acknowledges that there is nothing in its contents inconsistent with the rest of the Bible. But the peculiar position which is assigned to it among the epistles shows a trace of doubts as to its authorship or canonical authority, two points which were blended together in primitive times. Has it, then, a just claim to be received by us as a portion of that Bible which contains the rule of our faith and the rule of our practice, laid down by Christ and his apostles? Was it regarded as such by the primitive Church, to whose clearly expressed judgment in this matter all later generations of Christians agree to defer? Of course, if we possessed a declaration by an inspired apostle that this epistle is canonical, all discussion would be superfluous. But the interpretation (by F. Spanheim and later writers) of 2Pe 3:15 as a distinct reference to Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews seems scarcely tenable. For, if the “you” whom Peter addresses be all Christians (see 2Pe 1:1), the reference must not be limited to the Epistle to the Hebrews: or if it include only (see 2Pe 3:1) the Jews named in 1Pe 1:1, there may be special reference to the Galatians (Gal 6:7-9) and Ephesians (Eph 2:3-5), but not to the Hebrews. Was it, then, received and transmitted as canonical by the immediate successors of the apostles?

In the Western Church this book underwent a somewhat singular treatment. The most important witness here, Clement of Rome (A.D. 70 or 95) refers to this epistle in the same way as, and more frequently than, to any other canonical book. It seems to have been “‘wholly transfused,” says Mr. Westcott (On the Canon, p. 32), into Clement's mind. After his time it seems to have come under some doubt or suspicion in the West. It is not cited or referred to by any of the earlier Latin fathers except Tertullian, who ascribes it to Barnabas, and says it was “receptior apud ecclesias illo apocrvpho pastore moschorum,” that is, the pastor of Hermas (De Pudicit. c. 20). Irenaeus is said by Eusebius to have made quotations from it in a work now lost (Hist. Eccl 5, 26), but he did not receive it as of Pauline authorship (Phot. Biblioth. Cod. 252, p. 904, cited by Lardneer, 2, 165); and as Eusebius connects the Wisdom of Solomon with the Epistle to the Hebrews, as cited by Irenaeus, it is probable the latter viewed the two as on the same footing. It is omitted by Caius, who only reckons thirteen Pauline epistles (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 6, 26; Jerome, De Vir. illust. c. 59); Hippolytus expressly declares it not to be Paul's (Phot. p, 301); it is omitted in the Muratori fragment; and by the Roman Church generally it  seems to have been suspected (Euseb. H. E. 3, 3; 6:20). Victorinus has one or two passages which look like quotations from it, but he does not mention it, and certainly did not receive it as the work of Paul (Lardleer, 3, 300). In the 4th century it began to be more generally received. Lactantius, in the beginning of the century, apparently borrows from it; Hilary of Poictiers, Lucifer of Cagliari, Faustinus, and Marcellinus (who cites it as divina Scriptura); Victorinus of Rome, Ambrose, Philaster (though admitting that some rejected the epistle); Gaudentius, Jerome, and Augustine, in the latter half and the end of the century, attest its canonicity, and generally its Pauline origin.

In the Eastern churches it was much more generally, and from an earlier date, received. It is doubtful whether any citation from it is made by Justin Martyr, though in one or two passages of his writings he seems to have had it in his eye. Clement of Alexandria held it to be Paul's, originally written by him in Hebrew, and translated by Luke (Eusebius, H. E. 6, 14). Origen wrote homilies on this epistle; he frequently refers to it as canonical, and as the work of Paul, and he tells us he had intended to write a treatise to prove this (Lardner, 2, 472 sq.). Origen further attests that the ancients handed it do-n as Paul's (Euseb. H. E. 6, 25), by which, though he cannot be understood as intending to say that it had never been questioned by any of those who had lived before him, we must understand him at least to affirm that in the Church of Alexandria it had from the earliest period been received. Dionysus of Alexandria acknowledged it as part of sacred Scripture, and as written by Paul. By Basil, the Gregories, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Chrysostom, and all the Greeks, as Jerome attests, it was received. Eusebius, though he ranks it in one place among the ἀντιλεγόμενα, in deference to the doubts entertained respecting it in the Roman Church, nevertheless asserts its apostolic authority, and includes it among the books generally received by the churches. In public documents of the Eastern Church also, such as the Epistle of the Synod at Antioch, the Apostolical Constitutions, the Catalogue of the Council, its claims are recognized. In the Syrian churches it was received; it is found in the Peshito version; it is quoted by Ephrem as Paul's; and it is included among the canonical Scriptures in the catalogue of Ebedjesu (Lardner, 4:430, 440). To this uniform testimony there is nothing to oppose, unless we accept the somewhat dubious assertion of Jerome that it was rejected by the heretical teacher Basilides (Proem. in Ep. ad Tit.; but compare Lardner, 9:305).  At the end of the 4th century, Jerome, the most learned and critical of the Latin fathers, reviewed the conflicting opinions as to the authority of this epistle. He considered that the prevailing, though not universal view of the Latin churches was of less weight than the view not only of ancient writers, but also of all the Greek and all the Eastern churches, where the epistle was received as canonical and read daily; and he pronounced a decided opinion in favor of its authority. The great contemporary light of North Africa, St. Augustine, held a similar opinion. And after the declaration of these two eminent men, the Latin churches united with the East in receiving the epistle. The third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, and a decretal of pope Innocent, A.D. 416, gave a final confirmation to their decision.

Such was the course and the end of the only considerable opposition which has been made to the canonical authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Its origin has not been ascertained. Some critics have conjectured that the Montanist or the Novatian controversy instigated, and that the Arian controversy dissipated so much opposition as proceeded from orthodox Christians. The references to Paul in the Clementine Homilies have led other critics to the startling theory that orthodox Christians at Rome, in the middle of the 2nd century, commonly regarded and described Paul as an enemy of the faith-a theory which, if it were established, would be a much stranger fact than the rejection of the least accredited of the epistles that bear the apostle's name. But perhaps it is more probable that that jealous care with which the Church everywhere, in the 2nd century, had learned to scrutinize all books claiming canonical authority, misled, in this instance, the churches of North Africa and Rome. For to them this epistle was an anonymous writing, unlike an epistle in its opening, unlike a treatise in its end, differing in its style from every apostolic epistle, abounding in arguments and appealing to sentiments which were always foreign to the Gentile, and growing less familiar to the Jewish mind. So they went a step beyond the church of Alexandria, which, while doubting the authorship of this epistle, always acknowledged its authority. The church of Jerusalem, as the original receiver of the epistle, was the depository of that oral testimony on which both its authorship and canonical authority rested, and was the fountainhead of information which satisfied the Eastern and Greek churches. But the church of Jerusalem was early hidden in exile and obscurity. And Palestine, after the destruction of Jerusalem, became unknown ground to that class of “dwellers in Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome,” who once maintained close religious intercourse with  it. All these considerations may help to account for the fact that the Latin churches hesitated to receive an epistle, the credentials of which, from peculiar circumstances, were originally imperfect, and had become inaccessible to them when their version of Scripture was in process of formation, until religious intercourse between East and West again grew frequent and intimate in the 4th century.

Cardinal Cajetan, the opponent of Luther, was the first to disturb the tradition of a thousand years, and to deny the authority of this epistle. Erasmus, Calvin, and Beza questioned only its authorship. The bolder spirit of Luther, unable to perceive its agreement with Paul's doctrine, pronounced it to be the work of some disciple of the apostle, who had built not only gold, silver, and precious stones, but also wood, hay, and stubble upon his master's foundation. And whereas the Greek Church in the 4th century gave it sometimes the tenth place, or at other times, as it now does, and as the Syrian, Roman, and English churches do, the fourteenth place among the epistles of Paul, Luther, when he printed his version of the Bible, separated this book from Paul's epistles, and placed it with the epistles of James and Jude, next before the Revelation; indicating by this change of order his opinion that the four relegated books are of less importance and less authority than the rest of the New Testament. His opinion found some promoters, but it has not been adopted in any confession of the Lutheran Church.

The canonical authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews is, then, secure, so far as it can be established by the tradition of Christian churches. The doubts which affected it were admitted in remote places, or in the failure of knowledge, or under the pressure of times of intellectual excitement; and they have disappeared before full information and calm judgment.

II. Authorship. — From the above testimonies it will be perceived that the assertion of the canonicity of this book is mostly identified with the assertion of its Pauline authorship. The former of these positions does not, it is true, necessarily depend upon the latter, for a book may be canonical, yet not be the production of any individual whose name we know; but, as the case stands, the external evidence for the canonicity of the book is so nearly commensurate with that for the Pauline authorship of the book that we cannot make use of the one unless we admit the other. This gives immense importance to the question on which we now enter; for if it could  be shown that this epistle is not Paul's, the entire historical evidence for its canonicity must be laid aside as incredible.

1. History of Opinion on this Subject. — In this epistle the superscription, the ordinary source of information, is wanting. Its omission has been accounted for, since the days of Clement of Alexandria (apud Euseb. H. E, 6, 14) and Chrysostom by supposing that Paul withheld his name lest the sight of it should repel any Jewish Christians who might still regard him rather as an enemy of the law (Act 21:21) than as a benefactor to their nation (Act 24:17). Pantaenus, or some other predecessor of Clement, adds that Paul would not write to the Jews as an apostle because he regarded the Lord himself as their apostle (see the remarkable expression, Heb 3:1, twice quoted by Justin Martyr, Apol. 1, 12, 63).

It was the custom of the earliest fathers to quote passages of Scripture without naming the writer or the book which supplied them. But there is no reason to doubt that at first, everywhere, except in North Africa, Paul was regarded as the author. “Among the Greek fathers,” says Olshausen (Opuscula, p. 95), “no one is named either in Egypt, or in Syria, Palestine, Asia, or Greece, who is opposed to the opinion that this epistle proceeds from Paul.” The Alexandrian fathers, whether guided by tradition or by critical discernment, are the earliest to note the discrepancy of style between this epistle and the other thirteen. They received it in the same sense that the speech in Act 22:1-21 is received as Paul's. Clement ascribed to Luke the translation of the epistle into Greek from a Hebrew original of Paul. Origen, embracing the opinion of those who, he says, preceded him, believed that the thoughts were Paul's, the language and composition Luke's or Clement's of Rome. Tertullian, knowing nothing of any connection of Paul with the epistle, names Barnabas as the reputed author according to the North African tradition, which in the time of Augustine had taken the less definite shape of a denial by some that the epistle was Paul's, and in the time of Isidore of Seville appears as a Latin opinion (founded on the dissonance of style) that it was written by Barnabas or Clement. At Rome Clement was silent as to the author of this as of the other epistles which he quoted; and the writers who follow him, down to the middle of the 4th century, only touch on the point to deny that the epistle is Paul's.

The view of the Alexandrian fathers, a middle point between the Eastern and Western traditions, won its way in the Church. It was adopted as the  most probable opinion by Eusebius (Blunt, On the right Use of the early Fathers, p. 439-444); and its gradual reception may have led to the silent transfer, which was made about his time, of this epistle from the tenth place in the Greek Canon to the fourteenth, at the end of Paul's epistles, and before those of other apostles. This place it held everywhere till the time of Luther; as if to indicate the deliberate and final acquiescence of the universal Church in the opinion that it is one of the works of Paul, but not in the same full sense as the other ten epistles, addressed to particular churches.

In the last three centuries every word and phrase in the epistle have been scrutinized with the most exact care for historical and grammatical evidence as to the authorship. The conclusions of individual inquirers are very diverse, but the result has not been any considerable disturbance of the ancient tradition. No new kind of difficulty has been discovered; no hypothesis open to fewer objections than the tradition has been devised. The laborious work of the Rev. C. Forster (The Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews), which is a storehouse of grammatical evidence, advocates the opinion that Paul was the author of the language as well as the thoughts of the epistle. Professor Stuart, in the Introduction to his Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, discusses the internal evidence at great length, and agrees in opinion with Mr. Forster. Dr. C. Wordsworth (On the Canon of the Scriptures, Lect. 9) leans to the same conclusion. Dr. S. Davidson, in his Introduction to the New Testament, gives a very careful and minute summary of the arguments of all the principal modern critics who reason upon the internal evidence, and concludes, in substantial agreement with the Alexandrian tradition, that Paul was the author of the epistle, and that, as regards its phraseology and style, Luke co-operated with him in making it what it now appears. The tendency of opinion in Germany has been to ascribe the epistle to some other author than Paul. ‘Luther's conjecture that Apollos was the author has been widely adopted by Le Clerc, Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, Bunsen, Alford, and others. Barnabas has been named by Wieseler, Thiersch, and others. Luke by Grotius. Silas by others. Neander attributes it to “some apostolic man” of the Pauline school, whose training and method of stating doctrinal truth differed from Paul's. The distinguished name of H. Ewald has been given recently to the hypothesis (partly anticipated by Wetstein) that it was written neither by Paul nor to the Hebrews, but by some Jewish  teacher residing at Jerusalem to a church in some important Italian town, which is supposed to have sent a deputation to Palestine.

2. Arguments for and against the different Authors proposed, other than the Apostle Paul. — Most of these guesses are quite destitute of historical evidence and require the support of imaginary facts to place them on a seeming equality with the traditionary account. They cannot be said to rise out of the region of possibility into that of probability, but they are such as any man of leisure and learning might multiply till they include every name in the limited list that we possess of Paul's contemporaries.

(1.) Silas. — The claims of this companion of Paul to the authorship of one epistle find no support from the testimony of antiquity. The suggestion of them is entirely modern, having been first advanced by Bihme in the introduction to his commentary on this epistle (Lips. 1825), and by Mynster in the Studien und Kritiken, 2, 344; but they have adduced nothing in support of these claims which might not with equal plausibility have been urged on behalf of any other of the apostle's companions.

(2.) Clement of Rome. — Origen tells us that the tradition which had reached him was that some held this epistle to have been written by Clement, bishop of Rome, while others said it was written by Luke the evangelist (ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 6, 25). Erasmus espoused the claims of Clement, and Calvin inclined to the same view. Some evidence in favor of this hypothesis has been thought to be supplied by the resemblance of some passages in Clement's first epistle to the Corinthians to passages in one epistle; but these have much more the appearance of quotations from the former, or reminiscences of it on the part of the author of the latter, than such similarities of thought and expression as would indicate a community of authorship for the two. A close comparison of the one with the other leaves the impression very strongly that they are the productions of different minds; neither in style nor in the general cast of thought is there any prevailing affinity between them. Clement also was in all probability a convert from heathenism, whereas the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was undoubtedly by birth and education a Jew. Perhaps what Origen records means nothing more than that Clement or Luke acted as the party who reduced the epistle to writing, leaving the question of the authorship, properly so called, untouched. His whole statement is-” not heedlessly (οὐκ εἰκῇ) had the ancients handed it down as Paul's; but who wrote the epistle God truly knows. But the story which has come down to us from  some is, that Clement, who was bishop of Rome, wrote the epistle; from others, that it was Luke who wrote the Gospel and the Acts.” Jerome also, in referring to the tradition, explains it thus — ” quem [Clementem] aiunt ipsi adjunctum sententias Pauli proprio ordinasse et ornasse sermone” (De Viris illust. c. 5).

(3.) Luke. — The claims of Luke apparently rise a degree higher from the circumstance that, besides being named by Origen and Jerome as dividing with Clement the honors which, as these writers testify, were in certain quarters assigned to the latter, there is a character of similarity with respect to language and style between this epistle and the acknowledged productions of the evangelist. This has led several eminent scholars to adopt the hypothesis that, while the thoughts may be Paul's, the composition is Luke's. But against this conclusion the following considerations may be urged.

1. Where there is no other evidence, or at least none of any weight, in favor of identity of authorship, mere general similarity of style cannot be allowed to possess much force. Luke, however, is known to have been in such a connection with Paul as to justify in some sort the assumption of his having written on the apostle's behalf.

2. Assuming the epistle to be the production of Paul, it is easy to account for the resemblance of its style to that of Luke, from the fact that Luke was for so many years the companion and disciple of Paul; for it is well known that when persons for a long time associate closely with each other, and especially when one of the parties is an individual of powerful intellect whose forms of thought and modes of speech imperceptibly impress themselves on those with whom he associates, they fall insensibly into a similarity of tone and style both of speaking and writing (so Chrysostom, Hom. iv in Matthew, quoted by Forster, Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 648). The resemblances, however, in this case (see them pointed out by Alford, vol. 3, passim) are too striking and minute to be fully explained in this general manner.

3. It is not in the Epistle to the Hebrews alone that a resemblance to the style of Luke may be detected: the same feature pervades all Paul's epistles, especially those of a later date, as has frequently been observed by critics. In fine, while there are such resemblances of style, etc., as have been referred to between this epistle and the writings of  Luke, there are differences of a nature so weighty as completely to overbalance these resemblances, and authorize the conclusion that the author of the latter could not also be the author of the former. Both Stuart (Comment. 1, 333, London, 1828) and Eichhorn (Einleit. 3, 465) justly lay stress on the greater predominance of Jewish feelings in the Epistle to the Hebrews than in any of Luke's writings, and still more on the marked familiarity with the peculiarities of the Jewish schools displayed by the writer of the epistle, but of which no traces are apparent in any of the writings of the evangelist. Both writings display the combined influence of the Palestinian and the Hellenistic character on the part of their author; but in the Epistle to the Hebrews the former so decidedly predominates over the latter, while the reverse is the case with the writings of Luke, that it seems to the last degree improbable that the same person could have written both. Luke, moreover, was a convert from heathenism, whereas the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was evidently a Jew. It appears, therefore, that for the theory which ascribes the composition of this epistle to Luke as of his own dictation, there is no evidence of any kind which will bear examination, but, on the contrary, not a little against it.

4. Nevertheless, the association of Luke with Paul, and the many marked coincidences between Luke's phraseology and that of this epistle, give a strong color of probability to the supposition that the evangelist had something to do with its authorship, doubtless as assistant or under another's authority; for it cannot be presumed that he would have personally assumed the responsibility of a work like this, evidently conceived, written, and sent out as of apostolical authority, and with the personal allusions to the history apparently of Paul which we find in the final salutations. But if Luke were joint author with Paul, what share in the composition is to be assigned to him? This question has been asked by those who regard joint authorship as an impossibility, and ascribe the epistle to some other writer than Paul. Perhaps it is not easy, certainly it is not necessary, to find an answer which would satisfy or silence persons who pursue a historical inquiry into the region of conjecture. Who shall define the exact responsibility of Timothy, or Silvanus, or Sosthenes, in those seven epistles which Paul inscribes with some of their names conjointly with his own? To what extent does Mark's language clothe the inspired recollections of Peter, which, according to ancient tradition, are recorded in the second  gospel? Or, to take the acknowledged writings of Luke himself — “what is the share of the eye-witnesses and ministers of the word” (Luk 1:2), or what is the share of Paul himself in that gospel which some persons, not without countenance from tradition, conjecture that Luke wrote under his master's eye in the prison at Caesarea; or who shall assign to the follower and the master their portions respectively in those seven characteristic speeches at Antioch, Lystra, Athens, Miletus, Jerusalem, and Caesarea? If Luke wrote down Paul's Gospel, and condensed his missionary speeches, may he not have afterwards taken a more important share in the composition of this epistle?

(4.) Barnabas. — The hypothesis which claims the authorship of this epistle for Barnabas has in its support the testimony of Tertullian (De Pudicitia, c. 20), with whom, as we learn from Jerome (Epist. 129, ad Dardanum), several (plerique) among the Latins concurred. For this opinion Tertullian, in the passage referred to, assigns no reasons, and Jerome appears to have treated it as a mere conjecture resting upon Tertullian's authority alone; for, in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers (c. 5), he refers to this opinion as one “juxta Tertullianum,” whilst he says that the opinion that Luke was the author was one “juxta quosdam.” Hug is of opinion (Introd. p. 596, Fosdick's transl.) that in this passage we have not Tertullian's own view so much as a concession on his part to those whom he was opposing, and who, because of the very passage he is about to quote from the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb 6:4-8), were inclined to reject the claims of that epistle to be esteemed the production of Paul. This conjecture is of use, as it tends to show that Tertullian might have another reason for ascribing this epistle to Barnabas than his total ignorance that it had ever been imputed to Paul, as has been confidently inferred by several writers from the fact that it was obviously to the interest of his argument to uphold the Pauline origin of this epistle had he been aware of it. In recent times the ablest defender of this hypothesis is Ullmann, who has devoted to it an article in the first volume of his journal, the Studien und Kritiken; but the evidence he adduces in favor of it is very feeble. After enlarging on the testimony of Tertullian, he proceeds to the internal evidence in favor of Barnabas; but of the six reasons he assigns for ascribing the epistle to him, none possesses any force. The first, viz. the traces in the epistle of an Alexandrian education on the part of the author, supposing it granted, would not apply particularly to Barnabas, who was a native of Cyprus, and who, though Ullmann says “he had perhaps been in  Alexandria,” for aught we know had never seen that seat of allegorical learning. The second, viz. that Barnabas, being a Levite, was more likely, on that account, to understand the Jewish ritual, as we see the author of this epistle did, is of no weight, for there is nothing stated in the epistle on that head which any intelligent Jew might not have known, whether a Levite or not. The third, viz. that what the author of this epistle says concerning the law, divine revelation, faith, etc., is very Pauline, and such as we might expect from a companion of Paul, such as Barnabas was; the fourth, viz. that the tenor of the epistle is worthy such a man as Barnabas; the fifth, viz. that the writer of this epistle speaks of the Savior very frequently by the appellation ο ‘Ιοᾷεο, which Dr. Ullmann thinks indicates that the writer must have known our Lord during his personal ministry, which was probably the case with Barnabas; and the sixth, viz. that the names of persons mentioned in this epistle are names which Barnabas might have referred to had he written it-are reasons such as it would be idle to refute, and such as fill us with surprise that a man of Ullmann's learning and vigor should have gravely adduced them. With regard to the fifth also, Olshausen has justly observed (Opusc. Theologica, p. 115) that if it were certain that Barnabas had enjoyed the advantage of our Lord's personal ministry, it would clearly prove that he was not the author of this epistle, for the latter distinctly classes himself with those by whom this advantage had not been enjoyed (ch. 2, 3). Stuart and some others have laid great stress on the contrast afforded by this epistle to the extant epistle which passes under the name of Barnabas, with respect to style, tone, and general character, as supplying indubitable evidence that the former is the production of a different and a far superior mind. Of this there can be no question, and, were we quite certain that the epistle ascribed to Barnabas was really his production, the argument would be conclusive. But, though some very distinguished names may be cited in support of its authenticity, the greater weight, both of authority and evidence, is against it. SEE BARNABAS, EPISTLE OF. The total absence of any reason in favor of imputing the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews to Barnabas affords sufficient ground for rejecting this hypothesis without our attempting to adduce dubious and uncertain reasons against it.

(5.) Some Alexandrian Christian. — This hypothesis rests on certain features of the epistle which are said to betray Alexandrian culture, habits, and modes of thought on the part of the writer. These have been much insisted upon by Eichhorn, Schulz, Bleek, and others: but they are not  such, we think, as carry with them the weight which these writers have allowed to them. The standard of comparison by which the supposed Alexandrian tone of this epistle is evinced is supplied by the writings of Philo, between which and this epistle it is affirmed that there is so close a resemblance that it can be accounted for only on the supposition that the author of the latter was, like Philo, an Alexandrian Jew. Now, before this reasoning can be so much as looked at, it behooves those who use it to point out clearly how much of Philo's peculiar style and sentiment was owing to his Jewish, and how much to his Alexandrian education or habits of thought; because, unless this can be done, it will be impossible to show that any alleged peculiarity necessarily bespeaks an Alexandrian origin, and could not possibly have appeared in the writings of a pure Jew of Palestine. No attempt, however, of this sort has been made; on the contrary, it has been assumed that whatever is Philonian is therefore Alexandrian, and hence all resemblances between the writings of Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews have been urged as certain proofs that the latter must have been written by a converted Jew of Alexandria. Such an assumption, however, we would by no means concede; and we feel confirmed in this by an examination of the evidence adduced in support of the alleged Alexandrian character of this epistle. As Stuart has, we think, clearly shown (i, 321), and as even Tholuck, though obviously inclining the other way, has candidly admitted (Comment. on the Hebrews, 1, 68, § 7), there is nothing in this evidence to show that this epistle might not have been written by a Jew who had never left the bounds of Palestine. It is worthy of notice that several of the points on which Eichhorn chiefly insists as favoring his view, such as the prevalence of typical expositions of the Mosaic ritual in this epistle, and the greater elegance of its language and style (Einleit. 3:443 sq.), are given up by Bleek, and that of the two chiefly insisted upon by the latter, viz. the close affinity between this epistle and the writings of Philo, and the alleged mistake in regard to the furniture of the tabernacle which Bleek charges upon the author of this epistle in chap. 9:3, 4, and which he thinks no Jew of Palestine could have committed, both are relinquished by Tholuck as untenable (comp. the valuable remarks of Hug, Introd. p. 584, note, Fosdick's transl.). With regard to the latter, it may be remarked that, even supposing it proved that the writer of this epistle had erred in asserting that the pot containing the manna and Aaron's rod were placed in the ark of the testimony, and that, supposing θυμιατήριον to denote the altar of incense, and not the censer, he had fallen into the mistake of placing this within instead of without the veil, nothing could be thence  deduced in favor of the Alexandrian origin of the author. For, with regard to the former of these, it was a matter on which the Jews of Palestine had no better means of information than those of any other place, since, in the Temple as then standing, none of the furniture of the Holy of Holies had been preserved; and with regard to the latter, as it could not be the result of ignorance either in a Jew of Palestine or in a Jew of Alexandria, but must have been a piece of mere inadvertence on the part of either, it seems rather too much to conclude that it was such as the latter alone was capable of committing. That, however, there is no blunder in the case, has, we think, been very satisfactorily shown by Deyling (Obs. Sac. tom. 2, No. 47) and others (comp. Stuart, Tholuck, and Delitzsch, ad loc.).

(6.) Apollos. — The first to suggest Apollos as the probable author of this epistle was Luther ( Werke, ed. Walch, 12:204,1996, etc.). He has been followed by the majority of recent German scholars, many of whom have supported his conjecture with much ingenuity. It has undoubtedly been shown by them that Apollos may have been the writer; and they have, we think, proved that of all Paul's companions this is the one who was most fitted by education, life-circumstances, modes of thought, and religious stand-point, to have accomplished such a task had it fallen to his lot. Beyond this, however, their arguments seem to us signally to fail. What weight they have is derived almost entirely from the, assumed Alexandrian tone of the epistle; so that in setting aside this we of necessity invalidate what has been built on it. But it may be permitted us to remark that, even supposing the former established, the latter would by no means follow, any more than because a work produced in Germany in the present day was deeply tinctured with Hegelianism, it would follow from that alone that it must be the production of some certain individual rather than of any other disciple of Hegel's school. The adoption of this theory by Tholuck, after his exposure of the unsoundness of Bleek's reasonings, is matter of surprise. “Still,” says he (1, 69), “could it be rendered probable that any distinguished person having intercourse with Paul were an Alexandrian, and of Alexandrian culture, we might, with the greatest appearance of truth, regard him as the author of the epistle. Now such a one is found in the person of Apollos.” What is this but to say, “The arguments for the Alexandrian origin of this epistle, I must confess, prove nothing; but show me an end to be gained by it, and I will admit; them to be most conclusive!” Such a statement affords, we think, very clear evidence that the disposition to ascribe this epistle to Apollos is to be traced not to any  constraining force of evidence, but exclusively to what Olshausen, in his strictures on Bleek (Opusc. p. 92), justly denounces as the main source of that able writer's errors, on this question — ” Quod non ab omni partium studio alienum animum servare ipsi contigit.” It may be added that if this epistle was the product of Apollos or any other Alexandrian convert, it is very strange that no tradition to this effect should have been preserved in the church at Alexandria, but, on the contrary, that it should be there we find the tradition that Paul was the author most firmly and from the earliest period established.

3. We now pass on to the question of the Pauline origin of this epistle. Referring our readers for particulars to the able and copious discussion of this question furnished by the works of Stuart (Commentary, Introd.), Forster (The Apostol. Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, etc.), and Hug, we shall attempt at present a condensed outline of the evidence both for and against the Pauline authorship of this epistle.

a. Internal evidence,

1. In favor of the Pauline origin of the epistle.

(1.) A person familiar with the doctrines on which Paul is fond of insisting in his acknowledged epistles will readily perceive that there is such a correspondence in this respect between these and the Epistle to the Hebrews as supplies good ground for presuming that the latter proceeded also from his pen. Thai Christianity as a system is superior to Judaism with respect to clearness, simplicity, and moral efficiency; that the former is the substance and reality of what the latter had presented only the typical adumbration; and that the latter was to be abolished to make way for the former, are points which, if more fully handled in the Epistle to the Hebrews, are familiar to all readers of the epistles of Paul (comp. 2Co 3:6-18; Gal 3:22; Gal 4:1-9; Gal 4:21-31; Col 2:16-17, etc.). The same view is given in this epistle as in those of Paul of the divine glory of the Mediator, specifically as the reflection or manifestation of Deity to man (compare Col 1:15-20; Php 2:6; Heb 1:3, etc.). His condescension is described as having consisted in an impoverishing, and lessening, and lowering of himself for man's behalf (2Co 8:9; Php 2:7-8; Heb 2:9); and his exaltation is set forth as a condition of royal dignity, which shall be consummated by all his enemies being put under his footstool (1  Corinthians 15:25-27; Heb 2:8; Heb 10:13; Heb 12:2). He is represented as discharging the office of a “mediator,” a word which is never used except by Paul and the writer of this epistle (Gal 3:19-20; Heb 8:6); his death is represented as a sacrifice for the sins of man; and the peculiar idea is announced in connection with this, that he was prefigured by the sacrifices of the Mosaic dispensation (Rom 3:22-26; 1Co 5:7; Eph 1:7; Eph 5:2; Hebrews 7-10). Peculiar to Paul and the author of this epistle is the phrase “the God of peace” (Rom 15:33, etc.; Heb 13:20); and both seem to have the same conception of the spiritual “gifts” (1Co 12:4; Heb 2:4). It is worthy of remark, also, that the momentous question of a man's personal acceptance with God is answered in this epistle in the same peculiar way as in the acknowledged epistles of Paul. All is made to depend upon the individual's exercising what both Paul and the author of this epistle call “faith,” and which they both represent as a realizing apprehension of the facts, and truths, and promises of revelation. (Bleek and Tholuck have both endeavored to show that the πίστις of the Epistle to the Hebrews is not the same as the πίστις of Paul's acknowledged writings, but, in our view, with singular want of success. Tholuck's chief argument, which he urges as of more weight than any Bleek has advanced, is, that the writer has not here contrasted νόμος and πίστις, the ἔργα νόμπυ and the ἔργα πίστεως, as Paul would have done. But how can this be said when the great lesson of the epistle is, that always, even under the law itself; πίστις was the medium of acceptance and the channel of divine blessing to men? When Paul says, “We walk by faith, not by sight” [2Co 5:7], and the writer to the Hebrews. says that faith, by which the just live, is the evidence of things not seen [10:28; 11:1], what essential difference in their notion of faith and its working can be discerned?) By both, also, the power of this gracious principle is frequently referred to and illustrated by the example of those who had distinguished themselves in the annals of the Jewish race (comp. Rom 3:4; Rom 5:2; Heb 3:6; Gal 3:5-14; Heb 10:38; Heb 11:40).

(2.) Some of the figures and allusions employed in this epistle are strictly Pauline. Thus the word of God is compared to a sword (Eph 6:17; Heb 4:12); inexperienced Christians are children who need milk, and must be instructed in the elements, whilst  those of maturer attainments are full-grown men who require strong neat (1Co 3:1-2; 1Co 14:20; Gal 4:9; Col 3:14; Heb 5:12-13; Heb 6:1); redemption through Christ is an introduction and an entrance with confidence unto God (Rom 5:2; Eph 2:18; Eph 3:12; Heb 10:19); afflictions are a contest or strife, ἀγών (Php 1:30; Col 2:1; Heb 10:32); the Christian life is a race (1Co 9:24; Php 3:14; Heb 12:1); the Jewish ritual is a λατρεία (Rom 9:4; Heb 9:1; Heb 9:6); a person under the constraint of some unworthy feeling or principle is “subject to bondage” (Gal 5:1; Heb 2:15), etc.

(3.) Certain marked characteristics of Paul's style are found in this epistle. This department of the internal evidence has more, perhaps, than any other been canvassed by recent critics, and in some cases opposite conclusions have been drawn from the same phenomena. Thus the occurrence of era ἃπαξ λεγόμενα in this epistle has been adduced by the German scholars against the Pauline origin of it, whilst Stuart and Forster have both rested on this fact as strongly in favor of that conclusion; and as it appears to us with justice, for if it be made out from Paul's acknowledged writings that the use of unusual words is a characteristic of his style (and this has been placed by these writers beyond all question), it is obvious that the occurrence of the same characteristic in this epistle, so far from being an argument against, is, as far as it goes, an argument for our ascribing it to Paul. On arguments, however, based on such minute phenomena, we are not disposed to rest much weight on either side. Every person must be aware that an author's use of words is greatly modified by the circumstances under which he writes, or the design he has in writing; and the literature of every country presents us with numerous cases of authors whose works, written at different periods, and with different designs, present far greater diversities of expression than any which have been pointed out between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the acknowledged epistles of Paul. Hence cautious critics have declined to rest much in questions of literary parentage upon what Bentley calls (Dissert. on Phialaris, p. 19, London, 1699) “censures that are made from stile and language alone,” and which, he adds, “are commonly nice and uncertain, and depend upon slender notices.” Apart, however, from such minute niceties, there are certain marked peculiarities of  style which attach to particular writers, and flow so directly from the character of their genius or education that they can hardly express themselves in discourse without introducing them. Now such peculiarities the writings of Paul present, and the occurrence of them has always been felt to afford no small evidence of the authenticity of any production claiming to be his in which they are found. Paley, in enumerating these (Horae Paulinae, ch. 6, No. 2, 3), has laid stress chiefly on the following: A disposition to the frequent use of a word, which cleaves, as it were, to the memory of the writer, so as to become a sort of cant word in his writings; a propensity “to go off at a word,” and enter upon a parenthetic series of remarks suggested by that word; and a fondness for the paronomasia, or play upon words.

(4.) There is a striking analogy between Paul's use of the O.T. and that made by the writer of this epistle. Both make frequent appeals to the O.T.; both are in the habit of accumulating passages from different parts of the O.T., and making them bear on the point under discussion (comp. Rom 3:10-18; Rom 9:7-33, etc.; Heb 1:5-14; Hebrews 3; Heb 10:5-17); both are fond of linking quotations together by means of the expression “and again” (compare Rom 15:9-12; 1Co 3:19-20; Heb 1:5; Heb 2:12-13; Heb 4:4; Heb 10:30); both make use of the same passages, and that occasionally in a sense not naturally suggested by the context whence they are quoted (1Co 15:27; Eph 1:22; Heb 2:8; Rom 1:17; Gal 3:11; Heb 10:38); and both, in one instance, quotes passage in a peculiar way (comp. Rom 12:19; Heb 10:30). On the other hand, great stress has been laid by the opponents of the Pauline origin of this epistle on the fact that whilst Paul, in his acknowledged writings, quotes from the Hebrew original in preference to the Sept., where the latter differs from the former, the author of this epistle quotes exclusively from the Sept., even when it departs very widely from the Hebrew. To this it may be replied, 1st, that both Paul and the author of this epistle quote generally from the Sept.; secondly, that where the Sept. differs from the Hebrew, Paul does not always follow the Hebrew in preference to the Sept. (comp. Rom 2:24; Rom 10:11-18; Rom 11:27; Rom 15:12; 1Co 1:19, etc.); and, thirdly, That the writer of this epistle does not always follow the Sept. where it differs from the Hebrew, but occasionally deserts the former for the latter (e.g. Heb 10:30; Heb 13:5); (comp. Davidson,  Introd. 3, 231). There is no ground, therefore, for this objection to the Pauline origin of this epistle.

(5.) The Epistle to the Hebrews contains some personal allusions on the part of the writer which strongly favor the supposition that he was Paul. These are the mention of his intention to pay those to whom he was writing a visit speedily, in: company with Timothy, whom he affectionately styles. “our brother,” and whom he describes as having been set at liberty, and expected soon to-join the writer (Heb 13:23); the allusion to his being in a state of imprisonment at the time of writing, as well as of his having: partaken of their sympathy while formerly in a state of: bondage among them (Heb 13:19; Heb 10:34); and the transmission to them of a salutation, from the believers in Italy (Heb 13:24), all of which agree well with the supposition that Paul wrote this epistle while a prisoner at Rome.

2. Let us now glance at the main objections which from various sources have been urged against its Pauline origin.

(1.) It is unaccountable that Paul, had he written this epistle, should have withheld his name. But is it less unaccountable that Clement, or Apollos, or Luke, had any of them been the author should have withheld his name?

(2.) “This epistle is more calmly and logically written than it was possible for the energetic Paul to have written; all the analogies between Judaism and Christianity are calmly investigated and calmly adduced; the materials are arranged in the strictest order, and carefully wrought out according to this disposition, and conclusion follows conclusion with the greatest regularity; the language also is rotund and choice, and the representation unusually clear. All this is unlike Paul” (Eichhorn, Einleit. 3, 459). This is a singular assertion to make respecting the author of the Epistle to the Romans, a production characterized most eminently by these traits, excepting, perhaps, a less degree of calmness, which the special object of the present epistle may have more peculiarly called for.

(3.) “Whilst we occasionally meet Pauline termini, we find precisely in the leading ideas of the epistle a terminology different from that of Paul” (Tholuck, 1, 39, English transl.). The in-stances specified by Tholuck are the use of ἱερεύς, ποιμήν, and ἀπόστολος, as  designations of Christ; of ὁμολογία, which he says is confined to this epistle; of ἐγγιζειν τῷ θεῷ; and of τελειοῦν, with its derivatives in the sense in which it is used, Heb 7:19. Now, with regard to this objection, it may be observed, 1st, That supposing all the instances adduced by Tholuck to be unimpeachable, and supposing no reason could be assigned why Paul should use such in writing to Hebrews, when he did not use them in writing to' others, still the objection cannot have much weight with any person accustomed to weigh evidence, because not only is the number of Pauline termini found in this epistle far greater than the number of termini which, according to Tholuck, are “foreign to the apostle to the Gentiles;” but it is always less likely that the peculiar phrases of a writer should be borrowed by another, than that a writer noted for the use of peculiar words and phrases should, in a composition of a character somewhat different from his other productions, use terms not found elsewhere in ‘his writings. But, secondly, let us examine the instances adduced by Tholuck, and see whether they bear out his reasoning. “Paul nowhere calls Christ priest.” True; but though Paul, in writing to churches composed more or less of Gentile converts, whose previous ideas of priests and priestly rites were anything but favorable to their receiving under sacerdotal terms right notions of Christ and his work, never calls Christ a priest, is that any reason for our concluding that in writing to Jews, who had amongst them a priesthood of divine organization, and writing for the express purpose of showing that that priesthood was typical of Christ, it is inconceivable that the apostle should have applied the term priest to Christ? To us the difficulty would rather seem to be to conceive how, in handling such a topic, he could avoid calling Christ a priest. Paul nowhere calls Christ a shepherd and an apostle, as the writer of this epistle does. But the whole weight of this objection to the Pauline origin of this epistle must rest on the assumption that Paul never uses figurative appellations of Christ in his writings; for if he does, why not here as well as elsewhere? Now it could only be the grossest unacquaintedness with the apostle's writings that could lead any to affirm this. The very opposite tendency is characteristic of them. Thus we find Christ termed τέλος νόμου (Rom 10:4), διάκονον περιτομῆς (Rom 15:8), τὸπάσχα ἡμῶν (1Co 5:7), ἡ πέτρα (1 Corinthians 4), ἀπαρχή (1Co 15:23), εϊvς ἀνήρ (2Co 11:2), ἀκρογωνιῖος (Eph 2:20), etc. With these instances before us, why should it be deemed so utterly  incredible that Paul could have called Christ ἀπόστολος and ποιμήν, that the occurrence of such terms in the epistle before us is to be held as a reason for adjudging it not to have been written by him? With regard to the use of ὁμολογία in the sense of religious profession, the reader may compare the passages in which it occurs in this epistle with Rom 10:9; 2Co 9:13; 1Ti 6:12, and judge for himself how far such a usage is foreign to the apostle. The phrase ἐγγίζειν τῷ θεῳ occurs once in this epistle (Heb 7:19), and once in Jam 4:8; Paul also once uses the verb actively (Php 2:30); and, on the other hand, the author of this epistle once uses it intransitively (Philippians 10:25). As there is thus a perfect analogy in the usage of the verb-between the two, why it should be supposed improbable that Paul should use it in reference to God, or why a phrase used by James should be deemed too Alexandrian to be used by Paul, we feel ourselves utterly at a loss to conceive. With regard to the use of τελειοῦν, Tholuck himself contends (Appendix, 2, 297) that it everywhere in this epistle retains the idea of completing; but he cannot understand how Paul could have contemplated the work of redemption under this term in this epistle, since in no other of his epistles is it so used. This difficulty of the learned professor may, we think, be very easily removed by remarking that it does not appear to have been Paul's design elsewhere, so fully at least as here, to represent the superiority of Christianity over Judaism, as that arises from the former being sufficient, whilst the latter was not sufficient to complete men in a religious point of view, i.e. to supply to them all they need, and advance them to all of which they are capable. That this is the theme of the writer, the passages in which the word in question occurs show; and we see no reason why such an idea might not have occurred to Paul as well as to any other man. Arguments drawn from such special terms, moreover, must always be precarious when urged as objections, because they are not only indefinite, but are mostly negative in their character. A minute examination shows that they are not of much force in the present case; for if the expressions referred to do not occur in the same form in Paul's other epistles, yet similar phrases undoubtedly prevail, and the variation here is sufficiently accounted for by the different character and object of this epistle. See this and all the other questions connected with this epistle amply reviewed by Dr. Davidson (Introd. to the N.T. 3, 163-295), who, however, inclines to  the opinion that these peculiarities indicate the co-operation of some other hand with Paul in the composition of the epistle.

b. It yet remains that we should look at the external evidence bearing on this question. Passing by, as somewhat uncertain, the alleged testimony of Peter, who is supposed (2Pe 3:15-16) to refer to the Epistle to the Hebrews as the composition of Paul, and passing by also the testimonies of the apostolic fathers, which, though very decisive as to the antiquity and canonical authority of this epistle (see Forster's Inquiry, sec. 13), yet say nothing to guide us to the author, we come to consider the testimony of the Eastern and Western churches upon this subject. As respects the former, there are two facts of much importance. The one is; that of the Greek fathers not one positively ascribes this epistle to any but Paul; the other is, that it does not appear that in any part of the Eastern Church the Pauline origin of this epistle was ever doubted or suspected (compare Olshausen, Opusc. Theolog. p. 95).

In the Western Church this epistle did not, as we have seen, meet with the same early and universal reception. But of what value is the state of opinion in the early churches of the West in the question of evidence now before us? To judge of this, we must bear in mind that the sole amount of evidence arising from the testimony of the Latin churches is negative; all we can conclude from it, at the most, is that they had no sufficient evidence in favor of this epistle being Paul's; they do not seem to have had a shadow of historical evidence against its being his. The claims of Barnabas, Clement, and Luke rest upon mere individual conjecture, and have no historical support. Supposing, then, that the rejection of this epistle by the Latins cannot be accounted for by circumstances peculiar to them, still this fact cannot diminish the weight of evidence accruing from the unanimity of the Greeks and Asiatics. Had the Latins been as unanimous in favor of Apollos or Clement as the Eastern churches were in favor of Paul, the case would have been different. The value of Paul's claims would in that case have been equal to the difference between the value of the Eastern tradition and the value of the Western. This would have furnished a somewhat puzzling problem; though ever in that case the superiority of the Eastern witnesses to the Western would have materially advanced the claims of the apostle. As the case stands, all the positive external evidence extant is in favor of the Pauline authorship of this epistle; and the only thing against it is that in the Latin churches there appears to have been no commonly received tradition on the subject. Under such circumstances, the claims of  the apostle are entitled to be regarded as fully substantiated by the external evidence.

The result of the previous inquiry may be thus stated.

1, There is no substantial evidence, external or internal, in favor of any claimant to the authorship of this epistle except Paul.

2. There is nothing incompatible with the supposition that Paul was the author of it.

3. The preponderance of the internal, and all the direct external evidence goes to show that it was written by Paul. (See the Bibliotheca Sacra, Oct. 1867.)

4. The apparent coincidences with Luke's phraseology merely go to show, if they indeed be anything more than casual, that he exercised more than usual liberty as an amanuensis or reporter of Paul.

III. Times and Place of Writing. — Assuming the Pauline authorship of the epistle, it is not difficult to determine when and where it was written. The allusions in Heb 13:19; Heb 13:21, point to the closing period of the apostle's two years' imprisonment at Rome as the season during “the serene hours” of which, as Hug describes them (Introd. p. 603), he composed this noblest production of his pen. Modern criticism has not destroyed, though it has weakened this conclusion, by substituting the reading πρός ῾Εβραίους, “the prisoners,” for τοιῖς δεσμοῖςμον (A.V. “me in my bonds”), Heb 10:34; by proposing to interpret ἀπολελυμένον, Heb 13:23, as “sent away” rather than “set at liberty;” and by urging that the condition of the writer, as portrayed in Heb 13:18-19; Heb 13:23, is not necessarily that of a prisoner, and that there may possibly be no allusion to it in Heb 13:3. In this date, however, almost all who receive the epistle as Paul's concur; and even by those who do not so receive it nearly the same time is fixed upon, in consequence of the evidence furnished by the epistle itself of its having been written a good while after those to whom it is addressed had become Christians. The references to former teachers (Heb 13:7) and earlier instruction (Heb 5:12 and Heb 10:32) might suit any time after the first years of the Church; but the epistle was evidently written before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The whole argument, and especially the passages Heb 8:4 sq., Heb 9:6 sq. (where the present tenses of the Greek are unaccountably  changed into past in the English version), and Heb 13:10 sq., imply that the Temple was standing, and that its usual course of divine service was carried on without interruption. A Christian reader, keenly watching in the doomed city for the fulfillment of his Lord's prediction, would at once understand the ominous references to “that which beareth thorns and briers, and is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned;” “that which decayeth and waxeth old, and is ready to vanish away;” and the coming of the expected “Day,” and the removing of those things that are shaken (Heb 6:8; Heb 8:13; Heb 10:25; Heb 10:37; Heb 12:27). Yet these forebodings seem less distinct and circumstantial than they might have been if uttered immediately before the catastrophe. From the expression “they of (ἀπό) Italy” (Heb 13:24), it has been inferred that the writer could not have been in Italy; at Winer (Grammatik, § 66, 6) denies that the preposition necessarily has that force. Alford (Comment. 4, Proleg. p. 68 sq.), after Holzmann (Stud. u. Krit. 1859, 2, 297 sq.), contends that it was addressed to the Judaico-Christian Church at Rome; but in that case, how could it have been needful to inform then of Timothy's release (as the author does in the same connection. Heb 13:23)?

IV. To whom addressed. — That the parties to whom this epistle was addressed were converted Jews the epistle itself plainly shows. Ancient tradition points out the church at Jerusalem, or the Christians in Palestine generally, as the recipients. Stuart contends for the church at Caesarea, not without some show of reason; but the preponderance of evidence is in favor of the ancient tradition. Two things make this clear, says Lange: the one is, that only the Christians in Jerusalem, or those in Palestine generally, formed a great Jewish-Christian Church in the proper sense; the other is, that for the loosening of these from their religious sense of the Temple- worship there was an immediate and pressing necessity (Apostol. Zeitalter, 1, 176). We know of no purely Jewish-Christian community, such as that addressed in this epistle, out of Palestine, while the whole tone of the epistle indicates that those for whom it was intended were in the vicinity of the Temple. The inscription of the epistle, προς ῾Εβραίους, which is of great antiquity, favors the same conclusion (Roberts, Discussions on the Gospels, p. 215 sq.). Ebrard limits the primary circle of readers even to a section of the Church at Jerusalem. Considering such passages as 5, 12; 6, 10; 10, 32, as probably inapplicable to the whole of that church, he conjectures that Paul wrote to some neophytes whose conversion, though not mentioned in the Acts, may have been partly due to the apostle's  influence in the time of his last recorded sojourn in Jerusalem (Act 21:22). This, however, is unnecessary.

V. In what Language was it written? — Like Matthew's Gospel, the Epistle to the Hebrews has afforded ground for much unimportant controversy respecting the language in which it was originally written. The earliest statement is that of Clement of Alexandria (preserved in Euseb. H. E. 6:14), to the effect that it was written by Paul in Hebrew, and translated by Luke into Greek; and hence, as Clement observes, arises the identity of the style of the epistle and that of the Acts. This statement is repeated, after a long interval, by Eusebius, Theodoret, Jerome, and several later fathers; but it is not noticed by the majority. Nothing is said to lead us to regard it as a tradition, rather than a conjecture suggested by the style of the epistle. No person is said to have used or seen a Hebrew original. The Aramaic copy, included in the Peshito, has never been regarded otherwise than as a translation. Among the few modern supporters of an Aramaic original, the most distinguished are Joseph Hallet, an English writer in 1727 (whose able essay is most easily accessible in a Latin translation in Wolf's Curae Philologicae, 4, 806-837). The same opinion has found in Michaelis a strenuous defender (Introd. 4, 221). The arguments he adduces, however, are more specious than sound; and it has been abundantly shown by Lardner, Hug, Eichhorn, and others, that this opinion is untenable. Bleek (1, 623) argues in support of a Greek original on the grounds of

(1) the purity and easy flow of the Greek;

(2) the use of Greek words, which could not be adequately expressed in Hebrew without long paraphrase;

(3) the use of paronomasia-under which head he disallows the inference against an Aramaic original which has been drawn from the double sense given to διαθήκη (ix, 15); and

(4) the use of the Sept. in quotations and references which do not correspond with the Hebrew text. Why Paul should have written in Greek to persons residing in Judaea is best answered by the reasons which Hug (Introd. p. 326 sq.) and Diodati (De Christo Graeca loquente exercitatio, etc., edited by O.T. Dobbin, LL.B., London, 1843, and republished in the Biblical Repository for Jan. 1844) have  adduced to show that Greek was at that time well known to the mass of the Jews (compare Tholuck, 1, 78).

VI. Some have doubted whether this composition be justly termed an epistle, and have proposed to regard it rather as a treatise. The salutations, however, at the close seem rather to favor the common opinion, though it is of little moment which view we espouse.

VII. Condition of the Hebrews and Scope of the Epistle. — The numerous Christian churches scattered through out Judaea (Act 9:31; Gal 1:22) were continually exposed to persecution from the Jews (1Th 2:14), which would become more searching and extensive as churches multiplied, and as the growing turbulence of the nation ripened into the insurrection of A.D. 66. Personal violence, spoliation of property, exclusion from the synagogue, and domestic strife were the universal forms of persecution. But in Jerusalem there was one additional weapon in the hands of the predominant oppressors of the Christians. Their magnificent national Temple, hallowed to every Jew by ancient historical and by gentler personal recollections, with its irresistible attractions, its soothing strains, and mysterious ceremonies, might be shut against the Hebrew Christian. And even if, amid the fierce factions and frequent oscillations of authority in Jerusalem, this affliction were not often laid upon him, yet there was a secret burden which every Hebrew Christian bore within him — the knowledge that the end of all the beauty and awfulness of Zion was rapidly approaching. Paralyzed, perhaps, by this consciousness, and enfeebled by their attachment to a lower form of Christianity, they became stationary in knowledge, weak in faith, void of energy, and even in danger of apostasy from Christ. For, as afflictions multiplied round them, and made them feel more keenly their dependence on God, and their need of near, and frequent, and associated approach to him, they seemed, in consequence of their Christianity, to be receding from the God of their fathers, and losing that means of communion with him which they used to enjoy. Angels, Moses, and the high-Priest-their intercessors in heaven, in the grave, and on earth-became of less importance in the creed of the Jewish Christian; their glory waned as he grew in Christian experience. Already he felt that the Lord's day was superseding the Sabbath, the New Covenant the Old. What could take the place of the Temple, and that which was behind the veil, and the Levitical sacrifices, and the holy city, when they should cease to exist? What  compensation co-aid Christianity offer him for the loss which was pressing the Hebrew Christian more and more?

James, the bishop of Jerusalem, had just left his place vacant by a martyr's death. Neither to Cephas at Babylon, nor to John at Ephesus, the third pillar of the Apostolic Church, was it given to understand all the greatness of this want, and to speak the word in season. But there came from Rome the voice of one who had been the foremost in sounding the depth and breadth of that love of Christ which was all but incomprehensible to the Jew-one who, feeling more than any other apostle the weight of the care of all the churches, yet clung to his own people with a love ever ready to break out in impassioned words, and unsought and ill-requited deeds of kindness. He whom Jerusalem had sent away in chains to Rome again lifted up his voice in the hallowed city among his countrymen; but with words and arguments suited to their capacity, with a strange, borrowed accent, and a tone in which reigned no apostolic authority, and a face veiled in very love from wayward children who might refuse to hear divine and saving truth when it fell from the lips of Paul.

He meets the Hebrew Christians on their own ground. His answer is, “Your new faith gives you Christ, and in Christ all you seek, all your fathers sought. In Christ, the Son of God, you have an all-sufficient Mediator, nearer than angels to the Father, eminent above Moses as a benefactor, more sympathizing and more prevailing than the high-priest as an intercessor: his Sabbath awaits you in heaven; to his covenant the old was intended to be subservient; his atonement is the eternal reality of which sacrifices are but the passing shadow; his city heavenly, not made with hands. Having him, believe in him with all your heart with a faith in the unseen future strong as that of the saints of old, patient under present and prepared for coming woe, full of energy, and hope, and holiness, and love.”

Such was the teaching of the Epistle to the. Hebrews. We do not possess the means of tracing out step by step its effect upon them, but we know that the result at which it aimed was achieved. The Church at Jerusalem did not apostatize. It migrated to Pella (Eusebius, H. Ecclesiastes 3, 5); and there, no longer dwarfed under the cold shadow of overhanging Judaism it followed the Hebrew Christians of the Dispersion in gradually entering on the possession of the full liberty which the law of Christ allows to all.

The primary design of this epistle, therefore, was to dissuade-those to whom it is written from relapsing into Judaism, and to exhort them to hold  fast the truths of Christianity which they had received. For this purpose the apostle shows the superiority of the latter dispensation over the former, in that it was introduced by one far greater than angels, or than Moses, from whom: the Jews received their economy (1-3), and in that it affords a more secure and complete salvation to the sinner than the former (4-9). In demonstrating the latter position, the apostle shows that in point of dignity, perpetuity, sufficiency, and suitableness, the Jewish priesthood and sacrifices were far inferior to those of Christ, who was the substance and reality, while these were but the type and shadow. He shows, also, that by the appearance of the antitype the type is necessarily abolished; and adduces the important truth that now, through Christ, the privilege of personal access to God is free to all. On all this he founds an exhortation to, a life of faith and obedience, and shows that it has ever been only by a spiritual recognition and worship of God that good men have participated in his favor (11). The epistle concludes, as is usual with Paul, with a series of practical exhortations and pious wishes (12-13).

But this great epistle remains to after times a keystone binding together that succession of inspired men which spans over the ages between Moses and John. It teaches the Christian student the substantial identity of the revelation of God, whether given through the prophets or through the Son; for it shows that God's purposes are unchangeable, however diversely in different ages they have been “reflected in broken and fitful rays, glancing back from the troubled waters of the human soul.” It is a source of inexhaustible comfort to every Christian sufferer in inward perplexity, or amid “reproaches and afflictions.” It is a pattern to every Christian teacher of the method in which larger views should be imparted, gently, reverently, and seasonably, to feeble spirits prone to cling to ancient forms, and to rest in accustomed feelings.

VIII. Literature. —

1. Of general introductory treatises,. besides the formal Introductions of Michaelis, Eichhorn, De Wette, Davidson, Bleek, Home, etc., and the prolegomena in the regular commentaries of Stuart, Alford,. etc., the following express treatises in volume form may be especially named: Ziegler, Einleit. (Gött. 1791, 8vo); Bratt, De ar. qum. et auct. etc. (Gryph. 1806, 4to); Seyfarth, De Indole, etc. (Lips. 1821, 8vo); Winzer, De Sacerdotis officio, etc. (Lips. 1825, 4to); De Groot, Comparatio, etc. (Tr. ad Rh. 1826, 8vo); Bleek, Einleit. (Berl.. 1828, 8vo); Baumgarten-Crusius,  Conjecture, etc. (Jenae,. 1829, 4to); Gelpe, Vindicice, etc. (L. B. 1832, 8vo); Grossmann, De philos. Jud. etc. (Lips. 1834, 4to); Stenglin, Zeugnisse, etc. (Bamb. 1835, 8vo); Forster, Apostolical Authority, etc. (Lond. 1838, 8vo); Thiersch, De Ep. ad: Hebr. (Marburg, 1848, 8vo); Mole, De Christologia, etc. (Halle, 1854); Wieseler, Untersuchung, etc. (Kiel, 1861, 8vo); Riehm, Lehrbegr. etc. (1867, 8vo).

2. The following are special commentaries on the whole of the epistle alone, the most important of which are here designated by an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Athanasius, Commentaria (in Opp. I, 2); Chrysostom, Homiliae (in Opp. 12, 1); Cyril, Commentaria (in Mai, Script. Vet. 8, 2, 147); Alcuin, Explanatio (in Opp. I, 2); Aquinas, Expositio (in Opp. 7); \*Calvin, Commentarius (in Opp.; also in English, by Cotton, Lond. 1605, 4to; by a clergyman, London, 1841, 12mo; by Owen, Edilbi 1853, 8vo); Zuingle, Annotationes (in Opp. 4, 564); Ecolampadius, Explanationes (Argent. 1534, Basil, 1536, 8vo); Megander, Adnotationec (Tig. 1539, 8vo); GranAdis, Commentarius (Paris, 1546, 8vo); Bachmeister [ed. Streuensee], Disputatio (Rost. 1569, 8vo; also in Germ. Hal. 1755, 8vo); Brentz, Commentarius (Tub. 1571, 4to); Hyperius, Commentarii (Tig. 1585, fol.); Grynaeus, Explanatio (Basil. 1587, 8vo); Buccafoci, Commentarius [including John] (Rom. 1587, 4to); Hunn, Exegesis (F. ad M. 1589, 8vo); De Ribera [concluded by others], Commentarius (Salaen. 1598, Cologne, 1600, Turin, 1605, 8vo); Galenus, Commentarius (Duac. 1578, Lov. 1599, 8vo); — Dering, Lectures [on chap. 1-6] (in Works); Cameron, Responsiones (in. Opp. p. 366); Crell, Commentarius (in Opp. ii, 61); Rung, Analysis — (Vit. 1600, 8vo); Nahum, Commentarius [including Galatians and Ephes.] (Han. 1602, Svo); Rollock, Commentarius (Genesis 1605, 1610, 12mo; — also Analysis, Edinburgh, 1605, 8vo); Junius, Enarratio (Heidelberg, 1610, 8vo; also in Opp. 1, 1368); De Tena, — Commentarius (Toledo, 1611, 1617, fol.; with additions iby others, London, 1661, fol.; also in the Critici Sacri); Lyser, Commentarius (Vit. 1616, 4to); Capellus, Observationes (Sed. 1634, 8vo); Cocceius, In. Ep. ad H. (in Opp. 12, 315); Alting, Praelectiones [on chap. 1-10] (in 1Opp. 4); Scultetus, Ideae (Fracof. 1634, 8vo); Slichting, — Commentarius (Rac. 1634, 8vo); Jones, Commentary [includ. Philem.] (Lond. 1635, fol.); Dickson, Explanation (Aberd. 1635, 1649; Glasg. 1654; Lond. 1839, 8vo); Rapine, Expositio (Par. 1636, 8vo); Guillebert, Paraphrase ,[in French] (Paris, 1638, 8vo); Gerhard, Commentarius:(Jena, 1641, 1661, 4to); Vincent, Commentaria (Paris, 1644, fol.); Douname, Commentary  (London, 1646, fol.); — Lushington, Commentary [chiefly a translation of Crell and Slichting] (Lond. 1646, fol.); Godeau, Paraphrase fin French] (Paris, 1651, 12mo; in English, Lond. 1715, 12mo); Gouge, Commentary (London, 1655, fol.); Horne, Expositio (Bruns. 1655, 4to) Major, Commentaria (Jen. 1655, 1668, 4to); Wandalin, Paraphrasis (Havn. 1656, 4to); Caspar Streso, Commentarius (Hague, 1661, 4to); Lamson, Exposition (Lond. 1662, fol.); Owen, Exposition f Rabbinical illustrations] (London, 1668-74, 4 vols. fol.; Edinb. 1812-14,-7 vols. 8vo; London, 1840, 4 vols. 8vo; Edinb. 1854, 7 vols. 8vo; abridged, London, 1790, 1815, 4 vols. 8vo); \*Seb. Schmid, Commentarius (Argent. 1680, Lips. 1698, 4to); Mains, Paraphrasis (Giess. 1687, 1700, 4to); Wittich, Investigatio (Amsterd. 1691, 4to); \*Van Hoeke, Commentarius (Lugd. B. 1693, 4to; in German, Frankf. 1707, 4to); Groenwegen, Vytlegginge (Leyden, 1693, 1702, 4to); Nemeth, Explicatio (Franec. 1695,1702. 4to); De Marck, Commentarius [including min. proph.] (Tüb. 1696, 5 vols. 4to; 1734, 2 vols. fol.); Ackersloot, Vytlegginge (Hag. 1697, 4to; in German, Bremen, 1714, 4to); Creyghton, Verklaaring (Amst. 1699, 4to); Heidegger, Exegetica [including some other books of Scripture] (Tig. 1700, 1706, 1710, 4to); Schomer, Exegesis [includ. part of 1 Peter] (Rost. 1701, 4to); Braun, Commentarius (Amst. 1705, 4to); Olearius, Analysis (Lips. 1706, 4to); Brochmand, Commentarius (Havn. 1706, 4to); Starck, Notce (Lips. 1710, 4to); \*D'Outrein, Verklaaring (Amst. 1711, 4to; in German, Frankf. 1713, 1718, 2 vols. 4to); Limborch, Commentarius [includ. Acts and Rom.] (Rotterd. 1711, fol.); Clement Streso, Meditatien (Amst. 1714, 4to); Dorsche, Commentarius (Frankfort et Lips. 1717, 4to); Vermaten, Ontleeding (Amsterd. 1722, 4to); IHulse, Verklaaring (Rotterd. 1725, 2 vols. 4to); Peirce [continued by Hallet], Paraphrase (London, 1727, 4to; also [with Colossians and Phil.] ib. 1733, 4to; in Latin, with additions, by J. D. Michaelis, Hal. 1747, 4to); Duncan, Exposition (Edinb. 1731, 8vo; 1844, 12mo); Cellarius, Auslegung (Ulm, 1731, 4to); \*Rambach, Erklarung [ed. Neubaier] (Frankf. 1742, 4to); Carpzov, Exercitationes [comparison with Philo] (Helmst. 1750, 8vo; in Germ. lb. 1795, 8vo); Anon. Paraphrase (Lond. 1750, 8vo; in Latin, by Semler, Halle. 1779, 8vo); Sykes, Paraphrase Arian] (Lond. 1755, 4to); \*Cramer, Erklarung (Copenh. 1757, 4to); Michaelis, Erklarung (Frankf. 1762-4, 1780V, 2 vols. 8vo); Streuensee, Erklarung (Flensb. 1763,4to); Baumgarten, Erklarung (Hal. 1763, 4to); C. F. Schmid, Observationes (Lipsiae, 1766, 8vo); Zacharia, Erklarung (Gött. 1771; ed. by Rosenmüller, ib. 1793, 8vo); Morus. Uebersetzung (Leipz. 1776, 1786,  8vo); Blasche, Commentar (Leipzig, 1781, 8vo); Abresch, Annotationes (L. B. 1786-7, 3 vols. 8vo); Delphinus, Commentarius [includ. John] (Rom. 1787, 8vo); Storr, Erläuterung (Tub. 1789, 1809, 8vo); \*Ernesti, Lectiones [edit. Dindorf] (Lips. 1795, 8vo); Hezel, Versuch (Leipzig, 1795, 8vo); Valnecker, Scholce (in his selections, Amsterd. 1815, ii, 345600); Schulz, Anmerk. (Breslau, 1818, 8vo); Maclean, Commentary (London, 1819, 8vo); W. Jones, Lectures (Lond. 1821, 8vo); Boehme, Commentarius (Lips. 1825, 8vo); \*Stuart, Commentary (Andover, 1827, 1833, 1851, 1860; Lond. 1837, 8vo); G. V. Sampson. Notes- (Lond. 1828, 8vo); \*Bleek, Commentar (Berlin, 182841; Elberf. 1838, 1868, 8vo); \*Kuinol, Commentarius (Lipsie, 1831, 8vo); Paulus, Erläuterung (Heidelb. 1833, 8vo); Klee, Commentar (Mainz, 1833, 8vo); Knox, Serm0ons (Lond. 1834, 8vo); Bishop Parry, Exposition (Lond. 1834, 8vo); Conder, Notes (Lond. 1834, 8vo); Duke of Manchester, Argumenet [of chap. 1-4, 11] (Lond. 1835, 8vo); \*Tholuck, Commentar (Hamburg, 1836, 1840, 8vo; translated, London, 1842, 2 vols. 12mo); \*Stier, Auslegung (Halle, 1842, 8vo; Brunswick, 1862, 2 vols. 8vo); Maurice, Lectures (London, 1846, 8vo); Stengel, Erklarung (Karlsruhe, 1849, 8vo); \*Delitzsch, Commentar (Leipz. 1850, 8vo; translated, Edinburgh, 1868-70, 2 vols. 8vo); Miller, Notes (Lond. 1851, 12mo); \*Turner, Commentary (N. Y. 1852, 8vo); Ellard, Commentary (Edinburgh, 1854, 8vo); Lineman, Erklarung (Götting. 1855, 8vo); Tait, Exposition (Lond. 1855, 2 vols. 12mo); Patterson, Commentary (Edinb. 1856, 8vo); F. S. Sampson, Commentary [ed. by Dabney] (New York, 1856, 8vo); Boultbee, Lectures (London, 1856,12mo); Anon. Comparison with Old Test. (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Am. Bib. Union, Trans. with Notes (N. Y. 1858, 4to); Haldane, Notes (Lond. 1860, 12mo); Knowles, Notes (Lond. 1862, 8vo); John Brown, Exposition (Lond. 1862, 2 vols. 8vo); Kluge, Erkilda'sun (Neu Rup. 1863, 8vo); Dale, Discourses (London, 1865, 8vo); Blech, Predigten (Danz. 1865, in pts. 8vo); Hartmann, Ausleg. (Berl. 1866, 8vo); Longking, Notes (N. Y. 1867, 12mo); Lindsay, Lectures (Edinb. 1867, 5 vols. 8vo); Kurtz, Erklar. (Mitau, 1869, 8vo); Ewald, Erklar. (Gött. 1870,8vo). SEE EPISTLE.

## Hebron[[@Headword:Hebron]]

             (Heb. Chebron', חֶבְרוֹן., a community; Sept. Χεβρών), the name of an important city and of several men, also (in a different Heb. form) of a smaller town.

1. A place in the south of Palestine, situated 20 Roman miles south of Jerusalem, and the same distance north of Beersheba (Eusebius, Onom. s.v. Α᾿ρκώ); and still extant, 18 miles south from Jerusalem, in 310 32' 30” N. lat., 350 8' 20” E. long., at the height of 2664 Paris feet above the level of the sea (Schübert). It is one of the most ancient cities existing, having been built “seven years before Zoan in Egypt,” and being mentioned even prior to Damascus (Num 13:22; Gen 13:18; comp. 15:2). Its earlier name was KIRJATHARBA that is, the city of Arba, from Arba, the father of Anak and of the Anakim who dwelt in and around Hebron (Gen 23:2; Jos 14:15; Jos 15:3; Jos 21:11; Jdg 1:10). It appears still earlier to have been called MANURE, probably from the name of Abraham's Amoritish ally (Gen 23:19; Gen 35:27; comp. 14:13, 28); but the “oak of Mamre,” where the patriarch so often pitched his tent, appears to have been not in, but near Hebron. (See below.) The chief interest of this city arises from its having been the scene of some of the most remarkable events in the lives of the patriarchs. Sarah died at-Hebron, and Abraham then bought from Ephron the Hittite the field and cave of Machpelah, to serve as a family tomb (Gen 23:2-20). The cave is still there, and the massive walls of the Haram or mosque, within which it lies, form the most remarkable object in the whole city. The ancient city lay in a valley, and the two remaining pools, one of which at least existed in, the time of David, serve, with other circumstances, to identify the modern with the ancient site (Gen 37:14; 2Sa 4:12). Much of the lifetime of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was spent in this neighborhood, where they were all entombed, and it was from hence that the patriarchal family departed for Egypt by the way of Beersheba (Gen 37:14; Gen 46:1). After the return of the Israelites, the city was taken by Joshua and given over to Caleb, who expelled the Anakim from its territories (Jos 10:36-37; Jos 14:6-15; Jos 15:13-14; Jdg 1:20). It was afterwards made only of the cities of refuge, and assigned to the priests and Levites (Jos 20:7; Jos 21:11; Jos 21:13). David, on becoming king of Judah, made Hebron his royal residence. Here he reigned seven years and a half, here most of his sons were born, and here he was anointed king over all Israel (1Sa 2:1-4; 1Sa 2:11; 1Ki 2:11; 2Sa 5:1; 2Sa 5:3). On this extension of his kingdom Hebron ceased to be sufficiently central, and Jerusalem then became the metropolis. It is possible that this step excited a degree of discontent in Hebron which afterwards encouraged Absalom to raise in that city the standard of rebellion against his father (2Ki 15:9-10). Hebron was one of the places fortified by Rehoboam (2  Chronicles 11:10); and after the exile, the Jews who returned to Palestine occupied Hebron and the surrounding villages (Neh 11:15).

Hebron is not named by the prophets, nor in the New Testament; but we learn from the Apocrypha, and from Josephus, that it came into the power of the Edomites, who had taken possession of the south of Judah, and was recovered from them by Judas Maccabaeus (1 Macc. 5, 65; Josephus, Ant. 12, 8, 6). During the Great War, Hebron was seized by the rebel Simon Giorides, but was recaptured and burnt by Cerealis, an officer of Vespasian (Joseph. War, 4, 9; 7:9). Josephus describes the tombs of the patriarchs as existing in his day; and both Eusebius and Jerome, and all subsequent writers who mention Hebron down to the time of the Crusades, speak of the place chiefly as containing these sepulchers. In the course of time, the remarkable structure enclosing the tombs of Abraham and the other patriarchs was called the “Castle of Abraham;” and by an easy transition, this name came to be applied to the city itself, till in the time of the Crusades the names of Hebron and Castle of Abraham were used interchangeably. Hence, as Abraham is also distinguished among the Moslems by the appellation of el-Khulil, “the Friend” (of God), this latter epithet became, among them, the name of the city; and they now know Hebron only as el-Khulil (Robinson's Researches, 2, 456). Soon after the Crusaders had taken Jerusalem, Hebron also appears to have passed into their hands, and in 1100 was bestowed as a fief upon Gerhard of Avennes; but two years after it is described as being in ruins (Wilken, Gesch. der Kreuz. 2, 44; Saewulf, Peregrin. p. 269). In 1167 Hebron was raised to the rank of a bishopric (Will. Tyr. 20:3), and the title of bishop of Hebron long remained in the Romish Church, for it occurs so late as A.D. 1365. But it was merely nominal; for after the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin in 1187, Hebron also reverted to the Moslems, and has ever since remained in their possession. In the modern history of Hebron, the most remarkable circumstance is the part which the inhabitants of the town and district took in the rebellion of 1834, and the heavy retribution which it brought down upon them. They held out to the last, and gave battle to Ibrahim Pasha near Solomon's Pools. They were defeated, but retired and entrenched themselves in Hebron, which Ibrahim carried by storm, and gave over to sack and pillage. The town has not yet recovered from the blow it then sustained. In the 14th century pilgrims passed from Sinai to Jerusalem direct through the desert by Beersheba and Hebron. In the following century this route seems to have been abandoned for that by Gaza; yet the pilgrims sometimes took Hebron in their way, or visited it from Gaza. The  travelers of that period describe as existing here an immense charitable establishment, or hospital, where 1200 loaves of bread, besides oil and other condiments, were daily distributed to all comers, without distinction of age or religion, at the annual expense of 20,000 ducats. Hebron continued to be occasionally visited by European travelers down to the latter part of the 17th century, but from that time till the present century it appears to have been little frequented by them. The principal travelers who have been more recently there are Seetzen, Ali Bey, Irby and Mangles, Poujoulat, Monro, Stephens, Paxton, Lord Lindsay, Russegger, Schubert, Dr. Robinson, Dr. Olin, De Saulcy, Stanley, etc.

The town of Hebron lies low on the sloping sides of a narrow valley (of Mamre), surrounded by rocky hills. This is thought to be the “valley of Eshcol,” whence the Jewish spies got the great bunch of grapes (Num 13:23). Its sides are still clothed with luxuriant vineyards, and its grapes are considered the finest in Southern Palestine. Groves of gray olives, and some other fruit-trees, give variety to the scene. The valley runs from north to south; and the main quarter of the town, surmounted by the lofty walls of the venerable Haram, lies partly on the eastern slope (Gen 37:14; comp. Gen 23:18). The houses are all of stone, solidly built, flat roofed, each having one or two small cupolas. The town has no walls. The streets are narrow, seldom more than two or three yards in width; the pavement, where one exists, is rough and difficult. The shops are well furnished, better indeed than those of towns of the same class in Egypt, and the commodities are of a very similar description. The only display of local manufactures is the produce of the glass-works, for which the place has long been celebrated in these parts. Gates are placed not only at the entrance of the city, but in different parts of the interior, and are closed at night for the better preservation of order, as well as to prevent communication between the different quarters.

There are nine mosques in Hebron, none of which possess any architectural or other interest, with the exception of the massive structure which is built over the tombs of the patriarchs. This is esteemed by the Moslems one of their holiest places, and Christians are rigorously excluded from it. The only Europeans who, in a late period, have found their way to the interior, were Ali Bey and Giovanni Finati, the Italian servant of Mr. Bankes. The best account of it is that furnished by the Rev. V. Monro, who states that “the mosque, which covers the cave of Machpelah, and contains the patriarchal tombs, is a square building, with little external decoration, at the  south end of the town. Behind it is a small cupola, with eight or ten windows, beneath which is the tomb of Esau, excluded from the privilege of lying among the patriarchs. Ascending from the street, at the corner of the mosque, you pass through an arched way by a flight of steps to a wide platform, at the end of which is another short ascent; to the left is the court, out of which, to the left again, you enter the mosque. The dimensions within are about forty paces by twenty-five. Immediately on the right of the door is the tomb of Sarah, and beyond it that of Abraham, having a passage between them into the court. Corresponding with these, on the opposite side of the mosque, are those of Isaac and Rebekah, and behind them is a recess for prayer, and a pulpit. These tombs resemble small huts, with a window on each side and folding doors in front, the lower parts of which are of wood, and the upper of iron or bronze bars plated. Within each of these is an imitation of the sarcophagus that. lies in the cave below the mosque, which no one is allowed to enter. Those seen above resemble coffins with pyramidal tops, and are covered with green silk, lettered with verses from the Koran. The doors of these tombs are left constantly open; but no one enters those of the women-at least men do not. In the mosque is a baldachin, supported by four columns, over an octagonal figure of black and white marble inlaid, around a small hole in the pavement, through which a chain passes from the mop of the canopy to a lamp continually burning to give tight in the cave of Machpelah, where the actual sarcophagi rest.

At the upper end of the court is the chief place of prayer; and on the opposite side of the mosque are two larger tombs, where are deposited the bodies of Jacob and Leah” (Summer's Ramble, 1, 245). The cave itself he does not describe, nor does it appear that even Moslems are admitted to it; for Ali Bey (a Spaniard traveling as a Moslem) does not even mention the cave below while describing the shrines of the mosque. John Sanderson (A.D. 1601) expressly says that none might enter, but that persons might view it, as far as the lamp allowed, through the hole at the top, Moslems being furnished with more light for the purpose than Jews. At an earlier period, however, when the Holy Land was in the power of the Christians, access was not denied; and Benjamin of Tudela says that the sarcophagi above ground were shown to the generality of pilgrims as what they desired to see; but if a rich Jew offered an additional fee, “an iron door is opened, which dates from the time of our forefathers who rest in peace, and, with a burning taper in his hands, the visitor descends into a first cave, which is empty, traverses a second in the same state, and at last reaches a third, which contains six sepulchers, those of Abraham, Isaac,  and Jacob, and of Sarah, Rebekah, and Leah, one opposite the other. All these sepulchers bear inscriptions, the letters being engraved; thus, upon that of Abraham: This is the sepulcher of our father Abraham, upon whom be peace;' even so upon that of Isaac and all the other sepulchers. A lamp burns in the cave and upon the sepulchers continually, both night and day; and you there see tubs filled with the bones of Israelites; for it is a custom of the house of Israel to bring hither the bones and relics of their forefathers, and leave them there, unto this day” (Itinerary, 1, 77; ed. Asher, Berlin, 1840). The identity of this place with the cave of Machpelah is one of the few local traditions in Palestine which even Dr. Robinson suffers to pass without dispute, and may therefore be taken for granted. M. Pierotti, an engineer to the pasha of Jerusalem, has lately had an opportunity of leisurely examining the building; and in the spring of the year 1862 the prince of Wales and his suite were allowed to visit the interior, of which a description is given in App. 2 to Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish Church, pt. 1: “We reached the south-eastern corner of the massive wall of enclosure…. Up the steep flight of the exterior staircase, gazing close at hand on the polished surface of the wall, amply justifying Josephus's account of the marble-like appearance of the huge stones which compose it, we rapidly mounted. At the head of the staircase, which by its long ascent showed that the platform of the mosque was on the uppermost slope of the hill, and therefore above the level where, if anywhere, the sacred cave would be found, a sharp turn at once brought us within the precincts, and revealed to us for the first time the wall from the inside.... We passed at once through an open court into the mosque. With regard to the building itself, two points at once became apparent. First, it was clear that it had been originally a Byzantine church.

To any one acquainted with the cathedral of St. Sophia at Constantinople, and with the monastic churches of Mount Athos, this is evident from the double narthex, or portico, and from the four pillars of the nave. Secondly, it was clear that it had been converted at a much later period into a mosque I now proceed to describe the tombs of the patriarchs, premising always that these tombs, like all those in Mussulman mosques, and, indeed, like most tombs in Christian churches, do not profess to be the actual places of sepulture, but are merely monuments or cenotaphs in honor of the dead who lie beneath. Each is enclosed with a separate chapel or shrine, closed with gates or railings similar to those which surround or enclose the special chapels or royal tombs in Westminster Abbey. The first two of these shrines or chapels are contained in the inner portico, or narthex, before the entrance  into the actual building of the mosque. In the recess on the right is the shrine of Abraham, in the recess on the left that of Sarah, each guarded by silver gates. The shrine of' Sarah we were requested not to enter, as being that of a woman. A pall lay over it. The shrine of Abraham, after a momentary hesitation, was thrown open. The: chamber is cased in marble. The so-called tomb consists of a coffin-like structure, about six feet high, built up of plastered stone or marble, and hung with three carpets — green embroidered with gold. Within the area of the church or mosque were shown the tombs of Isaac and Rebekah. They are placed under separate chapels, in the walls of which are windows, and of which the gates are grated, not with silver, but iron bars. Their situation, planted as they are in the body of the: mosque, may indicate their Christian origin. In almost all Mussulman sanctuaries, the tombs of distinguished persons are placed, not in the center of the building, but in the corners. To Rebekah's tomb the same decorous rule of the exclusion of male visitors naturally applied as in the case of Sarah's. But on requesting to see the: tomb of Isaac, we were entreated not to enter… The chapel, in fact, contains nothing of interest; but I mention this story both for the sake of the singular sentiment which it expresses, and also because it well illustrates the peculiar feeling which has tended to preserve the sanctity of the place-an awe, amounting to terror, of the great personages who lay beneath, and who would, it was supposed, be sensitive to any disrespect shown to their graves, and revenge it accordingly.

The shrines of Jacob and Leah were shown in recesses, corresponding to those of Abraham and Sarah, but in a. separate cloister opposite the entrance of the mosque… It will be seen that up to this point no mention has been made of the subject of the greatest interest, namely, the sacred cave itself, in which one at least of the patriarchal family may possibly still repose intact the embalmed body of Jacob. It may well be supposed that to this object our inquiries throughout were directed. One indication alone of the cavern beneath was: visible. In the interior of the mosque, at the corner of the shrine of Abraham, was a small circular hole, about eight inches across, of which one foot above the pavement was built of strong masonry, but of which the lower part, as far as we could see and feel, was of the; living rock. This cavity appeared to open into a dark space beneath, and that space (which the guardians of' the mosque believed to extend under the whole platform) can hardly be anything else than the ancient cavern of Machpelah. This was the only aperture which the guardians recognized. ‘Once,' they said, ‘2500 years ago, a servant of a great king had penetrated through some other entrance. He descended in  full possession of his faculties and of remarkable corpulence; he returned blind, deaf, withered, and crippled. Since then the entrance was closed, and this aperture alone was left, partly for the sake of suffering the holy air of the cave to escape into the mosque, and be scented by the faithful; partly for the sake of allowing a lamp to be let down by a chain, which we saw suspended at the mouth, to burn upon the sacred cave. We asked whether it could not be lighted now. No,' they said; ‘the saint likes to have a lamp at night, but not in the full day-light.' With that glimpse into the dark void we and the world without must for the present be satisfied. Whether any other entrance is known to the Mussulmans themselves must be a matter of doubt.

The original entrance to the cave if it is now to be found at all, must probably be on the southern face of the hill, between the mosque and the gallery containing the shrine: of Joseph, and entirely obstructed by the ancient Jewish wall, probably built across it for this very purpose.' This account is somewhat at variance with the results? of the researches of I. Pierotti, who states, in a letter to the London Times, April 30, 1862, “The true entrance to the patriarchs' tomb is to be seen close to the western wall of the enclosure, and near the north-west comer; it is guarded by a very thick iron railing, and I was not allowed to go near it. I observed that the Mussulmans themselves did not go very near it. In the court opposite the entrance-gate of the mosque there is an opening, through which I was allowed to go down for three steps, and I was able to ascertain by sight and touch that the rock exists there, and to conclude it to be about five feet thick. From the short observations I could make during my brief descent, as also from the consideration of the east wall of the mosque, and the little information I extracted from the chief santon, who jealously guards the sanctuary. I consider that a part of the grotto exists under the mosque, and that the other part is under the court, but at a lower level than that lying under the mosque.” SEE MACHPELAH.

The court in which the mosque stands is surrounded ‘by an extensive and lofty wall, formed of large stones, and strengthened by square buttresses. This wall is the greatest antiquity in Hebron, and even Dr. Robinson supposes that it may be substantially the same which is mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 1, 14; War, 4, 9, 7), and by Eusebius and Jerome (Ononast. s.v. Arboch), as the sepulcher of Abraham; A common Moslem tomb in the neighborhood of Hebron passes as the tomb of Abner. He was certainly interred in this city (2Sa 3:32); and the head of Ishbosheth, after his assassination, was deposited in the same sepulcher (2Sa 4:12);  but there is slight evidence in favor of the tradition which professes to point out this locality to the modern traveler. Besides this venerable wall, there is nothing at Hebron bearing the stamp of antiquity save two reservoirs for rainwater outside the town. One of these is just without the southern gate, in the bottom of the valley. It is a large basin 133 feet square, and 21 feet 8 inches deep. It is built of hewn limestone of very solid workmanship, and obviously of ancient date. The depth of water of course varies at different times of the year: in May it is 14 feet. The descent is by flights of steps at the four corners, by which the water is brought up in vessels and skins, and poured out into troughs for the flocks, or carried away for domestic uses. Just at the north end of the main part of the town is another and smaller pool, also occupying the bed of the valley, and measuring 85 feet by 55, with a depth of 18- feet, containing (in May) 7 feet of water. These cisterns, which are connected with no perennial springs, and which are filled only by the rains, seem (at least in summer) to be the main dependence of the inhabitants for water, although that of the larger pool is neither clear nor clean. As these pools are doubtless of high antiquity, one of them is in all likelihood the “pool of Hebron” over which David hanged up the assassins of Ishbosheth (2Sa 4:12).

The present population of Hebron has not been clearly ascertained, but is probably about 5000. Most of the inhabitants are Moslems, of fierce and intolerant character. There are no resident Christians. The Jews amount to about 50 families, mostly natives of different countries of Europe, who have immigrated to this place for the purpose of having their bones laid near the sepulchers of their illustrious ancestors. They have two synagogues and several schools. As usual, they have a quarter of the city to themselves, where the streets are marrow and filthy, and the houses mean. In a few instances, however, they are in tolerable repair, and whitewashed.

The environs of Hebron are very fertile. Vineyards and plantations of fruit- trees, chiefly olive-trees, cover the valleys and arable grounds; while the tops and sides of the hills, although stony, are covered with rich pastures, which support a great number of cattle, sheep, and goats, constituting an important branch of the industry and wealth of Hebron. The hill-country of Judah, of which it is the capital, is indeed highly productive, and under a paternal government would be capable of sustaining a large population. That it did so once is manifest from the great number and extent of ruined terraces and dilapidated towns. It is at present abandoned, and cultivation ceases at the distance of two miles north of the town. The hills then  become covered with prickly and other stunted trees, which furnish Bethlehem and other villages with wood. About a mile from the town, up the valley, is one of the largest oak trees in Palestine. It stands quite alone in the midst of the vineyards. It is 23 feet in girth, and its branches cover a space 90 feet in diameter. This, say some, is the very tree beneath which Abraham pitched his tent; but, however this may be, it still bears the name of the patriarch (Porter's Handbook, p. 67 sq.). SEE OAK.

2. The third son of Kohath the Levite, and hence the uncle of Moses (Exo 6:18; 1Ch 6:2; 1Ch 6:18; 1Ch 15:9; 1Ch 23:12; 1Ch 23:19). B.C. ante 1738. His descendants are called HEBRONITES (Num 3:27, etc.).

3. A son of Mareshah, and apparently grandson of Caleb of Judah (1Ch 2:42-43). B.C. post 1612.

4. (Heb. Ebron', עֶבְרוֹן, prob. for עִבְדּוֹן, Abdon, as many MSS. read; Sept. Ε᾿βρών, Vulg. Abran.) A town on the northern border of Asher (Jos 19:28); possibly the same (Keil, Comment. in loc.) elsewhere (Jos 21:30) called ABDON SEE ABDON (q.v.).

## Hebron (2)[[@Headword:Hebron (2)]]

             A brief but excellent description of this venerable place is given in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (3:305 sq.), and the latest and most complete account of the Haram enclosure there may be found in the same work (page 333 sq.). We give some interesting particulars from Lieut. Conder's Tent Work in Palestine, 2:79:

"Hebron is a long stone town on the western slope of a bare, terraced hill; it extends alone the valley, and the main part reaches about seven-hundred yards north and south, including the Mosque Quarter, and the Quarter of the Gate of the Corner. On the north is a separate suburb, named from the mosque of 'Aly Bukka, who died in 670 A.H.; on the south also, and west of the road, is another small suburb. The Haram stands above the middle of the main quarter. The Sultan's Pool, a large, well-built reservoir, occupies part of the valley. West of the city is an open green below the Quarantine, surrounded by hills which are covered with olives. "The contrast between Hebron and Bethlehem is readily noticed; the town has a dead-alive appearance, and the sullen looks of the Moslem fanatics contrast with the officious eagerness of the Bethlehem Christians. There are some seventeen thousand Moslems in Hebron, according to the governor's account; and about six hundred Jews are tolerated in the Quarter of the Corner Gate. The town is the centre of commerce for the southern Arabs, who bring their wool and camel's-hair to its market. It has also a sort of trade in glass ornaments' and in leather water-buckets, but the bustle and stir of Bethlehem are not found in its streets; the inhabitants seem wrapped in contemplation of the tombs of their forefathers, and boast that uno pagan Frank has yet desecrated the holy shrines with his presence, or built his house in the town." (See Plan on page 535.)

## Hebronite[[@Headword:Hebronite]]

             (Heb. Chebroni', חֶבְרוֹנַי, Sept. Χεβρών ald Χεβρωνί, Vulg. Hebronitce), a designation of the descendants of HEBRON, the third son of Kohath, who was the second son of Levi, the younger brother of Amram, father of Moses and Aaron (Exo 6:18; Num 3:19; 1Ch 6:2; 1Ch 6:18; 1Ch 23:12). The immediate children of Hebron are not mentioned by name (comp. Exo 6:21-22), but he was the founder of a “family” (mishpachah) of Hebronites (Num 3:27; Num 26:58; 1Ch 26:23; 1Ch 26:30-31) or Bene-Hebron (1Ch 15:9; 1Ch 23:19), who are often mentioned in the enumerations of the Levites in the passages above cited. JERIAH was the head of the family in the time of David (1Ch 23:19; 1Ch 26:31; 1Ch 24:23 : in the last of these passages the name of Hebron does not now exist in the Hebrew, but has been supplied in the A.V. from the other lists). In the last year of David's reign we find them settled at Jazer, in Gilead (a place not elsewhere named as a Levitical city), “mighty men of valor” (בְּנֵי חִיַל), 2700 in number, who were superintendents for the king over the two and a half tribes in regard to all matters sacred and secular (1Ch 26:31-32). At the same time  1700 of the family under Hashabiah held the same office on the west of Jordan (1Ch 26:30).

## Hecataea[[@Headword:Hecataea]]

             apparitions which appeared during the performance of certain ceremonies in honor of the goddess Hecate (q.v.). An image of the goddess was  formed of incense of Arabia, myrrh, styrax, and certain animals called ascalabotse. These were all ground to powder, made into a paste, and moulded in an image of Hecate. Then, in the presence of this image, at midnight, under a lotus-tree, the ceremonies are duly performed, when the Hecataea appear and assume various shapes.

## Hecate[[@Headword:Hecate]]

             in Greek mythology, is a mystical figure, wrapped in deep darkness, as described by Hesiod. She is called the daughter of the Titan Perses by Asteria, but the accounts vary, sometimes Jupiter,' at others Tartarus, being mentioned as her father, and Juno, Ceres, Pheraea, etc., as her mother. She was the only one among the Titans who assisted Jupiter in the war with the giants; therefore she was not hurled into. Tartarus, as were the others, but was endowed with great power in heaven, on earth, as well as in the infernal regions. She is usually represented triformnate, from which circumstance she has the surname Tricephalus or Triceps, the three- headed. She possessed the keys to three roads, leading respectively to Hades, to heaven, and to a happy life on earth. Her work was usually at night, and therefore she has been confounded with the goddess of the moon, Selene.

## Hecatomb[[@Headword:Hecatomb]]

             (ἐκατόμ, from ἑκατόν, one hundred, and βοῦς, an ox), a sacrifice offered by the ancient Greeks only on extraordinary occasions, consisting of one hundred oxen. The word is sometimes applied to an offering of other animals than oxen; and it is used occasionally to denote any large sacrifice, a definite number being used for an indefinite.

## Hecht, Christian[[@Headword:Hecht, Christian]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born August 31, 1696, at Halle. He studied in his native place and at Leipsic; was in 1728 pro-rector of the gymnasium at Idstein, Nassau; in 1744 first pastor at Esens, in East-Frisia; and died January 18, 1747, leaving, Diss. de Sadducceismo Anna et Caiphae: — Antiquitates Kauraeorum: — Varia Variorum Judicia de Synesii, Cyrenensis in AEgypto Episcopi, Fuga Istius Episcopatus: — Commentatio de Secta Scribarum sive γραμματέων. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:1, 451; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hecke, Joseph Van[[@Headword:Hecke, Joseph Van]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, was born in 1795 at Bruges. In 1814 he joined the Jesuits, was for some time professor of canon law at Freiburg, Switzerland, and in Belgium, and went in 1837 to Brussels to take part in the continuation of the Acta Sanctorum. He wrote on Johannes Capistranus (q.v.) and Ignatius, patriarch of Constantinople (q.v.). Hecke died July 27, 1874. (B.P.)

## Heckel, Johann Christian[[@Headword:Heckel, Johann Christian]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, born at Augsburg in 1747, was deacon in his native city in 1780, and died December 7, 1798, leaving, Neues Beicht- und Communionbuch (Augsburg, 1778, 2 volumes): — Versuch einer theologischen Encyclopadie und Methodologie (Leipsic, 1778), and some ascetical works. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:289. (B.P.)

## Heckel, Johann Friedrich[[@Headword:Heckel, Johann Friedrich]]

             a German philologist and theologian, was born at Gera about 1640. After finishing his studies he travelled in Germany and Italy, where he connected himself with' Magliabecchi and Cinelli. On his return he became successively rector of the College of Reichenbach and sub-director of the College of Rudolstadt. He spent the last days of his life at Plauen and at Oelsnitz, where he died, in 1715, leaving, Memoria Freislebiana (Gera, 1664): — Dissertatio Historico-Philologico Theologica, etc. (Chemnitz, 1675): — Sciagraphia Theologorum Evangelicorum (Dresden, 1678): — Theophili Pistorii Ornithogamelion, etc. (ibid. eod.): — De Constini Duobus Numis (Frankfort, 1693): — Manipulum Primum Epistolarum Singularius, etc. (Plauen, 1695). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Hecker, Isaac Thomas[[@Headword:Hecker, Isaac Thomas]]

             a Roman Catholic priest, was born December 18, 1819. He was brought up a Protestant. At first he was engaged in business, but in 1843 joined the community at Brook Farm. In 1849, having entered the Catholic Church, he was ordained by cardinal Wiseman. At first he joined the Redemptorist; Fathers, but soon planned, and in 1859 founded, the Congregation of St. Paul, the members of the order being converts from Protestantism. He has been chief of the order from the start. In 1865 he founded the Catholic World. He died December 21, 1888. — See Appletons' Cyclop. of Amer. Biography.

## Hecker, Jacob Christian[[@Headword:Hecker, Jacob Christian]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1727. He studied at Ieipsic and Gottingen, was in 1751 deacon at Meuselwitz, in Altenburg, pastor at Eisleben in 1764 and died April 14, 1779. He published, De Oratore Sacro (Gottinugen, 1748): — De Erroribus Vulgi in Libris Sacris (eod.): — De Usu Religionis Christianae OEconomico et Civili (Kiel, 1770). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hecker, Johann Julius[[@Headword:Hecker, Johann Julius]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born November 2, 1707. He studied at Halle, was in 1735 preacher at Potsdam, in 1738 at Berlin, in 1750 member of consistory, and died June 24, 1768, leaving a few ascetical works. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Heckewelder, John Gottlieb Ernestus[[@Headword:Heckewelder, John Gottlieb Ernestus]]

             a distinguished Moravian missionary among the Indians of North America, born at Bedford, England, Mar. 12,1743, where his father, who had fled from Moravia for the sake of religious liberty, was engaged in the service of the Church. On the 2nd of April 1754, young Heckewelder came to America with his parents. At the age of nineteen years (1762) he accompanied Christian Frederick Post, an Indian teacher and colonial agent, to the Tuscara was Valley, in Ohio, where they attempted t establish a mission among the natives. This enterprise proving a failure, Heckewelder labored for some time as the assistant of David Zeisberger, on the Susquehanna. In the spring of 14.1 he joined this illustrious evangelist at Friedenstadt, on the Beaver Creek, Pa., and for the next fifteen years shared all the hardships, sufferings, and triumphs of the Indian mission, at its various stations in Ohio and Michigan. SEE ZEISBERGER, DAVID.

In the course of this period he married Miss Sarah Ohneberg (July 4, 1780), at Salem, Ohio, which was probably the first wedding ever solemnized in that state. Having severed his connection with the mission (October, 1786) on account of his wife's feeble health, he was appointed (1788) agent of the “Society of the United'-Brethren for propagating the Gospel among the Heathen” SEE ETTWEIN, JOHN, and made repeated but unsuccessful attempts, in consequence of the Indian War, to survey a tract of land in the Tuscara was Valley, granted to the Christian Indians by Congress as an indemnification for their losses in the Revolution. In 1792 and 1793 he was twice appointed assistant peace commissioner by the United States government, and was active in aiding the other commissioners to bring about a pacification. These humane efforts, however, proved abortive, and the war continued, ending in the total defeat of the Western tribes. In 1801 he settled at Gnadenhitten, Ohio, and devoted himself to the duties of his agency until 1810, when he resigned. The rest of his life he spent at Bethlehem hi literary labors, producing two works, namely, An Account of the History, Manners, and Customs of the Indian Nations who once inhabited Pennsylvania and the neighboring States (Philadelphia, 1818; transl into French by Duponceau, Paris, 1822, 8vo); and A Narrative of the Mission of the United Brethren among the Delaware and Mohegan Indians (Philadelphia, 1820). He died January 31, 1823. General Cass criticized his writings in the North Amer. Review, vol.  26. See also Rondthaler, Life of Heckewelder (Phila. 1847, 12mo). (E. de S.)

## Hedding, Elijah, D.D[[@Headword:Hedding, Elijah, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Pine Plains, N.Y., June 7, 1780. Trained religiously by a pious mother, he was converted on the Vergennes Circuit, Vermont, in 1798, and in 1800 was licensed to preach. His early labors in the itinerant ministry were full of toil and privation, and he often met with fierce persecution; but powerful revivals followed his ministry, especially in Vermont and New Hampshire. On the 16th of June 1801, he was admitted on trial in the New York Annual Conference, and appointed to Plattsburg Circuit; in 1802 to Fletcher; in 1803 to Bridgewater Circuit, New Hampshire; after which his work as a preacher lay wholly in New England. In 1807 he was made presiding elder of the New Hampshire District. The country was mountainous, newly settled, and poor; and Mr. Hedding's whole receipts for the first year were $4.25, besides his traveling expenses. In 1808 he was elected a delegate to the General Conference held at Baltimore. A plan for a “delegated” General Conference was discussed by this body, and at first rejected; a rupture seemed imminent, but a reconsideration was brought about, largely through Hedding's influence, and the plan was finally adopted. In 1809 he was appointed to the New London District, and in 1810 he married. In the ten years before his marriage he traveled 3000 miles a year, and preached nearly every day. His pay for this time averaged $45 per annum. “The circuits were large, often requiring three to five hundred miles to complete one round, and this round was completed in from two to six weeks, during which a sermon was to be preached and a class met daily; and often three sermons and three classes to be attended on the Sabbath.

The journeys, too, were performed on horseback, through rough and miry ways, and through wildernesses where no road as yet had been cast up. Rivers and swamps were to be forded. Nor could the journey be delayed. On, on, must the itinerant press his way, through the drenching rains of summer, the chilling sleet of spring or autumn, and the driving blasts or piercing cold of winter; and often amid perils, weariness, hunger, and almost nakedness, carrying the Bread of Life to the lost and perishing. And then, when the day of toil was ended, in the creviced hut of the frontier settler, the weary itinerant, among those of kindred hearts and sympathies, found a cordial though humble place of repose.” “For twenty-four years before his election to the episcopacy he received his annual appointments at Conference, and  prosecuted the duties assigned him on circuits, and stations, and presiding elders' districts. The fields of his labor lay, after the first few years, wholly in the New-England States; and when the New-England Conference was separated from New York, he became identified with that work. In the introduction and establishment of Methodism in New England-itself one of the most romantic, as it is perhaps the best recorded portion of Methodist history-he was an active and most: efficient agent, and in its stirring scenes and forlorn but heroic labors he spent the flower of his manhood; and upon it, no doubt, he left the impress of his own great spirit, which remains his noblest and most enduring monument.” From 1808 to 1824 he was a delegate to every General Conference, and was always eminent in. influence and power at the sessions of that body. In the “Presiding Elder Question” at the Conferences of 1820 and 1824, he stood with those who favored the election of presiding elders by the Conferences; but his; zeal in the cause never degenerated into rashness, or became liable to the charge of disloyalty. In 1824 he was elected bishop.

He accepted the office with great reluctance, and filled it with the most distinguished ability and acceptance for 26 years. “In the exercise of the episcopal functions he developed rare qualifications as a pre-siding officer, and especially as an expounder of ecclesiastical law. The soundness of his views upon the doctrines and discipline of the Church was so fully and so universally conceded, that in the end he became almost an oracle in these respects, and his opinions are regarded, with profound veneration. As a theologian and divine, his views were comprehensive, logical, and well matured. Not only had they been elaborated with great care, but the analysis was very distinct; and the successive steps were not only clearly defined in the original analysis, but distinct even in the minutiae of their detail. His discourses were after the same pattern — an example of neatness, order, perspicuity, and completeness. From the year 1844, age and increasing infirmities compelled him to seek relief from the heavy burden of labor he had previously preformed, and his visits to the Annual Conferences became less frequent. Yet his labors and responsibilities were still very great. He was almost incessantly sought unto by ministers in almost every part of the United States for counsel and assistance, and for information upon points of ecclesiastical law and in the administration of discipline.” In 1850 he had a severe attack of acute disease, but he partially recovered, and lingered, after suffering severely, until the 9th of April 1852, when he died in peace and triumph at his home in Poughkeepsie. His intellect suffered neither weakness; nor obscuration to the last. “About three o'clock in the morning,  a change took place betokening the near approach of death. Early in the morning his sufferings: were great; his extremities were cold, and his death agony was upon him; but his intellectual powers — consciousness, perception, memory, reason, were unaffected. Several Christian friends witnessed his dying struggles, and the glorious triumph of his abiding faith. The Rev. M. Richardson came in, and inquired whether his prospect was clear; he replied with great emphasis, ‘Oh yes, yes, YES! I have been wonderfully sustained of late, beyond the usual degree.' After a pause, he added, ‘I trust in Christ, and he does not disappoint me. I feel him, I enjoy him, and I look forward to an inheritance in his kingdom.” A full account of the labors of this great and good man will be found in the Life and Times of the Rev. E. Hedding, D.D., by D. W. Clark, D.D. (New York, 1855, 8vo; reviewed by Dr. Curry in the Methodist Quarterly, Oct. 1855); see also Stevens, History of the Methodist Episcopal Church; Sprague, Annals, 7, 354; North American Review, 72, 349.

## Hedge[[@Headword:Hedge]]

             the rendering in the A.V. (besides derivatives from סוּךְor סָכִךְ,. rendered as a verb), 1, of three words from the same root (גָּדִר), which, as well as their Greek equivalent (φραγμός), denotes simply that which surrounds or encloses, whether it be a stone wall ( גֵּדֵרge'der, Pro 24:31; Eze 42:10) or a fence of other materials. גָּדֵר, gader', and גְּדֵרָה, gederah', are used of the hedge of a vineyard (Num 22:24; Psa 89:40; 1Ch 4:23); and the latter is employed to describe the wide walls of stone, or fences of thorn, which served as a shelter for sheep in winter and summer (Num 32:16). The stone walls which surround the sheepfolds of modern Palestine are frequently crowned with sharp thorns (Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 299), — a custom at least as ancient as the time of Homer (Od. 14, 10), when a kind of prickly pear (ἄχερδος) was used for that purpose, as well as for the fences of cornfields at a later period (Arist. Eccl. 355). In order to protect the vineyards from the ravages of wild beasts (Psa 80:12), it was customary to surround them with a wall of loose stones or mud (Mat 21:33; Mar 12:1), which was a favorite haunt of serpents (Ecc 10:8), — and a retreat for locusts from the cold (Nah 3:17). — Such walls are described by Maundrell as surrounding the gardens of Damascus. “They are built of great pieces of earth, made in the fashion of brick and hardened in the sun. In their  dimensions they are each two yards long and somewhat more than one broad, and half a yard thick. Two rows of these, placed one upon another, make a cheap, expeditious, and, in this dry country, a durable wall” (Early Travels in Pal. p. 487). A wall or fence of this kind is clearly distinguished in Isa 5:5 from the tangled hedge, 2, מְשׂוּכָה, mzesukah' 1(מְסוּכָח, Mic 7:4), which was planted as an additional safeguard to the vineyard (comp. Sir 28:24), and was composed of the thorny shrubs with which Palestine abounds. The prickly pear, a species of cactus, so frequently employed for this purpose in the East at present, is believed to be of comparatively modern introduction. The aptness of the comparison of a tangled ‘hedge of thorn to the difficulties which a slothful man conjures up as an excuse for his inactivity will at once be recognized (Pro 15:19; comp. Hos 2:6). The narrow paths between the hedges of the vineyards and gardens, ‘: with a fence on this side and a fence on that side” (Num 22:24), are distinguished from the ~” highways,” or more frequented tracks, in Luk 14:23 (Hackett, Illustra. of Scripture, p. 166; Trench, On the Parables, p. 193). — Smith, s.v.

## Hedge, Levi, LL.D[[@Headword:Hedge, Levi, LL.D]]

             a professor in Harvard University, was born in 1777 at Hardwick, Mass. He graduated at Harvard University in 1792. “His whole life, from his childhood, may be said to have been connected with the University. In 1795 he was appointed tutor, and subsequently received the appointment of permanent tutor; in 1810 he was made college professor of logic and metaphysics; and in 1827 he was transferred to the Alford professorship of natural religion, moral philosophy, and civil polity. In 1830 he was compelled by an attack of paralysis to resign his position. He died Jan. 3, 1844. He is remembered by many pupils as a faithful instructor and kind friend.” He published a” System of Logic” (1818, 18mo), which passed through several editions, and has been translated into German. He was the father of Dr. F. H. Hedge, an eminent Unitarian minister. Christian Examiner, 36, 299.

## Hedinger, Johann Reinhard[[@Headword:Hedinger, Johann Reinhard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Stuttgart, September 7, 1664. He accompanied the duke Johann Friedrich of Wiirtemberg as chaplain to France, was in 1692 militarypreacher, in 1698 court-preacher and member of consistory, and died December 28, 1704. He wrote, De Fadere Gratiae: — Quaestiones Vexata de Testamenti Veteris Natura a Novo Discrepantia, and some ascetical works. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hedio, Gaspar or Caspar[[@Headword:Hedio, Gaspar or Caspar]]

             one of the early German Reformers, was born at Ettlingen, Baden, in 1494. He studied theology at Freiburg and Basle, where in 1519 he sustained, in presence of Capito, the theses afterwards printed under the title Conclusiones ex Evangelica Scriptura et veteri utriusque linguae  theologia mutuatas disp. Caspar Iledio (1519, fol.). They are 24 in number, treating on the attributes of God and predestination, and evince a decided tendency towards the Reformation. In 1520 he began to correspond with Luther and Zwingle; in the same year he was called to Mentz on the recommendation of Capito, and was made court preacher and vicar to the archbishop. He resigned his offices in 1523, and retired to Strasburg. The chapter of that city offered him the pulpit of the cathedral, but the bishop refused to confirm the offer until Hedio had promised to confine himself to preaching the Word of God. His preaching was very popular, because it was simple and Biblical. He was naturally timid, and incapable of taking a leading part in the religious movement then going on; but his services as coadjutor to Bucer and Capito in consolidating the Reformation in Strasburg were very great. In 1551 he was sent, with Lenglin and Soll, to confer with the German theologians on the subject of the Confession of Faith. He died at Strasburg Oct. 17,1552. Among his writings are Chronicon Germanicum, oder Beschr. aller alten christl. Kirchen bis aufs Jahr 1545 (Strasb. 1530,3 vols. fol.): — Smaragdi abbatis Commentarii in Evangelia et Epistolas, which he translated himself into German: — Chronicon abbatis Urspergensis correctum, et Paralipomena addita ab anno 1230 ad ann. 1537, translated also into German by himself: — Sententinae Ph. Melanchthonis, Mart. Buceri, Gasp. Hedionis et aliorums de pace Ecclesiae, annl. 1534 (1607, 8vo). Melchior Adam considers him also as the translator of the histories of Eusebius, Hegesippus, and Josephus, and other works. See Melchior Adam, Vitae Germanorum Philosophorums (Heidelberg, 1615-1620, 4 vols. 8vo), 1, 116; Haag, La France Protestante; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 718. (J. N. P.)

## Hedschra or Hedjra[[@Headword:Hedschra or Hedjra]]

             SEE HEGIRA.

## Hedstrom, Olif G[[@Headword:Hedstrom, Olif G]]

             a noted Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Sweden in 1803, of humble parents, who gave him a fair education. When twenty-two years old he joined a band of adventurous youths, who volunteered to take two frigates from Sweden to their purchasers in one of the South American republics. After a tempestuous voyage, instead of reaching South America they landed in New York. Mr. Hedstrom soon made arrangements to return to Sweden, but on the eve of his departure was robbed of his money. He was shortly afterward led to Willett Street Methodist Episcopal Church, N.Y., experienced religion, and on reaching his Swedish home began holding Methodist class-meetings and prayer-meetings, the first ever held in that land. In 1835 he returned to New York, joined the New York Conference, and in it travelled the following circuits: Charlotte, Jefferson, Coeymans, WindhamCatskill, and Prattsville.

In 1845 he was appointed to the Swedish mission, with his headquarters in the famous Bethel ship for Scandinavian seamen, foot of Carlisle Street, N.Y. He began by boarding, when possible, every incoming ship from Scandinavia or Denmark before it touched the shore, and distributing among the emigrants Bibles and tracts, telling them where they could find good temporary homes, and inviting them to the Bethel ship. In a single day he might be found in the counting- room of the rich gathering funds for the mission, far out on the deep seeking the lost sheep, at his desk answering letters from all parts of the  world, at the bedside of the sick and dying, and pleading from his pulpit with the waiting throng to accept Christ. Thus he continued till his death, May 6, 1877. Mr. Hedstrom was thoroughly devoted to his work, had a simplicity of manner and fund of experimental Christianity that won the hearts of all. His religion was full of joy, and his life of success. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1878, 1:42; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Heduosmon[[@Headword:Heduosmon]]

             SEE MINT.

## Hedwig, St[[@Headword:Hedwig, St]]

             was the daughter of Agnes and Berthold, duke of Carinthia. She married Henry, duke of Poland and Silesia, by whom she had three sons and three daughters. They afterwards made a vow of chastity, Henry becoming  priest and subsequently bishop, while Hedwig entered a Cistercian convent near Trebnitz, without, however, taking the veil. She died there October 15, 1243, and was buried in the convent. She was canonized by pope Clement IV in 1267 (or 1268). She is commemorated on the 17th of October. See Arnaud d'Andilly, Vie des Saints Illustra; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 728.

## Heenir[[@Headword:Heenir]]

             in Norse mythology. When the Wanes and Asas, after a long war, agreed on an armistice, they exchanged hostages. The Asas got the Wane Niord, the Wanes the Asa Haenir, who was very beautiful, but had no mental gifts, and soon the Wanes ceased to respect him. Both hostages remain in the power of their enemies until the destruction of the world, when they will return to their kindred.

## Heerbrand, Jakob[[@Headword:Heerbrand, Jakob]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born at Giengen Aug. 12, 1521. After studying at Ulm and Wittenberg, he was ordained at Tübingen, from whence he was banished for objecting to the Interim; but he was soon recalled, and made pastor of Herrenberg. In 1551, duke Christopher sent him as one of the theological delegates to the Council of Trent. Charles, prince of Baden, employed him in reforming the churches in his dominions, and in 1560 he was chosen professor of divinity at Tübingen, where he died May 22, 1600. Of his works, which are numerous both in German and Latin, the principal is Compendium Theologiae (Tübingen, 1578, fol., often reprinted), a work which long held its place as a textbook. The negotiations between the Tübingen theologians of that time and the patriarch of Constantinople caused this compend to be translated into Greek (by M. Crusius), and to be sent to Constantinople. The Greek translation was published, together with the original, at Wittenberg in 1782. His opponents used to call him, on account of his polemical zeal, Hollbrand (“hell-fire”). See Melchior Adam, Vit. Theologorum, 1, 137; Hook, Eccl. Biography, vol. 5.; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 5, 627.

## Heermann, Johann[[@Headword:Heermann, Johann]]

             a Silesian Protestant pastor and hymn writer, was born at Rauten, Silesia, Oct. 11, 1585. At school he displayed early talent. In 1611 he became pastor at Koben. During the Thirty Years' War Silesia was the seat of war and plunder, and Heermann was often obliged to conceal himself to save his life. He gave up his pastoral charge at Koben in 1638, and died Feb. 17, 1647. In the height of his troubles in 1630, he published a volume of hymns under the title Devoti llusica Cordis, and his productions afterwards were very numerous. Heermann's hymns are “distinguished by great depth and tenderness of feeling, by an intense love of the Savior, and by humility, while in form they are sweet and musical.” Many of them are still in use in Germany, and some have been translated into English. Two of them-”A  Song of Tears” and “A Song of Comfort” — together with several hymns written during his last illness, are given in Winkworth, Christian Singers of Germany, p. 197 sq, with a sketch of the life of Heermann. Others are given in Miss Winkworth, Lyra Germanica, and in Schaff, Christ in Song (N. York, 1869). A selection from his hymns, in German, may be found in Wackermagel, Heermann's eistliche Liedei (Stuttgart, 1856). Of his other works we mention Heptalogus Christi (on the seven words on the cross), Breslau, 1619; new edit. Berlin, 1856.

## Heeser, Johann[[@Headword:Heeser, Johann]]

             a Reformed theologian, who died in 1716, is the author of Prodomus Criticus seu Observationes Philologicae in Omnes Voces Chaldaicas et Multas Hebraicas Veteris Testamenti (Amsterdam, 1696,1714): העזר אבןsive Lexici Philologici, Hebraeo-Chaldaeo Sacri, Pars I (1714). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:367; Steinschneider, Bibl. Handbuch, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hegai[[@Headword:Hegai]]

             (Heb. Hegay', הֵגִי, perh. eunuch, Est 2:8; Est 2:15; Sept. Τα‹,Vulg. Egeus) or He'ge (Heb. id. הֵגֶא idem, Est 2:3; Sept. omits, Vulg. Egeus), the eunuch having charge of the harem of Xerxes, and the preparation of the females sought as concubines for him. B.C. 479. Winer (Wörterbuch s.v.) thinks he may be the same with Hegias ( ῾Ηγίας), who is mentioned by Ctesias (Perseus, 24) as present at the check of the Persian army at Thermopylae.

## Hegeimayer, Thomas Gottfried[[@Headword:Hegeimayer, Thomas Gottfried]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born July 30, 1730. He studied at Tubingen was in 1761 preacher, in 1777 professor of theology, and died April 13, 1786. He published, De Sanctis Mundum et Angelos Judicaturis in 1Co 6:3 (Tubingen, 1755): — Chaldaismi Biblici Fundamenta (1770): — Commentatio pro loco Eusebii in Hist. Ecc 4:13 (1777): —De Peccato Originali atque Speciatim (1778): — Oratio in Verba Psa 110:1 (1780): — An et quo Sensu Patres Antenicceni Christum Dicerint Creaturan (1781): — De θεοπνευστίᾷ (1784). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:110, 239, 402, 410, 422, 433, 446, 447, 596, 597. (B.P.)

## Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich[[@Headword:Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich]]

             the greatest of modern German metaphysicians. The following sketch of his life is modified from the English Cyclopaedia. He was born at Stuttgart Aug. 27, 1770, and was educated at the gymnasium of his native city. From 1788 to 1793 he studied at Tübingen, where he had for his class fellow the illustrious Schelling; and where he acquired not only a knowledge of the history of philosophy, but also a thorough acquaintance with the natural and political sciences. Upon being admitted doctor in philosophy, he accepted an engagement as private tutor, in which capacity he lived for some years, first in Switzerland, and afterwards at Frankfort- on-the-Main, until, on the death of his father in 1800, he was enabled, by the inheritance of a small patrimony, to devote himself to the study of philosophy. He accordingly proceeded to Jena, where Schelling was teaching his system of “Absolute Identity,” of which Hegel was at this period one of the warmest partisans. “Here he composed his first philosophical work, entitled Ueber die Differens der Fichte schen und Schellingschen Philosophie

On the Difference of the Systems of Fichte and Schelling); — which treatise, notwithstanding the sincerity with which Hegel then advocated the  views of the latter, contained the germ of that dissent which was afterwards expanded into a peculiar theory. He was also associated with Schelling in conducting the Kritische — Journal der Philosophie (Critical Journal of Science);;and among the most important of the articles contributed by him is that “On Faith and Science,” which contains a luminous review of the doctrines of Kant, Jacobi, and Fichte, whose several systems are represented as nothing more than so many forms of a purely subjective philosophy. In 1806, when Schelling went to Würzburg, Hegel was appointed to supply his place as lecturer. Now for the first time Hegel openly avowed his dissatisfaction with the system of Schelling. The difference between the ideas of the master and disciple was marked still more strongly in the Phoenomenologie des ,Geistes (Phenomenology of Mind), which was published at Bamberg, whither Hegel had retired after the battle of Jena. This work he used to call his Voyage of Discovery, as indicating the researches he had passed through in order to arrive at a clear knowledge of the truth. It contains an account of the several grades of development through which the ‘self,' or ‘ego,' proceeds: first of all from consciousness into self-consciousness; next into reflective and active reason, from which it becomes philosophical reason, self-cognizant and self-analyzing, until at last, rising to the notion of God, it manifests itself in a religious form. The title ‘Pheanomenology' points out the limits of the work, which is confined to the phenomena of mind as displayed in the elements of its immediate existence, that is, in experience. It traces the course of mind up to the point where it recognizes the identity of thought and substance, of reason and reality, and where the opposition of science and reality ceases. Henceforward mind develops itself as pure thought or simple science, and the several forms it successively assumes, which differ only in their subject-matter or contents, are the objects of logic, or ‘dialectic.' In 1808 he was called to preside over the gymnasium of Nurnberg. In 1812 he published his Logic (Wissenschaft der Logik), which was designed, with the ‘Phenomenology,' to complete the whole body of science.

Hegel employs the term logic in a very extended sense. He does not confine it, as is usually the case, to the account of the abstract forms of thought and the laws of connection of ideas, but understands by it the science of the self-sufficient and self determining idea-the science of truth and of reality. From his fundamental principle that thought and substance are one and identical, it followed that whatever is true of the former is true also of the latter, and consequently the laws of logic become ontological. From this point of view Hegel describes in this work the progress of  reason; how, by virtue of a peculiar and inherent impulse, it passes constantly onwards, until at last it returns into itself. The general merits of this work were at once admitted, and the high powers of philosophical reflection which it evinced were acknowledged by the offer of a professorship at Heidelberg in 1817. His first course of lectures was attended by a numerous and distinguished class, attracted by the profoundness and originality of his views, notwithstanding the great obscurity of his style. By the publication of the Encyklopadie der philos. Wissenschaften (Encyclopedia, of Philosophical Sciences) in 1817, his reputation as a philosopher was established, and Hegel was invited by the Prussian government to fill the chair at Berlin, which had remained vacant since the death of Fichte in 1814. This work, being designed as a manual for his class, takes a general view of his whole system, and exhibits in the clearest manner the ultimate tendency of his views. Considering logic as the base of all ontology, and starting from the idea in itself or potentially, he considers it as the essence and primary substance. He then examines thought as at first existing in itself, then in other or in nature; next in the mind of the individual, in a purely subjective point of view; and then objectively, in its outward realization; and, lastly, as he terms it, absolutely, that is, as manifesting itself in art, religion, and philosophy. From 1817 until death terminated his career there is nothing to relate in the life of Hegel beyond the constantly increasing celebrity of his lectures and the publication of several works. He successively published the Philosophy of Jurisprudence, two new editions of the Encyclopedia, the first volume of the second edition of his Logic, and several articles in the Annals of Scientific Criticism, which he had established as an organ of his system, and of its application to every branch of art and science” (Eng. Cyclop.). He died Nov. 14,1831, of cholera.

Hegel's influence upon the philosophy and theology of Germany has been very great. It is impossible, in brief space, to give a full idea of the Hegelian system. “The transcendental idealism of Kant formed the transition from the empiricism of the 18th century, and effected, as it were, a compromise between the ancient realism and the skepticism of Hume. To the system of Kant succeeded the pure and absolute idealism of Fichte, destined to be displaced in its turn by Schelling's system of absolute identity and intellectual intuition, which was itself to be further modified and developed by the dialectical momentum of Hegel. Essentially the systems of Hegel and Schelling are both founded on the same principle, namely, the absolute  ideality of thought and being; for there is evidently but little difference between the doctrine of Schelling, which supposed that the human mind contained within it the fullness of reality and truth, the consciousness of which it may attain to simply by contemplating its own nature, and that of Hegel, according to whom the concrete notion, or the reason, comprises within itself all verity, and that, in order to arrive at the science thereof, it is only necessary to employ logical thought, or dialectic. The difference is purely a difference of method. For the rigorous formalism of Fichte, Schelling had substituted a sort of poetical enthusiasm, and, banishing from philosophy the scientific form it had received from Wolff, had introduced into it the rapturous mysticism of the intellectual intuition. Hegel, however, insisting that the scientific system is the only form under which truth can exist, re-established the rights and utility of method by his doctrine of the dialectical momentum, or development of the idea. Indeed, with Hegel the method of philosophy is philosophy itself. This he defines to be the knowledge of the evolution of the concrete. The concrete is the idea, which, as a unity, is diversely determined, and has in itself the principle of its activity.

The origin of the activity, the action itself, and the result are one, and constitute the concrete. Its movement is the development by which that which exists merely potentially is realized. The concrete in itself, or virtually, must become actual; it is simple, yet different. This inherent contradiction of the concrete is the spring of its development. Hence arise differences, which, however, ultimately vanish into unity. There is both movement, and repose in the movement. The difference scarcely becomes apparent before it disappears, whereupon there issues from it a full and concrete unity. Of this he gives the following illustration: the flower, notwithstanding its many qualities, is one; no single quality that belongs to it is wanting in the smallest of its leaves, and every portion of the leaf possesses the same properties as the entire leaf. He then observes that although this union of qualities in sensible objects is readily admitted, it is denied in immaterial objects, and held to be irreconcilable. Thus it is said that man possesses liberty, but that freedom and necessity are mutually opposed; that the one excluding the other, they can never be united so as to become concrete. But, according to Hegel, the mind is in reality concrete, and its qualities are liberty and necessity. It is by necessity that man is free, and it is only in necessity that he experiences liberty. The objects of nature are, it is true, subject exclusively to necessity; but liberty without necessity is an arbitrary abstraction, a purely formal liberty” (English Cyclopaedia, s.v.).  Hegel “rejected the intellectual intuition of the philosophy of nature, and studied to make philosophy an intelligible science and knowledge by means of dialectics. He called philosophy the Science of Reason, because it is the idea and consciousness of all esse in its necessary development. It is his principle to include all particular principles in it. Now as the Idea is reason identical with itself, and as, in order to be cognizant of itself, or, in other words, as, in order to be self-existing (fir sich seyn), it places itself in opposition to itself, so as to appear something else, without, however, ceasing to be one and the same thing; in this case philosophy becomes divided:

1. Into logic considered as the science of the Idea in and for itself.

2. Into the philosophy of nature considered as the science of the Idea representing itself externally (reason thrown out in nature).

3. Its third division is that of the philosophy of mind, expressing the return of the Idea within itself, after having thrown itself without externally.

All logic, according to Hegel, presents three momentums:

1. The abstract or intelligible momentum, which seizes the object in its most distinct and determinate features, and distinguishes it with precision.

2. The dialectic or negative rational momentum consists in the annihilation of the determinations of objects, and their transition to the opposite determinations.

3. The speculative momentum perceives the unity of the determinations in their opposition.

Such is the method which philosophy aught to follow, and which is frequently styled by Hegel the immanent movement, the spontaneous development of the conception. Logic is essentially speculative philosophy because it considers the determinations of thought in and for itself, consequently of concrete and pure thoughts, or, in other words, the conceptions, with the significations of the self-subsisting foundation of all. The primary element of logic consists in the oneness of the subjective and objective; this oneness is the absolute science to which the mind rises as to its absolute truth, and is found in the truth, that pure Esseis pure  conception in itself; and that pure conception: alone is true Esse. The absolute idealism of Hegel has considerable affinity with Schelling's doctrine of Identity on this point, but it shows a clear departure from it in the method. With Hegel, logic usurps the place of what had been previously styled Metaphysics and Critique of pure Reason. The first, and perhaps the most suggestive, of Hegel's works, his Phenomenology of the: Mind, contains a history of the progressive development of the consciousness. Instinctive or common knowledge: only regards the object, without considering itself. But the consciousness contains, besides the former, also a perception of itself, and embraces, according to Hegel, three stages in its progress consciousness, self-consciousness, and reason. The first represents the object standing in opposition to the Ego, the second the Ego itself, and the third accidents attaching to the Ego, i.e. thoughts. This phenomenology constituted at first a. sort of introduction to pure science, whereas later it came to form a part of his doctrine of the mind. Purer science or logic is divided, 1st, into the logic of Esse or being (das Seyn); 2nd, into the logic of qualified nature (das Wesen); 3rd, into logic of the conception or of the idea.

The two first constitute the objective logic, and the last division the subjective logic, containing the substance of vulgar logic. Hegel treated as fully of the philosophy of right and of art as of the metaphysical part of his system. According to his view, the essential' in man is thought; but thought is not a general abstraction, opposed to the particular abstraction; on the contrary, it embraces the particular within itself (concrete generality). Thought does not remain merely internal and subjective, but it determines and renders itself objective through the medium of the will (practical mind). To will and to know are two inseparable: things; and the free-will of man consists in the faculty of appropriating and of rendering the objective world his own, and also in obeying the innate laws of the universe, because he wills it. Hegel places the existence of right in the fact that every existence in general is. the existence of a free-will. Right is usually confounded with morality, or with duty placed in opposition to inclination. There exists, however, a higher morality raised above this, which bids us act according to truly rational ends, and which ought to constitute the true: nature of man. We find the objective development of this higher morality in the State and in history (Tennemann, Manual of the History of Philosophy, § 424).  Hegel's view of the philosophy of religion is thus stated by Schwegler: “All religions seek a union of the divine and human. This was done in the crudest form, by

(a.) the natural religions of the Oriental world. God is with them, but a power of nature, a substance of nature, in comparison with which the finite and the individual disappear as nothing.

(b.) A higher idea of God is attained by the religions of spiritual individuality, in which the divine is looked upon as subject-as an exalted subjectivity, full of power and wisdom in Judaism, the religion of sublimity; as a circle of plastic divine forms in the Grecian religion, the religion of beauty; as an absolute end of the State in the Roman religion, the religion of the understanding or of design.

(c.) The revealed or Christian religion first establishes a positive reconciliation between God and the world by beholding the actual union of the divine and the human in the person of Christ, the God- man, and apprehending God as triune, i.e. as himself, as incarnate, and as returning from this incarnation to himself. The intellectual content of revealed religion, or of Christianity, is thus the same as that of speculative philosophy; the only difference being that in the one case the content is represented in the form of the representation, in the form of a history, while in the other it appears in the form of the conception” (Schwegler, Hist. of Philosophy, transl. by Seelye, N. Y. 1864, p. 364).

If, now, after having acquired a general idea of Hegel's philosophical system, we ask what solution that system gives to the questions which most interest humanity; what becomes in it of a just and merciful God, of the individuality and personality of man, the free agency and morality of his acts, his hopes of another life, of a brighter future, we shall find no satisfactory answer. The system claims to agree completely with true Christianity, yet its tendencies seem to be pantheistic and anti-Christian. Hegel himself constantly asserts that his philosophical system is in no way contradictory to the Christian religion, and only differs from it in its forms and expressions. Yet in his system the absolute idea, whose evolution constitutes both the spiritual and the material world, becomes, in its last development, the universal mind, the absolute and infinite subject; and this absolute subject is put in the place of God, who therefore can have no self- conscious existence except in finite and individual subjects. And since this system has no substance but the idea, no reality but the development of the  idea, and no absolute reality except the mind, which is its end, it follows that finite and individual subjects themselves are but fleeting forms of the universal mind, which is their substance. What becomes, then, of the immortality of the soul, which presupposes in it an independent substantiality, a true personality, an undying individuality? And if the universal mind be but the logical sum of finite minds, without other consciousness than what it finds in individuals, it follows that pantheism can only be avoided by falling into atheism; our personality can only be saved at the expense of that of God himself. Hegel's moral system seems to float between two extremes, each as dangerous as the other. In either case free agency and morality appear equally endangered. While actually destroying all distinctions — which, it is true, he considers as continually produced by universal motion, the single existing actuality-does not Hegel at the same time obliterate all distinction between good and evil, and destroy one of the surest pledges of a future life? If all is but evolution, the evolution of a given content, then all is virtually determined; and freedom, though proclaimed by the very essence of the mind, becomes necessity, in finite beings: all that they consider as their own work, the effect of their individual action, becomes really but a part of the universal work, an effect of the eternal activity of the general and absolute mind.

The essence of Hegel's religious philosophy is found in the doctrine that the world, including nature and humanity, is only the self-manifestation of God. Such a system, presented with the wonderful dialectical skill that Hegel possessed, could not fail to exert a great effect upon the theology of his age. Soon after he commenced the publication of The Journal for Scientific Criticism (1817), the Hegelian philosophy began to show its power. This magazine was at first exclusively devoted to the external propagation of Hegelianism, and it added greatly, during Hegel's lifetime, to the number of proselytes. Immediately after the death of Hegel his orthodox followers effected the publication of all his works (G. W. F. Hegel's Werke, durch einen Verein von Freunden des Verewigten, etc., Berlin, 1834-45, 18 vols. 8vo). Disputes soon arose in the Hegelian school concerning the Person of God, the Immortality of the Soul, and the Person of Christ, which terminated in the division of the school into two camps. Daumer, Weisse, Goschel, Rosenkranz, Schaller, and others (called the right wing), attempted to connect the theistic idea of God with the common notion of the divinity contained in the Hegelian philosophy, and to prove the former from the latter; whilst Michelet, Strauss, and others (the  left wing), maintained that the pantheistic idea of God was the only true result of the Hegelian principle, and represented God as the universal substance or the eternal universe, which becomes first absolutely conscious of itself in humanity. Goschel, Heinrichs, Rosenkranz, Marheinecke, and others, attempted, besides, to justify the ecclesiastical idea of Christ, as specifically the only God-man, on philosophical grounds, whereas Bauer, Conradi, Michelet, Strauss, and others, maintained that the unity of the divinity and of humanity was not realized in one individual, but in the whole of humanity, so that the latter in reality is the God-man. Finally, Strauss and Feuerbach (the extreme left) developed Hegelianism into full- blown atheism and infidelity. “The Hegelian school pretended to find an equivalent for the objects of Christian faith and the propositions of Christian theology in the dogmas of their system. The latter were said to be the pure and final rendering of that which Christianity presents in a popular form. The substantial contents of both were averred to be identical. The Trinity, the Atonement, and the other doctrines of the orthodox creed had now — so it was claimed-received a philosophical vindication, and the vulgar rationalism which had flippantly impugned these high mysteries was at length laid low. These sounding pretensions could only mislead the undiscerning. A philosophy which denies the distinct personality of God, and consequently must regard prayer as an absurdity, can by no legerdemain be identified with Christian doctrine. The appearance of the Life of Christ by Strauss, and the subsequent productions of Baur and his school, through the applications which they made of the Hegelian tenets to the New-Testament history and the teaching of the apostles, placed this conclusion beyond a doubt” (Fisher, Essays on the Supernatural, p. 587).

It is not to be understood that Hegel's system is now universally held to be pantheistic or even anti-Christian in tendency. An analysis and translation of Hegel's Phenomenology, also Outlines of his Logic, are given in the Journ. of Spec. Philos. vols. 1, 2, 3, (St. Louis, 1868-9), by the editor, W. T. Harris, which journal demands the careful study of all who profess to judge of Hegelianism. The points made in the Journal are also summed up by a writer in the Amer. Quar. Church Review, Oct. 1869, who maintains not only that Hegel's system is not pantheistic, but that it is the widest and deepest system of thought yet offered to mankind, and that, too, in full harmony with Christianity. We cite from this article the following passages: “To help us to the highest education of our reason is the aim of Hegel, and this help is the inestimable gift he offers to all who will understand him. To  him philosophy is not philosophy unless it ‘stands up for all those great religious interests to which alone we virtually live.' Every step of his system is towards the deep truths of the faith; but these things are not mere dogmas with Hegel; they appear as the logical results of the most logical of systems” (Journal of Speculative Philosophy, 1, 256). “In the Christian religion,” says Hegel, “God has revealed himself, that is, he has given us to understand what he is; and the possibility of knowing him thus afforded us renders such knowledge a duty. God wishes no narrow-hearted souls or empty heads for his children, but those whose spirit is of itself, indeed, poor, but rich in the knowledge of him, and who regard this knowledge as their only valuable possession” (Amer. Ch. Rev. Oct. 1869, p. 415). “They who regard God as negative unity, and the creature not as self-determining, these are pantheists.

With such a God we should only seem to be; we should only be ‘modes' of that ‘substance.' But man, being a self- determining creature, is his own negative unity, and hence his immortality. ‘He cannot be a mere phase of a higher being, for he is essentially a reflection of that.' We are made in God's image, and in him spiritually we see ourselves: who does not see, then, that the highest thought in Hegel's philosophy is only an elucidation of' the central dogma of the Christian faith. God is this ideal unity, and each person of the Holy Trinity is that one God in his entirety. To sum up briefly the points of this comparison: We have found that Hegel's doctrine of Being is the direct converse of the pantheistic theory; for whereas the latter considers pure Being identical with the All, Hegel regards it as equivalent to nonentity Secondly, pantheism has always held fast to the abstractions of the understanding, and hence it has attacked all forms of Becoming; but Hegel's invincible dialectic has demolished this strong position, and led us up to the higher ground of the concrete notion. Thirdly, the pantheistic view of the Negative is abstract. ‘Being alone is, and non-being is not.' But with Hegel the ultimate form of the negative is immanent contradiction; the negative is not for itself; but out of it is constituted the true positive. (This leads to the view of the Universal as the only real, independent individual, the I Am that I Am.) Fourthly, the true pantheists held Distinction to be impossible, while the theory of the materialistic pantheists was Atomism, the abstract and separate validity of Identity and Distinction; but Hegel leaves both theories far behind him when he penetrates to the inmost depths of the subject, and arrives at Self-determination as the origin and principle of all distinction whatever. (This, again, leads to the self-determination of the Absolute — the spirituality of God.) Fifthly, the unity of pantheism is a  ‘negative unity,' which annuls the independence of multiple factors; but with Hegel the true unity, the unity of the Absolute, is purely affirmative, subsisting through the very independence of its members. (And here we reach a development of the great Christian idea of the Trinity.) Here is not pantheism taking a new dress, but pantheism receiving a flat contradiction upon its cardinal principles” (ibid. p. 403-4).

Literature. — For an able article on Hegel's philosophy, and its influence on religion and theology in Germany, see Ulrici, in Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, 5, 629-646. See also, besides the works cited above, Kahnis, History of German Protestantism, p. 196, 244; Saintes, History of Rationalism, chap. 13, 18; Schaff, Apostolic Church, § 34; Princeton Review, Oct. 1848, art. 4; Morell, History of Modern Philosophy, chap. 5.; Bibliotheca Sacra, 8, 503; Vera, Introduction a la Philosophie de Hegel (Paris, 1855); Haym, Hegel und seine Zeit (Berlin, 1858); Chalybaeus, History of Philosophy from Kant to Hegel; Sibree, translation of Hegel's Philosophy of History (London, Bohn); Sloman and Wallon, translation of Hegel's Subjective Logic (Lond. 1855); Lewes, History of Philosophy (4th edit. Lond. 1871, 2 vols. 8vo), 2, 531 sq.; Stirling, Secret of Hegel, giving a translation of portions of Hegel's Logic (London, 1865, 2 vols. 8vo); Saisset, Modern Pantheism, 2, 11 sq.; Rosenkranz, Hegel als deutscher Natural philosoph (Leipz. 1870).

## Hegesippus[[@Headword:Hegesippus]]

             one of the earliest writers on Church History (between A.D. 150 and 180), was originally a Jew, born near the beginning of the 2nd century. He was converted to the Christian faith, and came to Rome about A.D. 168, where he died, according to the Alexandrine Chronicle, in the reign of Commodus, about A.D. 180. He wrote a collection of Υπομνήματα, or Memorials of the History of the Church, in five books, from the birth of our Lord to the time of Eleutherus, bishop of Rome, who succeeded Anicetus in A.D. 170. This work is all lost except a few fragments preserved by Eusebius, and one in the Bibliotheca of Photius. Several extracts may be found translated by Lardner (Credibility, vol. 2). All that remains of Hegesippus is given by Routh (Reliquiae Sacrae, 2nd edit. 1, 205 sq.), and also by Grabe (Spicilegium, 2, 203 sq.) and by Galland (Bibl. Patr. 2, 59). “The reports of Hegesippus on the character and martyrdom of St. James the Just, Simeon of Jerusalem, the rise of heresies, the episcopal succession, and the preservation of the orthodox doctrine in  Corinth and Rome, as embodied in the history of Eusebius, command attention for their antiquity; but, as they show that his object was apologetic and polemical rather than historical, and as they bear a somewhat Judaizing (though by no means Ebionistic) coloring, they must be received with critical attention” (Schaff, Church History, vol. 1, § 123).

The Socinians of the 17th century use his brief statements as proof of' the general spread of Judaizing tendencies in the 1James , 2 nd centuries, and Baur, of Tübingen, and his school, have recently reproduced this view. Bishop Bull answered the former, and Dorner, in his Lehre v. d. Person Christi, 1, 219 (Edinburgh trans. 1, 139 sq.), has refuted the latter. “The evidence tends to prove that he was not even a Hebrew Christian in the sense of observing the law, and there is the most complete proof that he did not regard the observance of the law as essential to salvation. With the destruction of this premise, the keystone of the two theories of the early Unitarians and of Baur is utterly destroyed. The Unitarians maintained that Hegesippus was an Ebionite or Nazarene, and that consequently the whole Church was in his day Ebionitic? though, unfortunately, the few Platonizing writers, who formed a miserable exception to the mass, have been the only writers that a subsequent corrupt age has preserved to us. Baur finds in Hegesippus a most determined antagonist of Paul, and his testimony is appealed to as proof that the Petrine faction had gained the predominance not only in the churches of the East, but even in. those of the West. Both theories run directly contrary to the repeated testimony of Eusebius, and to all the information which we have in regard to the Western churches, and they both fall to pieces unless it be proved that Hegesippus insisted upon the observance of the law as essential to salvation” (Donaldson, History of Christian Literature, 3, 188 sq.). See also Clarke, Succession of Sacred Literature; Neander, Church History, 1, 675, 676; Lardner, Works, vol. 2; Cave, Hist. Lit. 1. 265; Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 7, 156; Dupin, Eccles. Writers, cent. 2; Illgen, Zeitschrift, 1865, pt. 3.

## Heginbotham, Ottiwell[[@Headword:Heginbotham, Ottiwell]]

             an English poet, was born in 1744. He was ordained as a Congregational minister at Sudbury in 1765. and died there in 1768. His hymns, about twenty-five in all, were printed in 1794, and again in 1799 as a Supplement to Watts. Several of them are found in modern hymnals.

## Hegira[[@Headword:Hegira]]

             an Arabic word signifying flight (Hejra), now used to designate the epoch from which the Mohammedans compute time. The flight of Mohammed from Mecca to Medina is fixed by the Mohammedans on July 15, A.D. 622. The process of converting the years of the Hegira into the date after the birth of Christ is as follows. Divide the given number by thirty (the quotient expresses the intercalary cycles elapsed since the Hegira, the  remainder represents the number of years elapsed in the current intercalary cycle); multiply the quotient by 10,631 (the number of days contained in an intercalary cycle), adding to the product the sum of the days contained in the elapsed years of the current cycle, the days of the elapsed current months of the current year up to the time of reckoning, and to the result add again 227,015 (the number of days elapsed between Jan. 1 of the year 1, and July 15, 622, the date of the Hegira). The stun of days thus obtained is most readily converted into Julian years by dividing it by 1461 (the number of days in a Julian intercalary period), then multiplying the quotient by four, and adding to the product the number of whole years contained in the remainder of the division, which is obtained by dividing this remainder by 365. The number of days still remaining shows the day of the month in the current Julian year. Or else the following proportion may be made use of (T representing any date in the Turkish. calendar, and C the corresponding date in the Julian calendar): C =0.970203 T + 621.567785, and T = 1.030712 C 64.65745. If the date is subsequent to the Gregorian reform in the calendar, which can only be the case for modern times, then the Turkish date must first be converted into the Julian, which is then altered to the Gregorian by adding ten days to it for the period extending from Oct. 5, 1582, to the end of February, 1700; eleven days after the latter until the end of February, 1800, and twelve days for all subsequent dates. In making this reduction, the difference between the time at which the day begins in the Turkish and in the Christian calendar must be taken into consideration whenever the time of day of the event calculated is known, as it may make a difference in the date of one day more or less. The Turkish year begins at the end of July. The year 1859 A.C. is in their calendar 1275-76. A simpler mode of reduction, but not strictly accurate, is as follows: The Mohammedan year a lunar year of 354 days, and therefore 33 Mohammedan years =32 Christian. To reduce years of the Hegira, therefore, to years of the Christian era, subtract one from every thirty-three years, and add 622. Thus A.D. 1861 = 1277 of the Hegira. — Pierer, Universal Lexikon, 8:721.

## Hegius, Alexander[[@Headword:Hegius, Alexander]]

             (the name, according to some accounts, being Latinized from the name of his native village, Heck), a German humanist of the 15th century, was born within the diocese of Mitnster about 1433 or 1455 (the exact date is undetermined), and died at Deventer, Holland, in the latter part of 1498. He claims notice here because of his influence in reviving classical learning,  especially by means of the celebrated college which he established at Deventer. This school is named by Hallam (Lit. of Europe, 1, 109, Harpers' ed.) as one of the three schools thus early established in Western Europe, outside of Italy, for instruction in the classic languages, “from which issued the most conspicuous ornaments of the next generation.” Hegius is said to have been a friend of Rudolph Agricola, and to have himself received instruction in classical literature from Thomas a Kempis. Among his pupils may be named Erasmus, Hermann von dem Busche, Murmellius, and others, whose labors and success in literature add lustre to their teacher's fame. Hegius's writings were but few, and those mainly in the form of poetry and brief grammatical and philosophical treatises; one of a theological type is found in a miscellaneous collection of writings by him, published at Deventer, 1530, 4to, and entitled De Incarnationis Mysterio Dialogi duo, quibus additum de Paschae et Celebratione et inventione. Hallam (1. c. note) attributes to him “a small 4to tract entitled Conjugationes Verbornum Graeca, Daventrice Noviter extremo labore collectae et impressae,” without date or printer's name, and which he regards as the first book printed this side of the Alps in Greek. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 19, 616; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 763. (J. W. M.)

## Hegumenos[[@Headword:Hegumenos]]

             (from ἡγέομαι, to rule), in the Greek church, the superior of a convent, the abbot or archimandrite of a monastery.

## Heidanus, Abraham[[@Headword:Heidanus, Abraham]]

             professor of theology at Leyden, was born at Frankenthal, in the Palatinate, Aug. 10,1597. He was educated at Amsterdam and Leyden, and in 1627 was appointed to a pastoral charge in the latter city. In 1647 he became professor in the University of Leyden. Heidanus held a mild view of the doctrine of predestination, and adopted the Cartesian philosophy, of which he became a strong advocate. This involved him in various controversies, in which he bore himself admirably. Yet, when nearly eighty years old, he was dismissed from his professorship by the curators of the University. He died at Leyden Oct. 15, 1678. His Corpus Theologiae Christianae was posthumously published (1686, 2 vols. 4to).

## Heidegger, Johann Heinrich, D.D[[@Headword:Heidegger, Johann Heinrich, D.D]]

             a Swiss Protestant theologian, was born near Zurich July 1, 1633. He studied at Marburg and Heidelberg, where he graduated, and soon after became extraordinary professor of Hebrew, and then professor of theology. In 1659 he went to Steinfurt as professor of theology and ecclesiastical history. War having dispersed the students of Steinfurt, Heidegger returned to Zurich in 1665, and was professor of moral philosophy in the University of the city until 1667. He died at Zurich Jan. 18, 1698. He was the compiler of the famous Formula Consensus, adopted by the Synod of Zurich in 1675. SEE HELVETIC CONFESSIONS. His writings are chiefly polemical; the most important are Disputatio: theologica de fine nundi (Steinfurt, 1660,4to): — Defide decretorum Concilii Tridentini Quaestiones theologicae (Steinfurt, 1662 8vo):De Articulis fundamentalibus Judaicae Religionis (Steinfurt, 1664, 4to): — De Hist. sacra Patriarcharum (Amst. 1667-1671,2 vols. 4to; Zurich, 1729, 2 vols. 4to): — Anatome Concilii Tridentini (Zurich, 1672, 2 vols. 8vo):Dissertationes selectae sacram theologiam dogmaticam, etc. illust. (Zur. 1675-1690, 4 vols. 4to): — Enchirid. Biblicum succinctius (Zurich, 1681, 8vo; Amst. 1688, 8vo; Jena, 1723, 8vo): — Histor. Papatus, novissimo Historica Lutheranismi et Calvinismi Fabro opposita (Amst. 1684, 4to; 2nd ed. 1698, 4to; French,Amst. 1685, 2 vols. 12mo): — Mysterium Babylonis, seu in Divi Johannis theologi: Apocalypseos prophetiam de Babylone magnum diatribe. (Leyden, 1687, 2 vols. 4to): — In viam Concordiae ecclesiasticce Protestantium Manuductio (Amst. 1687. 8vo): Tumulus Concilii Tridentini, etc. (Zurich, 1690, 2 vols,. 4to): — Labores exegetici in Josuam, Matthaeum, Romanos, Corinthios et Hebrceos (Zurich, 1700, 4to): — Corpus Theologiae christ. (Zurich, 1700, fol.): — 1, Medzulla Medulle Theol. christ. in gratiam et usum tyronum, etc. His. autobiography was published by Hofmeister under the: title Hist. Vitae J. H. Heideggeri, cui non pauca historian Ecclesiae temporis ejusdem, nec non litteras concernantia inseruntur (Zurich, 1698, 4to). — Niceron, Memoires pour servir, 17, 143; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 766sq.; Schweizer, in Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 5, 652.

## Heidelberg Catechism[[@Headword:Heidelberg Catechism]]

             one of the symbolical books of the Reformed Church. Its name is derived from the city in which it was compiled and first printed. It is also sometimes styled the Palatinate Catechism, from the territory (the  Palatinate) of the prince (Frederick III) under whose auspices it was prepared. The original German title (of the editio princeps) is Catechismus, oder Christlicher Underricht, wie der in Kirchen und Schulen der Churfürstlichen Pfalz getrieben wirdt: Gedruckt in der Churfürstlichen Stad Heydelberg, dulrch Johannemr llayer, 1563 (Catechism, or Christian Instruction, according to the Usages of the Churches and Schools of the Electoral Palatinate).

I. History. — Soon after the introduction of Protestantism into the Palatinate in 1546, the controversy between Lutherans and Calvinists broke out, and for years, especially under the elector Otto Heinrich (1556-59), it raged with great violence in Heidelberg. Frederick III, who came into power in 1559, adopted the Calvinistic view on the Lord's Supper, and favored that side with all his princely power. He reorganized the Sapienz College (founded by his predecessor) as a theological school, and put at its head (1562) Zacharias Ursinus, a pupil and friend of Melancthon, who had adopted the Reformed opinions. SEE URINUS.

In order to put an end to religious disputes in his dominions, he determined to put forth a Catechism, or Confession of Faith, and laid the duty of preparing it upon Zacharias Ursinus (just named) and Caspar Olevianus, for a time professor in the University of Heidelberg, then court preacher to Frederick III. They made use, of course, of the existing catechetical literature, especially of the catechisms of Calvin and of John Lasco. Each prepared sketches or drafts, and “the final preparation was a the work of both theologians, with the constant co-operation of Frederick III. Ursinus has always been regarded as the principal author, as he was afterwards the chief defender and interpreter of the Catechism; still, it would appear that the nervous German style, the division into three parts (as distinguished from the five parts in the Catechism of Calvin and the previous draft of Ursinus), and the genial warmth and unction of the whole work, are chiefly due to Olevianus (Schaff, in. Am. Presb. Rev. July 1863, p. 379).

When the Catechism was completed, Frederick laid it before a synod of the superintendents of the Palatinate (December, 1562). After careful examination it was approved. The first edition, whose full title is given above, appeared in 1563. The preface is dated January 19 of that year, and runs in the name of the elector Frederick, who probably wrote it. A Latin version appeared in the same year, translated by Johannes Lagus and Lambertus Pithopeus. The German version is the authentic standard. Two other editions of the German version appeared in 1563. What is now the  eightieth question (What difference is there between the Lord's Supper and the Roman Mass?) is not to be found an the first edition; part of it appears in the second edition; and in the third, of 1563 — it is given in full as follows: “What difference is there between the Lord's Supper and the Popish Mass? The Lord's Supper testifies to us that we have full forgiveness of all our sins by the one sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which he himself has once accomplished on the cross; and that by the Holy Ghost we are engrafted into Christ, who with his true body is now in heaven at the right hand of the Father, and is to be there worshipped. But the Mass teaches that the living and the dead have not forgiveness of sins through the sufferings of Christ, unless Christ is still daily offered for them by the priest; and that Christ is bodily under the form of bread and wine, and is therefore to be worshipped in them. (And thus the Mass at bottom is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and passion of Christ, and an accursed idolatry.)”

The occasion for the introduction of this eightieth question appears to have been the decree of the Council of Trent “touching the sacrifice of the Mass,” Sept. 17, 1562. This declaration, and the anathemas pronounced at Trent against the Protestant doctrine of the sacraments, had not time to produce their effect before the issue of the first edition of the Catechism. But the elector soon saw the necessity for a strong and clear declaration on the Protestant side, and such a declaration is furnished in this eightieth question, which was added to the Catechism in 1563. The first edition of 1563 was for a long time lost; that given by Niemeyer (Collectio Confessionum, p. 390) is the third of that year. But in 1864 pastor Wolters found a copy and reprinted it, with a history of the text (Der Heidelb. Katechismus in seiner ursprüzglichen Gestalt, Bonn, 1864, sm. 8vo), which cleared up all doubt as to the various editions of 1563. In 1866 professor Schaff published a very valuable edition, revised after the first edition of 1563, with an excellent history of the Catechism (Der Heidelb. Kat. nach d. ersten Ausgabe von 1563 revidirt, Philad. 18mo). — Other editions appeared in 1571 and 1573, and in this last the questions are divided, as now, into lessons for fifty-two Sundays, and the questions are numbered. An abstract of the Catechism appeared in 1585. The larger Catechism has since been republished by millions; no book, perhaps, has gone through more editions, except the Bible, Bunyan's Pilgrim, and Kempis. It has been translated into nearly every spoken language. It was, of course, at once used throughout the Palatinate by command of the elector. But it soon spread abroad wherever the Reformed Church had found footing, especially in North Germany and parts of  Switzerland. It was early received in the Netherlands, and formally adopted at the Synod of Dort, 1618. Long and bitter controversies with Roman Catholics and Lutherans on the Catechism only endeared it the more to the Reformed. It is to this day an authoritative confession for the Reformed churches (German and Dutch). The (Dutch) Reformed Church directs all her ministers to explain the Catechism regularly before the congregations on the Sabbath day.

II. Contents. — The Catechism, in its present form, consists of 129 questions and answers. It is divided into three parts:

1. Of the misery of Man 1:2. Of the redemption of Man 1:3. Of the gratitude due from man (duties, etc.).

The arrangement of the matter is admirable, looking not simply to logical order, but also to practical edification. The book is not simply dogmatic, but devotional. It assumes that all who use it are Christians, and is thus not adapted for missionary work. As to the theology taught by the book, it is, in the main, that of pure evangelical Protestantism. On the doctrine of predestination it is so reticent that it was opposed, on the one hand, by the Synod of Dort, the most extreme Calvinistic body perhaps ever assembled, and, on the other (though not without qualification), by James Arminius, the greatest of all the opponents of Calvinism. On the nature of the sacraments the Catechism is Calvinistic, as opposed to the Lutheran doctrine. Dr. Heppe (deutscher Protestantismus, 1, 443 sq.) goes too far in asserting that the Catechism is thoroughly Melancthonian, and in no sense Calvinistic. Sudhoff answers this in his article in Herzog's Real- Encyklopadie, 5, 658 sq.; but he himself goes too far, on the other side, in finding that the Calvinistic theory of predestination, though not expressly stated, is implied and involved in the view of Sin and grace set forth in the Catechism (see Gerhart's article in the Tercentenary Monument, p. 387 sq., and also his statement in this Cyclopaedia, 3, 827). Olevianus, it will be remembered, was educated under the influence of Calvin; Ursinus under that of Melancthon. Dr. Schaff remarks judiciously that “the Catechism is a true expression of the convictions of its authors; but it communicates only so much of these as is in harmony with the public faith of the Church, and observes a certain reticence or reservation and moderation on such doctrines (as the twofold predestination), which belong rather to scientific  theology and private conviction than to a public Church confession and the instruction of youth” (American Presb. Review, July, 1863, p. 371).

Literature. — The 300th anniversary of the formation and adoption of the Heidelberg Catechism was celebrated in 1863 both in Europe and America. One of the permanent fruits of this celebration was the publication of The Heidelberg Catechism, Tercentenary Edition (New York, 1863, sm. 4to). This noble volume gives a comprehensive Introduction (by Dr. Nevin), and a critical edition of the Catechism in four texts Old German, Latin, Modern German, and English-printed in parallel columns. The Introduction gives an admirable account of the literature and history of the Catechism. The text used is that given by Niemeyer, and not that of the first edition of 1563, which, as has been stated above, was reprinted in 1864. See also Dr. Schaff as edition cited above, and an article by him in the American Presbyterian Review for 1863. The Latin text (with the German of the 3rd ed. of 1563) is given in Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum, p. 390 sq.; also in an edition by Dr. Steiner, Catechesis Religionis Christianae seu Catechismus Heidelbergensis (Baltimore, 1862). Another valuable fruit of the anniversary is The Tercentenary Monument (Chambersburg, 1863, 8vo), containing twenty essays by eminent Reformed theologians of Germany, Holland, and America, on the Catechism, its origin, history, its special relations to the German Reformed Church, and cognate subjects. For the older literary history, see Alting, Historia Ecclesiae Palatinae (Frankf. 1701); Struve, Pfilzische Kirchenhistorie (Frankfort, 1721); Mundt, Grundriss der pfalzischen Kirchengeschichte bis 1742 (Heidelb. 1798); Kocher, Katechetische Geschichte der Reformirten Kirche (Jena, 1756); Planck, Geschichte d. prot. Theologie, 2, 2,. 475-491; Van Alpen, Geschichte u. Litteratur d. Heidelb. Katechismus (Frankf. 1800); Augusti, Einleitung in die beiden Haupt-Katechismen d. Evang. Kirche (Elberf. 1824); Ersch und Gruber's A11. Encykl. 2, 4. 386 sq.; Nevin, Hist. and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism (Chambersburg, 1847); Sudhoff, Theologisches Handbuch zur Auslegung d. Heidelb. Kat. (Frankf. 1862). An elaborate article on the literature of the Catechism, by Dr. Harbaugh, is given in the Mercersburg Review, October, 1860. A copious list of writers on the Catechism (covering twelve pages) is given at the end of Bethune, Expository Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism (N. York, Sheldon and Colossians , 2 vols. 12mo), an admirable practical commentary, with a valuable historical introduction. Among the older commentators are Ursinus, Explicationes Catechesis Palatinae (Opera, 1612, vol. — 1); Ursinus,  Apologia Catechismi Palatinae (Opera, vol. 2). Translations-- Ursinus, The Summe of Christian Religion, lectures on the Catechism, transl. by H. Parrie (Lond. 1617 4to). The best transl. of Ursinus's Commentary is that of the Rev. G.W. Williard (Columbus, 1852, 8vo, 2nd ed.), with Introduction by Dr. J. W. Nevin. See also Cocceius, Heid. Cat. explicata et illustrata (Lugd. Bat. 1671, Amst. 1673); Driesseln. Ad Cct. Heid. Malnuductio (Gron. 1724, 4to), Kemp. Fifty-three Sermons on the Heidelberg Catechism, trans. by Van Harlingen (New Brunswick, N. J., 1810, 8vo). For the views of the early Dutch Arminians on the Catechism, see Considerationes Remonstrantinum in Cat. Heidelb. (in Act. et Script. Synod. Harderwlyk, 1620). See also Wolters, Zur Urgeschichte d. Heidelb. Kat., in Stud. u. Krit. 1867, Heft 1; Trechsel, in Stud. u. Krit. 1867, Heft 3; Plitt, Stud. u. Krit. 1863, Heft 1: Mercersburg Review, October, 1860.

## Heidelberg Confession[[@Headword:Heidelberg Confession]]

             SEE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

## Heidenheim (Heydenheini), Wolf or Benjamin ben-Simson[[@Headword:Heidenheim (Heydenheini), Wolf or Benjamin ben-Simson]]

             a Hebrew scholar and typographer, is distinguished in Hebrew literature by his exertions to provide editions of the Pentateuch free from the errors which marred preceding copies. Indeed, the city in which he lived, Rodelheim, near Frankfort on the Maine, became in his day the center of attraction for Hebrew typography. But he has also left us works of his own which betoken a thorough acquaintance with Hebrew philology. Jost even assigns him a place by the side of Mendelssohn. Heidenheim died in 1832, at \* a very old age. His most important works are הִטַעָמַים מַשְׁפְטֵי, a tract on the Hebrew accents (Rodelheim, 1808, 12mo): — מְבוֹא הִלָּשׁון, a treatise on different parts of Hebrew grammar (Rodelheim, 1806, 12mo): — חוּמִשׁ מְאיר אֵיבִיַם, the Pentateuch, with a Hebrew commentary, etc. (Rodelh. 1818-1821,8vo). We have also from him a catalogue of his works, containing 800 in number, under the title רְשַׁימִת הִסְּפָרַים(Rodelh. 1833, 8vo). Fürst, Bibl. Judaica, 1, 369; Etleridge, Introd. to Hebr. Lit. p. 422; Steinschneider, Bibliog. Hdbch. p. 60; Jost, Gesch. d. Juden. p. 361; Kitto, ii, 267. (J. H. W.)

## Heidenreich, Esaias[[@Headword:Heidenreich, Esaias]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Lemberg, April 10, 1532. He studied at Frankfort, was preacher at Lemberg, Schweidnitz, and at Breslau. In the latter place, where he died in 1589, he was also professor of theology at the gymnasium. He published sermons on Ruth, Joshua, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, and Micah. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.).

## Heidenreich, Johannes[[@Headword:Heidenreich, Johannes]]

             a German theologian, brother of Esaias, was born April 21, 1542, at Lemberg. He studied at Frankfort, was in 1573 doctor of theology and professor of philosophy, and finally professor of theology. He died March 31, 1617. He wrote, Examinatio Capitum Doctrinae Fratrum, ut Habesi Volunt, in Bohemia et Moravia: — De Patefactione Trium Personarum in Baptismo Christi Facta. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Heidrun[[@Headword:Heidrun]]

             in Scandinavian mythology, was a shegoat, said to stand above Walhalla, or the heaven of heroes, and feed on the leaves of a tree called Lmrath. From her teats flows mead enough every day to supply all the heroes.

## Heifer[[@Headword:Heifer]]

             (עֶגְלָה, eglah', fem. of עֵגֶל, “calf;” פָּרָה, parah', fern. of פָּר, “bullock;” Sept. and N.T. δάμαλις; Vulg. vacca). The Hebrew language has no expression that exactly corresponds to our “heifer,” for both eglah and parah are applied to cows that have calved (1Sa 6:7-12; Job 21:10; Isa 7:21); indeed, eylah means a young animal of any species, the full expression being עֶגְלִת בָּקָר, “heifer of kine” (Deu 21:3; 1Sa 16:2; Isa 7:21). The heifer or young cow was not commonly used for ploughing, but only for treading out the corn (Hos 10:11; but see Jdg 14:18), when it ran about without any headstall (Deu 25:4); hence the expression an “unbroken heifer” (Hos 4:16; Auth. V. backsliding”), to which Israel is compared. A similar sense has been attached to the expression “calf of three years old,” עֶגְלִת שְׁלַישַׁיָּה, i.e. unsubdued, in Isa 15:5; Jer 48:34 : but it has by some been taken as a proper name, Eglath Shelishiyah, such names being not very uncommon. The sense of” dissolute” is conveyed undoubtedly in Amo 4:1. The comparison of Egypt to a “fair heifer” (Jer 46:20) may be an allusion to the well- known form under which Apis was worshipped (to which we may also refer the words in Jer 46:15, as understood in the Sept., “Why is the bullock [μόσχος ἐκλεκτός] swept away?”), the “destruction” threatened being the bite of the gad-fly, to which the word keretz would fitly apply. “To plough with another man's heifer” (Jdg 14:18) implies that an advantage has been gained by unfair means. The proper names Eglah, Eneglaim, and Parah are derived from the Hebrew terms at the head of this article. SEE RED HEIFER.

## Heil[[@Headword:Heil]]

             an idol of the ancient Saxons in England. This image was dashed to pieces by Austin, the English apostle, who thereupon built Cerne Abbey, on the banks of the Frome, in Dorsetshire.

## Heilbronner, Jacob[[@Headword:Heilbronner, Jacob]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born August 15, 1548, at Eberlingen, in Wirtemberg. He studied at different universities, was in 1575 court-preacher at Zweibrucken, in 1577 doctor of theology, in 1581 general superintendent at Amberg, in 1588 court-preacher at Neuburg, Bavaria, in 1615 general superintendent at Bebenhausen, Wurtemberg, and died November 6, 1619, leaving, Schwenckfeldio-Calvinismus: — Synopsis Doctrines Calvinianae Refutata: — Flagellatio Jesuitica oder Jesuitische Lehre vomfreiwilligen Creutz der Geisfelung. See Winer,  Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:497; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Heilbronner, Johann Christlieb[[@Headword:Heilbronner, Johann Christlieb]]

             a German convert from Judaism (originally Moses Praeger), who lived in the 18th century, and instructed in Hebrew at different universities, is the author of Traktat uber Iesaias 53 (Tubingen, 1710): — Klare Beweisthumner dass Jesus der wahre Messias und Gottes Sohn sei (Dresden, 1715): — Confutatio Exceptionum Jud. contra Genealogiams Christi, Speciatim Illarum in Chissuk Emuna (1718; also in German). See Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 3:363; Kalkar, Israel und die Kirche, page 104; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:374; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Heilbronner, Philip[[@Headword:Heilbronner, Philip]]

             a German divine, brother of Jacob, was born June 30, 1546. For some time a preacher, he was called in 1574 as professor of theology at the gymnasium. in Lauingen, took the degree as doctor of theology in 1577, attended the colloquy at Ratisbon in 1601, and died April 17, 1616. He wrote, Loci Communes in Epistolas ad Galatas, Timotheum et Tituin: Vaticinia Prophetarum in Locos Communes Digesta: — Postcolloquium Ratisbonense: — Antithesis Doctrines Petri Apostoli et Pontificis Romani: — Synopsis Variorum Hujus Temporis Errorum: — Liber de Innocentia Lutheri, etc. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.).

## Heilmann, Johann David[[@Headword:Heilmann, Johann David]]

             a learned German theologian, was born at Osnabrück Jan. 13,1727. He studied at Halle, became rector of Hameln in 1764, and professor of theology at Göttingen in 1754, where he died Feb. 22. 1764. His principal writings are Specimen observ. ad illustrat. N.T. (Halle, 1743, 4to): — Paralliae entre l'esprit d'irrèligion d'oujourdhui et les anciens adversaires de la religion Chretienne (Halle, 1750, 8vo): — Compendium theologiae dogmatica (Göttingen, 1761 and 1.774 8vo): — Opuscula theol. Arjnumenti (ed. Danovius, Jena, 1774-77, 2 vols. 8vo). — G. G. Heyne, Heilmanni Memoria (Göttingen, 1764); Jocher, Allgem. Gelehrt. Lexikon, continued by Adelung, 2, 1868.

## Heilprin, Jechiel[[@Headword:Heilprin, Jechiel]]

             a distinguished Jewish philologist and historian, flourished in the first part of the 18th century. He Is said to have been born at Minsk in 1728, but the time of his death is unknown. He wrote (סֵדֵר הִדּוֹרוֹת) a History. of the  Jews, divided into three parts: Chronicles of Historic Events, from the Creation to his own Time. 2. Alphabetical Catalogue of the Mishnaic and Talmudic Doctors. 3. Alphabetical Index of Jewish Literati (Karlsr. 1769, and Zolkien, 1808, folio). Also (סֵ8 עֶרְכֵּי הִכַּנּוּיַים) a Hebrew Rabbinic Dictionary adapted to the Rabboth, Sifra, Mekiltha, Yolkut, and the works of the Cabalists (Dyrchenfurt, 1806, fol.). Furst commends the excellency of these works, and believes that the first part of Heilprin's history is an able contribution to Hebrew literature. — Furst, Bib;. Judaica, 1, 372; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebr, Literature, p.449. (J. H. W.)

## Heim, Francois Joseph[[@Headword:Heim, Francois Joseph]]

             a French painter, was born at Belfort, December 16, 1787. He studied in the Ecole Censtrale of Strasburg, and in 1803 entered the studio of Vincent, at Paris. In 1827 he was commissioned to decorate the Gallery Charles X in the Louvre, and completed his decorations of the conference- room of the Chamber of Deputies in 1844. He was made member of the legion of honor in 1855, and died September 29, 1865. Among his paintings of religious subjects are, Return of Jacob, in the Musee de Bordeaux; St. John; Resurrection of Lazarus, in the Cathedral Autun Martyrdom of St. Cyr, in St. Gervais; Martyrdom of St. Lauence, in Notre Dame; and his great picture of the Massacre of the Jews, in the Louvre. See Encyclop. Brit. 9th ed. s.v.

## Heimdal[[@Headword:Heimdal]]

             in Norse mythology, is the son of Odin, born of nine Jote-maidens, so that all were mothers of this god. From them he inherited beauty and greatness, from his father wisdom and power, and Odin placed him as guard of the Bifrbst bridge, where he lives in a beautiful palace, Himminbiorg (heavenly castle), and gazes about to see whether mountain giants or other enemies come near the bridge. When he is awake the gods can safely slumber, for no one can approach without his knowledge. At night he can see a distance of one hundred miles, he hears the grass and hairs grow, and sleeps as little as an eagle. When enemies approach he takes his horn and makes a great noise, and the Asas and the Einheriar, and the heroes in Walhalla assemble for combat. This takes place especially at the destruction of the world. He has a surname, Gullintani (gold-tooth), from the fact that his teeth are made of gold.

## Heineccius, Johann Michael[[@Headword:Heineccius, Johann Michael]]

             a Lutheran divine, was born at Eisenberg Dec. 12, 1674, and was educated at Jena, Frankfort, and Giessen. After a visit to Holland and Hamburg, he settled for a time in Helmstadt as tutor (Docent), but in 1699 became deacon at Goslar. In 1709 he removed to Halle as pastor, and in 1720 was appointed consistorial counselor and ecclesiastical inspector of the circle of the Saal (Saalkreis). He died Sept. 11,1722. His chief work, Eigentliche und woahrhafige Abbildung der alten und neuen griechischen Kirche nach ihrer historie, Glaubenslehren und Kirchengebrduchen (Leipsic, 1711), presents historically the doctrines, government, liturgy, and morals of the Greek. Church, ancient and modern. It is still a work of great value. Besides works in the departments of antiquities: and history, Heineccius wrote Prüfung der sogenannten neuen Propheten und ihres ausserordentlichen Aufstandes (Halle, 1715), against the French prophets (q.v.): Sendschreiben an Thomas Ittig wegen des Termini Gracaiae, on the Terminist controversy: — De Jurisconsultis Christianis priorumn sceculorun eorumque in ecclesiam meritis (Halle, 1713): — Colloquia religiosa publice et. privatim inter bina haec saecula habita (Halle and Magdeburg, 1719, 4to). — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 19, 624; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 782; Sax, Onomasticon literarium, pt. 6:p. 45. (J. W. M.)

## Heinemann, Jeremiah[[@Headword:Heinemann, Jeremiah]]

             a Jewish writer of Germany, was born July 20, 1788, and died at Berlin, Octobe 16, 1855. He published, Jedidja, a Jewish review (Berlin, 1817- 43): — Gebete an den hohen Festen (Leipsic, 1841): — Katechismus der jud. Religion (1812): — Sammlung der die religiose und burgerliche Vesfassung der Juden in den Preu. Staaten betreffender Gesetze, etc. (1821-28): — Allgemeines Gebetbuch der Israeliten (1838): — Religions- und Schulreden fur Israeliten (eod.): — Der Prophet Iesaia, the Hebrew text with Rashi, Chaldee, and commentary (1842): — Der Pentateuch, with Targum, Rashi, German translation, and Hebrew commentary (1831- 33). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:373 sq.; Kayserling, Bibliothek jud. Kanzelredner, 1:411; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:198, 523. (B.P.)

## Heiner, Elias, D.D[[@Headword:Heiner, Elias, D.D]]

             an esteemed German Reformed minister, was born at Taneytown, Maryland, September 16, 1810. He early connected with the Church; studied theology in the seminary of the Reformed Church at York, Pennsylvania, under the Reverend Lewis Mayer, D.D.; was licensed and ordained in 1833, and installed as pastor of the Reformed Church in Emmittsburg, Maryland. He was called to Baltimore in 1835, where he remained, faithfully preaching the gospel of the grace of God, to the close of his life, October 20, 1863. Dr. Heiner was a man of respectable talents, good culture, deep piety, and great zeal, combined with a vast amount of  practical tact. He was an acceptable preacher, and a most excellent pastor, enjoying to the last the full and unabated confidence of his people. He took a deep interest in the cause of missions, as well as in all the other benevolent operations of the Church, and did much to extend the Reformed Church in the city of Baltimore by his earnest and disinterested labors. He published the first volume of Dr. Mayer's History of the German Reformed Church, to which he prefixed a sketch of the author's life and labors. See Harbaugh, Fathers of the Reformed Church, 4:271.

## Heinicke, Samuel[[@Headword:Heinicke, Samuel]]

             a German philanthropist, “the most distinguished of the early teachers of the deaf and dumb in Germany,” was born April 10, 1729, at Nautzschütz, near Weissenfels, in Prussia, and died at Leipsic April 30, 1790. He passed his early life as a farmer and soldier, then pursued a course of study in the University of Jena, was subsequently for ten years a tutor: of the children  of count Schimmelmann at Hamburg, and then removed to Eppendorf. In this latter place, as early as 1754, he became much interested in a deaf and dumb child, and devised a system of instruction for it, which proved so successful as to attract other deaf mutes to him for instruction, and led to the establishment by the elector of Saxony in 1772 of a school at Leipsic for the education of deaf mutes. This school, “the first ever established or supported by the civil government,” was placed under Heinicke's charge, was continued after his death under the charge of his widow, and is still existing and prosperous. The “method of instruction was by articulation and reading on the lip,” and is said to have been superior in some respects to that of the abbé de l'Epee. Heinicke's labors and noble character gained for him deservedly the affection of the German people, though his method of treatment of his pupils was probably too harsh, and some of his writings were marred by coarse and ill-natured criticisms of opinions differing from his own.

He wrote upon the education of deaf mutes and theological- subjects, viz.: Biblische Geschichte des Alten Testaments zum Unterrichte taubstummer Personen (Hamburg. 1776, 8vo; only first part given): — Beobachtungen über Stumme und über die menschliche Sprache in Briefen (Hamb. 1778, 8vo): — Ueber die Denkart der Taubstummen und die Misshandlungen, denen sie durch unsinnige Kuren und Lehrarten ausgesetzt sind (Leipsic, 1780, 8vo): — Ueber alte und neue Lehrarten (Leipsic, 1783) — Wichtige Entdeckungen und Beitrdge zur Seelenlehre und zur menschlichen Sprache (Leipsic, 1784, 8vo): — Metaphysik fur Schulmeister und Plusmacher (Halle, 1785): — Ueber graue Vorurtheile und ihre Schaedlichkeit (Copenhagen and Leipsic, 1787): — Scheingötterei der Naturalisten, Deisten und Atheisten (Koethen, 1788): — Neues AB C, Sylben und Lesebuch nebst einer Aneisung, das Lesen in kurzer Zeit acf die leichteste Art und ohne Buchstabiren zu lernen (many editions, last Leipsic, 1790). Schlichtegroll assigns to Heinicke also a work on Kant's philosophical works, printed in German (Presburg, 1789, 8vo), but Meusel only the preface to it. Heinicke also wrote articles in thee Teutscher Merkur and Teutsches Museum, in which he maintained, against the views of the abbd de l'Epde, that deaf mutes should be taught not only to write, but also to speak. — New American Cyclopedia, 6:301; 9:59; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 23, 786 sq.; Petschke, Historische Nachricht von dem Unterrichte der Tautbstummnen und Blinden (Leipsic, 1793); Schlichtegroll, Nekrolog (1790), p. 313-315; Meusel, Lexikon der von 1750 bis 1800 verstorbenen deutschen Schrijtsteller (Leipsic, 1802- 16). (J.W.M.)

## Heinrichs, Carl Friedrich Ernst[[@Headword:Heinrichs, Carl Friedrich Ernst]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1798. He was ordained for the ministry in 1823, and was from 1827 pastor at Detmold. He died December 30, 1882, doctor of theology and member of consistory, leaving De iis, quae Potissimum Contulerint ad Lutherums Sacrorum Reformatorem Sensim Effingendum (Gottingen, 1819). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:742. (B.P.)

## Heinroth, Johann Christian Friedrich August[[@Headword:Heinroth, Johann Christian Friedrich August]]

             a German psychologist, was born at Leipsic, January 17, 1773, and died there in 1843, a doctor and professor of medicine. He wrote, Pistodiae oder Resultate freier Forschung uber Geschichte, Philosophie und Glhauben (Leipsic, 1829): — Der Schlussel zu Himnmel und Holle im Henschen (1829): — Die Luge (1834): — Geschichte und Kritik des Mysticismus (1830). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:363, 483, 493, 595; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:531. (B.P.)

## Heinsberg, Jean De[[@Headword:Heinsberg, Jean De]]

             a Belgian prelate of the 15th century, was at first canon of Liege and archdeacon of Hesbaye, and became bishop of Liege at the age of twenty- three. In 1444 he resolved to go to Palestine, in pursuance of a vow, but on arriving at Venice, wrote to the bey of Tunis, and was refused permission. He died in 1459. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Heinsius, Daniel[[@Headword:Heinsius, Daniel]]

             an eminent scholar, was born in 1580 at Ghent. He studied law for some months at Franeker, but, determining to devote himself to letters, he went to Leyden, where he studied under Joseph Scaliger. In 1599 he began to teach Latin in the university, and on the death of Scaliger (1609) he was made professor of history. He was afterwards made librarian to the University, and historiographer to the States of Holland. He was secretary to the Synod of Dort, 1618. SEE DORT. He died Feb. 23, 1655. Besides editing many Latin and Greek classics, he published Sacrarum exercitationum ad N.T. libri 20 (Lugd. Bat. 1639, fol.): — Aristarchus sacer, sire Exercitatiozes ad Nonni Paraphrasin in Johannern (Lugd. Bat. 1627, sm. 8vo). Heinsius was a strong advocate of a special Hellenistic dialect.

## Heinsius, Johann Georg[[@Headword:Heinsius, Johann Georg]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died at Reval in 1733, published De Batteo Sacerdosis Magqni (Wittenberg, 1719): — Kurze Fragen aus der Kirchenhistorie des Neuen Testamnents (Jena, 1724, 6 parts; 3d ed. 1731 sq., 12 parts): — Fragen aus der Kirchenhistorie des Alten  Testaments (ibid. eod. 3 parts). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Heinson, Johann Theodor[[@Headword:Heinson, Johann Theodor]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Hanover, July 5, 1665. He studied at Helmstuadt, and continued his Oriental studies in England. In 1695 he was first preacher at Melle. in the duchy of Osnabruck, in 1698 general superintendent and court-preacher of East Frisia, accepted in 1711 a call to Hamburg, anrd died September 21, 1726, leaving, De Nominibus et Essentia Dei (Helmstadt, 1690): — De Paradiso ejusque Amissione et Custodia (ibid. 1698). See Doring, Die ggelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:375; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Heir[[@Headword:Heir]]

             (some form of the verb יָרִשׁ, to possess; Gr. κληρόνομος, a receiver by lot). The Hebrew institutions relative to inheritance were of a very simple character. Under the patriarchal system the property was divided among the sons of the legitimate wives (Gen 21:10; Gen 24:36; Gen 25:5), a larger portion being assigned to one, generally the eldest, on whom devolved the duty of maintaining the females of the family. SEE BIRTHRIGHT.

The sons of concubines were portioned off with presents (Gen 49:1 sq.), but this may have been restricted to cases where the children had been adopted by the legitimate wife (Gen 30:3). But Jacob made the sons whom he had by his concubines heirs, as well as the others (Gen 49:12-27). Moses laid no restrictions upon the choice of fathers in this respect; and we may infer that the sons of concubines, for the most part, received an equal share with the other sons, from the fact that Jephthah, the son of a concubine, complained that he was excluded from his father's house without any portion (Jdg 11:1-7). Daughters had no share in the patrimony (Gen 31:14), but received a marriage portion, consisting of a maid-servant (Gen 29:24; Gen 29:29) or some other property. As a matter of special favor they sometimes took part with the sons (Job 42:15). The Mosaic law regulated the succession to real property thus: it was to be divided among the sols, the eldest receiving a double portion (Deu 21:17), the others equal shares: if there were no sons, it went to the daughters (Num 27:8), on the condition that they did not marry out of their own tribe (Num 36:6  sq.; Tob 6:12; Tob 7:13), otherwise the patrimony was forfeited (Josephus, Ant. 4, 7, 5). If there were no daughters, it went to the brother of the deceased; if no brother, to the paternal uncle; and, failing these, to the next of kin (Num 27:9-11). In the case of a widow being left without children, the nearest of kin on her husband's side had the right of marrying her, and, in the event of his refusal, the next of kin (Rth 3:12-13): with him rested the obligation of redeeming the property of the widow (Rth 4:1 sq.), if it had been either sold or mortgaged: this obligation was termed מַשְׁפִּט הִגְּאֻלָּה(“the right of inheritance”), and was exercised in other cases besides that of marriage (Jer 32:7 sq.). If none stepped forward to marry the widow, the inheritance remained with her until her death, and then reverted to the next of kin. SEE WIDOW.

The object of these regulations evidently was to prevent the alienation of the land, and to retain it in the same family: the Mosaic law enforced, in short, a strict entail Even the assignment of the double portion, which under the patriarchal regime had been at the disposal of the father (Gen 48:22), was by the Mosaic law limited to the eldest son (Deu 21:15-17). The case of Achsah, to whom Caleb presented a field (Jos 15:18-19; Jdg 1:15), is an exception; but perhaps even in that instance the land reverted to Caleb's descendants either at the death of Achsah or in the year of Jubilee. The land being thus so strictly tied up, the notion of heirship, as we understand it, was hardly known to the Jews: succession was a matter of right, and not of favor-a state of things which is embodied in the Hebrew language itself, for the word יָרִשׁ(A.V. “to inherit”) implies possession, and very forcible possession (Deu 2:12; Jdg 1:29; Jdg 11:24), and a similar idea lies at the root of the words אֲחֻזָּהand נֲחִלָה, generally translated “inheritance.” Testamentary dispositions were, of course, generally superfluous: the nearest approach to the idea is the blessing, which in early times conveyed temporal as well as spiritual benefits (Gen 27:19; Gen 27:37; Jos 15:19). It appears, however, that eventually the father had at least the right of expressing his last wishes or will in the presence of witnesses, and probably in the presence of the heirs (2Ki 20:1). The references to wills in the apostle Paul's writings are borrowed from the usages of Greece and Rome (Heb 9:17), whence the custom was introduced into Judaea: several wills are noticed by Josephus in connection with the Herods (Ant. 13, 16, 1; 17:3, 2; War, 2, 2, 3).  With regard to personal property, it may be presumed that the owner had some authority over it, at all events during his life-time. The admission of a slave to a portion of the inheritance with the sons (Pro 17:2) probably applies only to the personality. A presentation of half the personality formed the marriage portion of Tobit's wife (Tob 8:21). A distribution of goods during the father's lifetime is implied in Luk 15:11-13 : a distinction may be noted between οὐσία, a general term applicable to personalty, and κληρονομία, the landed property, which could only be divided after the father's death (Luk 12:13).

There is a striking resemblance between the Hebrew and Athenian customs of heirship, particularly as regards heiresses (ἐπίκληροι), who were, in both nations, bound to marry their nearest relation: the property did not vest in the husband even for his life-time, but devolved upon the son of the heiress as soon as he was of age, who also bore the name, not of his father, but of his maternal grandfather. The object in both countries was the same, viz. to preserve the name and property of every family (Smith, Dict. of Class. Ant. s.v. Epiclerus). SEE INHERITANCE.

In Col 1:15, Christ is called “the first-born of every creature,” i.e. “the heir of the whole creation,” as in Heb 1:2 he is called the “heir of all things.” Believers are called “heirs of the promise,” “of righteousness,” “of the kingdom,” “of the world,” “of God,” “joint heirs” with Christ, inasmuch as they are partakers of the blessings which God bestows upon his children, implying admission to the kingdom of heaven and its privileges (Gal 3:29; Heb 6:17; Heb 11:7; Jam 2:5; Rom 4:13; Rom 8:17), and finally possession of the heavenly inheritance (Joh 17:22-24; Rev 3:22). SEE ADOPTION.

## Heiric, Saint[[@Headword:Heiric, Saint]]

             a French monk, was born about 834, at Hery, near Auxerre. It is. supposed that his surname has been given to him more on account of his knowledge than for his actions. At the age of seven he was intrusted by his parents to the care of the Benedictine monks of St. Germain d'Auxerre, from whom he received his first instruction. He afterwards went. to the abbey of Fulda, where he was instructed by Haimon, a disciple of Alcuin. Some time later he left Fulda to go to Ferriere, to put himself under the discipline of the abbot Lupus. He died about 881. For his numerous writings we refer to Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Hel[[@Headword:Hel]]

             (cover), in Norse mythology, was the daughter of Loke and the giantess Angerbode, sister of the wolf Fenris and the snake Jormungand. The three sisters were the most frightful creations of the infernal regions, and as the Asas knew what dangers awaited them from these monsters, they threw the snake into the sea, where she grew until she encircled the whole earth as the Midgard snake. They also chained the wolf Fenris, and placed the third child in the infernal region. There she rules over all who do not die as warriors on the battle-field. She devours men, and lives on their marrow and brain.

## Hela[[@Headword:Hela]]

             in Slavonic mythology, was originally a Scandinavian deity, but worshipped also by the Wends, although in another sense, and with the attributes of an evil and angry deity. She was represented as a large woman, with a lion's open mouth. She was implored to protect from evil advice.

## Helah[[@Headword:Helah]]

             (Heb. Chelah', חֶלְאָה; rust, as in Eze 24:6; Sept. Α῾λαά v.r. Α᾿ωδά), one of the two wives of Ashur (a descendant of Judah), by whom she had three sons (1Ch 4:5; 1Ch 4:7). B.C. prob. cir. 1612.

## Helai Codex of the O.T[[@Headword:Helai Codex of the O.T]]

             SEE MANUSCRIPTS.

## Helam[[@Headword:Helam]]

             (Heb. Cheylam7', חֵילָם, place of abundance, 2Sa 10:16; but in 2Sa 10:17, Chelanm', חֵאלָם[with he ‘directive,” חֵאלָמָה, Josephus Χαλαμά], for which the margin prefers חֵלאָם; Sept. Αἰλάμ, Vulgate Helamn), a place “beyond the river” (i.e. either east of the Jordan or west of the Euphrates, although Josephus, Ant. 7:6, 3, understands it to mean east of the Euphrates), where David gained a victory over the combined forces of the Syrians under Hadadezer. apparently between Damascus and the country of the Ammonites. Ewald (Is'. Gesch. 2, 620) compares the Alanmatha (Α᾿λάμαθα) of Ptolemy (5, 15, 25), on the west bank of the Euphrates, near Nicephoritm. SEE DAVID.

## Helbah[[@Headword:Helbah]]

             (Heb. Chelbah', חֶלְבָּה, fatness; Sept. Ε᾿λβά v.r. Χεβδά and Σχεδία), a town in the tribe of Asher, from which the Canaanites were not expelled, mentioned between Achzib and Aphik (Jdg 1:31); but not (as Gesenius suggests) identical with Ahlab, which is also mentioned in the same verse. Perhaps it was situated in some fertile tract (as the names imply) in the valley of the Kishon, possibly at Ilaifit.

## Helbon[[@Headword:Helbon]]

             (Heb. Chelbon', חֶלְבוֹן, feet, i.e. fertile; Sept. Χελβών v.r. Χεβρών), a name which occurs only in Eze 27:18, where “the wine of Helbon” is named among the commodities brought from Damascus to the great market of Tyre. The Syriac, Symmachus, the Chaldee, and Vulgate, all regard the ‘word as an appellative descriptive of the quality of the wine as pingue vinuni or vinumu dulce coctum. — But it is better to accept the indication of the Sept., which, by giving the proper name Χελβών, must be supposed to have had in view a place, which has hence generally been inferred to be the same with that old city of Syria that appears under the form of Chalybon (Χαλυβάν) in Ptolemy (Geog. 5, 15) and Strabo (15, 505). — The latter author mentions this Chalybon as a place famous for wine; and in describing the luxury of the kings of Persia, he says they would have wheat brought from Assos in Eolia, Chalybonian wine out of Syria, and water from the Eulaeus (the river Ulai of Dan 8:2), which was the lightest of any. Both Hesychius and Plutarch (Vit. Alex. 2) speak of this famous wine. It has generally been thought that the name was derived  from Chalybon, where it was supposed the wine was produced. But is it not strange that Damascus should be represented as supplying the wine of Helbon to the marts of Tyre? Why would not the native merchants themselves carry it thither? A passage which Bochart quotes from Athenaeus (1, 51) throws light on this point: “The king of the Persians drank Chalybonian wine alone; which, says Poseidonius, was also produced in Damascus” (Bochart, Opp. 2, 486). We are thus led, both by the statement of Ezekiel and by that of Poseidonius, who was himself a native of Syria, to look for a Helbon or Chalybon at or near Damascus. Seleucus Nicator is said to have changed the name to Bercea (Niceph. Callist. 14:39); but the old name, as we see from Ptolemy, was not forgotten, and on the capture of the city by the Arabs in the 7th century it was again resumed (Schultens, Index Geogr. in vitam Saladini, s.v. Halebum). The city referred to has usually been identified with the modern Aleppo, a large city of Syria. called Huleb by the Arabs; but Russel states (Natural Hist. of Aleppo Lond. 1794, 1, 80) that but little wine is made there, and that the white wines especially are poor and thin, and difficult to keep; nor has this place ever obtained any celebrity for its vintages.

Hence Prof. Hackett is inclined to adopt the suggestion made to him while visiting this region in 1852 by Dr. Paulding, one of the American missionaries there, that the Biblical Helbon should rather be sought in one of the principal villages of the same name lying in the wady. Helbon, on the eastern slope of Anti-Lebanon, north of the Barrada. He was informed by those who had visited the place that the grapes produced there are remarkable for their fine quality, and that the wine obtained from them is regarded as the choice wine of that part of Syria (Illustrations of Scripture, N. York, 1855, p. 214). Dr. Robinson, to whom he mentioned this suggestion, visited the place in his last journey to Palestine, and fully accords with the identification. He thus describes the valley and town: “Wady Helbon is a valley an hour or more in length, shut in by high and rugged sides. The bottom is a strip of level ground, everywhere well cultivated. Throughout the whole extent of the valley there are well-kept vineyards. Even places so steep that the vinedresser cal approach them with difficulty are made to produce an abundance of grapes. In Damascus the grapes are chiefly esteemed for their fine flavor, and from them is made the best and most highly prized wine of the country. The village of Helbon is nearly midway up the valley. There are many ruins in and around it, but mostly dilapidated; and hewn stones, capitals, friezes, and broken columns are built into the walls of the modem dwellings. On the west of the village  is an extensive ruin, supposed to have once been a temple. On some of the blocks are fragments of Greek inscriptions no longer legible” (new ed. of Researches, 3, 471, 472).

## Helchiah[[@Headword:Helchiah]]

             (Χελκίας, 1Es 8:1) or Helchi'as (Helcias, 2Es 1:1), the Greek aid Latin forms of the name of the high-priest HILKIAH SEE HILKIAH (q.v.).

## Held, August H.M[[@Headword:Held, August H.M]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born February 22, 1806, at Knoop, near Kiel, Germany. After preparatory study at Kiel he entered the College of Renzburg, and at the close of his theological course was ordained as a Lutheran minister. Instead of entering the pastoral work, he established the Held Institute at Kiel, which he conducted with signal ability for many years. In 1847 he arrived in America. For a time he was assistant pastor of St. Matthew's Church, New York city. Subsequently he founded St. Mark's Church, in Sixth Street. A division occurring in the congregation, a large portion followed him and formed the nucleus of St. John's Church, which at first held its meetings in the old Hope Chapel, and afterwards in the New York University building on Washington Square. In 1858 St. Johns purchased the present church edifice in Christopher Street. For twenty-two years he was pastor of this church, and gathered, about him one of the largest Lutheran congregations in New York. Two years before his death he was obliged to relinquish the pastorate on account of declining health. He died in New York city, March 31, 1881. See Lutheran Observer, April 8, 1881.

## Held, Carl Friedrich Wilhelm[[@Headword:Held, Carl Friedrich Wilhelm]]

             a Protestant theologian, was born in 1830 at Treptow, Pomerania. In 1852 he was repetent at Gottingen, in 1860 professor at Zurich, in 1866 at Breslau, and accepted a call to Bonn in 1867. He died May 30, 1870, leaving De Opere Jesu Christi Salutari, etc. (Gottingen, 1860): — Jesus der Christ. 16 Apologetische Vortarage uber die Grundlehren des Christenthnms (Zurich, 1865): — Moderne Weltranschaung und Christenthum (Breslau, 1866): — Selbstzeugnisse Jesu in 15 Betrachtungen fur die Suchendean unsearer Zeit. (B.P.)

## Held, Christian[[@Headword:Held, Christian]]

             a German convert from Judaism, in the 17th century, was the. author of, Beweis aus der Schrift von dem dreieinigen Gott (Kiel, 1681): — Victoria Christiana contra Judaeos (Giessen, 1684). See Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 3:977; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:376; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Heldai[[@Headword:Heldai]]

             (Heb. Chelday', חֶלְדִי, worldly; Sept. Χολδαϊv, but οἱ ἄρχοντες in Zec 6:10; Vulg. Holdai), the name of two men.

1. A Netophathite and descendant of Othniel, chief of the twelfth division (24,000) of David's forces (1Ch 27:15). B.C. 1014. In 1Ch 11:30 (where he is called HELED) his father's name is said to be Baanahb; and in the parallel passage (2Sa 23:29) he is called HELEB.

2. One of those lately returned from the Captivity whom the prophet Zechariah was directed to take with him when he went to crown the high- priest Joshua, as a symbol of the future Messiah's advent (Zec 6:10). B.C. 520. In Zec 6:14 the name is written HELEM.

## Helding, Michael[[@Headword:Helding, Michael]]

             SEE SIDONIUS, MICHAEL.

## Heldua[[@Headword:Heldua]]

             the first station mentioned iii the Jerusalem Itinerary south of Berytus and north of Porphyreon; now probably khan el-Khulda (Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 435). — Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 320.

## Heleb[[@Headword:Heleb]]

             (Heb. Che'leb, חֶלֶב,fatness, as often; Sept. ῾Ελάδ,Vulg. Heled), son of Baumah the Netophathite, and one of David's warriors (2Sa 23:29); elsewhere more correctly called HELED (1Ch 11:30), or, still better, HELDAI (1Ch 26:15).

## Heled[[@Headword:Heled]]

             (Heb. Che'led, חֵלֶד, this world, as transitory; Sept. Ε᾿λάδ, Vulg. Heled), son of Baanah, a Netophathite, and one of David's warriors (1  Chronicles 11:30); called in the parallel passage (2Sa 23:29) HELEB, but more accurately HELDAI in 1Ch 27:15.

## Helek[[@Headword:Helek]]

             (Heb. Che'lek, חֵלֶק, a portion, as oftens Sept. Χελέχ and Χέλεχ,Vulg. Helec), the second son of Gilead of the tribe of Manasseh (Jos 17:2), whose descendants were called HELEKITES (Hebrew Cheli',

חֶלְקַי, Num 26:30; Sept. Χελεκί). B.C. cir. 1612.

## Helekite[[@Headword:Helekite]]

             (Num 26:30). SEE HELEK.

## Helem[[@Headword:Helem]]

             the name of one or two men, variously written in the Hebrew.

1. HE'LEM (הֵלֶם, a stroke; Sept. Ε᾿λάμ, Vulg. Helem), a brother of Shamer (or Shomer) and great-grandson of Asher, several of whose sons are enumerated in 1Ch 7:35.; perhaps the same with HIOTHAM, 1Ch 7:32. B.C. prob. cir. 1658.

2. CHE'LEM. (חֵלֶם, in Chaldee a dream, as often in Dan.; or robust; Sept. οί ὑπομένοντες αὐτόν,Vulg. Helesm), one of those associated with Zechariah in the typical crowning of the high-priest, or, as it appears, himself also crowned (Zec 6:14, “Heled,” prob. by erroneous transcription for Heled or HELDAI, Zec 6:10). Helena, ST., mother of Constantine the Great. She was born about 274; Gloucester, Triers, and Bithynia dispute the honor of being her birthplace. Some consider her as of noble family, while the older authorities state that she was daughter of a shepherd or innkeeper. Constantius Chlorus is said to have married her for her beauty. She is also said to have at first been only his concubine, but this, perhaps, is a mistake, arising from the fact that the Roman law applied to women marrying above their station a name which had also this meaning. When Constantius became emperor he repudiated her, and she resided, perhaps, in the neighborhood of Triers until her son Constantine called her back with the title of Augusta. She did much towards softening the naturally tyrannical disposition of her son. She undertook a pilgrimage to the Holy Land about 325, where, by so-called miraculous agencies, she is said to have discovered, under the ruins of a heathen temple, the  sepulcher and cross of Christ, the latter of which was “proved genuine by the miracles it wrought!” She built a church on the site, which remains to this day in part. All this gave a great impulse to pilgrimages to the Holy Land, and indirectly to the Crusades. She left Palestine in 327, returned to her son, and died probably soon after. The Romans claim to have her remains in the church of Ara Caeli. The monks of Hautvilliers, near Rheims (France), claim, on the other hand, that one of their order, as early as in the 9th century, brought the body of the saint from thence to their convent. Unfortunately, the Venetians state, on the other side that the saint was buried at Constantinople, and that her remains were thence transferred to their city. So devotees kneel in three different places, on the 18th of August, before the remains of the daughter of a shepherd or innkeeper, who subsequently became a sainted empress. — Monographs on St. Helena and her history are enumerated in Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 125. See Eusebius, Life of Constantine; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. and the articles Cross; SEE JERUSALEM.

## Heleph[[@Headword:Heleph]]

             (Heb. Che'leph, חֶלֶ, an exchange, as in Num 18:21; Num 18:31; Sept. joins' with prefixed preposition Μεέλεφ; Vulg. Heleph), a city mentioned apparently as the starting-point of the northern border of Naphtali, beginning at the west (Jos 19:33). Van de Velde thinks it may be the same with Beit-lf, a village with ancient remains (comp. Robinson, Later Researches, p. 61, 62), nearly due east of the Ras Abyad, and west of Kades, on the S. edge of a very marked ravine (wady el-Ayun), which probably formed part of the boundary between Naphtali and Asher (Van de Velde, Syria, 1 233); nor is the objection of Keil (Comment. ad loc.), that the position is represented as being at the intersection of the northern border of Palestine with the eastern line of Asher, altogether correct, since several of the associated names are likewise somewhat interior.

## Heleph (2)[[@Headword:Heleph (2)]]

             Of Beit-Lif, which is now generally accepted as the modern representative of this place, the following is the description in the Memoirs (1:201.) accompanying the Ordnance Survey: "A village built of stone, containing about one hundred and fifty Moslems (Guerin says eighty Metawileh), situated on a hill-top, with a few olives and arable land. Two cisterns and a birket (pool) near by supply the water."

## Helez[[@Headword:Helez]]

             (Heb. Che'lets, חֵלֶוֹor חֶלֶוֹ, in pause ח לֶוֹCha'lets, perh. loin or strong; Sept. Χαλλίς. or Χελλης v.r. Σελλής; Vulg. Heles, Helles), the name of two men.

1. Son of Azariah and father of Eleasah, of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 2:39). B.C. apparently ante 1017.

2. An Ephraimite of Pelon, and one of David's warriors, and afterwards captain of his seventh regiment (2Sa 23:26; 1Ch 11:27; 1Ch 28:10). B.C. 1014 et ante.

## Helfenstein, Charles[[@Headword:Helfenstein, Charles]]

             a minister of the German Reformed Church, and son of Rev. J. C. A. Helfenstein was born March 29, 1781. He spent his youth as a printer, and afterwards studied theology with Rev. Dr. Becker, of Baltimore, Md. He was licensed and ordained by the Synod of the German Reformed Church in May, 1801, and was pastor successively at Allemangel, Berks County, Pa.; Goshenhoppen, Montgomery County, Pa.; Ephrata, Lancaster County, Pa.; Hanover and Berlin, York County, Pa.; Rockingham County, Va.; and Mechanicsburg, Cumberland County, Pa. He died Dec. 19,1842. With many innocent eccentricities, he was actuated by deep earnestness, a childlike piety, and a kindly spirit. He preached in both the German and English languages. (H. H.)

## Helfenstein, John Conrad Albert[[@Headword:Helfenstein, John Conrad Albert]]

             one of the fathers of the German Reformed Church in the United States, was born at Moszbach, Palatinate, Feb. 16, 1748. He studied theology at the University of Heidelberg, and was sent by the Synod of Holland, in company with Rev. J. H. Helfferich and Rev. J. G. Gebhard, as missionaries to America. He arrived in New York Jan. 14, 1772, and soon after took charge of the congregation at Germantown, Pa. Towards the close of 1775 he accepted a call from Lancaster, but in 1779 returned to his Germantown congregation, and labored there until his death, May 17, 1790. He was an eloquent and successful preacher, and his ministry, both at Lancaster and Germantown, proved a great blessing. Several small volumes of his sermons have been published. — Harbaugh, Fathers of the Reformed Church, 2, 222 sq.

## Helfenstein, Jonathan[[@Headword:Helfenstein, Jonathan]]

             a German Reformed minister, third son of Rev. J. C. A. Helfenstein was born in Germantown. Pa., Jan. 19, 1784. He studied theology with Rev. Dr. Becker, of Baltimore, Md. He was licensed in 1805, and ordained in 1807; pastor of the German Reformed congregation in Carlisle till 1811, when he was called to Frederick, Md., where he labored with great success  to the time of his death, Sept. 29, 1829. He was a zealous pastor; aid an impressive preacher in both the German and English languages. (H. H.)

## Helffenstein, Samuel, D.D[[@Headword:Helffenstein, Samuel, D.D]]

             a prominent German Reformed minister, son of Reverend John C. Albert Helffenstein, was born at Germantown, Pennsylvania, April 17, 1775. He studied privately, partly under Reverend Mr. Stock, and partly under Reverend Dr. Melsheimer. His theological studies he prosecuted under Reverend Dr. William Hendel, the elder, pastor of the Reformed Church on Race Street, Philadelphia. He entered the ministry in 1796 or 1797. After preaching for a short time in Montgomery County, he received a call to the Race Street Church, as successor to his theological preceptor, who died about this time. Here he labored for a period of thirty two or three years, when he retired from the active duties of the ministry, and spent the remainder of his, days at his private residence in North Wales, Montgomery County, where he died, October 17, 1866. Dr. Helffenstein was a man of fine talents, thorough education, and superior pulpit abilities. He prepared a large number of young men for the ministry, and also took a deep interest in the establishment of the literary and theological institutions of the Reformed Church. In 1846 he published a work on didactic theology, which probably embodied the substance of his lectures to the students whom in earlier life he had under tuition. See Harbaugh, Fathers of the Germ. Ref. Church, 4:31. (D.Y.H.)

## Helfferich, John[[@Headword:Helfferich, John]]

             a son of Rev. John Henry Helfferich, was born in Weissenberg, Lehigh County, Pa., Jan. 17, 1795. He completed his theological studies with Rev. Dr. Samuel Helfenstein in Philadelphia, was licensed in 1816, and ordained in 1819. He became pastor of the same congregations in Lehigh County, Pa., which his father had served for many years, in which field he continued to labor with much zeal and success to the end of his life. He died suddenly, April 8, 1852. During his ministry he baptized 4591, and received into full communion with the Church, by confirmation, between two and three thousand persons. He preached only in the German language. (H. H.)

## Helfferich, John Henry[[@Headword:Helfferich, John Henry]]

             a minister of the German Reformed Church in the United States, was born at Moszbach, Palatinate, Oct. 22, 1739. After studying theology, he was licensed Sept. 22, 1761, and labored for a time in his own country. In January 1772, he arrived in New York as a missionary, together with Rev. J. C. A. Helfenstein and Rev. J. G. Gebhard. He soon after settled at Weissenberg, Lehigh County, Pa., where his charge comprehended as many as seven congregations at one time. Here he remained, declining all calls from other churches, and labored faithfully until his death, Dec. 5, 1810. “During his ministry Mr. Helfferich baptized 5830, and confirmed 4000 souls. He may be regarded as the father of the German Reformed Church in the field over which his labors extended. Though that part of the Church did not escape the general stagnation of a later period through German rationalism and indifference, yet the vantage-ground upon which it was placed, by means of his labors, has been a blessing to it down to our day.” — Harbaugh, Fathers of the Reformed Church, 2, 241 sq.

## Helgoland[[@Headword:Helgoland]]

             in Norse mythology; was an island of the North Sea, also called Fosetesland, from the god Fosete. It contained only herds, sacred to the god, an altar, and a spring, to drink from which was very beneficial.

## Helheim[[@Headword:Helheim]]

             in Norse mythology, is the kingdom of the cruel Hel (q.v.), large and extended, intersected by thirty-two rivers, which spring from the spring Hwergelmer, and one of which encircles the entire country. The gold- covered bridge, Gjalar, spans this valley. A maiden giantess, Modgudur, who keeps guard here, inquires of every one his name and family, and shows them the way to the palace of Hel. A high iron lattice surrounds the kingdom, and after having passed this, the visitor finds himself in one of the nine worlds. There are two maidens keeping guard also in Hel's palace; they have iron blood, which, when it falls to the ground, causes quarrel and war. Hel's palace contains a hall, Eliud, her table is called Hungur (hunger), Ganglate and Gangloit are her servant and maid, Kor her bed, Blick and Bol her covering. In Helheim or Niflheim lives the evil snake, Nidhogr, which gnaws at one of the three roots of the ash-tree, Ygdrasil. There, in a cave, the dog Garmr lives, who is to bring about the death of an Asa at the destruction of the world. Helheim is not a place of punishment, but simply the dwelling-place of those who do not die of wounds on the battle-field. After the end of-the world, the good are separated from the bad, the former go to eternal joy in Gimle (heaven), the latter to Nastrond.

## Heli, or rather Eli[[@Headword:Heli, or rather Eli]]

             (᾿Ηλί, in some ed. ᾿Ηλί or ᾿Ηλεί, Heb. עֵלַר, Ei), a name that occurs once in the N.T. and once in the Apocrypha.

1. The third of three names inserted between Achitob and Amarias in the genealogy of Ezra, in 2Es 1:2, for which there is no corresponding name in the Heb. list (Ezr 7:2-3).

2. The father-in-law of Joseph, and maternal grandfather of Christ (Luk 3:23). B.C. ante 22. SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

## Helias[[@Headword:Helias]]

             the Latin form (2Es 7:39) of the name of the prophet ELIJAH.

## Heling, Maurice[[@Headword:Heling, Maurice]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born in 1523 at Friedland, Prussia. He studied at different universities, was in 1550 rector at Eisleben, in 1556 superintendent at Nuremberg, and died October 2, 1595, leaving, Colloquium Evae et Marice Virginis: — De Perpetua Ecclesiae Conservatione Ministrorum: — De Argumenta Librorum Josuae, Judicum, Ruth et 2 Liborum Samuelis et Locorum Communium Consignationes Breves. See Zeltner, Leben und Schriften Helings (Altdorf, 1715); Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Heliodorus[[@Headword:Heliodorus]]

             (᾿Ηελιόδωρος, i.e. gift of the sun, a not unfrequent Greek name), the treasurer (ὁ ἐπὶ τῶνπραγμάτων) of Seleucus Philopator, who was commissioned by the king, at the instigation of Apollonius (q.v.), to carry away the private treasures deposited in the Temple at Jerusalem. According to the narrative in 2Ma 3:9 sq., he was stayed from the execution of his design by a “great apparition” (ἐπιφάνεια), in consequence of which he fell down “compassed with great darkness,” and speechless. He was afterwards restored at the intercession of the high- priest Onias, and bore witness to the king of the inviolable majesty of the Temple (2 Maccabees 3). The full details of the narrative are not supported by any other evidence. Josephus, who was unacquainted with 2 Macc., takes no notice of it (Ant. 12, 3, 3); and the author of the so called 4 Macc. attributes the attempt to plunder the-Temple to Apollonius, and differs in his account of the miraculous interposition, though he distinctly recognizes it (De Mltcc. 4 οὐρανόθεν ἔφιπποι προυφάνησαν ἄγγελοι.... καταπεσὼν δὲ ἡμιθανὴς οΑ῾᾿πολλώνιος .. ). Heliedorus afterwards murdered Seleucus, and made an unsuccessful attempt to seize the Syrian crown (App. Syr. 45). B.C. 175. — Comp. Wernsdorf, De ide Libr. Macc. § liv. Raffaelle's grand picture of “Heliodorus” has often been copied and engraved.

## Heliodorus of Emesa[[@Headword:Heliodorus of Emesa]]

             in Syria, flourished in the latter part of the 4th century after Christ. He was the author of the celebrated romance entitled AEthiopia, or account of the love and adventures of Theogenes and Chariclea, the oldest and best of the Greek romances, and the model of many subsequent ones. This was written in early life, and afterwards Heliodorus became a Christian, and was made  bishop of Tricca, in Sicily, where he introduced the regulation that every married priest should, upon his ordination, separate from his wife or be deposed (Socrates, Hist. Eccles. 5, 22). Nicephorus states (Hist. Eccles. 12, 34) that a provincial synod, because of the injurious tendency of the Ethiopica upon the minds of the young, decreed that Heliodorus should either condemn and disown it, or resign his bishopric. This statement is generally rejected as improbable, since it is made by no other author, and the Aithiopica contains nothing of a corruptive tendency. The best edition of the Greek text is that by Coraes (Paris, 1804,2 vols. 8vo). — Smith, Dict. Grk. and Rom. Biog. and Mythology, 2, 373; Dunlop, Hist. of Fiction (London, 1845, 1 vol. 8vo), p. 18-24; Photius, Cod. 73; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 5, 699. (J. W. M.)

## Heliogabalus (Elagabalus)[[@Headword:Heliogabalus (Elagabalus)]]

             emperor of Rome, was born at Emesa about A.D. 205. His name was Varus Avitus Bassianus, but he was made priest of Elagabalus (El-Gabal), the Syro-Phoenician Sun-god, about A.D. 217, and took that name. In May, 218, through the intrigues of his mother, Julia Maesa, with the soldiery, he was proclaimed emperor; and, soon after, Macrinus, who was marching to put down this usurpation, was defeated. His reign, which lasted not quite four years, was characterized by superstition, licentiousness, and cruelty to a degree hardly rivaled by the worst Roman emperors. He introduced the worship of the Sun god into Rome, and even passed a decree that no other celestial power should be worshipped. The praetorians slew him in camp, A.D. 222. As he himself introduced a new religion into Rome, it was not his policy to persecute, and so, during that time, the Christians had “rest.”

## Helios[[@Headword:Helios]]

             in Greek mythology (among the Romans Sol), the god of the sun, was one of the Titanides, brother of Selene and Aurora, all three children of the Titan Hyperion and the Titanid Thia. Helios rides in the wagon of the sun, drawn by four flashing steeds, borne from sea to sea, and gives the world the day. Aurora precedes, opens the sun's portals, strews roses on his path, glowing rays and golden locks undulate about his head, a light dress, woven from the breath of Zephyrus, flies about his hips, when he comes forth out of his palace. The latter lies in the west of the known world, where the sun sets. In order to come from here to the east, he sails back during the night in a golden canoe until he arrives again at the east. Near his palace were his herds and his gardens. As every god had a seat of worship, so Rhodes was especially sacred to Helios. Besides this the castle of Corinth belonged to him. According to Diodoris, Helios was a son of king Hyperion and his sister Basilea. The brothers of the king, fearing the latter would excel them in power, murdered him and drowned Helios.

## Helkai[[@Headword:Helkai]]

             (Heb. Chelkay', חֶלְקִי, for חֶלְקְיָה Jehovah is his portion; Sept. ῾Ελκαϊv), son of Meraioth, and one of the chief priests in the time of the high-priest Joiakim (Neh 12:15). B.C. post 536.

## Helkath[[@Headword:Helkath]]

             (Heb. Chelkath', חֶלְקִת, Jos 19:25, but חֶלְקָת, even without pause- accent, Jos 21:31;” construct” of , חֶלְקָה, smoothness, as in Gen 27:16, or potion, as in Gen 33:19, etc.; Sept. Χελκάθ),  a town of Asher, on the eastern border, mentioned as the starting-point in the direction (apparently southward) to Achshaph (Jos 19:25); assigned as one of the Levitical cities (Jos 21:31). In 1Ch 6:75, it appears to be erroneously written HUKOK. SEE HUKKOE. p the Onomnasticon it is simply mentioned by Eusebius as Eoiri, by Jerome as Elcath; but neither seems to have known it. De Saulcy inclines to identify it with a village called Kirkeh, which he reports not far southeast of Akka (Narrative, 1, 68); and Schwarz (Palestine, p. 191) thinks it is the modern Yerka, about seven miles north-east of Akka; but neither of these positions is in the neighborhood indicated by the text, which rather requires a locality nearer the north-eastern angle of the tribe, not unlikely at the ruined village Ukrith, about twelve miles S.E. of Tyre, as proposed by Van de Velde (Memoir, p. 320). SEE HELKATH- HAZZUARIM.

## Helkath-haz-zurim[[@Headword:Helkath-haz-zurim]]

             Tristram thinks (Bible Places, page 115) that a reminiscence of the battle here seems to be preserved in a broad, smooth valley close to Gibeon [el- Jib], called Wady el-'Aksar, 'the vale of the soldiery."' It runs north-west from the village.

## Helkath-hazzurim[[@Headword:Helkath-hazzurim]]

             (Heb. Chelkath'hats-Tsutrms', חֶלְקִתאּהִצֻּרַים,plot of the rocks), a designation of the plain just below the pool of Gibeon, on the east, acquired from the deadly combat between twelve of Ishbosheth's men and as many of David's, which formed a prelude to the general engagement (2Sa 2:16). SEE GIBEON. As to the name, “Ewald approves the reading which the Sept. seem to have followed (μερὶς τῶν ἐπιβούλων, apparently from their reading הִצָּרַים), as that which alone gives a suitable meaning to the name (Gesch. Isr. 2, 575, note 1). Gesenius renders by ‘the field of swords,' which can hardly be admitted; for, though צוּר is used in the sense of an ‘edge,' it is never used simply for ‘sword.' Furst gives Felsenkahlheit, ‘rock-smoothness,' as the meaning, the place being smooth and level as a surface of rock. Aquila gives κλῆρος τῶν στερεῶν, and the Vulg. Ager robustorum, taking צוּר in a figurative sense, of which, however, there is no other instance”

## Helkias[[@Headword:Helkias]]

             (Χελκίας), a still different Greek form (1Es 1:8) of the name of the high-priest HILKIAH.

## Hell[[@Headword:Hell]]

             a term which originally corresponded more exactly to HADES, being derived from the Saxon helan, to cover, and signifying merely the covered, or invisible place-the habitation of those who have gone from this visible terrestrial region to the world of spirits. But it has been so long appropriated in common usage to the place of future punishment for the wicked, that its earlier meaning has been lost sight of. In the English Bible it is used in the wider sense.

I. Hebrew and Greek Terms. — The three words, which all but monopolize the subject, are שַׁאוֹל, Sheol', in the O.T.; and ῞Αιδης, Hades, and Γέεννα, Gehenna, in the N.T. שְׁאוֹל occurs 65 times; in 61 of these it is rendered in the Sept. By ῞Αδης; twice by θάνατος (2Sa 22:6, and Pro 23:14); and twice omitted in the common text (Job 24:19; Eze 32:21). In the Vulg. שְׁאוֹל is translated 48 times by Infernus, and 17 times by Inferus [mostly Inferi (plur.)]. In our A.V. it is represented 31 times by Grave, 31 times by Hell, and 3 times by Pit. In the N. Test. our word Hell occurs 23 times; 12 times it stands for Γέεννα, and 11 times [perhaps the twelfth should be added, see Tischendorf and Bruder (Concord.) on Rev 3:7] for ῞Αδης. The Vulg. closely follows the original in its N.T. renderings; in all the twelve passages Γέεννα is simply copied into Ge'henna, while Infernus stands for every occurrence of ῞Αδης, except once (Mat 16:18), where the phrase πύλαι ¯δου (“gates of hell”) becomes “portae inferi.” Since, therefore, שְׁאוֹל, ςΑδης, and Γέεννα, are employed in the sacred original to designate the mysteries of HELL, we proceed to give first their probable derivation, and then their meaning, so far as Holy Scripture assists ῥ in its discovery.

(I.) Their Derivation. —

1. שְׁאוֹל‘(or, as it is occasionally written, שְׁאֹל), םלהשּׂ is by most of the old writers (see Cocceius, Lex. p. 840,841; Schindler, Lex. Pent. 1782; Robinson, Key to Hebrew Bible, 2, 217; and Leigh, Crit. Sacra, 1, 238; 2, 6) referred for its origin to שָׁאִל, to demand, seek, or ask. They are not agreed as to the mode of connecting the derivative with this root; Cocceius suggests an absurd reason, “ שְׁאוֹל notateum locum in quo quiest in quaestione est” (!) A more respectable solution is suggested by those who  see in the insatiableness of שְׁאוֹל (Pro 30:15-16) a good ground for connecting it with the root in question. Thus Fagius on Gin. 37; Buxtorf, Lexicon, s.v. referring to Isa 5:14; Hab 2:5; Pro 27:20. (Ernst Meier, Hebr. W-w-b, p. 187, also adopts this root, but he is far-fetched and obscure in his view of its relation to the derived word). (A good defense [by a modern scholar] of this derivation of Sheol from the verb שָׁאִל is given by Giider, Lehre.v. d. Erschein. Jesu Christi unter den Todten [Berne, 1853], and more briefly in his art. Hades [Herzog, 5, 441, Clark's trans. 2, 468]. His defense is based on the many passages which urge the insatiable demand of Sheol for all men, such as those we have mentioned in the text, and Gen 37:35; 1 Samuel 28; Psa 6:6; Psa 89:49. See also Venema [on Psa 16:10]; J. A. Quensted, Tract. de Sepultura Veterum, 9, 1.) Bottcher (De Inferis, p. 76, § 159) finds in the root שָׁעִל to be hollow, a better origin for our word. Gesenius (Thes. p. 1347), who adopts the same derivation, supposes that שׁעל means to dig out, and so contrives to unite שׁעלand שׁאל, by making the primary idea of digging lead to the derived one of seeking (see Job 3:21). Bottcher goes on to connect the German words Hohl (hollow) and Hohle (cavity) with the idea indicated by שׁעל, and timidly suggests the possibility of Hölle (Hell) coming from Hohle. Whilst decidedly rejecting this derivation, we do not object to his derivation of the Hebrew noun; amidst the avowed uncertainty of the case, it seems to be the least objectionable of the suggestions which have been offered, and, to provide an intelligible sense for the word Sheol, most in harmony with many Biblical passages. Bottcher defines the term to mean “vastus locus subterraneus” (p. 72, § 153). This agrees very well with the rendering of our A.V. in so far as it has used the comprehensive word Hell, which properly signifies “a covered or concealed place.”

2. Hades. — The universally allowed statement that the N.T. has shed a light on the mysteries of life and immortality which is only in an inferior degree discovered in the O.T., is seldom more distinctly verified than in the uncertainty which attaches to Sheol (the difficulty of distinguishing its various degrees of meaning, which it is generally felt exist, and which our A.V. has endeavored to express by an equal balance between Hell and Grave), in contrast with the distinction which is implied in the about equally frequent terms of Hades and Gehenna, now to be described. The “ΑριΧ of the N.T. was suggested, no doubt, by its frequent occurrence in  the Sept. The word was originally unaspirated, as in Homer's Α᾿ϊvδαο πύλαι (II. 5, 646; 9:312), and Hesiod's Α᾿ϊvδεω κύνα χαλκεόφωνον (Theog. 311), and Pindar's Α᾿ϊvδαν λαχεῖν (Pyth. 5, 130). This form of the word gives greater credibility to the generally received derivation of it from a privat. and ἰδεῖν, to see. (The learned authors of Liddell and Scott's Greek Lex. [s.v. ῞Αδης] throw some doubt on this view of the origin of the word, because of its aspirated beginning, in Attic Greek. But surely this is precarious ground. Is it certain that even in Attic writers it was invariably aspirated? AEschylus [Sept. c. Theb. (Paley) 310] has Α᾿ϊvδα προϊάψαι [with the lenis], according to the best editing. It is true that this is in a chorus, but in the Agam. 1505, also a choral line, we read μηδὲν ἐν ῞Αιδου μεγαλαυχείτῳ [with the aspirate], as if the usage were uncertain. Possibly in the elliptical phrase ἐν Α῾ιδου [scil οἴκῳ] the aspirate occurs because the genitive is really the name of the God [not of the region, which might, for distinction, have been then unaspirated]). Plutarch accordingly explains it by ἀειδὲς καὶ ἀόρατου (De Isid. et Osir. p. 382), and in the Etymol. Magn. ]δης is defined as χωριον ἀφεγγές, σκότους αἰωνίου καὶ ζόφου πεπλῃρομένον...ἐν ω οὐδὲν βλέπομεν. Hades is thus “the invisible place or region;” “Locus visibus nostris subtractus,” as Grotius defines it.

3. Gehenna (Γέεννα) is composed of the two Heb. words גֵּיא (valley) and הַנּוֹם (Hinnon, the name of the proprietor of the valley). In the Sept. Γαίεννα is used in Jos 18:16 to designate “the valley of the son of Hinnom,” the full expression of which is גֵּי בֶןאּהנֹּם The shorter appellation גֵי הַנּם occurs in the same verse. The Rabbinical writers derive הַנּם from נָהִם, “rugire” [to groan or mourn, in Eze 24:23], as if indicative of the cries of the children in the horrid rites of the Moloch- worship (see Buxtorf, Lex. Rab. p. 108; Glassius [ed. Dathii], Philolog. Sacr. i, 806). The etymological remarks have paved our way to the next section of our subject.

(II.) Biblical Meaning of these three Terms. —

1. Meanings of שְׁאוֹל, Sheol. —

(1.) The “Grave.” Much controversy has arisen whether within the meaning of Sheoel should be included “the grave;” indeed this is the only question of difficulty. The fact, which we have already stated, that our  A.V. translates שְׁאוֹל quite as often by “grave” as by the general term “hell,” supplies aprima facie reason for including it. Without, however, insisting on the probability that polemical theology, rather than Biblical science, influenced our translators, at least occasionally, in their rendering of the word, we may here adduce on the other side the telling fact that of all the ancient versions not one translates in any passage the Hebrew Sheol by the equivalent of grave. The other Greek translators, like the venerable Sept., so far as their fragments show (see Origen, Hexapla, passim), everywhere give ῞Αιδης for שְׁאוֹל (sometimes they use for the locative case the older and better phrase εἰς, ἐν Αιδου, sometimes ‘the more recent and vulgar εἰς τὸν ῎Αιδην, ἐν τῷ ῞Αιδῃ). The Samaritan text in the seven passages of the Pentateuch has either שיול (Siol) or שיאול. Onkelos and Jonathan everywhere, except in five passages, retain שְׁאוֹל. The Peshito everywhere in both Testaments renders the Hebrew Sheol and the Greek Hades by [שַׁיוּל] Shiul; and, as we have already seen, the Vulg. translates the same words in both the O.T. and the N.T. by inferus (plur. Inferi mostly), and, above all, Infernus (see above for particulars). It is to the later Targumists (the pseudo-Jonathan and the Jerusalem Targum), and afterwards to the Rabbinical doctors of the Middle Ages, that we trace the version of the “sepulcher” and “the grave” (thus in Gen 37:35; Gen 42:38; Gen 44:29; Gen 44:31, these Targumists rendered Sheol by בֵּר קְבוּרְתָא [the house of burial]; similarly did they render Psa 141:7; Job 7:9; Job 14:13; Job 17:13; Job 17:16; Job 21:13; Ecc 9:10, and other passages, in which it is observable how often they have been followed by our translators). See, for more information on this point, archbishop Usher, Works [by Elrington], 3:319-321; and, more fully, Bottcher (p. 68-70, sec. 146-149), who quotes Rashi and Aben Ezra [on Genesis 37 55J; D. Kimchi (Lib. Radia. s.v. שְׁאוֹל); and other Rabbis who expressly admit the grave within the scope of the meaning of Sheol; Bottcher also quotes a very long array of commentators and lexicographers [Rabbi Mardochai Nathan, with extravagant one-sidedness, in his Hebr. Concord. gives no other sense to Sheol but קבר, the grave], who follow the Rabbinical doctors herein; and he adds the names of such writers as deny the meaning of the grave to the Hebrew Sheol: among these occur the learned Dutch divines Vitringa and Venema. The latter of these expressly affirms, “ שְׁאוֹל nullo modo ad sepulchrum pertinebit” (Comment. ad Ps. i, 504). To the authorities he mentions we would add, as maintaining the same view, the learned Henry  Ainsworth (on Gen 37:35, Works, p. 135), who draws an important distinction; “שְׁאוֹל, the grave, the word meaneth not the grave digged or made with hands, which is named in Hebrew קֶבֶר, but it meaneth the common place or state of death” (a similar distinction is drawn by Luther [Enarr. in Genes. 42:38]; קברis only the grave in which an actual interment takes place; none that die unburied can have this word used of them; their receptacle is שאול, “commune quoddam raceptaculum non corporum tantum sed et animarum, ubi omnes mortui congregantur.” Ann. Seneca [lib. 8, controvers. 4] observes between natural burial and artificial — ” Omnibus natura sepulturam dedit,” etc. So Lucan, 7:818, says — ” Capit omnia tellus Quae genuit; caelo tegitur, qui non habet urnam.” Pliny [ Hist. Nat. 7, 54] distinguishes between natural burial by applying to it the Word sepelire, and burial by ceremony by using of it the synonym humare); Nicolaus (De Sepulchris Hebr. i, 8-14), who shows that שְׁאוֹל is never used of funeral pomp, nor of the burial of the body in the ground; Eberhard Busmann, who [in 1682] wrote, Dissertatio philol. de Scheol Hebr., makes a statement to the effect that he had examined all the passages in the O.T. and pronounces of them thus — “Nullum eorumu (excepto forsan uno vel altero, de quo tamen adhuc dubitari potest) de sepulchro necessario est intelligendum multa tamen contra ita sunt comparata ut de sepulchro nullo modo intelligi possint neac debeant.” Some modern writers, who have specially examined the subject, also deny that שְׁאוֹל ever means “the grave.” Thus Breecher, On the Immortality of the Soul as held by the Jews (and Pareau, Comment. de Immort. ac vitae fut. notit. 1807).

These reasons have led learned men, who have especially examined the subject, to exclude the grave (specifically understood as a made or artificial one) from the proper meaning of Sheol. We cannot but accept their view in critical exactness. But there is an inexact and generic sense of Sheol in which the word grave well expresses the meaning of the Scripture passages just mentioned, and (in justice to the A.V. it may be admitted) of most of the others, which our translators rendered by this word. (The passages in which the A.V. renders שְׁאוֹל by grave are these — Gen 37:35; Gen 42:38; Gen 44:29; Gen 44:31.; 1Sa 2:6; 1Ki 2:6; 1Ki 2:9; Job 7:9; Job 14:13; Job 17:13; Job 21:13; Job 24:19; Psa 6:5 [Hebr. 61; 30:3 [4]; 31:17 [18]; 49:14 [15], twice; 49:15 [16]; 88:3 [4]; 89:48 [49]; 141:7; Pro 1:12; Pro 30:16; Ecc 9:10; Son 8:6;  Isa 14:11 [marg. of Isa 5:9 has grave]; Isa 38:10; Isa 38:18; Eze 31:15; Hos 13:14, twice; and in Jon 2:2 [3] the maryin has “grave.”) Of this more vague sense Usher (Works, 3:324) says-” When Sheol is said to signify the grave, the term grave must be taken in as large a sense as it is in our Savior's speech (John 5, 28), and in Isa 26:19, according to the Sept. reading; upon which passage writes Origen thus--'Here and in many other places the graves of the dead are to be understood, not such only as we see are builded for the receiving of men's bodies-either cut out in stones, or digged down in the earth; but every place wherein a man's body lieth either entire or in part' otherwise they which are not committed to burial, nor laid in graves, but have ended their life in shipwrecks, deserts, and such like ways, should not seem to be reckoned among those which are said to be raised from the grave' (In Esai. lib. 28 citatus a Pamphilo, in Apol.)” We have here, then, the first meaning of the Hebrew שְׁאוֹלlargely applied, as we have seen, in our A.V. to “the grave,” considered in a universal sense (see the passages in the last note), commensurate with death itself as to the extent of its signification. (Comp. “the grave and gate of death” of the English Liturgy, Collect for Easter Even.) Though we carefully exclude the artificial grave, or קֶבֶר, from this category, there is no doubt, as bishop Lowth has well shown (De Sacra Poesi Hebr. Prael. 7 [ed. Oxon. with notes of Michaelis and Rosenmüller, 1821], p. 65-69), that the Hebrew poets drew all the imagery with which they describe the state and condition of the dead from the funeral rites and pomp, and from the vaulted sepulchers of their great men. The bishop's whole treatment of the subject is quite worth perusal. We can only quote his final remarks: “You will see this transcendent imagery better and more completely displayed in that noble triumphal song which was composed by Isaiah (Isa 14:4-27), previous to the death of the king of Babylon. Ezekiel has also grandly illustrated the same scene, with similar machinery, in the last prophecy concerning the fall of Pharaoh (32:18-32).” For an excellent vindication of the A.V. in many of its translations of the grave, we refer the reader to the treatise of archbishop Usher ‘(Answer to the Jesuit's Challenge, Works [ed. Elrington], 3, 319-324 and 332-340). We doubt not that, if grave is an admissible sense of' שְׁאוֹל, our translators have, on the whole, made a judicious selection of the passages that will best bear the sense: their purpose was a popular one, and they accomplished it, in the instance of uncertain words and phrases, by giving them the most intelligible turn they would bear, as in the case before us.  We undertake not to decide whether it would be better to leave the broad and generic word Sheol, as the great versions of antiquity did, everywhere; whether, e.g., Jacob's lament (Gen 37:35; Gen 42:38) and like passages would be more suitably, if not correctly, rendered by the simple retention of the original word, or the equally indefinite hades. There is some force in the observation often made (see Corn. a Lapide, on Gen 37:35; Bellarmine and others, adduced by Leigh, Crit. Sacrae, 1, 239) that “it was not the grave of Joseph which Jacob meant, for he thought indeed that his Son was devoured of wild beasts, and not buried.” See more on this passage in Pearson, Creed [ed. Chevallier], p. 437; Fulke, Translations, etc., p. 314; both which writers defend the version of grave. Ainsworth ad loc. (among the older commentators) and Knobel (among the moderns) contend for the general word hell [Knobel, Schattenreich ]. Rosenmüller learnedly states both views, and leans in favor of “locum, ubi mortui umbrarum instar degunt” (Scholia, 1, 576).

(2.) The other meaning of שְׁאוֹל, “Bell,” so rendered in thirty-one passages of A.V., according to the more ancient and, as it seems to us, preferable opinion, makes it local, i.e. the place of disembodied spirits. (῞Αιδης δὲ τόπος ἡμῖν ἀειδής, ἤγουν ἀφανὴς καὶ ἄγνωστος, ό τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν ἐντεῦθιν ἐκδημούσας δεχόμενος, Andr. Caesaricus in Apocal. c. 63.) A later opinion supposes the word to indicate “not the place where souls departed are, but the state and condition of the dead, or their permansion in death,” as bishop Pearson calls it (Creed [ed. Chevallier], p. 439). On this opinion, which that great divine “cannot admit as a full or proper exposition,” we shall say nothing more than that it is at best only a deduction from the foregoing local definition. That definition we have stated in the broadest terms, because, in reference to Dr. Barrow's enumeration (Serm. on the Creed [Art. “He descended into Hell”], Works [Oxford, 1830], 5, 416, 417) of the questions which have arisen on the subject before us, we believe that Holy Scripture warrants the most ample of all the positions suggested by that eminent writer, to the effect that the Sheol or Hell of which we treat is not merely ‘the place of good and happy souls,” or “that of bad and miserable ones,” but “indifferently and in common, of both those.” We propose to arrange the Biblical passages so as to describe, first, the state of the occupants of Sheol, and, secondly, the locality of it, in some of its prominent features. As to the first point, Sheol is (a) the receptacle of the spirits of all that depart this life. (Among the scriptural designations of the inhabitants of Sheol is רְבָּאְים[ קְהִלרin (in  Pro 21:16) is rendered “congregation of the dead” (or departed) in the A.V. This is better than the Sept. rendering συναγωγὴ γιγάντων, and Vulg. “coetus gigantum.” There is force in the word קהלthus applied, derived from the use of the word to designate the great “congregation” of the Jewish nation; SEE CONGREGATION. For the use of the word רפאיםas applicable to the dead, see especially Bottcher, De Infe. p. 94-10, § 193-204. The word occurs in this sense also in the grand passage of Isaiah 14. [In Isa 14:9 “Sheol stirs up its Rephaim” on the entrance of the spirit of the king of Babylon.] רפאיםis met with in six other places in the same sense of departed spirits. It is connected with

רָפֶה, “weak,” which occurs in Num 13:18, and other passages [see Furst, Hebr. W. — b. ii, 383]. The gentile noun [mentioned in Gen 14:5 and elsewhere, and rendered Rephain and Giants] is of the same form, but probably of a different origin [see Gesenius, Thes. p. 1302].) This general signification appears from Psa 89:47-48, and Isa 38:18-19 (in which latter verse the opposition in its universal sense between sheol and the state of life in this world is to be observed). We do not hesitate, with archbishop Usher (Works, 3:318), to translate שַׁאוֹלin these passages “hell” or “sheol,” instead of “grave,” as in the A.V. Sheol, therefore, is (b) the abode of the wicked, Num 16:33; Job 24:19; Psa 9:17 (Hebr. 18); 31:17 (18); Pro 5:5; Pro 9:18; Isa 57:9; and (g) of the good [both in their “disembodied” condition], Psa 16:10, comp. with Act 2:27; Act 2:31; Psa 30:3 (4); 49:15 (16); 86:13; Isa 38:10, compared with Job in, 17-19; Hos 13:14, comp. with 1Co 15:55. — With regard to the second point, touching some local features of Sheol, we find it described as very deep (Job 11:8); dark (Job 10:21-22); (yet confess and open to the eye of God, Job 26:6); with “valleys” (Gesenius, Thes. p. 1348) or depths of various gradations (Psa 86:13 [compared with Deu 32:22]; Pro 9:18); with bars (Job 17:16, comp. with Jon 2:6) and gates (Isa 38:10); situated beneath us; hence the dead are said “to go down” (יָרִד) to Sheol, Num 16:30; Num 16:33; Eze 31:15-17 (compared with Job 7:9; Gen 42:38). Comp. Josephus (Ant. 17:1, 3), who, when describing the tenets of the Jewish sects, attributes to the Pharisees the belief of a future state, in which “rewards and punishments” will be dealt out “to men in their disembodied state” (ταῖς ψυχαῖς) “under the earth” (ὑπὸ χθονὸς δικαιώσεις τε καὶ τιμάς, κ. τ. λ.). On the phrase of the creed  “descended into hell,” and sundry uses of יָרִדand κατελθεῖν as not necessarily implying local descent, but rather “removal from one place to another,” see Usher (Works, 3:392, 393). We have seen how some have derived the name of Sheol from its insatiability; such a quality is often attributed to it: it is all-devouring (Pro 1:12); never satisfied (Pro 30:16; Isa 5:14), and inexorable (Son 8:7).

2. There is in the Hades (῞Αιδης) of the N.T. an equally ample signification with the Sheol of the O.T., as the abode of both happy and miserable beings. Its characteristics are not dissimilar; it is represented as “a prison” (comp. 1Pe 3:19, where inhabitants of hades are called τὰ ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύματα); with gates and bars (πύλαι ]δου, Mat 16:18; comp. with the phrase εἰς ῞Αδου of Act 2:27; Act 2:31, with the ellipsis of δῶμα, οϊvκον); and locks (the “keys” of Hades, αἱ κλεῖς τοῦ ῞Αιδου, being in the hands of Christ, Rev 1:18); its situation is also downwards (see the ῞εως ¯δου καταβιβασθήσῃ of Mat 11:23, and Luk 10:15). As might be expected, there is more plainly indicated in the N.T. the separate condition of the righteous and the wicked; to indicate this separation other terms are used; thus, in Luk 23:43, Paradise (παράδεισος no doubt different from that of Pali, 2Co 12:4, which is designated, in Rev 2:7, as ὁ παράδεισος τοῦ θεοῦ, the supernal Paradise; see Robinson, Lexicon, N.T., p. 13,547; Wahl, Clavis, N.T., p. 376; Kuinol [ed. London] on N.T. 2, 237; and especially Meyer, Kommentar u. d. Neue Test. [ed. 4] 6:292, and the authorities there quoted by him) is used to describe that part of Hades which the blessed dead inhabit — a figurative expression, so well adapted for the description of a locality of happiness that the inspired writers employ it to describe the three happiest places, the Eden of Innocence, the Hades of departed saints, and the heaven of their glorious rest. The distinction between the upper and the lower Paradise was familiar to the Jews. In Eisenmenger's Entdecktes Judenthun, 2, 295-322, much of their curious opinions on the subject is collected. In p. 298 are given the seven names of the heavenly Paradise, while in the next three are contained the seven names of the lower Paradise of Hades. SEE PARADISE.

Another figurative expression used to designate the happy part of Hades is “Abraham's bosom,” ὁ κόλπος Α᾿βρααμ, Luk 16:22. (St. Augustine  who says [Quaest. Evang. 2, 38] “Sinus Abrahn e requies est beatorum pauperim in quo post harc vitam recipiuntur,” yet doubts whether hades is used at all in N.T. in a good sense: He says [Ep. 187, Works, 2, 689], “Whether the bosom of Abraham, where the wicked Dives was, when in his torment he beheld the poor man at rest, were either to be deemed the same as Paradise, or to be thought to pertain to hell or hades, I cannot define [non facile dixerim];” so also he writes on Psalms 85 [Works, 4:912]). For an explanation of the phrase, SEE ABRAHAM'S BOSOM.

3. We need not linger over the Biblical sense of our last word Γέεννα. Gehenna. We refer the reader to a “Discourse” by the learned Joseph Mede (Works, p. 3133) on Gehenna, which he shows was not used to designate “hell” before the captivity. He, in the same treatise, dwells on certain Hebrew words and phrases, which were in use previous to that epoch for designating Hades and its inhabitants-among these he especially notes רפאום and קהל ר, on which we have observed above. As Παράδεισος is not limited to the finite happiness of Hades, but embraces in certain passages the ultimate blessedness of heaven, so there is no violence in supposing that Γέεβννα (from the finite signification which it possibly bears in Mat 5:29-30; Mat 23:15, equivalent to the Τάρταρος referred to by Peter, 2Pe 2:4, as the place where the fallen angels are reserved unto judgment, or “until sentence,” comp. Jud 1:6) goes on to mean, in perhaps most of its occurrences in the N.T., the final condition of the lost, as in Mat 23:33, where the expression ἡ κρίσις τῆς γεέννης probably means the condemnation [or sentence] to Gehenna as the ultimate doom. SEE GEHENNA.

IV. Synonymous Words and Phrases. — (Most of these are given by Eisenmenger, Entdeck. Jud. 2, 324, and Galatinus, De Arcanis, 6:7, p. 345.)

1. דּוּמָה, Dumah, in Psa 115:17, where the phrase כָּלאּירְדֵי דּ, all that go down into silence,” is in the Sept. παντες οἴ καταβαίνοντες εἰς ]δου, while the Vulg. has “omnes qui descendunt in infe rum” (comp. Psa 94:17).

2. אֲבִדּוֹן, Abaddôn, in Job 26:6, is in poetical apposition with שְׁאוֹל(comp. Pro 27:20 [Kethib], where א ֲis in conjunction with שׁ, forming an hendiadys for destructive hell; Sept. ῞Αιδης καὶ ἀπώλεια; Vulg. Infernus et perditio; A.V. “Hell and destruction”).  3. בְּאֵר שִׁחִת, Beer Shachath, Psalm 55:24; A.V. “pit of destruction “Sept. Φπέαρ διαφθορᾶς; Vulg. Puteus interitus (see also passages in which בּוֹרand שִׁחִתoccur separately).

4. צִלְמָוֶתTsalmaveth, with or without חֹשֶׁךְ, in Psa 107:10, and other passages; Sept. Σκία θανάτου; Vulg. Umbra smortis; A.V. “shadow of death.”

5. תִּחְתַּיּוֹתאּאֶרֶוֹ, Tachtiy6th Erets, in Isa 44:23; A.V. “lower parts of the earth” [Sheol or Hades, Gesen.]; Sept. Τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς; Vulg. Extrema terrce (comp. Eze 26:20, etc., where the phrase is inverted, ארוֹאּתחתיות); of similar meaning is בּוֹר תִּחְתַּיּוֹת, Psa 88:6 (7).

6. תָּפַתּה, Tophteh, in Isa 30:33 [according to Eisenmenger]; for another application of this word, see Gesenius, Thes. s.v.; and Rosenmüller. ad loc.

7. The phrase first used of Abraham, Gen 25:8 (where it occurs, in the solemn description of the holy patriarch's end, midway between death and burial), “He was gathered to his fathers,” is best interpreted of the departure of the soul to Hades to the company of those who preceded him thither (see Cajetan, ad loc., and Gesen. Thes., s.v. אָסִ[Niphal], p. 131, Colossians 1).

8. Τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον, “the outer darkness” of Mat 8:12, et passim, refers probably to what Josephus (War, 3, 25) calls •δης σκοτιώτερος, “the darker Hades.”

V. Biblical Statements as to the Condition of those in “hell.” — The dreadful nature of the abode of the wicked is implied in various figurative expressions, such as “outer darkness,” “I am tormented in this flame,” “furnace of fire,” “unquenchable fire,” “where the worm dieth not,” the blackness of darkness,” “torment in fire and brimstone,” “the ascending smoke of their torment,” “the lake of fire that burneth with brimstone” (Mat 8:12; Mat 13:42; Mat 22:13; Mat 25:30; Luk 16:24; comp. Mat 25:41; Mar 9:43-48; Jud 1:13; comp. Rev 14:10-11; Rev 19:20; Rev 20:14; Rev 21:8). The figure by which hell is represented as burning with fire and brimstone is probably derived from the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah, as well as that which describes the smoke as ascending from it (comp. Rev 14:10-11, with Gen 19:24; Gen 19:28). To  this coincidence of description Peter also most probably alludes in 2Pe 2:6. SEE FIRE.

The names which in many of the other instances are given to the punishments of hell are doubtless in part figurative, and many of the terms which were commonly applied to the subject by the Jews are retained in the New Testament. The images, it will be seen, are generally taken from death, capital punishments, tortures, prisons, etc. And it is the obvious design of the sacred writers, in using such figures, to awaken the idea of something terrible and fearful. They mean to teach that the punishments beyond the grave will excite the same feelings of distress as are produced on earth by the objects employed to represent them. We are so little acquainted with the state in which we shall be hereafter, and with the nature of our future body, that no strictly literal representation of such punishments could be made intelligible to us. Many of the Jews, indeed, and many of the Christian fathers, took the terms employed in Scripture in an entirely literal sense, and supposed there would be actual fire, etc., in hell. But from the words of Christ and his apostles nothing more can with certainty be inferred than that they meant to denote great and unending miseries.

The punishments of sin may be distinguished into two classes:

1. Natural punishments, or such as necessarily follow a life of servitude to sin.

2. Positive punishments, or such as God shall see fit, by his sovereign will, to inflict.

1. Among the natural punishments we may rank the privation of eternal happiness (Mat 7:21; Mat 7:23; Mat 22:13; Mat 25:41; compare 2 Thessalonians 1, 9); the painful sensations which are the natural consequence of committing sin, and of an impenitent heart; the propensities to sin, the evil passions and desires which in this world fill the human heart, and which are doubtless carried into the world to come. The company of fellow-sinners and of evil spirits, as inevitably resulting from the other conditions, may be accounted among the natural punishments, and must prove not the least grievous of them.

2. The positive punishments have already been indicated. It is to these chiefly that the Scripture directs our attention. “There are but few men in such a state that the merely natural punishments of sin will appear to them  terrible enough to deter them from the commission of it. Experience also shows that to threaten positive punishment has far more effect, as well upon the cultivated as the uncultivated, in deterring them from crime, than to announce, and lead men to expect, the merely natural consequences of sin, be they ever so terrible. Hence we may see why it is that the New. Testament says so little of natural punishments (although these, beyond question, await the wicked), and makes mention of them in particular far less frequently than of positive punishments; and why, in those passages which treat of the punishments of hell, such ideas and images are constantly employed as suggest and confirm the idea of positive punishments” (Knapp's Christian Theology, § 156).

As the sins which shut out from heaven vary so greatly in quality and degree, we should expect from the justice of God a corresponding variety both in the natural and the positive punishments. This is accordingly the uniform doctrine of Christ and his apostles. The more knowledge of the divine law a man possesses, the more his opportunities and inducements to avoid sin, the stronger the incentives to faith and holiness set before him, the greater will be his punishment if he fails to make a faithful use of these advantages. “The servant who knows his lord's will and does it not, deserves to be beaten with many stripes:” “To whom much is given, of him much will be required” (Mat 10:15; Mat 11:22; Mat 11:24; Mat 23:15; Luk 12:48), Hence Paul says that the heathen who acted against the law of nature would indeed be punished; but that the Jews would be punished more than they, because they had more knowledge (Rom 2:9-29). In this conviction that God will, even in hell, justly proportion punishment to sin, we must rest satisfied. We cannot now know more; the precise degrees, as well as the precise nature of such punishments, are things belonging to another state of being, which in the present we are unable to understand. For a naturalistic view of the subject, with a copious review of the literature, see Alger, Doctrine of a Future Life (Bost. 1860). For the theological treatment of this topic, SEE HELL PUNISHMENTS.

## Hell Punishments, Nature Of[[@Headword:Hell Punishments, Nature Of]]

             — The term HELL (Hölle), as stated above, originally denoted the “nether world,” the “place of departed spirits.” It came to be almost exclusively applied at a later period to the “place of torment” for the wicked. The scholastic divines distinguished between the Limbus, or place of the souls of departed spirits, and hell, properly so called, where the damned suffer their punishment (Aquinas, Summae Suppleml. qu. 69).

The nature of the punishments of hell has been very variously understood in different times. In the early Church the fire of hell was generally considered as a real, material fire. So Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Cyprian. Origen, however, “believed the misery of the wicked to consist in separation from God, the remorse of conscience, etc. (De Princ. 2, 10. Opp. 1, 102). The eternal fire is neither material nor kindled by another person, but the combustibles are our sins themselves, of which conscience reminds us: thus the fire of hell resembles the fire of passions in this world. The separation between the soul and God may be compared with the pain which we suffer ‘when all the members of the body  are torn out of their joints. By ‘outer darkness' Origen does not so much understand a place devoid of light as a state of complete ignorance; he ‘thus appears to adopt the idea of black bodies only by way of accommodation to popular notions. It should also be bone in mind that Origen imagined that the design of all these punishments was to heal or to correct, and thus finally to restore the sinner to the favor of God” (Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, § 78).

From the latter part of the 3rd century onward to the rise of scholasticism, the punishments of hell were generally described by material images, and, indeed, were considered; to a large extent, as material punishments. Gregory of Nazianzus († 389?) supposed the punishment of the damned to consist essentially in their separation from God, and in the consciousness of their own moral debasement (Orat. 16, 9, p. 306: Τοῖς δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων βάσανος μᾶλλον δὲ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων τὸ ἀπεῤῥφθαι θεοῦ, καὶ ἣ ἐν τῷ συνειδότι αἰσχύνη πἐραςοὐκ ἔχουσἀ). Basil, on the contrary, gives a more vivid description of that punishment (Homil. in Psalms 23; Opp. 1, 151, and elsewhere). Chrysostom represents the torments of the damned in a variety of horrid pictures (in Theod. lapsum, 1, c. 6, Opp. 4, 560, 561). Nevertheless, in other places (e.g., in his Ep. ad Rom. hom. 31 Opp. 10, 396) he justly observes that it is of more importance to know how to escape hell than to know where it is and what is its nature. Gregory of Nyssa (Orat. Catech. 40) endeavors to divest the idea of hell of all that is sensuous (the fire of hell is not to be looked upon as a material fire, nor is the worm which never dies an ἐπίγειον θηρίον). Augustine imagines that separation from God is in the first instance to be regarded as the death and punishment of the damned (De morib. eccles. cuth. c. 11); but he leaves it to his readers to choose between the more sensuous or the more spiritual mode of perception. It is, he says, at all events, better to, think of both (De civit. Dei, 21 9, 10).

From the 8th to the 16th centuries the tendency was to regard the punishments of hell more as physical and material than as moral and spiritual; in the doctrine of the Church the two sorts of punishment were combined. Aquinas treats of the punishments of hell under the title Poena Damnatorum (Summae Suppl. qu. 97), and teaches, 1. that the damned will suffer other punishments besides that of fire; 2. that the “undying worm” is remorse of conscience; 3. that the “darkness” of hell is physical darkness, only so much light being admitted as will allow the lost to see and apprehend the punishments of the place; that, as both body and soul are to  be punished, the fire of hell will be a material fire. Augustine's view, he says, is to be considered rather as a passing opinion than as a decision (loquitur opinando et non determinando). The fire, according to Aquinas, is of the same nature as our ordinary fire, though “with different properties;” and the place of punishment, though not certainly known, is probably under the earth. Others of the schoolmen, however (especially the Mystics), made the suffering of hell to consist rather in separation from God, and in the consequent consciousness of sin, and of unavailing repentance, than in material penalties.

The Reformation made little change in the doctrine as to the nature of future punishment. The substance of the Reformed doctrine is given in the Westminster Confession, chap. 33, as follows: “The wicked, who know not God, and obey not the Gospel of Jesus Christ, shall be cast into eternal torments, and be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power;” and in the Larger Catechism, quest. 29, “What are the punishments of sin in the world to come? A. The punishments of sin in the world to come are everlasting separation from the comfortable presence of God, and most grievous torments in soul and body, without intermission, in hell-fire forever.” In general, both Protestant and Roman Catholic theologians agree in making that punishment to consist (1) of the pena damni, penalty of loss or deprivation, separation from God, and hence loss of all possible sources of enjoyment (Mat 6:21; Mat 22:13; Mat 25:41; compare Wesley, Sermons, 2, 148), of which loss the damned will be fully conscious; (2) of the pana sensus, penalty of sense or feeling, as the natural consequence of sin. “These punishments are inevitable, and connected as closely and inseparably with sin as any effect with its cause. From the consciousness of being guilty of sin arise regret, sorrow, and remorse of conscience, and it is these inward pangs which are the most grievous and, tormenting. The conscience of man is a stem accuser, which cannot be refuted or bribed, and the more its voice is disregarded or suppressed here upon earth, the more loudly will it speak hereafter. Add to this that the propensity to sin, the passions and evil desires which in this world occupy the human heart, are carried along into the next. For it cannot be supposed that they will be suddenly eradicated as by a miracle, and this is hot promised. But these desires and propensities can no longer find satisfaction in the future world, where man will be placed in an entirely different situation, and surrounded by a circle of objects entirely new, hence they will become the more  inflamed. From the very nature of the case, it is plain, therefore, that the state of such a man hereafter must necessarily be miserable. Shame, regret, remorse, hopelessness, and absolute despair, are the natural, inevitable, and extremely dreadful consequences of the sins committed in this life.” (3) Besides these natural penalties of sin, there will also be positive penalties inflicted by divine justice. The New Testament speaks far more distinctly and frequently of these positive punishments than of the natural ones, and especially of the “undying worm,” and of “the eternal fire.” The general tendency of modern theology is to regard these expressions as figurative representations of the positive penalties of hell Doddridge remarks that, “On the whole, it is of very little importance whether we say there is an external fire, or only an idea of such pain as arises from burning; and should we think both doubtful, it is certain God can give the mind a sense of agony and distress which should answer and even exceed the terrors of those descriptions; and care should certainly be taken so to explain Scripture metaphors as that hell may be considered as consisting more of mental agony than of bodily tortures” (Lect. on Divin. 223).

Of similar tenor are the following remarks by Dr. Wardlaw: “What the nature of that suffering shall be it is vain for us to attempt to conjecture. It has been conceived that if we suppose clear apprehensions of God and sin in the understanding; an unslumbering conscience; an unceasing conflict between full, irrepressible convictions of all that is awful in truth, and an enmity of heart remaining in all its virulence; passions raging in their unmitigated violence; regrets as unavailing as they are torturing; conscious desert and unalleviated hopelessness; with the entire removal of all, in whatever form, that on earth enabled the sinner to banish thought and exclude anticipation, we have materials for a sufficient hell. I will not deny it…. I cannot but think, therefore, that there must be something more than conscience, something of the nature of positive punitive infliction: conscience attesting its justice, certifying its being all deserved. What shall be the precise nature of that infliction is another question. There may surely be something of the nature of punitive infliction without adopting the theory of literal fire, of a lake of fire, a lake burning with brimstone. I have no more belief, as I have just said, in a literal fire than in a literal worm; and no more belief in either than in the existence, for the heaven of the Bible, of a literal paradise, in the center of which grows the tree of life, or of a literal city, of which the length, and breadth, and height are equal, of which the foundations are precious stones, the gates of pearl, and the streets of gold,  with a pure river of living water flowing through the midst of it. But the mind of fallen man is in love with sin, and in selfish hatred of God and holiness. In a mind of this character the difficulty may amount to impossibility of awakening any adequate sense of future suffering, or any salutary alarm in the anticipation of it, by any representation of it more directly spiritual, or even mental. In these circumstances, then, if an impression of extreme suffering is to be made, it seems as if figure, taken from what is still in the midst of all the perversions of depravity felt to be fearful, were almost, if not altogether, indispensable for the purpose. The figures of Scripture on this subject are felt, and felt powerfully, by every mind. The very mention of the “worm that dieth not” awakens a more thrilling emotion, undefined as it is (perhaps, indeed, the more thrilling that it is undefined), than anything you can say to an unregenerate man about the operations of conscience, and the “fire that never shall be quenched” than any representation you can ever make to him of sin, and the absence of God, and the sway of evil passions, and the pangs of remorse, and horribleness of sin-loving and God-hating company. Such images have the full effect intended by them. They give the impression, the vivid and intense impression, of extreme suffering; although what proportion of that suffering shall be the native and necessary result of the constitution of human nature when placed in certain circumstances, and what proportion of more direct penal infliction, the Scriptures do not tell us, entering into no such discussions. And it would be useless for us to conjecture, or to attempt the adjustment of such proportions” (Systematic Theology, Edinburgh, 1857, 3:700). For a copious list of books on the subject, see Abbot's bibliographical appendix to Alger, History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, § 3 F, 3.

On the Duration of the punishment of hell, SEE UNIVERSALISM.

## Hell, Christs Descent Into[[@Headword:Hell, Christs Descent Into]]

             (descensus ad inferos; κατάβασις εἰς ἃδου), a phrase used to denote the doctrine taught, or supposed to be taught, in the fifth article of the Apostles' Creed.  I. History of the Clause. — The clause is not found in the Nicaeno- Constantinopolitan Creed (A.D. 381), nor in any creed before that date. Pearson states that it was not “so anciently used in the Church” as the rest of the Apostles' Creed; and that it first appears in the Creed of Aquileia, 4th century, in the words descendit in inferna. King, in his Histor. Symbol. Apost. c. 4, asserts that it was inserted as a testimony against Apollinarism; but this view is controverted by Waage in his Commentatio on this article of the Creed (1836). It is certain, however, that the clause was afterwards used by the orthodox as an argument against the Apollinarian heresy which denied to Christ a rational human soul (see Neander, Church History, Torrey's ed., 2, 433). Rufinus († 410), while stating that it is found in the Creed of Aquileia, denies that it existed before that time in the Creed as used in the Roman or Eastern churches. Rufinus adds that “though the Roman and Oriental churches had not the words; yet they had the sense of them in the word buried,” implying that the words “he descended into Hades” are equivalent to “he descended into the grave.” Socrates, Hist. Eccl. 2, 37, 41, gives it as stated in the Arian Creed adopted at Sirmiumn A.D. 350, and at Rimini in 360. It is given in the Athanasian Creed (5th century). It fails to be found, except in the Athanasian Creed and in a few MSS., before the 6th century, but became quite common in the 7th, and is universal after the 8th century (Pearson, On the Creed, art. 5, notes). It remains in the Apostles' Creed as used in the Greek and Roman churches; the Lutheran Church, and the Church of England. It is also retained in the Creed as used by the Protestant Episcopal Church, with a note in the rubric. that “any churches may omit the words He descended into hell, or may, instead of them, use the words He went into the place of departed spirits, which are considered as words of the same meaning in the Creed.” The clause was omitted by the Convention of 1785, but, the English bishops objecting, it was replaced, with the qualification named, after a great deal of discussion in 1786, 1789, and 1792 (see White, Hist. of the Prot. Episcopal Church; Muenscher, in Bib. Sac. April, 1853). It is omitted in the Creed as used by the Methodist Episcopal Church.

II. The Doctrine-

1. Scripture. — There is no passage in which it is expressly stated that Christ descended into hell, but there are several which express or imply that his soul went, after his death, into the “place of departed spirits.  (1.) Thus David says (Psa 16:9-10): “Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth: my flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.” And Peter applies this passage to Christ (Act 2:25-27): “For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.”

(2.) The passage in Eph 4:8-10 (“Now that he ascended,” etc.), is supposed by some writers to imply the descent into Hades, but the best interpreters apply it to the Incarnation.

(3.) Paul, in Rom 10:7 (‘Who shall descend into the deep,” etc. τίς καταβὴσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον), seems to imply a descent of Christ “into the abyss.”

(4.) 1Pe 3:18-20 : “For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he night bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.” This passage is relied on by many, not only as strongly asserting that Christ descended into Hades, but also as explaining the object of that descent. But the weight of interpretation, from Augustine downwards, seems to be against this view. Dr. A. Schweitzer, in a recent monograph (Hinabgefahren z. Hille als Mythus, etc., Zurich, 1868, p. 49), interprets the passage to mean that the preaching spoken of was “addressed to ‘the spirits in prison' in the days of Noah, while they were yet in the flesh; and this preaching consisted, to a great extent, in the building of the ark. By this work, undertaken at the command of the Spirit of Christ, and prosecuted, through many years, to completion in the sight of the people, they were warned to repent; but the people persisted in disobedience, and at last the flood swept them away” (Baptist Quarterly Review, July, 1869, p. 381). This view accords with that held by Augustine, Aquinas, Scaliger, Beza, Gerhard, Hammond, Leighton, and others, and which has of late been readopted by Dr. Hofmann (Schriftbeweis, II, 1, 33m), of the influence of the pre-existent Spirit of Christ at the time of the Deluge. It is  also the interpretation of the passage given by Dr. A. Clarke (Comm. on 1 Peter). So also Dr. Bethune: “Christ, in Noah, by his Spirit, preached to them before the Flood, just as in his ministers he preaches to us by his Spirit now” (Lectures on the Heidelbery Catechism, 1, 406). Alford (Comment. ad loc.) gives a copious account (chiefly translated from Meyer) of the views of various commentators, ancient and modern; on the passage, and subjoins his own view, as follows: “I understand these words to say that our Lord, in his disembodied state, did go to the place of detention of departed spirits, and did there announce his work of redemption, preach salvation, in fact, to the disembodied spirits of those who refused to obey the voice of God when the judgment of the.

Flood was hanging over them. Why these rather than others are mentioned- whether merely as a sample of the like gracious work on others, or for some special reason unimaginable by us — we cannot say. It is ours to deal with the plain words of Scripture, and to accept its revelations so far as vouchsafed to us. And they are vouchsafed to us to the utmost limit of legitimate inference from revealed facts. That inference every intelligent reader will draw from the fact here announced; it is not purgatory, it is not universal restitution, but it is one which throws blessed light on one of the darkest enigmas of the divine justice-the cases where the final doom seems infinitely out of proportion to the lapse which has incurred it; and as we cannot say to what other cases this κἠευγμα may have applied, so it would be presumption hi us to limit its occurrence or its efficacy. The reason of mentioning, here these sinners above other sinners appears to be their connection with the type of baptism which follows. If so, who shall say that the blessed act was confined to them?” (Comm. on N.T. vol. 4, pt. i, p. 368).

2. The Fathers. — In several of the Ante-Nicene fathers we find the doctrine that “Christ descended into Hades to announce to the souls of the patriarchs and others there the accomplishment of the work of redemption, and to conduct them to his kingdom of glory.” So Justin Martyr († 167?), Dial. cuns Tryph. § 72, cites a passage from Jeremiah (cut out, he says, by the Jews) as follows: “The Lord God remembered his dead people of Israel who lay in the graves; and he descended to preach to them his own salvation.” Irenaeus († 200?), Adv. Haer. 4, 27, 2: “The Lord descended into the regions beneath the earth, preaching his advent there also, and declaring the remission of sins received by those who believe on him” (see also 5, 31, 2). Clement of Alexandria († 220) devotes chap. 6 of book 6 of  the Stromata to the “preaching of the Gospel to Jews and Gentiles in Hades.” See also Tertullian, De Anima, 7, 55; Origen, Cont. Cels. 2, 43. The Gnostics generally denied the descensus cad isnferos; but Marcion (2nd century) regarded it as intended to benefit the heathen who were in need of redemption. The later fathers were still more distinct in their utterances; see Cyril, Catech. 4, 11; 14:19; Ambrose, De Incar. 37, 42; Augustine, Epist. 164 et al.; Jerome, Epist. 22 et al. “The later fathers generally adopted the notion that, till Christ's death, the patriarchs and prophets were in Hades, but afterwards (from the time that Christ said to the thief on the cross that he should be with him in Paradise) they passed into Paradise, which, therefore, they distinguished from Hades. Hades, indeed, they looked on as a place of rest to the just, but Paradise as far better. Here, of course, we begin to perceive the germ of the doctrine of the Limbus Patrum. Yet the notion entertained by the fathers was vastly different from that of the mediaeval Church. Another opinion, however, grew up also in the early ages, namely, that Christ not only translated the pious from Hades to more joyous abodes, but that even some of those who in old times had-been disobedient, yet, on hearing Christ's preaching, believed, and so were saved and delivered from torment and hell. This appears to have been the opinion of Augustine. He was evidently puzzled as to the meaning of the word Hades, and doubted whether it ever meant a place of rest and happiness (although at times he appears to have admitted that it did); and, thinking it a place of torment, he thought Christ went thither to save some souls, which were in torment, from thence. Some, indeed, went so far as to think that hell vas cleared of all souls that were there in torment, and that all were taken up with Christ when he rose from the dead and ascended into heaven; but this was reckoned as a heresy.... One principal reason why the fathers laid great stress (on the belief in Christ's descent to Hades was this. The Arians and Apollinarians denied the existence of a natural human soul in Jesus Christ. ‘Now the true doctrine of our Lord's humanity, namely, that ‘he was perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting,' was most strongly maintained by asserting the article of his descent to Hades. For whereas his body was laid in the grave, and his soul went down to Hades, he must have had both body and soul. Accordingly, the fathers with one consent maintain the descent of Christ's soul to hell” (Browne, On the Thirty-nine Articles, p. 93). Nevertheless, it was not opposition to Apollinarism that originally led to the adoption of the clause into the Creed; the Gnostics, long before, had  denied the descensus ad inferos, but Apollinaris did not deny it (Neander, Ch. Hist., Torrey, 2, 433).

In what may be called the mythology of Christendom, the “descent into hell” has always played an important part. The apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus contains a vivid description of it, very highly colored. A voice like thunder is heard crying, “Lift up your gates, and be ye lift up,” etc. But the gates were made fast, but on a repetition of the call were opened, “and the King of glory entered, in form as a man, and all the dark places of Hades were lighted up.” “And straightway Hades cried out (ch. 22),' We are conquered. Woe unto us! But who art thou, that hast such power and privilege? And what art thou, that comest hither without sin, small in seeming but excellent in power, the humble and the great, slave at once and master, soldier and king, wielding power over the dead and the living, nailed to the cross, and the destroyer of our power? Truly thou art the Jesus of whom the arch satrap Satan spake to us, that by thy cross and death thou shouldest purchase the universe!' Then the King of Glory, holding Satan by the head, delivered him to the angels, and said, ‘Bind his hands and feet, and neck and mouth, with irons.' And giving him over to Hades, he said, ‘Receive and hold him surely until my second advent' (ch. 24). Then the King of Glory stretched out his right hand, and took the forefather Adam, and raised him up, and turning to the rest also, he said, ‘Come with me, all of you, as many as have died by the wood which this man ate of; for lo! I upraise ye all by the wood of the cross!' After these things he brought them all forth. And the forefather Adam, filled with exceeding joy, said, ‘I render thee thanks, O Lord, that thou hast brought me up from the depths of Hades.' Thus, too, said all the prophets and saints: ‘We thank thee, O Christ, Savior of the world, that thou hast redeemed our life from corruption.' And while they were saying these things, the Savior blessed Adam in the forehead with the sign of the cross, and did the like to the patriarchs and the prophets, and the martyrs and forefathers, and taking them with him, he rose up out of Hades. And as he journeyed, the holy fathers, accompanying him, sang, ‘Praised be he who hath come in the name of the Lord. Hallelujah!”‘(Thilo, Cod. Apocryph. 1, 667 sq.; Forbes, On the Thirty-nine Articles, 1, 52 sq.) A dramatic representation of the “descent into hell,” in imitation of the above picture in Nicodemus, is given in the discourse De Adventu et annunciatione Joannis.Bpt. ap. Inferos, commonly ascribed to Eusebius of Emesa (tc.  360); see Augusti's edition of Eusebius of Emesa, p. 1 sq. (Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, § 134).

3. Middle Age. — These images took possession of the popular mind, and were even held as true pictures by many of the clergy. In the medieval mysteries, “the harrowing of hell” was one of the most popular representations. Death and hell were pictured as dismayed at the loss of their victims, as Christ was to set all the captives free. So the Vision of Piers Plowman declares that Christ

“Would come as a Kynge, Crouned with aungels, And have out of helle Alle mennes soules.”

The subject was also a favorite one in the religious art of the 14th and 15th centuries.

The scholastic divines divided Hell into three different apartments: “1. Hell, properly so called, where the devils and the damned are confined; 2. Those subterranean regions which may be regarded as the intermediate states between heaven and hell, and be again subdivided into

(a.) Purgatory, which lies nearest to hell;

(b.) The limbus infantum (puerorum), where all those children remain who die unbaptized;

(c.) The limbus patrun, the abode of the Old Testament saints, the place to which Christ went to preach redemption to the souls in prison.

The limbus last mentioned was also called Abraham's bosom; different opinions obtained concerning its relation to heaven and hell” (Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, § 208). Aquinas taught that Christ rescued the souls of the pious of the old dispensation from the limbus patrum (Summa Suppl. qu. 69, art. 5).

4. Modern. —

(1.) The Greek Church holds that the descensus was a voluntary going down into Hades of the human soul of Christ united to his divinity; that he remained there during the period between his death and his resurrection, and devoted himself to the work he had performed on earth: i.e. that he offered redemption and preached the Gospel to those who were subject to Satan's power in consequence of original sin, releasing all believers, and all  who died in piety under the O.T. dispensation, from Hades. (Conf. Orthod. 1, 49, ed. Kimmel, 1840, p. 118).

(2.) The Roman Church rests its doctrine in tradition alone. It teaches that Christ, in his entire personality, including his divine and human natures, descended voluntarily, for the sake of the saints of Israel, into the linbus patrum, or into the ignus purgatorius (fire of purgatory), and there demonstrated himself Son of God by conquering the daemons, and by granting to the souls of the ancients who dwelt in Hades their freedom from the limbus, and admission to felicity in heaven. “His soul also really and substantially descended into hell, according to David's testimony: Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell'… (Psalm 15:10). He descended in order that, clothed with the spoils of the arch-enemy, he might conduct into heaven those holy fathers and the other just souls whose liberation from prison he had purchased,” etc. (Cat. Concil. Trid. art. 5).

(3.) Lutherans. — Luther himself did not speak positively on this topic. He agreed at first with Jerome and Gregory in supposing a limbus patrum whither Christ went. But whenever he mentioned the subject after 1533, he was accustomed to remark that Christ destroyed the power of the devil and of hell, whither he went with soul and body. The later Lutheran theology recognized the descent as a real descent into hell. Christ, the God-man, after the resurrection and the reunion of his soul with his body, immediately before his reappearance on earth, i.e. early on Easter morning, went, body, and soul, to the hell of the damned, the time which elapsed between his death on the cross and the resurrection having been spent in Paradise. The “descent into hell” was the first act accomplished by the God-man after his entrance into his divine unlimited power, and is therefore considered as the first degree of the state of exaltation. It thus constitutes also his first entering into possession of the kingdom of his power, and in the revelation of his victory over the devil, and the consequent inability of the latter to prevail against believers, whence the” descent” is also designated as “the triumph over the devil and his angels.” His preaching in hell is designated as condemnatory (legalis and damnatoria, Formula Concordiae, art. 9). The Lutheran divines have generally maintained the doctrine as thus put forth, though not without controversy among themselves. AEpinus (Johannes Hoch, † 1533) taught that Christ's descent into hell belonged, not to his state of exaltation, but to that of humiliation, his soul suffering the punishments of hell while his  body remained in the grave. He denied that 1Pe 3:18 refers to “the descent into hell” at all.

(4.) Reformed. — In the Reformed theology in general, the “descent into hell” has been interpreted metaphorically, or as meaning simply either the burial of Christ or his sufferings. So Calvin: “It was necessary for Christ to contend with the powers of hell and the horror of eternal death.”… He was treated as a criminal himself, to sustain all the punishments which would have been inflicted on transgressors; only with this exception, that it was not possible that he should be holden of the pains of death. Therefore it is no wonder if he be said to have descended into hell, since he suffered that death which the wrath of God inflicts on transgressors” (Institutes, bk. 2, ch. 16 § 10). The Heidelberg Catechism substantially follows Calvin: “Quest. 44. Why is there added ‘he descended into hell?' That in my greatest temptations I may be assured, and wholly comfort myself in this, that my Lord Jesus Christ, by his inexpressible anguish, pains, terrors, and hellish agonies, in which he was plunged during all his sufferings, but especially on the cross, hath delivered me from the anguish and torments of hell.” Dr. Nevin remarks on this answer that it gives the words of the Creed” a signification which is good in its own nature, but, at the same time, notoriously at war with the historical sense of the clause — itself.” The doctrine is stated in the Westminster Catechism (Larger), answer to question 50, as follows: “Christ's humiliation after death consisted in his being buried and continuing in the state of the dead, and under the power of death, until the third day, which has been otherwise expressed in the words ‘he descended into hell.” Beza maintained that the descent into Hades simply meant the burial of Christ; and in this opinion he was followed by Drusius, by Dr. Barrow, and other English divines: and so Piscator, and several of the Remonstrants (Arminius, Curcellaeus, Limborch), refer it to the state of death (status ignominiosus) as part of the humiliation to which the Prince of Life was subjected.

Church of England. — The third article of religion runs as follows: “As Christ died for us, and was buried, so also is it to be believed that he went down into hell.” In the first book of Edward VI it was more fully stated as follows: “The body of Christ lay in the sepulcher until his resurrection; but his ghost departing from him, was with the ghosts which were in prison, or in hell, and did preach to the same, as the place of St. Peter doth testify.” And in the Creed-in Meter, given at the end of the old version of the Psalms in the Prayer book, it is stated as follows:

“His body then was buried

As is our use and right;

His spirit after this descent

Into the lower parts,

Of them that long in darkness were,

The true light of their hearts.”

Pearson, after an elaborate but not always luminous examination of the clause, sums up his own view of the doctrine as follows: “I give a full and undoubting assent unto this as to a certain truth, that when all the sufferings of Christ were finished on the cross, and his soul was separated from his body, though his body were dead, yet his soul died not; and though it died not, yet it underwent the condition of the souls of such as die; and being he died in the similitude of a sinner, his soul went to the place where the souls of men are kept who died for their sins, and so did wholly undergo the law of death: but because there was no sin in him, and he had fully satisfied for the sins of others which he took upon him, therefore, as God suffered not his Holy One to see corruption, so he left not his soul in hell, and thereby gave sufficient security to all those who belong to Christ of never coming under the power of Satan, or suffering in the flames prepared for the devil and his angels. And thus, and for these purposes, may every Christian say, I believe that Christ descended into hell” (Exp. of the Creed, Oxford, 1820, p. 376). Some of the divines of the Church of England held the Calvinistic view of this subject; others held the old theory of the descent of Christ into hell that he might triumph over Satan, as he had before triumphed over death and sin (Heylyn, Hist. Presb. p. 349; Bilson, Survey of Christ's Sufferings, 1604). Hugh Broughton (t 1612) taught conclusively that Hades is simply the place of departed souls, and that the rational soul of Christ, in. his intermediate state, went into this locality. This has since been the generally received opinion in the Church of England; so Horsley, “Christ descended to the invisible mansion of departed spirits, and to that part of it where the souls of the faithful, when delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity… In that place he could not but find the souls that are in it in safe keeping; and, in some way or other, it cannot but be supposed he would hold conference with them; and a particular conference with one class might be the means, and certainly could be no obstruction, to a general communication with all” (Sermons, vol. 1, Serm. 20). Dr. Joseph Muenscher discusses the whole subject, historically and critically, in an able article in the Bibliotheca Sacra, April, 1859, and concludes, as to the Protestant Episcopal Church,  that her doctrine, as given in the Liturgy and Homilies, “can only be reconciled with that of the Creed and Articles by a liberal construction of the Creeds.' And this has been done by the American Church herself in the rubric prefixed to the Creed, in which she substitutes the words ‘he went into the place of departed spirits' as of equivalent import. The terms in which this substitute is couched are quite general and indefinite. By employing the verb went in the place of descended, she virtually repudiates the hypothesis of a subterranean cavity as the receptacle of disembodied souls. And the phrase “place of departed spirits” determines nothing as to an immediate locality, separate and distinct from both heaven and hell. It merely affirms that the soul of Jesus at his death went to its appropriate place in the invisible, spiritual world. Thus understood, the dogma of Christ's descent into hell is freed from all difficulty and mystery, and made plain to the comprehension of every mind, as well as consonant with the general tenor of Scripture. The results to which we are brought by the preceding remarks are:

1. That the soul of man does not die or sleep with the body, but, immediately after the dissolution of the latter, passes into a separate, disembodied, conscious state, and into its appropriate place (so far as spirits may be supposed to occupy place), either of enjoyment or suffering- its heaven or its hell-according to the moral character which it may possess.

2. That there is no third intermediate place of spiritual existence; no subterranean habitation of disembodied souls, either of probation or of purgation; no imaginary paradise in the under world where the souls of the pious are preserved in safe-keeping; no limbus patrum, no limbus infantum, no purgatory.

3. That our Savior, according to the Creed, was perfect man a well as perfect God, having a human soul no less than a human body.

4. That when crucified he died in reality, and not merely in appearance (syncope), since there took place an actual separation of his soul and body.

5. That the idle and unprofitable question as to the object of Christ's descent into Hades is precluded; a question which greatly perplexed the fathers, the schoolmen, and the Reformers, and led to the invention of many absurd and unscriptural theories.”  See Petavius, De Theol. Dogmat. (Antw. 1700). tom. 2, pt. 2, p. 196; Knapp, Theology, § 97; Dietelmayr, Hist. dogmates de descensu Christi ad inferos (2nd ed. Aitorf, 1762, 8vo); Hacker, Dissert. de descensu Christi ad Inferos (Dresden, 1802); Pearson, On the Creed, art. 5; Edwards, History of Redemption, notes, p. 351,377; Stuart, Exegetical Essays on oFuture Punishment; Plumptre, Christ and Christendom, p. 342; Burnet, Hardwick, Browne, On the Thirty-nine Articles, art. 3; Neale, Hist. of the Puritans (Harpers' ed.), 1, 210; Kinig, die Lehre von Christi Hollenfahrt (Frankf. 1842); Bittcher, de Injeris rebusque post mortem futuris, etc. (Dresden, 1846,2 vols.); Guder, Lehre v. d. Erscheinung Christi u. d. Todten (Berlin, 1853); Glider, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6:178; Zeitschriftifir die Lutherische Theologie, 1868, No. 4; Biblical Repository, April, 1843, p. 470; Bibliotheca Sacra, Nov. 1847, p. 708; Huidekoper, Christ's Mission to the Under World (Boston, 1854); Bp. Hobart, On the State of the Departed; Bethune, Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism, lect. 19; Christian Examiner, 1, 401; Martensen, Christian Dogmatics, § 171; Dorner, Person of Christ (Index, s.v. Hell); Church Review, July, 1857; Muenscher, in Bibliotheca Sacra, April 1859. For old monographs on the subject, see Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 67. SEE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

## Helladius[[@Headword:Helladius]]

             bishop OF CAESAREA, in Cappadocia, succeeded his teacher, Basil the Great, in that see in 378. He attended two councils of Constantinople in 381 and 394. His life of St. Basil is cited by Damascenus, but the authenticity of that work is doubtful See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Helladius (2)[[@Headword:Helladius (2)]]

             bishop OF TARSU , lived about A.D. 430. He made himself remarkable by his affection for Nestorius, and was deprived of his bishopric on that account. But it was restored to him again on the condition that he would join himself with those who pronounced the anathema against Nestorius. There are extant of him six letters. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Hellenist[[@Headword:Hellenist]]

             ( ῾Ελληνιστής, A.V.” Grecian;” comp. ῾Ελληνισμός, 2Ma 4:13). In one of the earliest notices of- the first Christian Church at Jerusalem (Act 6:1), two distinct parties are recognized among its members, “Hebrews” and Hellenists, who appear to stand towards one another in some degree in a relation of jealous rivalry. So, again, when Paul first visited Jerusalem after his conversion, he spoke and disputed with the Hellenists (Act 9:29), as if expecting to find more sympathy among them than with the rulers of the Jews. The term Hellenist occurs once again  in the N.T. according to the common text, in the account of the foundation of the Church at Antioch (Act 11:20), but there the context, as well as the form of the sentence (καὶπρὸς τούς, though the καὶ is doubtful), seems to require the other reading “Greeks” (Ε᾿λληνες), which is supported by great external evidence as the true antithesis to “J Jews” (Ι᾿ουδαίοις, not ῾Εβραίοίς, 5, 19). SEE HEBREWS.

The name, according to its derivation. whether the original verb ( ῾Ελληνίζω) be taken, according to the common analogy of similar forms (μνδιζω, ἀττικίζω, Φιλιππίζω), in the general sense of adopting the spirit and character of Greeks, or, in the more limited sense, of using the Greek language (Xenophon, Anwb. 7, 3, 25), marks a class distinguished by peculiar habits, and not by descent. Thus the Hellenists as a body included not only the proselytes of Greek (or foreign) parentage (οἱ σεβόμενοι ῞Ελληνες,, Act 17:4 (?); οἱ σεβόμενοιπροσήλυτοι, Act 13:43; οἱ σεβόμενοι,, Act 17:17), but also those Jews who, by settling in foreign countries, had adopted the prevalent form of the current Greek civilization, and with it the use of the common Greek dialect, to the exclusion of the Aramaic, which was the national representative of the ancient Hebrew. Hellenism was thus a type of life, and not an indication of origin. Hellenists might be Greeks, but when the latter term is used (῞Ελληνες, Joh 12:20), the point of race and not of creed is that which is foremost in the mind of the writer. (See Jour. Sac. Lit. Jan. and April, 1857.) SEE GRECIAN.

I. As to the particular class in question, referred to in the Acts, the following are the different opinions that have been held:

1. That the distinctive difference between them was simply one of language, the Hebrews speaking the Aramaic of Palestine, the Hellenists the Greek. This is the most ancient opinion, being that expressed in the Peshito, and given by Chrysostom, Theophylact, etc.; and it is the one which has received the largest number of suffrages in more recent times. Among its advocates are Joseph Scaliger, Heinsius, Drusius, Grotius, Selden, Hottinger, Hug, etc.

2. That the distinction was partly of country, partly of language: the Hebrew being a native of Judaea, and using the Aramaic language, the Hellenist born among the Gentiles, and using the speech of the country of  which he was a native. So Erasmus, Lightfoot, Bengel, Wahl, De Wette, Davidson, Alford, Baumgarten, etc.

3. That the difference was one of religious history, the Hebrew being a born child of the covenant, the Hellenist a proselyte from heathenism. So Beza, Salmasius, Pearson, Basnage, Pfannkuche, etc.

4. That the difference was one of principle: the Hebrew adhering to the one set of beliefs or modes of thought, the Hellenist adopting another. According to some, this difference had the effect of constituting the Hellenists into a distinct sect among the Jews, such as the Essenes; whilst others, without going this length, regard the two classes as standing to each other very much in the relation in which parties in the state holding different political views, or parties in the same Church having different aims and modes of regarding religious truth in modern times, may stand to each other; the Hebrews being like the Conservative or High-Church party, while the Hellenists advocated a more progressive, unfettered, and comprehensive scheme of thinking and acting. This latter view, in its substance, has recently found an able advocate in Mr. Roberts (Discussions on the Gospels, p. 148 sq.). According to him, “the Hellenists were those Jews, whether belonging to Palestine or not, who willingly yielded to the influence of Gentile civilization and habits, and were thus distinguished by their free and liberal spirit; the Hebrews, again, were the rigid adherents to Judaism, who, in spite of the providential agencies which had been long at work, endeavored to keep up those peculiar and exclusive usages by which the Jews had for so many centuries been preserved distinct from all other nations.”

We are not disposed to reject entirely any of these opinions. Each of them seems to have an element of truth in it, though the contributions they make to the whole truth on this subject are by no means of equal importance. The last alone points to what must be regarded as the fundamental and formative characteristic of Hellenism among the Jews. There can be no doubt historically that some such distinction as that to which it refers did subsist in the Jewish, nation (see Jost, Gesch. des Judenthuns, 1, 99 sq., 345 sq.), and had come to a height at the commencement of the Christian era; and nothing can be more probable than that the existence of such a distinction should manifest itself in the very way in which the distinction between the Hebrews and the Hellenists is asserted to have shown itself in Act 6:1 sq. It is in agreement with this, also, that Paul should have  entered into discussion chiefly with the Hellenistic Jews at Jerusalem; for it is probable that as his early Hellenic culture pointed him out as the person most fitted to meet them on their own ground, he may have been specially set upon this work by the other apostles. Kitto, s.v. Still this difference of views could hardly of itself have constituted so marked and obvious a distinction as is implied in the various texts above cited, unless it had been exhibited in some outward characteristic; and no external sign could have been more certain, natural, and palpable than that familiar use of the Greek language which at once betrayed a foreign Jew, to whom it was vernacular, in contrast with the Palestinian Jew, by whom Greek, although too prevalent in that age everywhere to have been unknown to any, was nevertheless always spoken with a Hebrew coloring and accent. SEE DISPERSION.

II. It remains to characterize briefly the elements which the Hellenists contributed to the language of the N.T., and the immediate effects which they produced upon the apostolic teaching:

1. The flexibility of the Greek language gained for it in ancient times a general currency similar to that which French enjoys in modern Europe; but with this important difference, that Greek was not only the language of educated men, but also the language of the masses in the great centers of commerce. The colonies of Alexander and his successors originally established what has been called the Macedonian dialect throughout the East; but even in this the prevailing power of Attic literature made itself distinctly felt. Peculiar words and forms adopted at Alexandria were undoubtedly of Macedonian origin, but the later Attic may be justly regarded as the real-basis of Oriental Greek. This first type was, however, soon modified, at least in common use, by contact with other languages. The vocabulary was enriched by the addition of foreign words, and the syntax was modified by new constructions. In this way a variety of local dialects must have arisen, the specific characters of which were determined in the first instance by the conditions under which they were, formed, and which afterwards passed away with the circumstances that had produced them. But one of these dialects has been preserved after the ruin of the people among whom it arose, by being consecrated to the noblest service which language has yet fulfilled. In other cases the dialects perished together with the communities who used them in the common intercourse of life, but in that of the Jews the Alexandrine version of the 0. Test., acting in this respect like the great vernacular versions of England and  Germany, gave a definiteness and-fixity to the popular language which could not have been gained without the existence of some recognized standard. The style of the Sept. itself is, indeed, different in different parts, but the same general character runs through the whole, and the variations which it presents are not greater than those which exist in the different books of the N.T.

The functions which this Jewish-Greek had to discharge were of the widest application, and the language itself combined the most opposite features. It was essentially a fusion of Eastern and Western thought; for, disregarding peculiarities of inflection and novel words, the characteristic of the Hellenistic dialect is the combination of a Hebrew spirit with a Greek body, of a Hebrew form with Greek words. The conception belongs to one race, and the expression to another. Nor is it too much to say that this combination was one of the most important preparations for the reception of Christianity, and one of the most important aids for the adequate expression of its teaching. On the one hand, by the spread of the Hellenistic Greek, the deep, theocratic aspect of the world and life, which distinguishes Jewish thought, was placed before men at large; and, on the other, the subtle truths which philosophy had gained from the analysis of mind and action, and enshrined in words, were transferred to the service of revelation. In the fullness of time, when the great message came, a language was prepared to convey it; and thus the very dialect of the N.T. forms a great lesson in the true philosophy of history, and becomes in itself a monument of the providential government of mankind.

This view of the Hellenistic dialect will at once remove one of the commonest misconceptions relating to it. For it will follow that its deviations from the ordinary laws of classic Greek are themselves bound by some common law, and that irregularities of construction and altered usages of words are to be traced to their first source, and interpreted strictly according to the original conception out of which they sprang. A popular, and even a corrupt dialect is not less precise, or, in other words, is not less human than a polished one, though its interpretation may often be more difficult from the want of materials for analysis. But in the case of the N.T., the books themselves furnish an ample store for the critic, and the Sept., when compared with the Hebrew text, provides him with the history of the language which he has to study.

2. The adoption of a strange language was essentially characteristic of the true nature of Hellenism; the purely outward elements of the national life were laid aside with a facility of which history offers few examples, while the inner character of the people remained unchanged. In every respect, the thought, so to speak, was clothed in a new dress. Hellenism was, as it were, a fresh incorporation of Judaism according to altered laws of life and worship. But, as the Hebrew spirit made itself distinctly visible in the new dialect, so it remained undestroyed by the new conditions which regulated its action. While the Hellenistic Jews followed their natural instinct for trade, which was originally curbed by the Mosaic law, and gained a deeper insight into foreign character, and with this a truer sympathy, or at ‘least a wider tolerance towards foreign opinions, they found means at the same time to extend the knowledge of the principles of their divine faith, and to gain respect and attention even from those who did not openly embrace their religion. Hellenism accomplished for the outer world what the Return accomplished for the Palestinian Jews: it was the necessary step between a religion of form and a religion of spirit: it witnessed against Judaism as final and universal, and it witnessed for it as the foundation of a spiritual religion which should be bound by no local restrictions. Under the influence of this wider instruction, a Greek body grew up around the synagogue-not admitted into the Jewish Church, and yet holding a recognized position with regard to it-which was able to apprehend the apostolic teaching, and ready to receive it. The Hellenists themselves were at once missionaries to the heathen and prophets to their own countrymen. Their lives were an abiding protest against polytheism and pantheism, and they retained with unshaken zeal the sum of their ancient creed, when the preacher had popularly occupied the place of the priest, and a service of prayer, and praise, and exhortation had succeeded in daily life to the elaborate ritual of the Temple. Yet this new development of Judaism was obtained without the sacrifice of national ties. The connection of the Hellenists with the Temple was not broken, except in the case of some of the Egyptian Jews. Unity coexisted with dispersion; and the organization of the Church was foreshadowed, not only in the widening breadth of doctrine, but even externally in the scattered communities which looked to Jerusalem as their common center. In another aspect Hellenism served as the preparation for a catholic creed. As it furnished the language of Christianity, it supplied also that literary instinct which counteracted the traditional reserve of the Palestinian Jews. The writings of the N. Test., and all the writings of the apostolic age, with the exception of the original  Gospel of Matthew, were, as far as we know, Greek; and Greek seems to have remained the sole vehicle of Christian literature, and the principal medium of Christian worship, till the Church of North Africa rose into importance in the time of Tertullian. The Canon of the Christian Scriptures, the early creeds, and the liturgies, are the memorials of this Hellenistic predominance in the Church, and the types of its working; and if in later times the Greek spirit descended to the investigation of painful subtleties, it may be questioned whether the fullness of Christian truth could have been developed without the power of Greek thought tempered by Hebrew discipline.

The general relations of Hellenism to Judaism are well treated in the histories of Ewald and Jost; but the Hellenistic language is as yet, critically speaking, almost unexplored. Winer's Grammar (Gramm. d. N.T. Sprachidions, 7th ed. 1868) has done great service in establishing the idea of law in N.T. language, which was obliterated by earlier interpreters, but even Winer does not investigate the origin of the peculiarities of the Hellenistic dialect. The idioms of the N.T. cannot be discussed apart from those of the Sept., and no explanation can be considered perfect which does not take into account the origin of the corresponding Hebrew idioms. For this work even the materials are as yet deficient. The text of the Sept. is still in a most unsatisfactory condition; and while Bruder's Concordance leaves nothing to be desired for the vocabulary of the N.T., Trommius's Concordance to the Sept., however useful, is quite untrustworthy for critical purposes. SEE GREEK LANGUAGE.

## Heller, Yomtov Lipman B.-Nathan[[@Headword:Heller, Yomtov Lipman B.-Nathan]]

             a distinguished Rabbi of the Polish school, born at Wallerstein, duchy of Anspach, Germany, in 1579. He filled the appointment of Rabbi to the great synagogues at Vienna, Prague, and Krakau. While at Prague (1629) he was prosecuted by the government upon a charge that he had written in praise of the Talmud to the injury of the Christian religion, was imprisoned, and fined 10,000 florins. After his release he went to Poland, where, in 1644, he became Rabbi of the synagogue at Krakau. Here he died in 1654. Heller wrote his autobiography (מגילת איבה), printed in 1836, which contains a complete list of all his works. Among the most important of them, are his glossaries to the Mishna (תוספות יט). These are considered by Oriental scholars as very valuable. — Jost, Gesch. d. Juden. 3, 243; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebr. Literature, p. 448.

## Hellier, Benjamin[[@Headword:Hellier, Benjamin]]

             an English Methodist preacher, was born at Wick, St. Lawrence, near Bristol in 1825; in 1844 entered Richmond College; in 1847 was appointed  assistant tutor at Dedsbury, and from that time, with the exception of six years spent in the ministry, he was employed in the various departments of the Theological Institution. In 1884 he delivered the Fernly lecture on The Universal Mission of the Church of Christ. He died March 8, 1888.

## Helm[[@Headword:Helm]]

             πηδάλιον, the rudder of a ship (Jam 3:4). SEE RUDDER.

## Helm, James Isbell, D.D[[@Headword:Helm, James Isbell, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, and afterwards an Episcopal, was born in Washington County, Tennessee, April 25, 1811. He graduated from Georgetown College, Kentucky, in 1833, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1836. He was ordained an evangelist by the Presbytery of West Tennessee, June 23, 1838; labored as a missionary in Giles County in 1837 and 1838; was pastor at Salem, N.J., in 1840; teacher at Newton in 1852; at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in 1853, and at Princeton, N.J., in 1855. He was reordained in the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1860; was an assistant rector in St. Mark's Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, from 1860 to 1862; rector at St. Paul's Church, Sing Sing, N.Y., in 1863, and died there October 15, 1880. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 94.

## Helmbreker, Theodore[[@Headword:Helmbreker, Theodore]]

             an eminent Dutch painter, was born at Haarlem in 1624, and was instructed in the school of Peter Grebber. On the death of that master he visited Rome, and spent some time in Florence and Naples. He finally settled at Rome, where he executed for the church of the Jesuits a noble landscape, in which is introduced The Temptation of Christ in the Desert. At Naples, in the refectory of the Jesuits' College, are three sacred subjects, most admirably executed: Christ in the Garden; Christ Carrying his Cross; and The Crucifixion. Helmbreker died at Rome in 1694. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts. s.v.

## Helmer, Charles Downs[[@Headword:Helmer, Charles Downs]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Canajoharie, N.Y., November 18, 1827. After spending two years in Hamilton College, he entered Yale, from which he graduated in 1852. The two years following he was a teacher in the Deaf-and Dumb Institution in New York city. In 1857 he graduated from Union Theological Seminary. The next two years he spent in Europe. He was ordained pastor of Plymouth Church, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, September 11, 1859, from which he was dismissed, May 31, 1865; from December, 1866, to December 1875, he was pastor of Union Park Church, Chicago, Illinois; from March 1877, until his death, he was pastor of Tompkins Avenue Church, Brooklyn, N.Y. The degree of D.D. which was offered to him in 1875 by Beloit College, was declined. He died April 28, 1879. See Cong. Year-book, 1880, page 21.

## Helmet[[@Headword:Helmet]]

             (כּוֹבִע or קוֹבָעkob, kob, περικεφαλαία), a military cap for the defense of the head in battle (1 Samuel Helmont, FRANCOIS MERCURE, baron VAN, was born at Vilvorde in 1618. In his youth he studied medicine, and applied himself especially to alchemy. He then joined a band of gypsies, with whom he traveled through part of Europe, but was arrested in Italy in 1662, and cast into the dungeons of the Inquisition. In 1663, being liberated, he went to Sulzbach, where he worked with Knorr of Rosenroth at the Kabbala denudata. He published, about the same time, a work on the alphabet of the primitive tongue, i.e. Hebrew (Sulzbach, 1667, 12mo), which, according to him, is so natural that every letter expresses merely the position of the lips while pronouncing it: he pretended to teach the deaf and dumb to articulate all the sounds of his alphabet at first sight. He believed in the transmigration of souls, the universal remedy, and the philosopher's stone. He traveled afterwards through England, and returned through Hanover to Berlin, in a suburb of which city he died in 1699 (Moreri says he died at Cologne; Toppens, in Switzerland; Wachter, at Emmerich, in Dec. 1698). Leibnitz wrote on him the following epitaph:

“Nil patre inferior,

 jacet hic Helmontius alter,

Qui junusxi varias mentis et artis opes:

Per quem Pythagoras et cabbala sacra revixit Elcensque,

parat qui sua cuncta sibi.”

Besides the alphabet above mentioned, he wrote Opuscula Philosophica, quibus continentur principia philosophie antiquissim et recentissimae, etc. (Amsterd. 1690, 12mo): — Quaedam prcemeditatae et consideratce Cogitationes super quatuor priora capita libri primi Moisis, Genesis nominati (Amst. 1697, 8vo): — De Attributis divinis, etc. See Adelung, Hist. de la Folie humaine, 4:294-323 Moreri, Grand Dict. hist.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 864.

## Helmich, Werner[[@Headword:Helmich, Werner]]

             a Dutch Protestant divine, and one of the early promoters of the reformed religion in that country, was born at Utrecht in 1551. In 1579 he was chosen pastor of his fellow-citizens. In 1582 he was the first to preach the Protestant religion openly in the cathedral of Utrecht. He was pastor at Amsterdam in 1602, and died August 29, 1608, leaving Analysis of the Psalms (1644).

## Helmont, Segres James Van[[@Headword:Helmont, Segres James Van]]

             a Flemish painter, the son of Matthew, was born at Antwerp, April 17, 1683, and studied under his father, also the fine works of great masters at Brussels. His principal works are in the churches at Brussels. In the Church of Mary Magdalene is a fine picture of the Martyrdom of St. Barbara; in St. Michael's is the Triumph of David; and at the Carmelite one of his most capital works, representing Elisha Sacrificing the Priests of Baal. He died at Brussels, August 21, 1726. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Helmstadian Controversy[[@Headword:Helmstadian Controversy]]

             a name given to the controversy raised by Calixtus in the 17th century, from Helmstadt, the place where it originated. SEE CALIXTINES.

## Helmuth, Justus Christian Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Helmuth, Justus Christian Henry, D.D]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born at Helmstadt, in the duchy of Brunswick, in 1745.. His father dying when he was yet a boy, he left home without the knowledge of the family, and was overtaken on the highway by a nobleman in his carriage, who entered into a conversation with him, and inquired whither he was going. The lad informed him that he had left home because he was angry with God, having prayed earnestly to him during his father's illness for his restoration to health, but God had not answered his petition. Interested in the artless reply of the innocent boy, the nobleman took him into his carriage and afterwards sent him to Halle at his expense, to be educated at the Orphan House, and afterwards at the University. His first sermon was preached in the chapel of the Orphan House, and among his hearers was Bogatzky, the author of the Schatz-Kastlein (Golden Treasury), who predicted the future greatness of the young preacher. He was ordained by the Consistorium at Wernigerode, and was sent by the theological faculty at Halle as a missionary to America in 1769. The first ten years of his ministry he labored in Lancaster, Pa., with great acceptance. In 1779 he accepted a unanimous call to Philadelphia, where he continued the pastoral work as long as his physical strength admitted. For eighteen years he was professor of German and Oriental languages in the University of Pennsylvania, from which institution he received in 1785 the degree of D.D. In connection with his colleague, Dr. Schmidt, he organized a private seminary for candidates for the Lutheran ministry, which was in operation twenty years. In the pulpit he had more than ordinary power. His preaching was characterized by great unction and overwhelming pathos, and often produced wonderful results. During the prevalence of the yellow fever he visited the sick and dying without fear. He buried 625 of his members. He died in the 80th year of his age, Feb. 5,1824. He was the author of a work on Baptism and the Sacred Scriptures, published in 1793; also of a practical treatise on Communion with God; numerous devotional books for children, and a volume of Hymns. He edited likewise the evangelical Magazine, published for some years in Philadelphia in the German language. (M. L. S.)

## Heloise[[@Headword:Heloise]]

             SEE ABELARD.

## Helon[[@Headword:Helon]]

             (Heb. Chelon', חֵלן, strong; Sept. Χαιλών), the father of Eliab, which latter was phylarch of the tribe of Zebulon at the Exode (Num 1:9; Num 2:7; Num 7:24; Num 7:29; Num 10:16). B.C. ante 1658.

## Help[[@Headword:Help]]

             besides its ordinary signification of assistance in general, has in two passages of the N.T. a technical application.

1. HELPS (βοήθειαι), nautical apparatus for securing a vessel, when leaking, by means of ropes, chains, etc., passed around in the process of “undergirding” (q.v.), in the emergency of a storm (Act 27:17). SEE SHIP.

2. HELPS (άντιλήψεις; Vulg. opitulationes; 1Co 12:28). This Greek word, signifying aids or assistances, has also a meaning, among others, corresponding. to that in this passage, in the classical writers (e.g. Diod. Sic. 1, 87). In the Sept. it answers to עֶזְרָה(Psa 22:19), to מָעוֹן(Psa 108:12), and to זָרוֹע(Psa 83:8). It is found in the same sense, Sir 11:12; 2Ma 11:26; and in Josephus (War, 4, 5, 1). In the N.T. it occurs once, viz. in the enumeration of the several orders or classes of persons possessing miraculous gifts among the primitive Christians (ut supra), where it seems to be used by metonymy; the abstract for the concrete, and to mean helpers; like the words δυνάμεις, “miracles,” i.e. workers of miracles; κυβερνήσεις, “governments,” i.e. governors, etc., in the same enumeration. Many persons h1 this country, by a similar idiom, call their servants “help.” Great difficulty attends the attempt to ascertain the nature of the office so designated among Christians. Theophylact explains ἀντιλήψεις, ἀντεχεσθαι τῶν ἀσθενῶν, helping or supporting the infirm. So also Gennadius, in AEcumenius. But this seems like an inference from the etymology (see the Greek of Act 20:35).

It has been assumed by some eminent modern writers that the several “orders” mentioned in Act 20:28 correspond respectively to the several “gifts” of the Spirit enumerated in Act 20:8-9. In order, however, to make the two enumerations tally, it is necessary to make “divers kinds of tongues” and “interpretation of tongues” in the one answer to “diversities of tongues” in the other, which, in the present state of the received text, does not seem to be a complete correspondence. The  result of the collation is that ἀντιλήψεις answers to “prophecy;” whence it has been inferred that these persons were such as were qualified with the gift of “lower prophecy,” to help the Christians in the public devotions (Barrington's Miscellanea Sacra, 1, 166; Macknight on 1Co 12:10-28). Another result is that “governments” answers to “dissenting of spirits.” To both these Dr. Hales very reasonably objects as unlikely, and pronounces this tabular view to be “perplexed and embarrassing” (New Analysis, etc., Lond. 1830, 3:289). Bishop Horsley has adopted this classification of the gifts and office-bearers, and points out as “helps,” i.e. persons gifted with “prophecies or prediction,” such persons as Mark, Tychicus, Onesimus. Vitringa, from a comparison of 1Co 12:28-30, infers that the ἀντιλήψεις denote those who had the gift of interpreting foreign languages (De Synag. Vet. 2, 505, Franque. 1696); which, though certainly possible, as an arbitrary use of a very significant word, stands in need of confirmation by actual instances. Dr. Lightfoot also, according to his biographer, adopted the same plan and arrived at the same conclusion (Strype's Life of Lightfoot, prefixed to his Works, p. 4, Lond. 1684). But Lightfoot himself explains the word “persons who accompanied the apostles, baptized those who were converted by them, and were sent to places to which they, being employed in other things, could not come, as Mark, Timothy, Titus.” He observes (ii, 781) that the Talmudists sometimes call the Levites מסעדי לכהנים, “the helpers of the priests.” Similar catalogues of miraculous gifts and officers occur Rom 12:6-8, and Eph 4:11-12; but they neither correspond in number nor in the order of enumeration. In the former, “prophecy” stands first, and in the latter second; and in the former many of the terms are of wide import, as “ministering,” while minute distinctions are made between others, as between “teaching” and “exhortation,” “giving” and “showing mercy.” Other writers pursue different methods, and arrive at different conclusions. For instance, Hammond, arguing from the etymology of the word, and from passages in the early writers, which describe the office of relieving the poor as peculiarly connected with that of the apostles and bishops by the deacons, infers that ἀντιλ. “denotes a special part of the office of those men which are set down at the beginning of the verse.” He also explains κυβερνήσεος as another part of their office (Hammond, Comment. ad loc.). Schletisner understands “deacons who had the care of the sick.” Rosenmüller, “Diaconi qui pauperibus, peregrinis, aegrotis, mortuis, procurandis praserant.”

Bishop Pearce thinks that both these words may have been originally put in the margin to explain δυνάμεις, “miracles or  powers,” and urges that ἀντιλ is nowhere mentioned as a gift of the Spirit, and that it is not recapitulated in Eph 4:29-30. Certainly the omission of these two words would nearly produce exactitude in the recapitulation. Bowyer adopts the same conjecture, but it is without support from MSS. or versions. He also observes that to the end of Eph 4:28 some copies of the Vulgate add “interpretationes sermonum,” ἑρμηνει῎ας γλωσσῶν; as also the later Syriac, Hilary, and Ambrose. This addition would make the recapitulation perfect. Chrysostom and all the Greek interpreters consider the ἀντιλ and κυβερν. as importing the same thing, namely, functionaries so called with reference to the two different-parts of their office: the ἀντιλ superintending the care of the poor, sick, and strangers; the κυβερν the burial of the dead and the executorship of their effects including the care of their widows and orphans, rather managers than governors (Blomfield's Recensio Synopt.). After all, it must be confessed, with Doddridge, that “we can only guess at the meaning of the words in question, having no principles on which to proceed in fixing it absolutely” (Family Expositor, on 1Co 12:28). (See Alberti, Glossar. p. 123; Suicer, Thesaurus, in voc.; Salmasius, De Faenore Trapezitico. p. 409, — Wolfii Curae Philolog. Basil. 1741.) Stanley remarks (Commentae ad loc.) that the word “ἀντίληψις, as used in the Sept., is not (like διακονία) help ministered by an inferior to a superior, but be a superior to an inferior (comp. Psa 89:18; Sir 11:12; Sir 51:7), and, thus is inapplicable to the ministrations of the deacon to the presbyter.” Probably it is a general term (hence the plur.) to include those occasional labors of evangelists and special laborers, such as Apollos in ancient times and eminent revivalists in modern days, who have from time to time been raised up as powerful but independent. promoters of the Gospel. SEE GIFTS, SPIRITUAL.

## Help-meet[[@Headword:Help-meet]]

             (or rather, as the best editions of the Bible now punctuate it, HELP MEET for him, עֶזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ, e'zer, ke-negdo', a help as his counterpart, i.e. an aid suitable and supplementary to him), a delicate and beautiful designation of a wife (Gen 2:18-20), which exactly expresses her relation. SEE MARRIAGE.

## Helve[[@Headword:Helve]]

             (עֵוֹ, ets, wood, as often elsewhere), the handle or wooden part of an axe (Deu 19:5). SEE AXE; SEE TREE.

## Helvetic Confessions[[@Headword:Helvetic Confessions]]

             the later Confessions of faith of the Reformed churches of Switzerland. SEE BASLE, CONFESSIONS OF.

I. The Confessio Helvetica prior (the second Confession of Basle) was framed by a convention of delegates from Baslq, Zurich, Berne, Schaffhausen, Mülhausen, St. Gall, and Biel, which began its sessions at Basle Jan, 30, 1536. Among the eminent theologians who took part in it were Megander of Berne, Granaeus and Myconius of Basle, Leo Judae and Bullinger of Zurich. During their sessions, Bucer and Capito, who were striving earnestly to unite the Lutheran and Reformed churches, arrived in Basle, and seem to have exercised a decided influence in the formation of the Confession, though they had no vote in the Convention. The Confession was drawn up by Bullinger, Myconius, and Grynaeus, in Latin, and translated into German by Leo Juda (Augusti, Lib. Symb. Reform. p. 626). In March, 1536, it was adopted as the standard of doctrine. It consists of twenty-seven short articles: 1-5 of Scripture and Tradition; 6:of God; 7, 8:of Man, the Fall, and Original Sin; 9:of Free Will; 10-13, the Person and Work of Christ as Savior; 14-19, the Church and Ministry; 20- 24, the Sacraments; 26, Civil Government; 27, Marriage. The Latin title of the Confession is Ecclesiarum ver Helfetiam Confessio fidei summaria et generalis, composita Basilece, A.D. 1536. It is Calvinistic and (moderately) Zwinglian in doctrine. The Confession, in both German and Latin, is given in Niemeyer, Collectio Confesssionum, p. 105-122.

II. Confessio Helvetica Posterior, the second Helvetic Confession, A.D. 1566. The first Confession above mentioned, though generally received, did not give universal satisfaction in Switzerland, especially as it was believed that the Lutheran influence had been allowed to operate in its formation. Bullinger undertook to revise it, and, at the request of the elector Palatine. Frederick III, he finished the work, with the aid of Beza and Gualter, and handed over the Confession, thus prepared, to the elector, who printed it in German, and adopted it (A.D. 1565, as the Reformed  standard in his territory. The elector also made use of it to vindicate the Reformed doctrines against the Lutherans at the Diet of Augsburg, January 1566. The attention of the Swiss churches was called to this revised- Confession as a standard under which they could all agree. By the year 1578 the Confession had received the sanction of the Swiss cantons, and had also been approved by the Reformed churches of Poland, Hungary, Scotland, and France (the latter receiving it in Beza's translation). It adopts Calvin's doctrine on the Lord's Supper, but “presents the Augustinian doctrine of election in a mild form, far behind Calvin” (Gieseler, Church History, ed. H. B. Smith, 4:422). No Reformed Confession has been more widely diffused. The title of the Confession is Confessio et Expositio Brevis et Simplex sincerae Religionis Christianae. It consists of thirty chapters: chaps. 1 and 2 treat of the Scriptures, Tradition, etc.; 3, of God and the Trinity; 4 and 5, of Idols or Images of God, Christ, and the Saints, and of the Worship of God through Christ, the sole Mediator; 6, of Providence; 7, of the Creation of all Things, of Angels, Devils, Man 1:8, of Sin and the Fall of Man 1:9, of Free Will. The condition of man after the fall is thus stated: Non sublatus est quidenm homini intellectus, non erepta ei voluntas, et prorsus in lapidernt vel truncum est commutatus (The intellect of man was not taken away by the fall, nor was he robbed of will, and changed into a stock or stone). Art. x treats of Predestination and Election. The second paragraph runs thus: Ergo non sine medio, licet non propter ullum meritum nostrum, sed in Christo et propter Christum, nos elegit Deus, ut qui jam in Christo insiti per fidem, illi ipsi etiam sint electi, reprobi vero, qui sunt extra Christum, seculndum illud Apostoli, 2Co 13:5 (Therefore, not without a medium, though not on account of any- merit of ours, but in Christ, and on account of Christ, God elected us; so that they who are engrafted in Christ by faith are the elect, while the reprobate are those who are out of Christ, according to the apostle, in 2Co 13:5). This chapter has been the subject of much controversy, both Calvinists and Arminians finding their own doctrine in it. Chap. 11 treats of Christ as God-man, the only Savior; 12 and 13, of the Law and the Gospel; 14-16, of Repentance and of Justification by Faith; 17-22, of the Church, the Ministry, the Sacraments; 23 and 24:of Assemblies, Worship, Feasts, and Fasts; 25-29, Catechism, Rites, Ceremonies, etc.; 30, of the Civil Magistracy. This Confession is given in Latin in the Sylloye Confession-um (Oxon. 1827, 8vo); by Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum, p. 462 sq.; by Augusti, Corpus Librorum Symbolicorum, p. 1-102. A tercentenary edition, edited by Dr. E. Bohl, was published at Vienna, 1865  (120 pp. 8vo). See Gieseler, Church History, 1. c.; Shedd, History of Doctrines, 2, 469; Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, § 221; Fritzsche, Conf. Hel. Posterior, Zurich, 1839; Augusti, Allg. christl. Symbolik, 1861, p. 158.

## Helvetic Consensus[[@Headword:Helvetic Consensus]]

             (Formula Consensus Helvetica), a confession of faith drawn up in 1675 by J. G. Heidegger at the request of the Calvinistic divines of Switzerland. It was chiefly designed to restrain the progress of the mitigated Calvinism of Amyraldus and the school of Saumur generally, which was spreading in Switzerland. SEE AMYRALDUS. Turretin, Zwinger, Werenfels, Hottinger, and other Swiss theologians aided in its preparation, but its form is chiefly due to Heidegger.

It consists of a preface and twenty-six canons. Canons 1-3 treat of the Scriptures; and the second (against Cappel) maintains that the Hebrew text is to be received as divinely inspired, not only as to the substance, but as to the very words, consonants, vowels, and vowel points (tum quoad consonas, tum quoad vocalia, sive puncta ipsa, sive punctorum saltent potestatem, et tum quoad res, tum quoad verba Θεόπνευστος). The remaining canons are chiefly occupied with definitions of the Calvinistic view of predestination, sin, grace, the extent of the atonement, etc., all which are set forth in language as decided as that cited above with regard to the Scriptures. The Formula is given in full by Augusti (Corpus Libr. Symbol. Reform. D. 443 sq.) and by Niemeyer (Collectio Confess. p. 729). Within a year from its promulgation it was adopted by the magistrates of Basle, Zurich, Berne, etc., but it was not received at Geneva until 1679. It was finally made authoritative throughout Switzerland: all ministers, teachers, and professors were bound to subscribe to it; and it was ordained that no candidate for the ministry should be admitted except upon declaration that he received it ex anivso (Augustli 1. c. p. 646).

But these strong measures, together with the influence of the French clergy, and especially the intercession of Frederick William of Brandenburgh, produced a reaction; and in 1686 the magistrates of Basle allowed the admission of candidates without subscription to the Formula. By 1706 its strict obligation had fallen into disuse at Geneva. In the other cantons it was still retained, but gave rise to long conflicts. In 1722 the kings of Prussia and England sent letters to the Swiss Cantons, for the sake of the unity and peace of Protestantism, to drop the use of the Formula as a binding creed.  In 1723 they renewed these letters to the same purpose. By 1740 the Formula had fallen entirely into disuse. “It never acquired authority outside of Switzerland. Within about fifty years it was abrogated. One of the strongest advocates of this last measure was Turretin's own son, Alphonso Turretin, who was as zealous in opposing as his father had been in advocating it. If there was ever a creed which deserves to be called the manifesto of a theological party rather than a confession of faith on the part of the Church, the Formula Consesus is that one” (Fisher, in New Englander, July, 1868, p. 502). See Hottinger, Formulae Consensus Historia (1723, 4to), in favor of the Consensus; Pfaff, Schediasma theol. de Form. Consens. Helvet. (Tübingen, 1723, 4to), on the Lutheran side; Schröckh, Kirchen. seit der Reformation, 8, 659 sq.; Barnaud, Memoirs pour servir ha ‘histoire des troebles a l'occasion du Consensus (Amst. 1726, 8vo); Mosheim, Ch. History, cent. 17 pt. 2, ch. 3; Trechsel, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 5, 719 sq.; Shedd, Hist. of Doctrins, 2, 472; Augusti, Allg. christl. Symbolik, 1861, p. 160; Schweizer, in Zeitschrifi für d. hist. Theol. 1860, p. 122; Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, ed. H. B. Smith, § 222, and references there.

## Helvetius, Claude Adrien[[@Headword:Helvetius, Claude Adrien]]

             a French infidel, was born in Paris in January, 1715, and was educated by the Jesuits at the College of Louis-le-Grand. He afterwards studied law and finance, and, through the influence of queen Maria Leczinska, became a farmer-general. His life was disorderly up to the time of his marriage in 1751. In 1758 he published his De l'Esprit, which was a summary of the doctrines of the Encyclopedia. The book was bitterly denounced; and, “to regain the favor of the court, Helvetius successively published three letters of apology which gradually advanced in humility and submission. Notwithstanding the confession which they contained of a Christian faith, and his disclaimer of all opinions inconsistent with its spirit, the doctors of the Sorbonne drew up a formal condemnation of the work, which they declared to be a compendium of all the evil contained in all the bad books that had yet appeared. It was publicly burned, according to a decree of the Parliament of Paris.” The style of the book is vicious and declamatory. Helvetius died at Paris Dee. 26, 1771, leaving a work behind him entitled De l'Homme, de ses Facults, et de son Education, which was published the same year at London and Amsterdam by prince Gallitzin, 2 vols. 8vo. “By esprit Helvetius understood as well the mental faculties as the ideas acquired by them. Both faculties and ideas he reduced to simple sensation,  and he accounts for man's superiority over the brutes by the finer organism of his senses and the structure of his hands. Man, he considers, is the work of nature, but his intelligence and virtue are the fruit of education. The end of virtue is happiness, and utility determines the value of all actions, of which those are virtuous which are generally useful. Utility and inutility are, however, merely relative, and there is consequently nothing which is either absolutely good, or absolutely evil. The happiness and enlightenment of the people he makes to be the true end of all human government; and, denying a divine Providence in the government of the world, he declares all religion to be a cheat and a prejudice” (Engl. Cyclopedia, s.v.). His system is simply the lowest materialism. There have been several editions of his complete works (Lond. 1777, 2 vols. 4to; 1794, 5 vols. 8vo; Paris, 1795,14 vols. 18mo, ed. by Lefebvre; Paris, 1818, 3 vols. 8vo). See St. Lambert, Essai sur la Vie et les Ouvrages d'Helvetius; English Cyclopedia, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 885; Morell, History of Modern Philosophy, p. 110, 337; Remusat, in Revue d. deux Mondes, Aug. 15, 1858; Farrar, Critical History of Free Thought, lect. 5.

## Helvicus (Helwig)[[@Headword:Helvicus (Helwig)]]

             was born Dec. 26, 1581, at Sprendlingen, Darmstadt, where his father was minister. He studied at Marburg, and was able to teach Hebrew at twenty. It is said that he spoke Hebrew as freely as his mother tongue. In 1605 he was made professor of Greek and Hebrew at the School of Giessen, which in 1606 was erected into a university by the landgrave. In 1610 he was made professor of divinity. He died Sept. 10, 1617. His most important work is Theatrum Historicum et Chronologicum sive Chronologiae Systema novum (1610, often reprinted, and translated into English); also a Chronologia Universalis (1612).

## Helvidius[[@Headword:Helvidius]]

             a so-called heresiarch of the 4th century, a layman who opposed the growing superstitions of the Church, and especially the nascent worship of the Virgin Mary. He was a pupil of Auxentius, bishop of Milan, and the precursor of Jovinian (q.v.). Jerome was at the time preaching the “gospel of celibacy,” and Helvidius opposed this tendency also. He maintained that Mary had other children besides Jesus, and supported his opinion by the N. Test., and by the authority of Tertullian and Victorinus. “He affirmed also that by this opinion he in nowise infringed on the honor of Mary. He  attacked also the exaggerated under valuation of married life. He quoted the examples of the patriarchs, who had maintained a pious life in wedlock; while, on the other hand, he referred to the examples of such virgins as had by no means lived up to their calling. These opinions of Helvidius might lead s to conclude that the combating of a one-sided ascetic spirit was a matter of still more weight with him than the defense of his views with regard to Mary. Perhaps, also, he may have been led into these views simply by exegetical inquiries and observations, and so had been drawn into this opposition to the oven aluation of celibacy merely for the purpose of defending his opinion against an objection on the score of propriety” (Neander, Ch. Hist., Torrey's, 2, 340). Augustine (De Haeres. c. 84) calls his followers Helvidiani. Jerome wrote a treatise against him (adv. Helvidiusm), in which we find some passages of Helvidis's writings. See Epiphanius, Haeres. c. 70, 78; Augustine, Haeres. c. 56, 84; Neander, I. c.

## Helwig, Jacob[[@Headword:Helwig, Jacob]]

             a Lutheran theologian and bishop of Esthonia, who died January 19, 1684, is the author of, Disp. de Emanutele: — De Passione Christi  θεανθρώπου: — De Statu Eximanitonis θεανθρώπου. See Witte, Diarium; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:378. (B.P.)

## Helwig, Johann Andreas[[@Headword:Helwig, Johann Andreas]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born January 26, 1668, at Berlin. He studied at different universities, was in 1693 adjunct of the philosophical faculty at Wittenberg, in 1695 adjunct of the cathedral church at Reval, and in 1696 pastor at Narva. In 1713 he was again at Reval, and died February 7, 1720, leaving, De Nomine Missae in Sanctorum Honorem Celebratae (Rostock, 1691): — De Scepticismo Cartesii (Wittenberg, 1692): — De Panibus Facierum contra Witsium (eod.): — De Nomine Jehovah Patribus Ignoto (eod.): — De Simone Mago (1693). See Gadebusch, Lieflandische Bibliothek; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Helyot, Pierre[[@Headword:Helyot, Pierre]]

             a Franciscan monk of great learning (known also as father HIPPOLYTUS), was born at Paris in 1660, and died in 1716. He went twice to Rome on business of the order, and traveled through the whole of France. He is chiefly distinguished as the author of the Histoire des ordres monastiques religieux et militaires (Paris, 1714-21, 8 vols. 4to), of which he gathered the materials during his travels, and which is to this day the most complete work of the kind, though several of the orders are not treated in it. He died during the publication of the fifth volume, and the work was finished by Bullot. A new edition by Migne appeared at Paris in 1847-50 (4 vols. royal 8vo). See Lelong, Bibl. history de la France; Querard, La France litter.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé. 23, 893.

## Hem of a garment[[@Headword:Hem of a garment]]

             (שׁוּל, shul, Exo 28:33-34; Exo 29:24-26; elsewhere the “skirt” of a robe; κράσπεδον, Mat 9:20; Mat 14:30; elsewhere “border”). The importance which the later Jews, especially the Pharisees (Mat 23:5), attached to the hem or fringe of their garments was founded upon the regulation in Num 15:38-39, which ascribed a symbolical meaning to it. We must not, however, conclude that the fringe owed its origin to that passage; it was in the first instance the ordinary mode of finishing the robe, the ends of the threads composing the woof being left in order to prevent the cloth from unraveling, just as in the Egyptian calasiris  (Herod. ii, 81; see Wilkinson's Anc. Egyptians, ii, 90), and in the Assyrian robes as represented in the bas-reliefs of Nineveh, the blue ribbon being added to strengthen the border. The Hebrew word צַיצַת, tsitsith', “fringe” (Num 15:38-39), is expressive of the fretted edge: the Greek κράσπεδα.(the etymology of which is uncertain, being variously traced to κροσσός, ἄκρος πέδον, κρηπίς) applies to the edge of a river or mountain (Xenoph. Hist. Gr. 3:2, § 16: 4:6, § 8), and is explained by Hesychius as τὰ ἐν τῷ ἄκρῳ τοῦ ἱματίου κεκλώσμένα ῥάμματα καὶ τὸ ἄκρον αὐτοῦ. The beged or outer robe was a simple quadrangular piece of cloth, and generally so worn that two of the corners hung down in front: these corners were ornamented with a “ribbon of blue,” or, rather, dark violet, the ribbon itself being, as we may conclude from the word used, פָּתַיל, as narrow as a thread or piece of string. The Jews attached great sanctity to this fringe (Mat 9:20; Mat 14:36; Luk 8:44), and the Pharisees made it more prominent than it was originally designed to be, enlarging both the fringe and the ribbon to an undue width (Mat 23:5). Directions were given as to the number of threads of which it ought to be composed, and other particulars, to each of which a symbolical meaning was attached (Carpzov, Apparat. p. 198). It was appended in later times to the talith more especially, as being the robe usually worn at devotions, whence the proverbial saying quoted by Lightfoot (Exercit. on Matthew 5, 40), “He that takes care of his fringes deserves a good coat” (see Hilder, De Hebraeor. vestib friimbriatis, Tübingen, 1701). SEE FRINGE.

## Hemam[[@Headword:Hemam]]

             (Gen 36:22). SEE HOIAM.

## Heman[[@Headword:Heman]]

             (Heb. Heyman', הֵימָן, i. q. מְהֵימִן, ChlaId. faithful; Sept. Αἰμάν or Αἱμάν, v.r. Α᾿μάν, Α᾿νάν, Αἰμουάμ, etc.), the name of two men.

1. A person named with three others celebrated for their wisdom, to which that of Solomon is compared (1Ki 4:31), probably the same as the son of Zerah and grandson of Judah (1Ch 2:6). B.C. post 1856; SEE ETHAN.

2. Son of Jobl, and grandson of Samuel, a Kohathite of the tribe of Levi, and one of the leaders of the Temple music as organized by David (1  Chronicles 6:33; 15:17; 16:41,42). B.C. 1014. This, probably, is the Heman to whom the 88th Psalm is ascribed. He had fourteen sons and three daughters (1Ch 25:5), some of whom are enumerated in 1Ch 25:4. Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun are termed “seers” in 2Ch 29:14; 2Ch 29:30; 2Ch 35:15, which refers rather to their genius as sacred musicians than to their possessing the spirit of prophecy (1Ch 15:19; 1Ch 25:1; 2 Chronicles 5, 12), although there is not wanting evidence of their occasional inspiration. SEE ASAPH.

## Hemans, Mrs. Felicia Dorothea[[@Headword:Hemans, Mrs. Felicia Dorothea]]

             (nee Browne), an English poetess, was born at Liverpool, September 25, 1794. She married a military man in 1812, separated from him in 1818, and died May 16, 1835. She published numerous volumes of poems, largely religious, which have been widely popular. They have been published collectively as her Works (with a Memoir, Lond. 1839, 7 volumes, and often since).

## Hemath[[@Headword:Hemath]]

             (Heb. Chammath', חִמִּת, the same name as Hammath; Sept. Αἰμάθ; Vulg. translates calor), a Kenite, ancestor of the Rechabites (1Ch 2:55). B.C. prob. cir. 1612. “Hemath,” in Amo 6:14, is an incorrect Anglicized form of חֲמָת(Chamath', Sept. Αἰμάθ v.r. Ε᾿μάθ, Vulg. Enath), the city HAMATH SEE HAMATH q.v.

## Hemenway, Francis Dana, D.D[[@Headword:Hemenway, Francis Dana, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Chelsea, Vermont, November 10, 1830. He was converted in early life. graduated from the Concord Biblical Institute in 1853, taught in Newbury Seminary, where he had formerly been a pupil, joined the Vermont Conference, and in 1855 was stationed at Montpelier, where he remained two years, and then located on account of ill-health. In 1857 he removed to Evanston, Illinois, as principal of a preparatory school there, and soon after was elected adjunct professor of Biblical literature in the Garrett Biblical Institute of that place. He was afterwards promoted to the chair of Biblical exegesis, and finally made professor of exegetical theology, having meanwhile become a member of the Michigan Conference, and in 1861 he was temporarily a pastor in Kalamazoo, and the following year was transferred to the Rock River Conference, and stationed in Chicago. He was a delegate to the General- Conference in 1876. He died April 19, 1884. See Minutes of Annual Conference, 1884, page 342.

## Hemerobaptistae[[@Headword:Hemerobaptistae]]

             (ἡμεροβαπτισταί). Eusebias (Hist. Eccles. 4:22) cites from Hegesippus a list of heresies prevalent among the Jews, mad names, as one of the heretical sects, the Hemerobaptistae. Epiphanius (Haeres. 17) also names this sect, and derives their name from the fact that they hold daily ablutions to be essential to salvation (see also Apost. Const. lib. 6 cap. 6). Mosheim  (Commentaries, Introd. chap. 2, § 9, endeavors to show that the so-called “Christians of St. John” are descended from these ancient Hemerobaptists. See Suicer, Thesaurus (Amst. 1728), 1, 1331; and the articles SEE CHRISTIANS OF ST. JOHN; SEE MENDEANS. ‘

## Heminge [[@Headword:Heminge ]]

             SEE HEMMING.

## Hemiphorium[[@Headword:Hemiphorium]]

             (ἡμιφόριον), a priestly upper garment, probably a short pallium (q.v.).

## Hemlock [[@Headword:Hemlock ]]

             appears in the Auth. Vers. as the rendering of two Heb. words in some of the passages where they occur.

1. ROSH ( ראֹשׁand רוֹשׁ) is thought originally to signify “poison,” and is therefore supposed to indicate a poisonous, or, at least, a bitter plant. This we may infer from its being frequently mentioned along with laanah or “wormwood,” as in Deu 29:18, “Lest there should be among you a root that beareth gall (rosh) and wormwood (laanah);” so also in Jer 9:15; Jer 23:15; and in Lam 3:19, “Remembering mine affliction and my misery, the worm-wood and the gall.” That it was a berry bearing plant has been inferred from Deu 32:32, “For their vine is of the vine of Sodom, and their grapes are grapes of gall (rosh); their clusters are bitter.” In Jer 8:14; Jer 9:15; Jer 23:15, “water of gall” (rosh) is mentioned, which may be either the expressed juice of the fruit or of the plant, or a bitter infusion made from it. That it was a plant is very evident from Hos 10:4, where it is said “their judgment springeth up as hemlock (rosh) in the furrows of the field;” also in Amo 6:12, “For ye have turned judgment into gall (laanah, ‘wormwood'), aiff the fruit of righteousness into hemlock (rosh).” The only other passages where it occurs are in speaking of the “poison” (Job 20:16) or “venom” of asps (Deuteronomy 22:33), or “gall” in a figurative sense for sorrow (Lam 3:5), or as food (Psa 69:21). SEE GALT; SEE POISON.

Though rosh is generally acknowledged to indicate some plant, yet a variety of opinions have been entertained respecting its identification: some, as the Auth. Vers. in Hos 10:4, and Amo 6:12, consider cicuta or hemlock to be the plant intended. Tremellius adopts this as the meaning of rosh in all the passages, and is followed by Celsius (Hierobot. 2, 49). The cuta of the Romans, the ρχιᾷΕτΟῃ of the Greeks, is generally  acknowledged to have been what we now call hemlock, the conium maculatum of botanists. There can be no doubt of its poisonous nature (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 25:13). Celsius quotes the description of Linnaeus in support of its growing in the furrows of fields, but it does not appear to be so common in Syria. Celsius, however, adduces Ben-Melech, the most learned of Rabbins, as being of opinion that rosh was conium or hemlock. But there does not appear any necessity for our considering rosh to have been more poisonous than lacnah or wormwood, with which it is associated so frequently as to appear like a proverbial expression (Deu 29:18; Jer 9:15; Jer 23:15; Lam 3:19; Amo 6:12). The Sept. translators render it agrostis, intending some species of grass. Hence some have concluded that it must be loliumn tenulentum, or darnel, the zizanium of the ancients while others have thought that some of the solaneae or luridae of Linnaeus, as the belladonna or the solanun nigrum, common nightshade, or still, again, the henbane, is intended. But no proof appears in favor of any of this tribe, and their sensine properties are not so remarkably disagreeable as to have led to their being employed in what appears to be a proverbial expression. Hiller, in his Hierophyticon (ii, 54), adduces the centaury as a bitter plant, which, like others of the tribe of gentians, might answer all the passages in which rosh is mentioned, with the exception of that (Deu 32:32) where it is supposed to have a berried fruit. Dr. Harris, quoting Blayney on Jer 8:14, says, “In Psa 69:21, which is justly considered as a prophecy of our Savior's sufferings, it is said, They gave me rosh to eat,' which the Sept. have rendered χολήν, gall. Accordingly, it is recorded in the history, Mat 27:34, They gave him vinegar to drink, mingled with gall,' ὄξος μετὰ χλῆς. But in the parallel passage (Mar 15:23) it is said to be ‘wine mingled with myrrh,' a very bitter ingredient. From whence I am induced to think that χολή, and perhaps rosh, may be used as a general name for whatever is exceedingly bitter: and, consequently, when the sense requires, it may be put specially for any bitter herb or plant, the infusion of which may be called ‘waters of rosh.' SEE MYRRH.

2. LAANAH' (לֲעִנָה) occurs in the passages above cited and in a few others, where it is translated “wormwood” (Deu 29:18; Pro 5:4; Jer 9:15; Jer 23:15; Lam 3:15; Lam 3:19; Amo 5:7); and only in a single passage is it rendered “hemlock” (Amo 6:12). SEE WORMWOOD.

## Hemmenway, Moses, D.D[[@Headword:Hemmenway, Moses, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Framingham, Massachusetts, in 1735. He graduated from Harvard College in 1755, and after preaching at Lancaster, Boston, Townsend, and m Massachusetts, and at New Ipswich, N.H., for short periods, ministered a year in Wells, where he was ordained regular pastor, August 8, 1759. Near the close of 1810 he was compelled to cease preaching on account of a cancer in the face, and he died in Wells, April 5, 1811. Many of his published writings are of a controversial character. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:541.

## Hemmenway, Moses, D.D.[[@Headword:Hemmenway, Moses, D.D.]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in 1735 at Framingham, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1755, and was ordained pastor in Wells, Mass., Aug. 8, 1759, where he labored until his death, April 5,1811. He published Seven Sermons on the Obligation and Encouragement of the Unregenerate to labor for the meat which endureth to everlasting Life (1767): — Vindication of the Power, Obligation, etc., of the Unregenerate to attend the means of Grace, against the Exceptions of Samuel Hopkins in his Reply to Mills (1772): — Remarks on Rev. Mr. Hopkins's Answer to a Tract entitled “A Vindication,” etc. (1774): A Discourse on the divine Institution of Pure Baptism as a standing Ordinance of the Gospel (1781): — A Discourse on the Nature and Subjects of Christian Baptism (1781): — Discourse concerning the Church, in Schich the several Acceptations of the Word are explained, etc. (1792): — Remarks on the Rev. Dr. Emmons's Dissertation, on the scriptural Qualifications for Admission and Access to the Christian Sacraments, and on his Strictures on a Discourse concerning the Church (1794), and several occasional sermons. — Sprague, Annals, 1, 541.

## Hemmerlin or Hammerlein, Felix (Malleolus)[[@Headword:Hemmerlin or Hammerlein, Felix (Malleolus)]]

             a Swiss theologian, was, born at Zurich in 1389. After studying the canon law at the University of Erfurt he went to Rome. On his return to Switzerland in 1421 he was appointed canon at Zoffingen, and the year after he was made provost of St. Ursus, in Soleure. With the revenues of these livings he collected a large library. He took part in the Council of Basle (1441-3), and was conspicuous there for his zeal in reforming ecclesiastical discipline. He made many bitter enemies, and in 1439 they made an attempt on his life, and wounded him seriously. This did not, however, deter him from continuing his reproofs of the loose lives of the clergy, and the general lack of discipline. After long-continued disputes with his colleagues at Zurich, he was stripped, through their influence, of all his emoluments. He also drew upon himself the hatred of a party of his countrymen by the thirtieth chapter of his treatise De Notilitate, in which he condemned the Swiss confederates, who in 1444 made war on his native city. Some members of this party, who attended the Carnival at Zurich in 1554, seized Hemmerlin and carried him to Constance, where he was thrown into prison, and treated with great cruelty. He was unwilling to retract any of his writings, and was condemned to perpetual imprisonment  in a convent. He was taken to a monastery of barefooted monks at Lucerne, and died there in 1457, a martyr to his devotion, not, indeed, to evangelical, but to ecclesiastical discipline. Many of his writings are collected in Varice Oblectationis Opuscula et Tractatus (Basle, 1497, fol.). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 268; Reber, Felix Hemzerliz (Zurich, 1746); Herzog, Real Encyklopädie, 5, 732.

## Hemming (Hemingius)[[@Headword:Hemming (Hemingius)]]

             an eminent theologian of Denmark, was born in the isle of Lalald in 1513. He studied four years at Wittenberg under Melancthon, and imbibed his mild spirit. Returning to Denmark, he became preacher, and afterwards professor of Hebrew and theology at Copenhagen. In 1557 he became professor of theology and vice-chancellor. He was a voluminous writer in exegetical, dogmatical, and practical theology, and his Latin style is highly praised. Opposing the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity, he was greatly reproached by the Lutherans as a Crypto-Calvinist. In his Syntagmina Instit. Christ. (1574) he expressed himself on the Eucharist in a conciliatory way; but this so-called recantation has been interpreted in accordance with the Calvinistic doctrine, as well as with the Lutheran. In 1579 he was made canon of Roeskilde, where he died in peace in 1600. His Opuscula Theologica, including his shorter treatises, were edited by Goulart (Geneva, 1586, fol.).

## Hempel, Albert Ephraim[[@Headword:Hempel, Albert Ephraim]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born April 24, 1670. He studied at Leipsic and Wittenberg, was pastor at Nordhausen in 1692, licentiate of theology at Wittenberg in 1697, doctor of theology in 1711, and died  March 25, 1722, leaving, De Spinis Coronae Christi (Leipsic, 1686): — De Theologiae Onomatologia: — De τεκνοφιλίᾷ Divina ex Jer 31:10 (Wittenberg, 1691): — De Chiliasmo Descripto et Rejecto (1692): — Consilium Dei circa Hominis Creationem ex Gen 1:26 (1697): — De Resurrectione Spirituali. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hempel, Christian Gottlob[[@Headword:Hempel, Christian Gottlob]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1748, at Horburg, near Merseburg. He studied at Leipsic, and died Feb. 11, 1824. He published, Beitrag zur richtigen Erklarung des Kryptopelagianismus (Leipsic, 1783): — Irrlichter und Irrgdnge (Kothen, 1790), and other ascetical works. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hempel, Ernst Wilhelm[[@Headword:Hempel, Ernst Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1745. He studied at Leipsic. In 1769 he was university preacher at Leipsic, professor of philosophy in 1776, in 1787 professor of theology, and died April 12,1799, leaving, Cuinam S.S. Trinitatis Personae Promulgatio Legis Praecipue Tribuenda sit (Leipsic, 1771): — De Sapientia Dei (1773): — Prima Linguae Ebraeae Elementa (1776, 1789): — Kurze und treue Beschreibung der Kennicotschen Bibelausgabe (1777): — De vera Significatione Vocabuli Semen (1787): — De Deo Invisibili (1790-91, 4 parts): — De loco Gal 3:20 (1792): — Fidem Litteris Sacris Hacabendam Rationi Convenienter Postulari (1794, 4 parts). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands. s.v. (B.P.)

## Hemphill, John, D.D[[@Headword:Hemphill, John, D.D]]

             an Associate Reformed minister, was born in County Derry, Ireland, in 1761. He arrived at Philadelphia shortly after the close of the American Revolution. He was a tailor by trade. He graduated at, Dickinson College in 1792, was ordained at Greencastle in 1794-95, went south on a missionary tour, and returned to Greencastle in May, 1795. In 1796 he was installed pastor of Hopewell, Union, and Ebenezer, remaining in this connection until a short time previous to his death, which occurred May 30, 1832. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, IX, 4:62.

## Hemsen, Johann Tychsen[[@Headword:Hemsen, Johann Tychsen]]

             a German theologian, was born at Boldixum (Schleswig) Oct. 15,1 1.92. He studied at Copenhagen and Göttingen, where he graduated in 1821. In 1823 he became extraordinary professor of theology in the University of Göttingen, and died there May 14, 1830. He wrote Anaxagoras Klazonenemnsis, seu de vita ejus ephilosophiat (Gött. 1821, 8vo):Die Authenticitaet d. Schriften d. Evangelisten Johannes (Schleswig, 1823; against Bretschneider's Probabilien): — De Christologia Joannis Baptistce (Gott. 1824): — Der Apostel Paulus, sein Leben, Wirken, und seine Schriften, posthumous (Gött. 1830, 8vo), etc. He also wrote in the Gelehrte Anzeigeen of Göttingen, and the Neue Krit. Bibliothek of Seebold; and edited Staüdlin's Gesch. u. Littérateur d. Kirchengesch. (Hanover, 1827), and Berengarii Turonensis Liber de sacra Caena, adversus Lanzfrancum (Lpz. 1830). ‘See Neuer Nekrolog d. Deutschen (1830), 1, 422-424; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 23, 901. (J. N. P.)

## Hen[[@Headword:Hen]]

             (Heb. Chen, חֵן, grace, as often; Sept. translates χάρις, Vulg. Hem), the son of Zephaniah, to whom the prophet was sent with a symbolical crown (Zec 6:14); probably a figurative name for JOSIAH (Zec 6:10).

## Hen (2)[[@Headword:Hen (2)]]

             (ὄρνις, a bird, especially the domestic fowl, Mat 23:37; Luk 13:34). We have no evidence that the ancient Hebrews were accustomed to the breeding of poultry, but that the later Jews were acquainted with it (Chald. תִּרְנְגוּלְתָּא) is evident from 2Es 1:30; Mat 23:37; Luk 13:34; Luk 22:60-61. Michaelis is of opinion that the incubation of the common hen is referred to in Jer 17:11. The original country of the common poultry fowl is India, where it is called the jungle bird. SEE COCK.

The metaphor used in the passages of the Gospels where the term “hen” occurs has always been admired for its beauty. When the hen sees a bird of prey coming, she makes a noise to assemble her chickens, that she may cover them with her wings from the danger. The Roman army, as an eagle, was about to fall upon the Jews; our Lord-expresses a desire to guard them from threatened calamities, but they disregarded his invitations and warnings, and fell a prey to their adversaries. Thee word there employed is used in the same specific sense in classical Greek (Aristoph. Av. 102, Vesp. 811). That a bird so intimately connected with the household, and so common in Palestine, as we know from Rabbinical sources (Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 256), should receive such slight notice, is certainly singular (see Reland, De yalli cantu Hier. audito, Rotterd. 1709; Detharding, id. Rost. 1752); it is almost equally singular that it is nowhere represented in the paintings of ancient Egypt (Wilkinson, 1, 234). SEE FOWL.

## Hen (3)[[@Headword:Hen (3)]]

             a name for spirits among the Lao-Tseu, in China. They are the souls of those who are neither good nor evil. They are generally friendly to man, and though invisible, they perform many good offices for him. The emperor puts his country under their protection, and he deposes or degrades them if they neglect their duty.

## Hena[[@Headword:Hena]]

             (Heb. Hena', הֵנָע, signif. unknown; Sept. Α᾿νά, but in Isa 37:13 blends with the following name into Α᾿ναεγγουγαμά, q.d. “Ana-near- Ava;” Vulg Ana), a city (apparently of Mesopotamia) mentioned in connection with Sepharvaim and Ivah as one of those overthrown by Sennacherib before his invasion of Judaea (2Ki 18:34; 2Ki 19:13; Isa 37:13). According to the conjecture, of Busching (Erdbeschr. 11, 263, 757), it is the town which is still called by the Arabs Anah. It lies on  the Euphrates, amid gardens, which are rich in dates, citrons, oranges, pomegranates, and other fruits. The modern site is on the right bank of the stream, while the name also attaches to some ruins a little lower down upon the left bank; but between them is “a string of islands” (Chesney's Euphrates Expedition, 1, 53), upon one of which stands a castle. Perhaps, in ancient times, the city lay, for the most part, or entirely, upon this island, for Abulfeda says that “Anah is a small town on an island in the middle of the Euphrates” (see Assemani, Bibl.Orient. 3, 2, 717; Michaelis, Supplem. p. 562). The inhabitants are chiefly Arabs and Jews. Conjecture further identifies Ana with a town called Anat ( תis merely the feminine termination), which is mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions as situated on an island in the Euphrates (Fox Talbot's Assyrian Texts, p. 21; Layard's Nineveh and Babylon, p. 355), at some distance below its junction with the Chabour, and which appears as Anatho (Α᾿ναθω) in Isidore of Charax (Mans. Parth. p. 4). Hitzig, however (Comment. on Isaiah 1. c.), thinks the name an appellation, equivalent to “the Lowland,” and in this signification First (Heb. Lexikon, s.v.) concurs (q. d. כּנע; SEE CANAAN ). SEE SEPHARVAIM.

## Henadad[[@Headword:Henadad]]

             (Heb. Chenadad', חֵנָדָד, probably for הָדָד חֵןfavor of Hadad; Sept. ᾿Ηναδάδ), a Levite whose sons were active in the enterprises of the restoration after the captivity (Ezr 3:9); two of the latter, Bavai and Binnui, are named (Neh 3:18; Neh 3:24; Neh 10:9). B.C. ante 535.

## Henchman, Humphrey[[@Headword:Henchman, Humphrey]]

             an English prelate, was made bishop of Salisbury in 1660, bishop of London in 1663, and died October 7, 1675. He published, Diatriba Praeliminaris H. Hammondi Tract. de Confirmatione Praefixa (1661). See Allibone, Diet. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Hencke, Georg Johann[[@Headword:Hencke, Georg Johann]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1681. He studied at Halle, and died as preacher at Glauchau, April 12, 1720, leaving, De Usu LXX Interpretum in Novo Testamento (Halle, 1709): — Introductio ad Libros Apocryphos (1710): — Prolegomena ad Libros Apocryphos Veteris Testamenti (1711): — De Textu Novi Test. Graeco: — De Usa Librorum Apocaryphorum Vet. Test. im Novo Testam (eod.). He also published a number of sermons. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Henckel, Johann Otto[[@Headword:Henckel, Johann Otto]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Marburg, November 22, 1636. He studied at different. universities, was doctor and professor of theology at Rinteln, and died December 22, 182, leaving, Disputationes de Peccatis: — De Ministerio Ecclesiastico: — De Latrone Converso: — De Peccato Originis: — De Omniscientia Carnis Christi: — De Schismate. See Gotz, Eloqia Theologorum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hendan[[@Headword:Hendan]]

             (Heb. Chemdan', חֶמְדָּן, pleasant; Sept. Α᾿μαδά, Vulgate Hemdam), the first named of the foul “children” of Dishon, which latter was a son of Seir and one of the Horite “dukes” antecedent to the supremacy of the Edomites in Mt. Seir (Gen 36:26). B.C. cir. 1964. In 1Ch 1:41, the name is, by an error of transcribers, written Hamran (Heb. Chamrani, חִמְרָן, Sept. correctly Α᾿μαδί, Vulg. Hanran, Eng.Vers. “‘Amram”). “The name Hemdan is by Knobel (Genesis, p. 256) compared with those of Humeidy and Hamady, two of the five families of the tribe of Omriln r Amran, who are located to the E. and S.E. of Akaba (Robinson, Researches, 1, 268); also with the Bene-Hanzyde, who are found a short distance S. of Kerek (S.E. comer of the Dead Sea); and from thence to El- Busaireh, probably the ancient Bozrah, on the road to Petra. (See Burckhardt, Syria, etc., p. 695, 407.)

## Hendel, William D.D[[@Headword:Hendel, William D.D]]

             one of the pioneers of the German Reformed Church in the United States, was born in the Palatinate in the first half of the 18th century. Having completed his theological studies, he came to America in 1764, and in Jan. 1765 became pastor of the German Reformed congregation at Lancaster, Pa. During the years 1769-1782 he had charge of the congregation at Tulpehocken and neighboring congregations. Indeed, he served as many as nine at a time, besides making frequent missionary excursions. In Sept. 1782, he accepted a call to return to his Lancaster congregation. He was made D.D. by the College of New Jersey in 1788. In February, 1794, he removed to Philadelphia, which was his last station. Shortly after his arrival the yellow fever broke out the second time, and while faithfully ministering to the sick and dying, he died of the fever Sept. 29, 1798. Dr. Hendel was  a good scholar, and a man of great pulpit talents. — Harbaugh, Fathers of the Reformed Church, ii, 120 sq.

## Hendel, William, D.D[[@Headword:Hendel, William, D.D]]

             an eminent German Reformed minister, son of the Reverend Dr. William Hendel, was born in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, October 14, 1768. After completing his preparatory studies he entered Columbia College in New York, where he passed through a regular collegiate course. His theological  studies he pursued in the seminary at New Brunswick, N.J., under the Reverend Drs. Gross and Livingston. In 1792 he was licensed to preach the gospel, and the following year ordained, and installed as pastor of the Tulpehocken charge, in Berks County, Pennsylvania. He resigned this charge in 1823, and removed to Womelsdorf, in the same county, where he died, July 11, 1846. Dr. Hendel manifested a deep interest in the cause of education, and in consequence had to suffer some persecution. See Harbaugh, Fathers of the Ref. Church, 3:58. (D.Y.H.)

## Henderson, Alexander[[@Headword:Henderson, Alexander]]

             a minister of the Church of Scotland, was born in Fifeshire about 1583. He studied at St. Andrew's, where he passed A.M. in 1603, and where, about 1610, he was professor of philosophy. About 1615 (according to M'Crie) he was presented to the parish of Leuchars by archbishop Gladstanes. As the episcopal government was very unpopular with the people, they resisted Mr. Henderson's settlement, even to the extent of closing the church doors against him. In a few years, however, Henderson became convinced that “episcopacy was unauthorized by the Word of (God, and inconsistent with the reformed Constitution of the Church of Scotland.” He entered into the strife against prelacy with great vigor. In 1619 he was called before the High Commission at St. Andrew's, but defended himself successfully. When the episcopal liturgy was ordered to be used in Scotland in 1637 he joined in the resistance made to it. He was one of the writers of the renewed “League and Covenant,” sworn to by thousands at Grayfriars' Church, Edinburgh, March 1, 1638. He was moderator of the famous General Assembly of that year, and he executed the functions of his office with singular skill, firmness, and prudence. At the nineteenth session Henderson preached a powerful sermon, and at its close pronounced the sentence of deposition (against the bishops) which had been adopted by the Assembly. He was removed, much against his will, in 1638, from the church at Leuchars to Edinburgh. In 1640 he was made rector of the University of Edinburgh. During 1642 he was employed in managing the correspondence with England regarding reformation and reunion of the churches. In 1643 he was again moderator of the General Assembly; and in that year he, with others, represented Scotland at the Westminster Assembly, and he resided in London for three years. In 1645 he was appointed to assist the commissioners of Parliament to treat with the king at Uxbridge, and also at Newcastle in 1686. In the papers on episcopacy delivered by him in these conferences he displayed great learning and ability. His constitution was broken by long and excessive labors. In the summer of 1846 he returned to Edinburgh, and on the 19th of August in that year he died of the stone. The Constitution of the Scottish Church was framed chiefly by Henderson. “He was evidently of that sort of men of which martyrs are made, and needed only a change of circumstances to have given his name a high place among those who have sealed a good  confession with their blood. Nearly every considerable production of that memorable period bears his impress. The Solemn League and Covenant was his own composition. The Directory was formed under his eye. He wrote the principal part of the Confession of Faith with his own hand. And the form of Church government which the Assembly attempted in vain to give to the Church of England was little more than a transcript of that which he had a little before drawn up for the Church of Scotland” (Curry, in Methodist Quarterly, 1848, p. 600). “So long as the purity of our Presbyterian establishment remains.” says Dr. Aiton, “as often as the General Assembly of our Church is permitted to convene — while the Confession of Faith and Catechisms Larger and Shorter hold a place in our estimation second to the Scriptures alone — and till the history of the revolution during the reign of Charles I is forgotten the memory of Alexander Henderson will be respected, and every Presbyterian patriot in Scotland will continue grateful for the Second Reformation of our Church, which Henderson was so instrumental in effecting.” His life was spent in active labors, allowing little time for writing, except the documents and pamphlets necessary to the great controversy in which he took so large a part. Two of his sermons — preached severally before the two houses of Parliament (1644) and the House of Lords (1645)are given at the end of M'Crie's Life of Alexander Henderson (Edinburgh, 1846). See also Howie, Scots' Worthies, p. 349; Collier, Eccles. Hist. of England, 8, 293- 325; Hetherington. Church of Scotland, vol. 1; Cunningham, Church Principles (Edinburgh, 1863), p. 384 sq.

## Henderson, Ebenezer, D.D[[@Headword:Henderson, Ebenezer, D.D]]

             an eminent Scotch divine, was born at Dunfermline Nov. 17, 1784. At an early age he determined to devote his life to foreign missions, and went to Denmark, in order to sail thence for India. But he found work in the north of Europe in the circulation of the Bible, which occupied him for twenty years. After several years spent in this way in Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, he was deputed by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1814 to proceed to Iceland on a similar mission; and in 1819 he was sent through Russia on the same errand. In 1826 he was appointed president of the Missionary College at Hoxton; and in 1830 he was made professor of theology and Biblical literature at the Highbury College. His studies in the language and literature of the Bible had been carried on vigorously during his previous long career-in the service of the Bible Society, and he distinguished himself, both as professor and as author, by thorough and  scholarly work. In 1850 he was compelled by decline of health to relinquish his literary labors, and after a short service as pastor at East Sheer he gave up all public work. He died at Mortlake, Surrey, and May 16, 1858. Dr. Henderson's reputation as a Biblical critic was equal to that of any man of his time in England, and he was widely known and respected in other countries. He received the degree of D.D. from Amherst College, Mass., and from the University of Copenhagen at the same time. His knowledge of the languages of the Bible was accurate, and he used freely most of the important living languages. He was orthodox in his theology, and never handled the text of the Bible in the reckless and arbitrary manner which was common in Germany in his time. He was not an elegant writer, and his translations of Scripture are not always in good taste; but most persons competent to judge will agree to Dr. W. L. Alexander's judgment that “his contributions to Biblical literature are among the most valuable the age has produced, especially his lectures on Inspiration, and his commentaries on Isaiah and the Minor Prophets.” His writings include Iceland, Journal of a Residence in that Island (Edinb. 1818, 2 vols. 8vo): — Biblical Researches and Travels in Russia, with Observations on the Rabbinical and Caraib Jews (Lond. 1826, 8vo): — translation of M. F. Roos, Exposition of Daniel (1811, 8vo): — The Mystery of Godliness, on 1Ti 3:16 (Lond. 1830): — Divine Inspiration (Lond. 1836, often reprinted, 8vo): — Commentary on Isaiah, with a new translation (London, 1840, 8vo): — Comm. on the Minor Prophets, with a new translation (London, 1845, 8vo): Comm. on Jeremiah, with translation (Lond. 1851, 8vo): — Comm. on Ezekiel (Lond. 1855, 8vo). He edited, with additions, Stuart's translation of Ernesti, Elements of Interpretations (1827, 12mo), Egid. Gutbirii Lexicon Syriacunz (1836, 24mo), and a new edition of Buck, Theological Dictionary (Lend. 1833, and often). A Life of Dr. Henderson has recently been issued (1869).

## Henderson, Isaac J., D.D[[@Headword:Henderson, Isaac J., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Natchez, Mississippi, January 6, 1812. He graduated at Jefferson College in 1831, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1835. Soon after his license he spent two years as an evangelist in Mississippi, Arkansas, and Louisiana; then came to Galveston, Texas; accepted a call, and in a short time secured funds for the erection of the first Presbyterian church there. About 1850 he accepted a call to Jackson, Mississippi. In 1852 he went to Prytania Street Church in New Orleans, and labored over eleven years. In 1866 he began to preach at Annapolis, Md. He died December 8, 1875. Dr. Henderson was faithful, practical, and interesting to all classes. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1876, page 21.

## Henderson, James, M.D[[@Headword:Henderson, James, M.D]]

             a Scotch Congregational medical missionary, was born in 1830, and received a careful religious training by a pious widowed mother. He began life as a shepherd-boy, but spent several sessions at the Edinburgh University. He offered his services to the London Missionary Society, and after six months of private theological instruction, during which time he received his degree of M. D. from the University of St. Andrews, he set sail for Shanghai, China. On his arrival, in 1860, he immediately applied himself with his characteristic zeal to medical work, and his thorough devotion, united with his remarkable surgical skill,, soon raised the reputation of the Chinese hospital to the highest point. In June 1865, he was seized with fever, and died July 31 following. See (Lond.) Cong. Year- book, 1866, page 258.

## Henderson, John[[@Headword:Henderson, John]]

             a Scotch merchant and philanthropist, was born in 1782 at Borrowstanes-; was bred to business, and was eminently successful in. trade. His religious life was even more earnest than his mercantile zeal, and he devoted a large part of his income to benevolence. He took especial interest in the observance of the Lord's Day, and offered prizes to workingmen for essays on Sabbath Observance. SEE SABBATH. He was one of the most active promoters of the Evangelical Alliance (q.v.), and contributed largely to its funds. The Waldensian churches, as well as Foreign Missions, received  large benefactions from him; while at home, he was a constant contributor to the erection of churches, and for all works of benevolence. It is said that for years his charitable outlays amounted to more than £30,000 a year. He died at his residence, The Park, near Glasgow, May 1, 1867. — Evangelical Christendom, June 1867.

## Henderson, Matthew H., D.D[[@Headword:Henderson, Matthew H., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was rector for several years in Newark, N.J., until about 1856; subsequently he removed to Athens, Georgia, where he became rector of Emmanuel Church, and there remained. until his death, December 2, 1872. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1874, page 138.

## Henderson, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Henderson, Robert, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington County, Virginia, May 31, 1764. Being left an orphan at an early age, he struggled hard in obtaining an education. He was licensed and ordained by the Abingdon Presbytery in 1788, and was pastor at Danbridge, Tennessee, where he remained more than twenty years. He afterwards preached at Pisgah, Murfrees Spring, Nashville, and Fraisklin. He died in July 1834. Dr. Henderson was a most earnest and vigorous supporter of gospel orders, especially as connected with the worship of God. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3:528.

## Hengel, Wessel Albert Van[[@Headword:Hengel, Wessel Albert Van]]

             a Dutch theologian, was born at Leyden, November 12, 1779, where he also received his theological education. In 1803 he was pastor at Kalslagen, in 1805 at Driehuizen, in 1810 at Grootrebroek, in 1815 professor of theology at Franeker, and in 1818 professor at Amsterdam. In 1827 he was called to Leyden, and died February 6, 1871. He wrote, Annotationes in Loca Nonnulla Novi Testamenti (Amsterdam, 1824): — Institutio Oratoris Sacri (Leyden, 1829): — Commentarius Perpetuus in Epistolam Pauli ad Philippenses (1838): — Commentarius Perpetuus in Prioris Pauli ad Corinthios Epistolie Caput Quintum Decimum (1851): — Interpretatio Pauli Epistolae ad Romanos (1854-59, 2 volumes): — Five Epistles to Strauss, on his Life of Jesus (2d ed. 1824): — Meritorum Joannis Henrici van der Palm Commemoratio Brevis (1840). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:241; 2:61, 111; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:535; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hengstenberg, Ernst Wilhelm[[@Headword:Hengstenberg, Ernst Wilhelm]]

             a German theologian was born Oct. 20, 1802, at Frondenberg, in Westphalia, and was prepared for the ministry under the instruction of his father, who was pastor at Frondenberg. Entering the University of Bonn, he gave himself earnestly to Oriental and philosophical studies, an early fruit of which appeared in his translation of Aristotle's Metaphysics (Bonn, 1824), and in an edition of the Moallakah of Amralkais (Bonn, 1823). In 1823 he went to Basle, where, under the influence of the Missionary Institute, he became earnestly interested in religion and theology. In 1824 he became privatdocent in theology at Berlin; in 1826, professor extraordinary; in 1828, ordinary professor; and in 1829, doctor of theology. For many years his organ was the Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, begun in 1827, an orthodox journal, which, during its active and often stormy career, has rendered great service against Rationalism, but has also been noted for its violent polemical spirit in favor of Lutheranism, and, of late, even of, Ritualism, as well as of absolutism in Church and State. He was, after 1848, a bitter opponent of the union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches in Prussia, so much desired by Frederick William III, and by Neander and other leading theologians, against whom Hengstenberg's severity of language was often inexcusable. His contributions to the Kirchenzeitung, during his forty-two years' connection with it, were enough to make many volumes; but he was, besides, a laborious writer, especially in exegetical theology. He died June 3, 1869. His principal works are Christologie des alten Testaments (Berlin, 2nd edit. 3 vols. 8vo, 1854-57; translated by Reuel Keith from 1st edit., N. York, 1836-39, 3 vols. 8vo; also transl. by Theo. Meyer from 2nd edit. Edinburgh, 4 vols. 8vo, 1863): — Beitrage zur Einleitung ins alte Test. (Berlin, 1831-39, 3 vols. 8vo): — Die Bücher Moses u. Egypten (Berlin, 1841, 8vo): — Conmmentar iiber die Psalmen (Berlin, 2nd edit. 1849-52, 4 vols. 8vo; translated by Fairbairn and Thompson, Edinburgh, 1857, 3 vols. 8vo): — Erlauterungen 2. d. Pentateuch, vol. 1. (Die Geschichte Bileams, etc.), transl. by Ryland, Edinb. 1858: — Oezebarung Johannis (2nd edit. Berlin, 1861-62, 2 vols. 8vo; transl by Fairbairn from 1st edit.,  Edinb. 1851, 2 vols. 8vo): — Das Evangelium d. Johannes erlutert (Berlin, 1861-2, 2 vols.; translated, Edinb. 1865,2 vols. 8vo): — Ezechielerklart: Ecclesiastes: — Das Hohelied Salomonis aucsgelegt (Berlin, 1853, 8vo). There are also the following additional translations from the Einleitung: Dissertations on the Genuineness of the Pentateuch, by Ryland (Edinb. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo); Egypt and the Books of Moses, by Robbins (Edinburgh, 8vo; Andover, 1843); On the Genuineness of Daniel and Zechariah, bound with Ryland's translation of the History of Balaam (Edinb. 1858, 8vo); Comm. on Ecclesiastes, with Treatise on the Song of Solomon, Job, Isaiah, etc. (Philadelphia, 1860).

## Hengstenberg, Wilhelm Von[[@Headword:Hengstenberg, Wilhelm Von]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, and cousin of the famous theologian, was born February 9, 1804, at Elberfeld. He studied at Erlangen and Berlin, and for a number of years acted as tutor to prince William. In 1838 he entered upon his ministerial functions at Radensleben, and about the  same time was ennobled. From 1841 to 1854 he was pastor at Teltow, and when the courtpreacher, von Gerlach, died, Hengstenberg was appointed as his successor, in 1854, at the recommendation of the general superintendent, Dr. Hoffmann. After the latter's death he was made first court-preacher, and died September 25, 1880. Hengstenberg was no writer, but he left lasting memorials in such institutions as Bethanien and Bethesda, in the capital of the German empire. He was a warm friend of the home mission, and a preacher in the true sense of the word. (B.P.)

## Henhofer, Aloys[[@Headword:Henhofer, Aloys]]

             a German divine, was born at Volkersbach, near Ettlingen, of Roman Catholic parents, July 11, 1789. His mother destined him for the Roman Catholic priesthood, and hoped that he would become a missionary. He studied at the University of Freiburg, and at the Roman Catholic Seminary of Meersburg. After his ordination as priest, he was tutor fob some years in a noble family, and in 1818 became pastor at Muhlhausen. Here he soon found the need of a deeper personal religion, and was greatly edified by the conversation of Fink, one of Sailler's disciples, and by reading the Life of Martin Boos. His preaching became earnestly evangelical, and crowds flocked to hear him. His orthodoxy was soon questioned, and, on examination, he avowed his doubts as to the Romanist doctrine of the Mass. His excommunication followed (Oct. 16, 1822), and gave occasion to his book Christliches Glaubensbekenntniss d. Pfiarre's Henhöfer. A flock of his converts speedily gathered around him, and in 1823 he was installed as its Evangelical Protestant pastor. In 1827 he was called to Spock, near Carlsruhe, where he labored as pastor for thirty-five years. His influence was felt widely in the revival of evangelical religion throughout Baden. He died December 5, 1862. Besides numerous pamphlets on the Roman Catholic controversy, and on practical questions, he published Der Kampf des Unglaubens nit Aberglauben u. Glauben, ein Zeichen unserer Zeit (Heidelberg, 1861): — Predigten (posthumous, Heidelberg, 1863). See also Frommel, Aus dem Leben des Dr. Aloys Henhifer (Carlsruhe, 1865, 8vo).

## Henich, Johann[[@Headword:Henich, Johann]]

             a Lutheran divine of Germany, was born January 1, 1616. He studied at different universities, was in 1643 professor of Hebrew at Rinteln, in 1651 professor of theology, and died June 27, 1671. He wrote, Compendium Theologies: — De Veritate Religionis Christianes: — Histories Ecclesiasticae Partes Tres: — Institutiones Theologices: — De Gratia et Praedestinatione: — De Sanctissimo S. Trinitatis Mysterio: — De Veneratione Nominis Divinii Jehovah: — De Auctoritate Antiquitatis Ecclesiasticae et Conciliorum: — De Bonis Fidelium Operibus. See Sagittarius, Introductio ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Henil[[@Headword:Henil]]

             in the mythology of the Vandals, was a protecting god, who was worshipped under the symbol of a staff, with a hand wearing an iron ring.

## Henke, Ernst Ludwig Theodor[[@Headword:Henke, Ernst Ludwig Theodor]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born February 22, 1804, at Helmstadt. He studied at Gottingen and Jena, took his degree as doctor of philosophy in 1826, and commenced the academical career at Jena in 1827 by presenting his De Epistolce, quae Barnabae Tribuitur, Authentia. In 1828 he was appointed theological professor at the "Collegium Carolinum" in Brunswick, in 1833 was called to Jena, in 1839 to Marburg, and died there, December 1, 1872. He published, Georg Calixtus und seinse Zeit (Halle, 1853-60, 2 volumes): — Theologorum Saxonicorum Consensus Repetitus Fidei Vere Lutheranae (Marburg, 1846): — Consensus Repeitis Fidei Vere Lutherane (ibid. 1847). He also contributed to the first edition of Herzog Real-Encyclop., to the Hallische Encyclop., and other similar works. His lectures on the Church History since the Reformation were  published by Gass (Halle, 1874-78, 2 volumes); those on homiletics and liturgics by Zschimmer (ibid. 1876). See Mangold, E.L. Th. Henke, Ein Gedenkblatt (Marburg, 1879); Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyclop. s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:536 sq. (B.P.)

## Henke, Heinrich Phillip Konrad[[@Headword:Henke, Heinrich Phillip Konrad]]

             a German theologian, was born at Hehlen, in Brunswick, July 3, 1752. His early proficiency was so great that before he went to the university he was employed as a gymnasial teacher (1771-72). After studying philology and theology at Helmstadt, he was made professor of philosophy there in 1777, and in 1780 professor of theology. In 1803 he became principal of the Carolinum, Brunswick. After a very successful career, both as teacher and writer, he died May 2, 1809. In theology he belonged to the rationalistic school of Semler, and his Church History is written in a spirit of bitter hatred of ecclesiastical authority. His Life by Bollmann appeared at Helmstadt in 1816. As a critic he certainly had great merits, but his rationalistic views have made his writings short-lived. His reputation chiefly rests on his Allgemeine Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche (Brunsw. 1799-1808, 6 vols. 8vo; finished by Vater, 1813-20, vols. vii and 8). It is a “clever and spirited work; but the Church appears in it, not as the temple of God on earth, but as a great infirmary or bedlam” (Schaff; Ch. History, 1, 22; see also Kahnis, German Protestantism, p. 177). He wrote also, Lineamnenta institutionum fidi Christianae historico-criticarusm (Helmstadt, 1783; 2nd ed. 1795; German, 1803): — Magazine. d. Religions-philosophie, Exegese und Kirchengesch. (Helmst. 1793-1804, 12 vols.): — Archiviur. die neueste Kirchengesch. (Weimar, 1794-99, 6 vols.): — Religionsannalen (Brunsw. 1800-05, 12 numbers) — Kirchengesch. des 18ten Jahrh. (Brunsw. 1802): — Hist. Untersuchungen in d. Christ. Glaubenslehre (Helmst. 1802): — Beitrdge z. neuesten Gesch. d. Religion, etc. (Berlin, 1806, 2 vols.). See F. A. Ludewig, Abriss einer Lebensgesch. Henkes; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 933.

## Henkel, Charles[[@Headword:Henkel, Charles]]

             was descended from a long line of ministerial ancestors in the Lutheran Church. He was born May 18, 1798, in New Market, Va. He studied theology under the direction of his father, the Rev. Paul Henkel, and was licensed to preach the Gospel in 1818, and immediately commenced his ministry in Mason County, Va. In 1820 he removed to Columbus, Ohio; and in this field continued, amid many deprivations and toils, till 1827, when he took charge of the Somerset pastorate. His health, however, gradually failed, and he died Feb. 2, 1841 He was a man of vigorous mind, and a diligent student. Several of his sermons were published. On one occasion he was engaged in a public controversy with a Roman Catholic  priest; and was very successful in exposing the absurdities of that false system. (M. L. S.)

## Henkel, Paul[[@Headword:Henkel, Paul]]

             a divine of the American Lutheran Church, was born in Rowan County, N. C., Dec. 15,1754. In 1776 he was awakened under the preaching of Whitefield, who at that time was exciting deep interest throughout the country. He commenced a course of study under the direction of pastor Krüch, of Frederick. Md., with a view to the Lutheran ministry. He was licensed to preach by the Synod of Pennsylvania, and in 1792 became pastor at New Market, Va. His labors extended to Augusta, Madison, Pendleton, and Wythe counties. His position was very much that of an itinerant missionary, visiting destitute portions of the Church, gathering together the scattered members, instructing and confirming the youth, and administering the sacraments. In 1800 he accepted a call to Rowan, his native county, N. C.; but, the location being unfavorable to the health of his family, he removed in 1805 to New Market, and labored as an independent missionary, preaching wherever his services were required, and depending for his support solely upon the good-will of the people. He made repeated tours through Western Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, Indiana, and Ohio. In 1809 he wrote a work on Christian Baptism in the German language, which he subsequently translated into English. In 1810 he published a German Hymnbook, and in 1816 one in English, many of the hymns being his own composition. In 1811 he published his German, and, soon after, his English Catechism. He also published a German work in rhyme, entitled Zeitvertreib, designed to satirize the fanaticism, the folly, and vices of the day. Mr.Henkel adhered with great tenacity to the standards and usages of his Church. In the earlier part of his ministry he approved of some of the alterations made by Melancthon in the Augsburg Confession, but at a later period his doctrinal position was the unaltered Confession. As a preacher he had more than ordinary power. He educated a large number of candidates for the ministry, who have occupied responsible positions in the Lutheran Church. His habits of life were plain and simple, and, although opposed to everything that looked like ostentation in the discharge of his official duties, he invariably wore his clerical robes. In person he was large and well formed, measuring nearly six feet in height. Five of his sons became ministers in the Lutheran Church. Towards the close of his life he was attacked with paralysis, and died November 17, 1825. (M. L. S.)

## Henley, Samuel, D.D[[@Headword:Henley, Samuel, D.D]]

             an English clergyman, was professor of moral philosophy in the college of Williamsburg, Virginia. He was rector of Rendlesham, Suffolk, and in 1805 principal of the East India College at Hertford. He died in 1816. He published several Sermons (1771-1803). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Henneberg, Johann Valentin[[@Headword:Henneberg, Johann Valentin]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Gotha, February 4, 1782, and died March 18, 1831. He published, Vorlesungen uber die Leidensgeschichte Jesu (Gotha, 1820): — Commentar uber die Geschichte Jesu Christi (Leipsic, 1822): — Commentar uber die Geschichte des Begrabnisses Jesu (1826): — Homilien uber die Leidensgeschichte Jesu ( Gotha, 1809): — Die Schrift des Neuen Testaments (1819). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:559; 2:61, 153, 285, 306. (B.P.)

## Hennepin, Louis[[@Headword:Hennepin, Louis]]

             a Recollect missionary and traveler, was born in Flanders about 1640. In 1675 he was sent to Canada, and in 1678 started to accompany the traveler Lasalle. He founded a convent at Fort Cataracouy, and with two other monks followed Lasalle in his tour among the Canadian lakes in 1679. Lasalle sent him, in 1680, with another person named Dacan, to find the sources of the Mississippi. They followed the stream tip to the 46° lat. north, but were stopped by a fall which Hennepin called Sault de St. Antoine de Padoue. He was then for eight months a prisoner among the Sioux, but was liberated by the French, and returned to Quebec April 5, 1682. After his return to Europe he was-for a while keeper of the convent of Renty, in Artois, and finally retired to Holland. The date of his death is not ascertained. Hennepin disparaged the Jesuits as missionaries, and was, in turn, disparaged by the Jesuit Charlevoix. He wrote Description de la Louisiane, etc., avec la carte du pays, les moeurs et la maniere de vivre des sauvages (Paris, 1683 and 1688, 12mo; 1688, 4to): — Nouvelle Decouverte d'un tris grand pays situe dans l'Amneique, entre le Nouveau Mexique et la mitner Glaciale, avec cartes, etc., et les avantages que l'on en peut tirer par l'etablissement des colonies (Utrecht, 1697, 12mo, and in the Recueil des Voyages au Nord, vol. 9:etc.): — Nouveau Voyage dans un pays, etc., depuis 1679 jusqu'à 1682, avec les reflexions sur les entreprises du sieur Lasalle (Utrecht, 1698, 12mo; Recueil des Voyages au Nord, vol. 5, 1734). — See Charlevoix, Hist. Géneralé de la Nouvelle France; Dinaux, Archives hist. du Nord; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23 940 sq. (J. N. P.)

## Hennequier, Jerome[[@Headword:Hennequier, Jerome]]

             a French Dominican, was born in 1633. He studied at Douay, was professor of theology and philosophy at Cambray in 1675, and died March 13, 1712, leaving, Cultus Maricas Virginis Vindicatus: — De Absolutione Sacramentali Percipienda et Impertienda. See Echard, De Scriptoribus Ordinis Dominicanorum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hennequin, Aimar[[@Headword:Hennequin, Aimar]]

             a French prelate, became abbot of Epernay, and afterwards bishop of Rennes. He took an active part in the insurrection of the Parisians, May 16, 1588. In February following the duke of Mayence appointed him general colunsellor of the union. On the recognition of Henry IV (March 22, 1594) the bishop of Rennes retired to his diocese, where he died in 1596, leaving, Les Confessions de Saint Augustin (Paris, 1577): — Brevis Descriptio  Sacrificii Missae (1579): — Imitation de Jesus-Christ (Paris, 1582). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Henni, John Martin, D.D[[@Headword:Henni, John Martin, D.D]]

             an eminent Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Obersanzen, canton Graubiinden, Switzerland, June 13, 1805. He studied at the gymnasia of St. Gall and Zurich, went to Rome in 1824, and was there educated for the priesthood. In 1827 he came to America with bishop Fenwick of Cincinnati, and went to the seminary at Bardstown, Kentucky, where he was ordained priest, February 2, 1829. He was assigned to the spiritual charge of the German-speaking Catholics of Cincinnati, and was also made professor in the Athenaeum in that city, which has since developed into St. Xavier's College. He was afterwards sent as a missionary to the north- western part of Ohio. In 1834 he was brought back to Cincinnati and made pastor of the Holy Trinity Church, and vicar-general to bishop Pturcell. He was a leader in everything pertaining to the welfare of the German immigrants, and in 1836 he founded and became the first editor of the Wahrheitsfreund. At the Fifth Provincial Council at Baltimore, in 1843, Milwaukee was made a see, and Henni was appointed its first bishop, being ordained in the Cathedral of Cincinnati, March 19, 1844. In 1847 St. Mary's Church was opened, a cathedral begun, and a hospital founded and put in charge of the Sisters of Charity. Archbishop Henni established an orphan asylum, introduced the School Sisters of Notre Dame, and built two churches. In 1855 he opened the seminary of St. Francis de Sales. Henni died September 7, 1881. He left a powerful establishment, with three dioceses, 185 priests, 258 churches, 125 schools. 25 religious and charitable institutions, and 200,000 Catholics. See (N.Y.) Catholic Annual, 1883, page 51; De Courcy and Shea, Hist. of the Cath. Church in the U.S. page 594.

## Hennig, Balthasar Gottlob[[@Headword:Hennig, Balthasar Gottlob]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born October 5, 1742, not far from Leipsic. Having completed his studies, he was called as professor of Greek and Hebrew to Thorn, and died May 31, 1808, superintendent and member of consistory. He published, De ὀρθοτομίᾷ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ἀληθέιας ad Locum 2Ti 2:15 (Leipsic, 1767): — De Collectione Canonum et Decretorum Dionysiana (1769): — De Praestantia Allegorarum Novi Testamenti (Thorn, 1773): — De Regno Messiae ad Loca Psalms 62 et 89  (1774): — De Notitiis Vet. et Novi Testamenti in Doctrina Christiana (1781): — De Religione Christiana (1790). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hennig, Georg Ernst Sigismund[[@Headword:Hennig, Georg Ernst Sigismund]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born January 1, 1746, at Jauer, in Silesia. In 1776 he accepted a call to Konigsberg, was professor of theology in 1802, and died September 23, 1809, leaving Glaubens- und Sittenlehre (Konigsberg, 1793), and a number of Sermons. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Henning, Jacob[[@Headword:Henning, Jacob]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Greifswalde, May 26, 1633. He studied at different universities, was pastor and professor of theology at his native place, and died September 28, 1704, leaving, De Sabbathi Christianorum Moralitate: — De Justitia Divina Essenliali: — De Natura Hominis ante Peccatum Integra: — De Omnipraesentia Humanae Christi: — Naturaae: — De Poenitentia, Confessione et Absolutione: — De Sensu Scripturae S. Literali: — De Securitate Humana, ad Genes. 9:6: — De Messia a Deo Percusso, ad Esaiae 53:4, 5: — De Joanne Baptista, ad Mat 3:1-4 : — De Reconciliatione Nostra cum Deo per Mortem. Christi ad Rom 5:10 : — De Pignore Haereditatis Nostrae Sanctissimo, ad Eph 4:30 : — De Intercessione Christi Gloriosa, ad 1Jn 2:1 : — De Christiani Hominis Nativitate et Vita, ad 1Jn 3:9. See Pipping, Memoriae Theologorum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Henninger, John[[@Headword:Henninger, John]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Washington Co., Va.; was converted while young; entered the Western Conference in 1807; was made presiding elder in 1816 on French-Broad District; located in 1818, and yet labored with zeal until he re-entered the itinerancy in Holston Conference in 1825, and so labored until his death, Dec. 3, 1829. Mr. Henninger was a faithful, popular, and successful minister, and a consistent and devout Christian. During the latter part of his life he was very efficient as presiding elder, and as agent for Holston College. — Minutes of Conferences, 3, 56; Radford, Methodism in Kentucky, 2, 57.

## Henoch[[@Headword:Henoch]]

             (1Ch 1:3; 1Ch 1:33). SEE ENOCH.

## Henoticon[[@Headword:Henoticon]]

             (Greek, ἑνωτικόν, uniting into one), the name given to a “Decree of Union” issued by the Greek emperor Zeno, A.D. 482, by the advice of Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, with a view to reconcile the Monophysites and the orthodox to the profession of one faith. It recognized the Nicene and Constantinopolitan creeds, but did not name the decrees of Chalcedon. It thus required a sacrifice of opinion on the part of the Monophysites; but, at the same time, it deprived the orthodox of the advantages they had gained at the Council of Chalcedon. The Roman patriarch, Felix II, condemned it in 483, and in 518 it was suppressed. — Moshefn, Church Hist. cent. 5, pt. 2, ch. 5, § 19. The Henoticon is given, in Greek, in Gieseler, Ch. Hist. 1, §10 SEE MONOPHSITES.

## Henrici, Daniel[[@Headword:Henrici, Daniel]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Chemnitz, April 5, 1615. He studied at different universities, was professor at Leipsic, and died March 15, 1666. He wrote, Tractatus de Inspiratione Verborum S. Scripturae: — Delineatio Christianismi: — Disputationes de Immanuelis Conceptione et Nativitate: — De Evangelio Prophetico: — De Baptismo ad Mat 27:18-20 : — De Primogenitura Christi: — De Christo Dei et Marice Filio: — De Messiae Officio Regio: — De Judiciis Ebraeorun: — De Incarnatione Filii Dei: — De Religione Zwinglio-Calviniana in Articulo de S. Cena. See Freher, Theatrum Eruditorum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Henricians[[@Headword:Henricians]]

             SEE HENRY OF LAUSANNE.

## Henriques, Frey (1)[[@Headword:Henriques, Frey (1)]]

             a Portuguese Jesuit and missionary, who died in 1556, on the Malabar coast, left Carta S. Ignacio Escrita de Tand (published in Italian, Venice, 1559). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Henriques, Frey (2)[[@Headword:Henriques, Frey (2)]]

             a Portuguese ecclesiastical writer, was born at Lisbon. He entered the order of the Jesuits while young, and taught theology in several colleges of his order. He died in 1590, leaving Constituigoes das Religiozas de Santa Martha de Lisboa. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Henriques, Henrique (1)[[@Headword:Henriques, Henrique (1)]]

             a Portuguese missionary, was born at Villa Vicoza about 1520. He was one of the first associates of the society founded by Ignatius, and was sent to the Portuguese establishments in Asia. He was well versed in different Shemitic languages. He died February 6, 1600, on the coast of Malabar, leaving, Vocabulario e Arte de Grammat. da Ling. Malabar: — Metho do de Confessar: — Doutrina Christad: — Vida de Christo, N. Senfhora, e Santos: — Contra as Fabulas dos Gentios: — 24 Cartas Sobre a Missao. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Henriques, Henrique (2)[[@Headword:Henriques, Henrique (2)]]

             a Portuguese theologian, was born at Oporto in 1536. He joined the Jesuits, and taught philosophy and theology in the colleges of his order at Cordova and at Salamanca; but afterwards went to the Dominicans, and became famous by his writings against the Molinists. He finally returned to the Jesuits, and died at Tivoli, February 28, 1608, leaving, Sunmma Theologiae Moralis (Salamanca, 1591; Venice, 1596): — De Claribus Ecclesiae, condemned by the court of Rome: — De Justitia Censurarum in Causa Republicae Venetae (MSS. preserved in the Vatican, No. 5547): also a large number of small treatises. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Henriquez, Crisostomo[[@Headword:Henriquez, Crisostomo]]

             a Spanish historian, was born at Madrid in 1594. At the age of thirteen he entered the order of the Cistercians, and afterwards he taught philosophy, theology, and history in various colleges of his community. In 1622 he was  sent into the Netherlands, where the archduke Albert received him very kindly. He died at Louvain, December 23, 1632, leaving more than forty works, for which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Henriquez, Enrico[[@Headword:Henriquez, Enrico]]

             an Italian cardinal, was born in the district of Otranto in 1701. He became successively legate to the republic of San Marino, ambassador to Philip V, king of Spain, and cardinal under Benedict XIV, and was charged with. the government of Romagna. He died April 25, 1756, leaving several orations, for which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Henry (1)[[@Headword:Henry (1)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of the see of Galloway in 1226, '27, '28, '31, '37, '40. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 278.

## Henry (2)[[@Headword:Henry (2)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was abbot of Holyroodhouse, and was made bishop of Galloway in 1255. He ratified to the convent of Dryburgh all the churches granted to it within his diocese. He was bishop of Galloway in 1290. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 273.

## Henry (3)[[@Headword:Henry (3)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of Galloway in 1334. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 273.

## Henry (4)[[@Headword:Henry (4)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was elected and confirmed bishop of Ross, October 19, 1463, and was still bishop in 1476. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 189.

## Henry IV[[@Headword:Henry IV]]

             king of France and Navarre, son of Antoine de Bourbon and Jeanne d'Albret, was born at Pau, in Bearn, Dec.15, 1553. He was carefully educated in Protestant principles by his excellent mother, who recalled him to her home at Pau from the French court in 1566. In 1569 he joined the Huguenot army at La Rochelle, and was acknowledged as their leader, the actual command, however, being left with Coligni (q.v.). The peace of St. Germain (1570) allowed him to return to court, and in 1572 he married Margaret, sister of Charles IX. The massacre of St. Bartholomew followed  soon after, and Henry's life was only spared on that awful night on his promise to become a Roman Catholic. During the next three years he was watched as a prisoner, though not in confinement. In 1576 he again took the field as the head of the Huguenots; and, after years of alternate victory and defeat, he made peace with Henry III, whose death in 1589 made him, in right of the Salic law, king of France. A large part of the nation, however, was too strongly Roman Catholic to allow his accession to the throne in peace. The “League” made the duke of Maine lieutenant general of the kingdom; but in 1590 the battle of Ivry, between the duke and Henry, ended in a grand victory for the latter. In 1593 Henry agreed to become a Roman Catholic, and publicly recanted at St. Denis. By the year 1598 all France was peaceably subject to him. “Henry was censured for his change of religion, and by none more earnestly than by his faithful friend and counselor, Duplessis Mornay. On the other hand, many of the Roman Catholics never believed his conversion to be sincere. But the truth probably was, that Henry, accustomed from his infancy to the life of camps and the hurry of dissipation, was not capable of serious religious meditation, and that he knew as little of the religion which he forsook as of that which he embraced. In his long conference at Chartres in September, 1593, with Duplessis Mornay, which took place after his abjuration, he told his friend that the step he had taken was one not only of prudence, but of absolute necessity; that his affections remained the same towards his friends and subjects of the Reformed communion; and he expressed a hope that he should one day be able to bring about a union between the two religions, which, he observed, differed less in essentials than was supposed. To this Duplessis replied that no such union could ever be effected in France unless the pope's power was first entirely abolished (Mem. et Correspondence de Duplessis Miornay depuis l'an 1571 jusqu'en 1623, Paris, 1824-34) (English Cyclopaedia, s.v.).

His reign was a very successful one, but we are concerned here only with its relations to the Church. On the 15th of April 1598, Henry signed the Edict of Nantes (q.v.) to secure justice to his Protestant subjects, and liberty of conscience. During Henry's life no public persecution of Protestants was possible, but the ignorant intolerance of the rural functionaries and priests often frustrated his good wishes and commands. On the 14th of May 1610, he was assassinated in his carriage by one Ravaillac, supposed to have been a tool of the Jesuits.

## Henry Of Langenstein[[@Headword:Henry Of Langenstein]]

             (also Henricus de Hassia), was born in Hesse about 1325. He studied at Paris, where he afterwards taught philosophy, theology, astronomy, and mathematics, and finally became vice-chancellor of the university. He was one of the leaders of the opposition to the prevailing materialism and superstition. In 1390 he accepted a call as professor in the newly founded university at Vienna, was its rector in 1393, and died in 1397. He wrote, Consilium Pacis de Unione ac Reformatione Ecclesiae (in Hermann von  der Hardnt's Magnum (Ecum. Con. Consil. volume 2): — Secreta Sacerdotum, quae in Missa Teneri Debent. Henry of Langenstein is now counted among the reformers before the Reformation. See Fabricius. Bibliotheca Mediae et Infinae Latinitatis; Hartwig, Leben und Schriften Heinrichs von Langenstein (Marburg, 1858); Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyclop. s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Henry Of Sandwich[[@Headword:Henry Of Sandwich]]

             archdeacon of Oxford in 1259, was consecrated bishop of London in 1263. He took part with the seditious barons against king Henry III, for which he was excommunicated by Othobon, the pope's legate. He went to Rome, but did not receive absolution for seven years. He returned home, and died September 16, 1273, and was buried in his own church of St. Paul's, London. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 2:135.

## Henry VIII[[@Headword:Henry VIII]]

             king of England, was born in Greenwich June 28, 1491. He was second son of Henry VII and queen Elizabeth (of York). His elder brother Arthur, Prince of Wales, dying in 1502, Henry became heir apparent. In 1503 a dispensation was obtained from Julius II (pope) to allow Henry to marry his brother Arthur's widow (Catharine of Aragon) — a match which turned out sadly enough. Henry came to the throne April 22, 1509. The early years of his reign were comparatively uneventful. Wolsey became prime minister about 1513, and governed, for about fifteen years, with a view to his own ambition as well as to the passions of his master; but, on the whole, England prospered under his administration. SEE WOLSEY. Henry was at this time an ardent advocate of Roman views in 1521 he published his Adsertio septen, Sacramen form adversus Martinum Lutherun (4to), for which service the pope conferred on him the title of Defensor Fidel, which the sovereigns of England still retain. (See, for details of the controversy between Henry and Luther, Waddington, History of the Reformation, ch. 21.) In a few years Henry began to grow weary, of his queen. His male children died, and he fancied that Providence punished him in this way for having contracted in unlawful marriage with his brother's widow. The question of the legitimacy of this marriage had never been fully settled, even by the pope's authorization. At all events, it was easy for a prince of Henry's temperament to believe that the marriage was unlawful, when such a belief was necessary to the gratification of his passions. Moreover, the Spanish queen was unpopular in England. Henry had recourse to an expedient suggested by Cranmer, “namely to consult all the universities of Europe on the question ‘whether the papal dispensation for such a marriage was valid,' and to act on their decision without further appeal to the pope. The question was accordingly put, and decided in the negative by the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Bologna, Padua, Orleans, Angiers, Bourges, Toulouse, etc., and by a multitude of theologians and canonists” (Palmer, Ch. History, p. 159). Henry had clearly made up his mind to marry Anne Boleyn as soon as the divorce from Catharine could be accomplished. “Anne was understood to be favorably disposed towards those new views on the subject of religion and ecclesiastical affairs which had been agitating all Europe ever since Luther had begun his intrepid career by publicly opposing indulgences at Wittenberg ten years before. Queen Catharine, on the other hand, was a good Catholic; and, besides, the circumstances in which she was placed  made it her interest to take her stand by the Church, as, on the other hand, her adversaries were driven in like manner by their interests and the course of events into dissent and opposition. This one consideration sufficiently explains all that followed. The friends of the old religion generally considered Cathainle's cause as their own; the Reformers as naturally arrayed themselves on the side of her rival. Henry himself again, though he had been till now resolutely opposed to the new opinions, was carried over by his passion toward the same side; the consequence of which was the loss of the royal favor by those who had hitherto monopolized it, and its transference in great part to other men, to be employed by them in the promotion of entirely opposite purposes and politics. The proceedings for the divorce were commenced by an application to the court of Rome in August 1527. For two years the affair lingered on through a succession of legal proceedings, but without any decisive result. From the autumn of 1529 are to be dated both the fall of Wolsey and the rise of Cranmer. SEE CRANMIER, THOMAS.

The death of the great cardinal took place on the 29th of November 1530. In January following the first blow was struck at the Church by an indictment being brought into the King's Bench against all the clergy of the kingdom for supporting Wolsey in the exercise of his legatine powers without the royal license, as required by the old statutes of provisors and premunire; and it was in an act passed immediately after by the Convocation of the province of Canterbury, for granting to the king a sum of money to exempt them from the penalties of their conviction on this indictment, that the first movement was made toward a revolt against the see of Rome, by the titles given to Henry of ‘the one protector of the English Church, its only and supreme lord, and, as far as might be by the law of Christ, its supreme head.' Shortly after, the convocation declared the king's marriage with Catharine to be contrary to the law of God. The same year Henry went the length of openly countenancing Protestantism abroad by remitting a subsidy to the confederacy of the elector of Brandenburg and other German princes, called the League of Smalcald. In August, 1532, Cranmer was appointed to the archbishopric of Canterbury. In the beginning of the year 1533 Henry was privately married to Anne Boleyn: and on the 23rd of May following archbishop Cranmer pronounced the former marriage with Catharine void. In' the mean time the Parliament had passed an act forbidding all appeals to the See of Rome. Pope Clement VII met this by annulling the sentence of Cranmer in the matter of the marriage, on which the separation from Rome became complete. Acts were passed by the Parliament the next year declaring that  the clergy should in future be assembled in convocation only by the king's writ, that no constitutions enacted by them should be of force without the king's assent, and that no first-fruits, or Peter's pence, or money for dispensations. should be any longer paid to the pope. The clergy of the province of York themselves in convocation declared that the pope had no more power in England than any other bishop. A new and most efficient supporter of the Reformation now also becomes conspicuous on the scene, Thomas Cromwell (afterwards lord Cromwell and earl of Essex), who was this year made first secretary of state, and then master of the rolls. SEE CROMWELL, THOMAS.

In the next session, the Parliament, which reassembled in the end of this same year, passed acts declaring the king's highness to be supreme head of the Church of England, and to have authority to redress all errors, heresies, and abuses in the Church; and ordering first-fruits and tenths of all spiritual benefices to be paid- to the king. After this, various persons were executed for refusing to acknowledge the king's supremacy; among others, two illustrious victims, the learned Fisher, bishop of Rochester, and the admirable Sir Thomas More. SEE FISHER, JOHN; SEE MORE, THOMAS. In 1535 began the dissolution of the monasteries, under the zealous superintendence of Cromwell, constituted for that purpose visitor general of these establishments. Latimer and other friends of Cranmer and the Reformation were now also promoted to bishoprics; so that not only in matters of discipline and polity, but even of doctrine, the Church might be said to have separated itself from Rome. One of the last acts of the Parliament under which all these great innovations had been made was to petition the king that a new translation of the Scriptures might be made by authority and set up in churches. It was dissolved on the 18th of July 1536, after having sat for the then unprecedented period of six years. The month of May of this year witnessed the trial and execution of queen Anne — in less than six months after the death of her predecessor, Catharine of Aragon — and the marriage of the brutal king, the very next morning, to Jane Seymour, the new beauty, his passion for whom must be regarded as the true motive that had impelled him to the deed of blood. Queen Jane dying on the 14th of October, 1537, a few days after giving birth to a son, was succeeded by Anne, sister of the duke of Cleves, whom Henry married in January, 1540, and put away in six months after-the subservient Parliament, and the-not less subservient convocation of the clergy, on his mere request, pronouncing the marriage to be null, and the former body making it high treason ‘by word or deed to accept, take, judge, or believe  the said marriage to be good.' Meanwhile the ecclesiastical changes continued to proceed at as rapid a rate as ever. In 1536 Cromwell was constituted a sort of lord lieutenant over the Church; by the title of vicar general, which was held to invest him with all the king's authority over the spirituality. The dissolution of the monasteries in this and the following year, as carried forward under the direction of this energetic minister, produced a succession of popular insurrections in different parts of the kingdom, which were not put down without great destruction of life both in the field and afterwards by the executioner. In 1538 all incumbents were ordered to set up in their churches copies of the newly-published English translation of the Bible, and to teach the people the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, in English; the famous image of our Lady at Walsingham, and other similar objects of the popular veneration, were also, under Cromwell's order, removed from their shrines and burnt (English Cyclopedia, s.v.).

But Henry never abandoned the special Romanist opinions to which he had committed himself personally by controversy. “When, in 1538, the princes of the League of Smalcald offered to place him at its head, and even to alter, if possible, the Augsburg Confession so as to make it a common basis of union for all the elements of opposition to Rome, Henry was well inclined to obtain the political advantages of the position tendered him, but hesitated to accept it until all doctrinal questions should be settled. The three points on which the Germans insisted were the communion in both elements, the worship in the vulgar tongue, and the marriage of the clergy. Henry was firm, and the ambassadors of the League spent two months in conferences with the English bishops and doctors without result. On their departure (Aug. 5,1538) they addressed him a letter arguing the subjects in debate the refusal of the cup, private masses, and sacerdotal celibacy to which. Henry replied at some length, defending his position on these topics with no little skill and dexterity, and refusing his assent finally. The Reformers, however, did not yet despair, and the royal preachers even ventured occasionally to debate the propriety of clerical marriage freely before him in their sermons, but in vain. An epistle which Melancthon addressed him in April, 1539, arguing the same questions again, had no better effect. Notwithstanding any seeming hesitation, Henry's mind was fully made lip, and the consequences of endeavoring to-persuade him against his prejudices soon became apparent. Confirmed in his opinions, he proceeded to enforce them upon his subjects in the most arbitrary manner;  ‘for, though on all other points he had set up the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession,' yet on these he had committed himself as a controversialist, and the worst passions of polemical authorship-the true ‘odium theologicum' acting through his irresponsible disposition, rendered him the cruelest of persecutors. But a few weeks after receiving the letter of Melancthon, he answered it in his own savage fashion” (Lea, Sacerdotal Celibacy, p. 481). In 1539, under the ascendancy of bishop Gardner (q.v.), the “Six Articles” were enacted, in favor of transubstantiation, communion in one kind, celibacy, private masses, and auricular confession. SEE ARTICLES, SIX, vol. 1, p. 442. Cromwell endeavored to mitigate the severity of the government in its cruel persecutions of all who would not accept these articles, and lost his own head for his temerity in 1540. In the same year Henry was divorced from Anne of Cleves and married to Catharine Howard, who, in 1541, was herself repudiated and executed for adultery. He then married his sixth wife, Catharine Parr, who survived him. The licentious monarch died Jan. 28 1547.

Much has been made by Roman Catholic controvertists of the bad life of Henry VIII as an argument against the Reformation. On this point we cite Palmer, as follows: “The character of Henry VIII, or of any other temporal or spiritual promoters of reformation in the Church, affords (even if it were not exaggerated) no proof that the Reformation was in itself wrong. Admitting, then, that Henry and others were justly accused of crimes, the Reformation which they promoted may in itself have been a just and necessary work; and it would have been irrational and wrong in the Church of England to have refused all consideration of subjects proposed to her examination or approbation by the royal authority, and to refuse her sanction to reforms in themselves laudable, merely because the character of the king or his ministers were unsaintly, and his or their private motives suspected to be wrong. Such conduct on the part of the Church would have been needlessly offensive to temporal rulers, while it would (in the supposed case) have been actually injurious to the cause of religion, and uncharitable judgment of private motives. It must be remembered that although Henry and the protector Somerset may have been secretly influenced by avarice, revenge, or other evil passions, they have never made them public. They avowed as their reasons for supporting reformation the desire of removing usurpations, establishing the ancient rights of the Church and the crown, correcting various abuses prejudicial to true religion, and therefore the Church could not refuse to take into  consideration the specific object of reformation proposed by them to her examination or sanction. Nor does the justification of the Church of England in any degree depend on the question of the lawfulness of Henry's marriage with Catharine of Aragon or with Anne Boleyn; such matters, as Bossuet observes, “are often regulated by mere probabilities,” and there were at least abundant probabilities that the marriage with Catharine was null ab initio; but this whole question only affects the character of Henry VIII and of those immediately engaged in it; it does not affect the reformation of the Church of England” (Palmer, On the Church, part 2, chap. 1). SEE ENGLAND, CHURCH OF.

## Henry of Ghent[[@Headword:Henry of Ghent]]

             (Henricus de Gandavo: proper name Goethals), a theologian of the 13th century. He was born at Ghent in 1217, studied at the University of Paris, and was a pupil of Albertus Magnus. Admitted to lecture at the Sorlonne, he acquired great distinction as a teacher of philosophy and theology, ard obtained the surname of Doctor Solemnis. “He was endowed with great sagacity of understanding, attached to the system of the Reslists, and blended the ideas of Plato with the formularies of Aristotle: attributing to the first a real existence independent of the divine Intelligence. He suggested some new opinions in psychology, and detected many speculative errors, without, however, suggesting corrections for them, owing to the faultiness of the method of the philosophy of his time” (Tennemann). Henry became canon, and afterwards archdeacon of Tournay, and died there A.D. 1293. His writings arc, Quodlibetac in 4 Libb. Sententialrum (Paris, 1518, fol. reprinted with commentary by Zuccoli, 1613, 2 vols. fols.): — Summa Theologiae (Paris, 1520, fol.):De Scriptor. Ecclesiasticis (in Fabricius, ibl. Eccl.). See Duph;, Eccles.  Writers, cent. 13; Ritter, Gesch. d. Philosophie, 8355; Tennemann, Manual Hist. Phil. § 267.

## Henry of Gorcum[[@Headword:Henry of Gorcum]]

             (Henricus Gorcomitss), so named from his birthplace, Gorcum, in Holland, a philosopher and theologian of the 15th. century, vice-chancellor of the Academy of Cologne. He wrote commentaries on Aristotle, Aquinas, and Peter Lombard; also Tract. de cerenmoniis Ecclesiasticis: — De Celebritate Festorumn: Contra Hussitas.

## Henry of Huntingdon[[@Headword:Henry of Huntingdon]]

             an early English historian, was born about the end of the 11th century. He became archdeacon of Huntingdon before 1123. At the request of Alexander, bishop of Lincoln, he wrote a general history of England, from' he landing of Julius Caesar to the death of Stephen (1154), in eight books. It is to be found in Savile's Scriptores post Bedam praecipui (Lond. 1596, fol.; Francof. 1601); also in English, The Chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon, etc., edited by T. Forester (Lond. 1853, sm. 8vo). Warton (Anglia Sacra, ii, 694) gives a letter of Henry of Huntingdon to the abbot of Ramsey, Epistola ad Walterum de Miundi Contemptu, which contains many curious anecdotes of the kings, nobles, prelates, and other great men who were his contemporaries. It is given ah o in D'Achery, Spicilegium, 3, 503. — English Cyclopedia; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, 1, 1439; Wright, Biog. Brit. Lit. (Anglo Norman Period).

## Henry of Lausanne[[@Headword:Henry of Lausanne]]

             (frequently called HENRY OF CLUGNY), founder of the sect of Henricians in the 12th century. He is represented by Papal writers as a heretic and fanatic, but the truth seems to be that he was one of the “reformers before the Reformation.” He is said to have been an Italian by birth, and a monk of Clugny. Disgusted with the corruptions of the times, he left his order, and became “a preacher of repentance.” At first he was held in high honor even by the clergy. The field of his labor was the South of France; the time between A.D. 1116 and 1148. His first efforts were made at Lausanne and its neighborhood (hence his surname). His piety, modesty, and eloquence soon gained him a wide reputation. He preached vigorously against that “sham Christianity which did not prove its genuineness by the fruits of good living, and warning against the prevalent  vices. This led him next to warn men against their false guides, the worthless clergy, whose example and teaching did more to promote wickedness than to put a stop to it. He contrasted the clergy as they actually were with what they ought to be; he attacked their vices, particularly their unchastity. He was a zealot for the observance of the laws of celibacy, and appeared in this respect, like other monks, a promoter of the Hildebrandian reformation. It was probably his practical, restless activity, and the opposition that he met with on the part of the higher clergy, which led him to proceed further, and, as he traced the cause of the corruption to a deviation from the primitive apostolical teaching, to attack errors in doctrine. He must have possessed extraordinary power as a speaker, and this power was enhanced by his strict mode of living. Many men and women were awakened by him to repentance, brought to confess their sins, and to renounce them.

It was said a heart of stone must have melted under his preaching. The people were struck under such conviction by his sermons, which seemed to lay open to them their inmost hearts, that they attributed to him a sort of prophetic gift, by virtue of which he could look into the very souls of men” (Neander, Church History, Torrey's, 4, 598). He was invited to Mans, where Hildebert, the bishop, favored him at first; but his preaching soon excited the people against the priests to such a degree that even the monasteries were threatened with violence. Hilbebert drove him from Mans; and, after various wanderings, he joined the disciples of Peter of Bruys, in Provence. The archbishop of Aries arrested him, and at the second Council of Pisa, 1134, he was declared a heretic, and confined in a cell. “Subsequently, however, he was set at liberty, when he betook himself again to South France, to the districts of Toulouse and Alby, a principal seat of anti-churchly tendencies, where also the great lords, who were striving to make themselves independent, favored these tendencies from hatred to the dominion of the clergy. Among the lower classes and the nobles Henry found great acceptance; and, after he had labored for ten years in those regions, Bernard of Clairvaux, in writing to a nobleman and inviting him to put down the heretics, could say, The churches are without flocks, the flocks without priests, the priests are nowhere treated with due reverence, the churches are leveled down to synagogues, the sacraments are not esteemed holy, the festivals are no longer celebrated.' When Bernard says, in the words just quoted, that the communities are without priests, he means the priests had gone over to the Henricians, for so he complains in a sermon, in which he speaks of the rapid spread of this sect: ‘Women forsake their husbands, and husbands  their wives, and run over to this sect. Clergymen and priests desert their communities and churches; and they have been found sitting with long beards (to mark the habitus apostolicus) among weavers”‘(Neander, 1. c.). Bernard of Clairvaux opposed him earnestly. Pope Eugene II sent Bernard, with the cardinal of Ostia, into the infected district. Henry was arrested, and condemned at the Council of Rheims, A.D. 1148, to imprisonment for life. He died in prison A.D. 1149. See Basnage, Hist. des Eglises Reformes, 4, ch. 6:p. 145: Neander, Ch. Hist. 4, 601 sq.; Neander, Heilige Bernard p. 294 sq.; Hahn, Geschichte der Ketzer, cent. 12; Gieseler, Church History, period 3 § 84.

## Henry of St. Ignatius[[@Headword:Henry of St. Ignatius]]

             a Flemish theologian, was born at Ath in the 17th century. He joined the Carmelites of his native city, and for many years- taught theology in their schools. During a journey he made to Rome in 1701-1709, he acquired great influence with pope Clement XI. On his return he wrote a number of books of Jansenist tendency, and in which he showed himself especially severe on the Jesuit casuists. He died about 1720. The most important of his Writings are, Theologia vetus fundamentalis (Liege, 1677, fol.) Holinismus, profligatus (Liege, 1715, 2 vols. 8vo): — Artes Jesuiticae (Strasb. 3rd ed. 1710; 4th ed. 1717, 12mo):Tuba magna mirum clangens sonum, ad SS. D. N. papam Clementem XI etc. de necessitate reformandi Soc. Jesu (Strasb. [Utrecht] 1717, 2 vols. 12mo). See Dupin, Bibl. des Auteurs- Eccls. pt. 1; Richard et Giraud, Bibl. Sacrae; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 154.

## Henry of Zutphen[[@Headword:Henry of Zutphen]]

             SEE MOLLER.

## Henry, Caleb Sprague, D.D[[@Headword:Henry, Caleb Sprague, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister and writer, was born at Rutland, Massachusetts, August 20, 1804. He graduated from Dartmouth College in 1825; studied theology at Andover in 1828, and for several years was settled as a Congregational minister at Greenfield, Massachusetts, and Hartford, Conn. In 1835 he entered the Episcopal Church, and was appointed professor of mental and moral philosophy in Bristol College, Pennsylvania. With Dr. Hawks he established, in 1837, The New York Review, and from 1839 to 1852 he was professor of philosophy and history in the University of New York, a part of the time acting as chancellor. From 1847 to 1850 he was rector of St. Clement's Church in that city. He afterwards held rectorships in Poughkeepsie and Newburgh and in Litchtield, Conn., and died at Newburgh, N.Y., March 9, 1884. Professor Henry was the author of many volumes of essays, etc., the last of which, entitled Dr. Oldhlam at Graystones, and His Talk There, was published anonymously in 1860.

## Henry, Caleb Sprague, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Henry, Caleb Sprague, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Rutland, Massachusetts, August 2, 1804. He graduated from Dartmouth College in 1825, studied one year at Andover Theological Seminary, served as Congregational minister at Greenfield, Massachusetts (1829-31), and at West Hartford, Connecticut (1833-35); was ordained deacon in the Episcopal ranks the last-named year, and presbyter in 1836; was professor in Bristol College, Pennsylvania (1835-38), and in New York University (1838-52); rector of St. Clement's, N.Y. (1847-50), of St. Michael's, Litchfield, Connecticut (1870-73), and died at Newburgh, N.Y., March 9, 1884. He published several historical and religious works.

## Henry, Matthew[[@Headword:Henry, Matthew]]

             a celebrated English nonconformist divine and commentator, was born at the farmhouse of Broad Oak, Flintshire, the dwelling of his maternal grandfather, Oct. 18, 1662. His parents had retired to that place because his father, Rev. Philip Henry (q.v.), had been ejected from his parish by the Act of Uniformity in 1662. His early education was obtained in the school of Mr. Doolittle at Islingrton. In 1685 he entered Gray's Inn as a student of law: but his religious life had been settled at an early-age, and his bent of mind was towards the ministry. While at Gray's Inn he devoted much of his time to theological studies. In 1686 he returned to Broad Oak, and soon began to preach, by the invitation of his friend, Mr. Illidge, at Nantwich. The fame of his discourses having spread, he was invited to Chester, where he preached in the house of a Mr. Henthorne, a sugar-baker, to a small audience which formed the nucleus of his future congregation. But in 1687 king James granted license to dissenters to preach. Mr. Henry accepted a call to a dissenting congregation in Chester, where he remained twenty-five years. During this period he went through the Bible more than once in expository lectures. In 1712 he accepted the charge of a chapel in Hackney, London. “At the commencement of his ministry, therefore, he began with the first chapter of Genesis in the forenoon, and the first chapter of Matthew in the afternoon. Thus gradually and steadily grew his ‘Exposition' of the Bible. A large portion of it consists of his public lectures, while many of the quaint sayings and pithy remarks with which it abounds, and which give so great a charm of raciness to its pages, were the familiar extempore observations of his father at family worship, and noted down by Matthew in his boyhood.” He suffered much from the stone in his later years, but his labors continued unabated. It was his habit to make a visit to Chester once a year. In 1714 he set out on this journey, May 31.

On his return he was taken ill with paralysis at Nantwich, where he said to his friend, Mr. Illidge, “You have been used to take notice of the sayings of dying men; this is mine: that a life spent in the service of God, and communion with him, is the most pleasant life that any one can live in this world.” He died June 22, 1714. Mr. Henry was a faithful pastor, a discriminating preacher, and a laborious, versatile, and original author. “Although his publications furnish much less to afford gratification, in a literary point of view, than do the works of many who are justly designated ‘fine writers,' they possess a vigor which, without the least endeavor to attract, awakens and sustains the attention in an uncommon degree. In a single sentence he often pours upon Scripture a flood of light: and the palpableness he gives to the wonders contained in God's law occasions excitement not unlike that which is produced by looking through a microscope. The feelings, too, which his subject had called forth in himself he communicates admirably to others. In his whole manner-the same at nine years old as at fifty-there is a freshness and vivacity which instantly put the spirits into free and agile motion — an effect somewhat similar to that play of intellectual sprightliness which some minds (obviously the greatest only) have the indescribable faculty of creating. But the crowning excellency remains; nothing is introduced in the shape of counteraction. There are no speeches which make his sincerity questionable; no absurdities to force suspicion as to accuracy in theological knowledge, or inattention to the analogy of faith; no staggering, and untoward, and unmanageable inconsistencies; nothing by which ‘the most sacred cause can be injured;' or the highest interests of men placed in jeopardy; or which can render it imperative, exactly in proportion as the understanding is influenced, to repress or extinguish the sentiments, ‘in order to listen with complacency to the Lord Jesus and his apostles”‘(Foster, Essays, p. 440). His most important work is An Exposition of the Old and New Testament (many editions; best, London, 1849, 6 vols. 4to; New York, 6 vols. imp. 8vo). It was completed by Henry up to Acts; the rest was framed on his MSS. by a number of ministers. It is a popular rather than a scientific commentary, abounding in practical wisdom; and it has been more widely circulated than any work of the kind, except, perhaps, Clarke's Commentary. He also published a Life of Philip Henry, and a number of sermons and practical writings, which may be found in his Miscellaneous Works, edited by J. B. Williams (Lond. 1830, imp. 8vo; N.Y. 1850, 2 vols. 8vo). See Williams, Life and Writings of M. Henry (prefixed to his Miscel. Works); Tong, Life of M. Henry (1716, 8vo; also reprinted with the  Exposition); Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 824; Literary and Theological Review, 1, 281; Kitto's Journal of Sacred Lit. 2, 222; Bogue and Bennett, History of the Dissenters, 1, 493.

## Henry, Paul Emile[[@Headword:Henry, Paul Emile]]

             a Protestant writer, was born at Potsdam March 22, 1792. He was of French extraction, and studied at the French College in Berlin. He afterwards devoted himself to the study of Hebrew. He was consecrated minister at Neufchatel in 1813, visited Paris in 1814, during the occupation of the city by the Allies. Having returned to Berlin, he was appointed catechist of the Orphan Asylum, pastor of the church of Frederickstadt in 1826, and director of the French Seminary. He died at Berlin Nov. 24,1853. He wrote Das Leben Johann Calvin's (Berlin, 1844; Hamb. 183- 544, 3 vols. 8vo; 1846, 8vo; transl. by Stebbing, Life and Times of Calvin, Lond. 1849, 2 vols. 8vo). He published also a German translation of the Confession of Faith of the French Reformed Church (Berlin, 1845). He intended publishing a collection of Calvin's letters as a continuation of the Life of that reformer, but died before it was completed. See Haag, La France Protestante; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 225.

## Henry, Philip[[@Headword:Henry, Philip]]

             an English dissenting divine, was born Aug. 24,1631, at the palace of Whitehall, where his father was page to James, duke of York. He was educated at Westminster School, and at Christ Church, Oxford, where he obtained a studentship in 1648. He was ordained as a Presbyterian minister in 1657, and settled at Worthenbury, Flintshire. He married Miss Mathews, a lady of fortune, and became possessed of the estate of Broad Oak, Shropshire. He was driven out of his church by the Act of Uniformity in 1662. “Our sins,” he said, “have made Bartholomew-day, in the year 1662, the saddest day for England since the death of Edward the Sixth, but even this for good.” By the Conventicle and Five-mile acts he was driven from his house, and compelled to seek safety in concealment. In 1687, when king James proclaimed liberty of conscience, Mr. Henry immediately fitted up part of his own house for worship. His labors were not confined to Broad Oak, but it was his habit to preach daily at different places in the neighborhood. But his labors hastened his rest; for, when writing to a friend who anxiously inquired after his health, he says, “I am always habitually weary, and expect no other till I lie down in the bed of spices.”  He died June 24,1696, exclaiming, “O death, where is thy sting?” An account of his Life and Death was written by his son Matthew, and has often been reprinted (see Henry, Miscellaneous Works, vol. 1: N. York, Carters. 1855, 2 vols. 8vo). A volume of his Sermons, with notes by Williams, was first published in 1816 (London, 8vo), and has since been reprinted in the Miscellaneous Works of Mr. Henry, above cited. See Life by Matthew Henry: Jones, Christian Biography; Bogue and Bennett, History of the Dissenters, 1, 433.

## Henry, Robert (1), D.D[[@Headword:Henry, Robert (1), D.D]]

             a Scotch Presbyterian divine, was born at Muirtown, St. Ninian's, Stirlingshire, February 18, 1718. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh; licensed to preach in 1746, and officiated at Carlisle from 1748 to 1760. and at Berwick-upon-Tweed from 1760 to 1763. He was minister of the church of the New Greyfriars from 1763 to 1776. In 1774 he was  moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. He died November 24, 1790. As an author he is best known by a History of Great Britain (1771, 1774, 1777, 1781, 1785, 6 volumes). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Fasti Eccles. Scoticance, 1:16, 71.

## Henry, Robert (2), D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Henry, Robert (2), D.D., LL.D]]

             an Episcopal clergyman, was born at Charleston, S.C., December 6, 1792. He graduated from the University of Edinburgh in 1814, was president of the College of South Carolina in 1834 and 1835, and filled in succession in that institution the chairs of logic and moral philosophy, of metaphysics and belles-lettres, and of the Greek language and literature. He died February 6, 1856, leaving several Sermons. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Henry, Robert W., D.D[[@Headword:Henry, Robert W., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was a native of Scotland. He came. to America, and became pastor in Chicago, Illinois, after which he removed to New York, and was installed co-pastor with Reverend Dr. McElroy of the Scotch Presbyterian Church. He remained in this charge until called by the North Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He went to Europe in May, 1869, and having visited the East he was on his return home, but was smitten down by Syrian fever, and died at Alexandria, Egypt, October 18, 1869. See Presbyterian, November 13, 1869. (W.P.S.)

## Henry, Symmes Cleves, D.D[[@Headword:Henry, Symmes Cleves, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Lamington, N.J., June 7, 1797. He graduated from the College of New Jersey in 1815; studied theology for two years at Princeton Theological Seminary; was ordained evangelist by the Presbytery of Newton, May 3,1818; became stated supply at Salem, Massachusetts, immediately after his ordination; served as stated supply at Rochester, N.Y., in 1819; the next year of the Third Church of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; preached at Cranberry, N.J., from 1820 until his death, March 22, 1857. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 20.

## Henry, Thomas Charlton, D.D[[@Headword:Henry, Thomas Charlton, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia Sept. 22, 1790, and educated at Middlebury College, Vt., where he graduated in 1814. After studying theology at Princeton, he was ordained in 1816; became pastor of a Presbyterian church in Columbia, S. C., 1818; and removed to the Second Church, Charleston, in 1824. In 1826 his health failed, and he spent several months traveling in Europe. He died in Charleston of yellow fever, Oct. 4, 1827. He published. A Plea for the West (1824): — An Inquiry into the Consistency of Popular Amusements with Christianity (Charleston, 1825, 12mo): — Etchings from the Religious World (Charleston, 1828, 8vo): — Letters to an Anxious Inquirer (1828, 12mo; also London, 1829, with a memoir of the author). — Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 826; Sprague, Annals, 4, 538.

## Henschenius, Godfrey[[@Headword:Henschenius, Godfrey]]

             a Dutch Jesuit and ecclesiastical historian, was born at Venrai, Flanders, Jan. 21, 1601. In 1635 he was appointed assistant to Bollandus in compiling the Acta Sanctorum (q.v.). After the death of Bollandus in 1665, when only five volumes of that work had made their appearance, father Daniel Papebroch was associated with Henschenius in the task of completing it. Henschenius continued the work until his death in 1681. — Aiegambe, Script. Soc. Jesu, s.v.; Hoefer,: — Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 231.

## Hensel, Johann Adam[[@Headword:Hensel, Johann Adam]]

             a Lutheran minister, who died in Silesia, February 2, 1778, is the author of Geschichte der protestantischena Gemneinzen in Schlesien (Liegnitz, 1768). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:808; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Henshaw, John K., D.D[[@Headword:Henshaw, John K., D.D]]

             a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Middletown, Conn., June 13, 1792, and passed A.B. in Middlebury College in 1808. He was bred a Congregationalist, but, under the influence of Rev. Dr. Kewley, then of Middletown, he became religious, and entered the Protestant  Episcopal Church. Bishop Griswold appointed him a lay reader, and by his zealous labors several congregations were established in different parts of Vermont. On his twenty-first birthday he was ordained deacon, and soon after he was called to St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., where, on his twenty-fourth birthday.' (June 13, 1816), he was ordained priest. In 1817 he was called to St. Peter's, Baltimore, where he served as pastor with uninterrupted success for twenty-six years. In 1830 the degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Middlebury College. In 1843 he was elected bishop of Rhode Island, and made rector of Grace Church, Providence. He was alike energetic and successful in his parish and in his diocese, and during his administration the Church grew not only in numbers, but in power. In 1852 he was called to perform episcopal functions in the diocese of Maryland during bishop Whittingham's absence; and on the 19th of July 1852, he died of apoplexy, near Frederick, Maryland. Bishop Henshaw was a man of clear, sound, and vigorous intellect: he was trained to patient labor, and his moral power was very great indeed. These qualities fitted him eminently for his work, and both within and without the Church he was recognized as in every way worthy to exercise the high functions of a Christian bishop. He published several Sermons, Charges, and Discourses: — An Oration delivered before the Associated Alumni of Middlebury College (1827): — A volume of Hymns (1832): — The Usefulness of Sunday Schools: — Henshaw's Sheridan (1834): — Theology for the People of Baltimore (1840, 8vo): — Memoir of Right Rev. Richard Channing Moore, D.D. (1842): An Inquiry concerning the Second Advent (1842). See Sprague, Annals, 5, 545; Church Review, 5, 397.

## Henshaw, Joseph, D.D[[@Headword:Henshaw, Joseph, D.D]]

             an English clergyman, was made prebendary of Peterborough, dean of Chichester in 1660, and bishop of Peterborough in 1663. He died March 9, 1678, leaving, Horcs Successivnc (1631): Dayly Thoughts (1651). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Hensler, Christian Gottfried[[@Headword:Hensler, Christian Gottfried]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born March 9, 1760, in Holstein. In 1786 he was professor of theology at Kiel, resigned his office in 1809, and thereafter resided in Halle until his death, April 24, 1812. He is the author of Bemerkungen uber Stellen in der Psalmen und in der Genesis (Hamburg, 1791): — Erlauterung des ersten Buches Samuelis und der Salomonischen Denkspruche (1796): — Iesaias neu ubersetzt und mit Anmerkungen (1788): — Bemerkungen uber Stellen in Jeremias Weissagungen (1805): — Animadversiones in Quaedam 12 Prophetarum Minorum Loca (1786): — Der Brief des Apostels Jarkobus ubersetzt und erlautert (1801): — Die Wahrheit und Gottlichkeit der christlichen Religion dargestellt (1803). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:105, 195, 217, 220, 223, 269, 272, 386; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:384. (B.P.)

## Hentenius, Johannes[[@Headword:Hentenius, Johannes]]

             a Dominican and professor at Louvain, where he died, October 2, 1566, published, Biblia ad Vetustissima Exemplaria Recens Castigata Jussu Collegarum (Louvain, 1547): — Euthymii Zigabeni Commentaria in iv Evangelia (1544): — Ecumenii Commentarii (1545): — De Vera Deo Apte Inserviendi Methodo (translated from the Spanish, 1560). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:60, 893, 898; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Henzi, Rudolph[[@Headword:Henzi, Rudolph]]

             professor of Oriental languages and of Old-Testament exegesis, who died at Dorpat in 1829, is the author of Libri Ecclesiastce Argumenti Brevis Adumbratio (Dorpat, 1827). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:82; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:539; Fiirst. (who spells the name Henze), Bibl. Jud. 1:385. (B.P.)

## Heothmna[[@Headword:Heothmna]]

             (τὰ ἑωθινά), in the Greek Church, designates (1) an antiphonal anthem of lauds; (2) gospels relating to the resurrection.

## Hepburn[[@Headword:Hepburn]]

             a Scotch prelate, was rector of Partoun and abbot of Dunfermline in 1515. In June of the same year he was constituted lord treasurer. In 1516 he became bishop of Moray. He died in 1524. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 148.

## Hepburn, George[[@Headword:Hepburn, George]]

             a Scotch prelate, was early preferred to the provostry of Lincluden, and February 9, 1503. was elected abbot of the monastery of Aberbrothock. In 1509 he was made lord treasurer, and in 1510 he was elected bishop of the see of the Isles. In 1512 he was commentator both of Arbroath and Icolumkill. This prelate was slain with the king on the unfortunate field of Flodden, September 9, 1513. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 305.

## Hepburn, John (1)[[@Headword:Hepburn, John (1)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of the see of Brechin in 1517, and was still there in 1532. He died in August, 1543. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 165.

## Hepburn, John (2)[[@Headword:Hepburn, John (2)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of Dunblane, and one of the lords of council of session in 1467. In 1476 he assisted at the consecration of dean Livingstone to the see of Dunkeld. He was bishop of this see in 1479. He died in 1508. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 178.

## Hepburn, Patrick[[@Headword:Hepburn, Patrick]]

             a Scotch prelate, was prior of St. Andrews in 1522, and in 1524 was made secretary, in which office he continued until 1527. He was advanced to the see of Moray in 1535, and at the same time held the abbey of Scone in perpetual commendam. He was bishop of Moray still in 1561, and probably in 1568. He died at Spynie Castle, June 20, 1573. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 150.

## Hepha[[@Headword:Hepha]]

             (Heb. Cheyphah', חיפה, in the Talmud. Schwarz, Palest. p. 197; mentioned by several ancient writers [Reland, Palcest. p. 699] as lying on the Phoenician coast of Palestine; the Sycaminos of the Onomast., the Jerusalem Itin., and Josephus [Ant. 13, 12, 3]), the modern Haijf, a place of considerable trade at the foot of Carmel, on the bay of Acre (Robinson, Researches, 3, 194), with the ruins of Sycaminos 11 mile north-west of the present town (Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 320).

## Hepher[[@Headword:Hepher]]

             (Heb. Che'pher, חֵפֶר, a well, or shame; Sept. ῎Οφέρ or ῎Οφέρ, ῎Εφερ and Α᾿φέρ, but ᾿Ηφάλ in 1Ch 1:6), the name of a city and of three men. SEE GATH-HEPHER.

1. A royal city of the Canaanites captured by Joshua (Jos 12:17); probably the same district as “the land of Hepher,” in the vicinity of Sochoh and Aruboth, assigned to Ben-Hesed, one of Solomon's table- purveyors (1Ki 4:10). The locality thus indicated would seem to be in the vicinity of Um-Burj, south of Suweicheh.

2. The youngest son of Gilead, and great-grandson of Manasseh (Num 26:32). He was the father of Zelophehad (Num 27:1; Jos 17:2-3), and his descendants are called HEPHERITES (Num 26:32). B.C. ante 1618.

3. The second son of Ashur (a descendant of Judah) by one of his wives, Naarah (1Ch 4:6). B.C. cir. 1612.

4. A Mecherathite, one of David's heroes, according to 1Ch 11:36; but the text is apparently corrupt, so that this name is either an interpolation, or identical with the ELIPHALET of 2Sa 23:34. See UR.

## Hepher (2)[[@Headword:Hepher (2)]]

             This place Trelawney Saunders (Map of the O.T.) identifies with Khurbet Kafir, which the Ordnance Map lays down eight miles northwest of Hebron (and three miles east of Um-Burj, the neighborhood which we had conjecturally assigned), and the Memoirs describe (3:355) as "foundations and heaps of stones. It has the appearance of an old site, and an ancient road passes it."

## Hepherite[[@Headword:Hepherite]]

             (Heb. Chephri', חֶפְרַי, Sept. Οφερί), a descendant of HEPHER 2 (Num 26:32).

## Hephzi-bah[[@Headword:Hephzi-bah]]

             (Heb. Chephtsi-bah', חֶפְצַיאּבָהּ, my delight is in her), a (fem.) real and also symbolical name.

1. (Sept. Ε᾿ψιβά,Vulg. Hacphsiba.) The mother of king Manasseh, and consequently queen dowager of king Hezekiah (2Ki 21:1). Notwithstanding the piety of her husband, and her own amiable name, her irreligion may be inferred from the character of her son. — B.C. 709-696.

2. (Sept. Θέλημα ἐμὀν,Vulg. Voluntas mea in ea.) A figurative title ascribed to Zion in token of Jehovah's favor (in the return from the  Captivity, and especially in the Messiah's advent), in contrast with her predicted desolation (Isa 62:4).

## Heppe, Heinrich Ludwig Julius[[@Headword:Heppe, Heinrich Ludwig Julius]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Cassel in 1820. He studied at Marburg, was in 1844 doctor of philosophy and licentiate of theology, and commenced his academical career at Marburg. In 1850 he was professor of theology, in 1864 he was honored with the doctorate of theology, and died July 25, 1879. He wrote, Diss. de Loco Evang. Luces 16:1-9 (Marburg, 1844): — Thatsachen aus der Kurhessischen Kirchengeschichte (Cassel, eod.): — Geschichte der hessischen General synoden von 1568-1582 (1847, 2 volumes): — Historische Untersuchungen uber den Kasseler Catechismus (ibid. eod.): —Einfuhrug der Verbesserungspunkte in Hessen, etc. (1849): — Gesch. des deutschen Protestantismus (1852-57, 3 volumes): — Die confessionelle Entwicklung der hessischen Kirche (1853): — Die confessionelle Entwickluung der altprotestantischen Kirche Deutschlands (1854): — Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantismus im 16 Jahrhundert (Gotha, 1857, 3 volumes): — Geschichte des deutschen Volksschulwesens (1858-60; 5 volumes): — Dogmatik der evang. reform. Kirche (1860): — Die Bekenntnisschriften der reform. Kirchen Deutschlands (eod.): — Theodor Beza. Leben und ausgewahlte Schriften (1861): — Entstehung und Fortbildung des Lutherthums (1863): — Philipp Melanchthon, der Lehrer Deutschlands (1867): — Zur Geschichte der evang. Kirche Rheinlands und Westfalens (1867-70, 2 volumes): — Geschichte der quietistischen Mystik in der  Kathol. Kirche (Berlin. 1875): — Kirchengeschichte beider Hessen (Marburg, 1876, 2 volumes): — Geschichte des Pietismus in der Reformirten Kirche (Leyden, 1879). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:539 sq.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v.; Zur Erinnerung an B. Heppe (Marburg, 1879). (B.P.)

## Heraclas, Saint[[@Headword:Heraclas, Saint]]

             patriarch of Alexandria, was a brother of Plutarch, who was martyred about A.D. 204, under Septimius Severus. They had both been heathen, but were converted by Origen, who was then teaching at Alexandria. After escaping from the persecution to which his brother fell victim, Heraclas became an ascetic, but still continued to study Greek philosophy under Ammonius Saccas. He was next associated with Origen as a catechist, and when the latter was compelled to leave Egypt on account of his difficulty with Demetrius of Alexandria, Heraclas remained alone in charge of the theological school of that city. He retained this position until he became himself patriarch. He died in 246. The Roman martyrology commemorates him on the 14th of July. See Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. 6, 15; Tillemont, Memoires Eccles. vol. 3; Baillet, Vies des Saints, July 14th.

## Heracleia[[@Headword:Heracleia]]

             a festival anciently celebrated at Athens every five years in honor of the Grecian god Heracles (q.v.).

## Heracleon[[@Headword:Heracleon]]

             SEE HERACLEONITES.

## Heracleonites[[@Headword:Heracleonites]]

             a Gnostic sect of the 2nd century, so named from Heracleon (a disciple of Valentinus), who was distinguished for his scientific bent of mind. “He wrote a commentary on the Gospel of St. John, considerable fragments of which have been preserved by Origen; perhaps also a commentary on the Gospel according to Luke. Of the latter, a single fragment only, the exposition of Luk 12:8, has been preserved by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. 4, 503). It may easily be conceived that the spiritual depth and fullness of John must have been pre-eminently attractive to the Gnostics. To the exposition of this gospel Heracleon brought a profound religious sense, which penetrated to the inward meaning, together with an understanding invariably clear when not led astray by theosophic speculation. But what he chiefly lacked was a faculty to appreciate the simplicity of John, and earnest application to those necessary means for evolving the spirit out of the letter, the deficiency in which among the Gnostics generally has already been made a subject of remark. Heracleon honestly intended, indeed, so far as we can see, to derive his theology from John. But he was entirely warped by his system; and with all his habits of  thought and contemplation, so entangled in its mesh-work that he could not move out of it with freedom, but, spite of himself, implied its views and its ideas in the Scriptures, which he regarded as the fountain of divine wisdom” (Neander). His fragments are gathered in Grabe, Spicilegium, 2, 83. See Neander, Ch. History, 1, 434; Mosheim, Comm. 1, 472; Lardner, Works, 2, 256; and the article SEE GNOSTICS.

## Heracles[[@Headword:Heracles]]

             SEE HERCULES.

## Heraclides[[@Headword:Heraclides]]

             surnamed Cyprus, from his place of birth, was liberally educated, became a monk under Evagrius, and deacon at Constantinople. He was an ardent friend of Chrysostom, who caused his election as bishop of Ephesus in 401; hut he was afterwards persecuted along with that eminent ecclesiastic, and finally shared his exile.

## Heracliteans[[@Headword:Heracliteans]]

             the followers of the philosopher Heraclitus (q.v.).

## Heraclitus[[@Headword:Heraclitus]]

             (᾿Ηράκλειτος), a philosopher of Ephesus, flourished about B.C. 500. He belonged to the Ionian school. “He was a profound thinker, of an inquisitive spirit, and the founder of a sect called after him, which had considerable reputation and influence. His humor was melancholy and sarcastic, which he indulged at the expense of the democracy established in his native town, and with which he was disgusted.' The knowledge he had acquired of the systems of preceding philosophers (vying with one another in boldness), of Thales, Pythagoras, and Xenophanes, created in him a habit of skepticism of which he afterwards cured himself. The result of his meditations was committed to a volume (Περὶ φύσεως), the obscurity of which procured for him the appellation of σκοτεινός. He also made it his object to discover an elemental principle; but either because his views were different, or from a desire to oppose himself to the Eleatme, he assumed it to before, because the most subtle and active of the elements” (Tennemann, Manual History of Philosophy, § 102).

“According to Heraclitus, the end of wisdom is to discover the ground and principle of all things. This principle, which is an eternal, ever-living unity, and pervades and is in all phenomena, he called fire. By this term Heraclitus understood, not the elemental fire or flame, which he held to be the excess of fire, but a warm and dry vapor; which therefore, as air, is not distinct from the soul or vital energy, and which, as guiding and directing the mundane development, is endued with wisdom and intelligence. This supreme and perfect force of life is obviously without limit to its activity; consequently, nothing that it forms can remain fixed; all is constantly in a process of formation. This he has thus figuratively expressed: ‘No one has ever been twice on the same stream.' Nay, the passenger himself is without identity: ‘On the same stream we do and we do not embark; for we are and  we are not.' The vitality of the rational fire has in it a tendency to contraries, whereby it is made to pass from gratification to want, and from want to gratification, and in fixed periods it alternates between a swifter and a slower flux. Now these opposite tendencies meet together in determinate order, and by the inequality or equality of the forces occasion the phenomena of life and death. The quietude of death, however, is a mere semblance which exists only for the senses of man. For man in his folly forms a truth of his own, whereas it is only the universal reason that is really cognizant of the truth. Lastly the rational principle which governs the whole moral and physical world is also, the law of the individual; whatever, therefore, is, is the wisest and the best; and ‘it is not for man's welfare that his wishes should be fulfilled; sickness makes health pleasant, as hunger does gratification, and labor rest.' The physical doctrines of Heraclitus formed no inconsiderable portion of the eclectical system of the later Stoics, and in times still more recent there is much in the theories of Schelling and Hegel that presents a striking though general resemblance thereto.” Hegel declared that the doctrine of Heraclitus, that all things are “perpetual flux and reflux,” was an anticipation of his own dogma, “Being is the same with non-being.” “The fragments of Heraclitus have been collected from Plutarch, Stobaeus, Clenens of Alexandria, and Sextus Empiricus, and explained by Schleiermacher in Wolf and Buttmann's Museum der Aitherthusmswissenschcft, vol. 1” (English Cyclopedia). Professor Bernays, of Bonn, gathered from Hippocrates a series of quotations from Heraclitus, and published them under the title Heraclitea (1848). The epistles which bear the name of Heraclitus are spurious; they are given, with valuable notes and dissertations, in Die Heraclitischen Briefe, ein Beitrag z. philos. u. relig. Lit. (Berl. 1869). See Smith, Dict. (f Class. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Lewes, Hist. of Philos. 1867, 1, 65 sq.; Lassalle, Die Philosophie el. Herakleitos (Berlin, 1858). Heraclius. SEE MONOTHIELITE. Herald only occurs in Dan 3:4; the term there used (כָּרוֹז, ז6ראכ) is connected etymologically (Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 712) with the Greek κηρύσσω and κράζω, and with our “cry;” There is an evident allusion to the office of the herald in the expressions κηρύσσω, κράυζ, and κήρυγμα, which are frequent in the N.T., and which are but inadequately rendered by “preach,” etc. The term “herald” might be substituted in 1Ti 2:7 : 2Ti 1:11; 2Pe 2:5, as there is evidently in these passages an allusion to the Grecian games (q.v.). Herb is the rendering of the following terms in the Auth. Vers. of the Bible: usually עֵשֶׂב, e'seb, any green plant or herbage collectively, often  rendered “grass;” applied generally to annual plants without woody stems, growing in the fields (Gen 2:5; Gen 3:18; Exo 9:22; Exo 10:12; Exo 10:15) and on mountains (Isa 42:15; Pro 27:25), growing up and setting seed (Gen 1:11-12; Gen 1:29), and serving as food for man (Gen 1:30; Gen 3:18; Psa 104:14) and for beast (Deu 11:15; Psa 106:20; Jer 14:6; Dan 4:15; Dan 4:23; Dan 4:32-33; Dan 5:21); comprehending, therefore, vegetables, greens, and sometimes all green herbage (Amo 7:1-2). Men are said to “flourish as a green herb” (Psa 72:16; Psa 92:7; Job 5:25); also to wither (Psa 102:4; Psa 102:11). Hence, too) those seized with fear and turning pale (Gr. χλωροί) are compared to the herb. of the field which grows yellow and withers (2Ki 19:26; Isa 37:27). יָרָק, yarak', properly signifies green, and is applied to any green thing, verdure, foliage of fields and trees (2Ki 19:26; Isa 37:27; Isa 15:6, Exo 10:15; Num 22:4; Psa 37:2; Gen 1:30; Gen 9:3); specially a plant, herb (Deu 11:10; 1Ki 21:2); a portion of herbs, vegetables (Pro 15:17). דֶּשֶׁא de'she, and

חָצַיר, chatsir' properly designate ῥ grass, the first when young and tender, the latter when grown and fit for mowing. SEE BOTANY. אוֹר, 6r (lit. light), in the fern. אוֹרָה, orah', plural אוֹרוֹת, oro'th', “occurs in two passages of Scripture, where it is translated herb in the Auth.Vers.: it is generally supposed to indicate such plants as are employed for food. The most ancient translators seem, however, to have been at a loss for its meaning. Thus the Sept. in one passage (2Ki 4:39) has only the Heb. word in Greek characters, ἀριώθ, and in the other (Isa 26:19) ἴαμα, healing. The Vulg., and the Chaldee and Syriac versions, translate oroth in the latter passage by light, in consequence of confounding one Heb. word with another, according to Celsius (Hierobot. 1, 459). Rosenmüller says that oroth occurs in its original and generic signification in Isa 26:19, viz. green herbs. The future restoration of the Hebrew people is there announced under the type and figure of a revival of the dead. Thy dew is a dew of green herbs,' says the prophet, i.e. as by the dew green herbs are revived, so shalt thou, being revived by God's strengthening power, flourish again. The other passage, however appears an obscure one with respect to the meaning of oroth. Celsius has, with his usual learning, shown that mallows were much employed as food in ancient times. Of this there can be no doubt, but there is no proof adduced that  oroth means mallows; there are many other plants which were and still are employed as articles of diet in the East, as purslane, goosefoot, chenpodiums, lettuce, endive, etc. But oroth should be considered in conjunction with pakyoth; for we find in 2Ki 4:39, that when Elisha came again to Gilgal, and there was a dearth in the land, he said unto his servant, ‘Set on the great pot, and seethe pottage for the sons of the prophets; and one went out into the field to gather herbs (oroth), and found a wild vine, and gathered thereof wild gourds (pak-yoth) his lap full, and came and shred them into the pot of pottage, for they knew them not.' As pakyoth is universally acknowledged to be the fruit of one of the gourd tribe, so it is not unreasonable to conclude that oroth also was the fruit of some plant, for which the pakyoth had been mistaken. This may be admitted, as nothing better than conjecture has been adduced in support of other interpretations, and as there are fruits, such as that of the egg-plant, which are used as articles of diet, and for which the fruit of the pakyoth, or wild gourd, might have been mistaken by an ignorant person” (Kitto). But perhaps, as this was a time of great famine, the servant went out to gather any green vegetable likely to contribute towards the savoriness and nutritiousness of the broth, and his mistake may have arisen not so much from any resemblance between the pakyoth and any particular kind of oroth of which he was in quest, but rather from indiscriminately seizing whatever vegetable he met with, without knowing its noxious properties. Thus we may regard oroth in both passages as a general designation of esculent plants, in this case wild ones. SEE GOURD.

The “bitter herbs” (מְרֹרַים, merorim') with which the Israelites were commanded to eat the Passover bread (Exo 2:8; Num 9:11 : the same Heb. word occurs also in Lam 3:15, “He hath filled me with bitterness, he hath made me drunken with wormwood”) doubtless in general “included the various edible kinds of bitter plants, whether cultivated or wild, which the Israelites could with facility obtain in sufficient abundance to supply their number either in Egypt, where the first Passover was eaten, or in the deserts of the peninsula of Sinai, or in Palestine. The Mishna (Pesachim. c. 2, § 6) enumerates five kinds of bitter herbschazereth, ‘ulshin, thamcah, charchabina, and maror — which it was lawful to eat either green or dried. There is great difficulty in identifying the plants which these words respectively denote, but the reader may see the subject discussed by Bochart (Hieroz. 1, 691, ed. Rosenmüller) and by Carpzovius (Apparat. Hist. Crit. p. 402). According to the testimony of  Forskal, in Niebuhr's Preface to the Description de I'Arabie (p. 44), the modern Jews of Arabia and Egypt eat lettuce, or, if this is not at hand, bugloss, with the Paschal lamb. The Greek word ρχ-πι is identified by Sprengel (Hist. Rei Herb. 1, 100) with the Helminthia echioides, Lin., bristly helminthia (ox-tongue), a plant belonging to the chicory group. The Picris of botanists is a genus closely allied to the Helminthia. Aben Esra, in Celsius (Hierob. 2, 227), remarks that, according to the observations of a certain learned Spaniard, the ancient Egyptians always used to place different kinds of herbs upon the table, with mustard, and that they dipped morsels of bread into this salad. That the Jews derived this custom of eating herbs with their meat from the Egyptians is extremely probable, for it is easy to see how, on the one name, the bitter-herb salad should remind the Jews of the bitterness of their bondage (Exo 1:14), and, on the other hand, how it should also bring to their remembrance their merciful deliverance from it. It is curious to observe, in connection with the remarks of Aben Esra, the custom, for such it appears to have been, of dipping a morsel of bread into the dish (τὸ τρυβλίον) which prevailed in our Lord's time. May not τὸ τρύβλιον be the salad-dish of bitter herbs, and τὸ ψσώμιον the morsel of bread of which Aben Esra speaks? The merdrim may well be understood to denote various sorts of bitter plants, such particularly as belong to the crucifers, as some of the bitter cresses, or to the chicory group of the compositae, the hawkweeds, and sow-thistles, and wild lettuces, which grow abundantly in the peninsula of Sinai, in Palestine, and in Egypt (Decaisne, Florula Sinaica, in Annal. des Scienc. Nat. 1834; Strand, Flor. Palaest. No. 445, etc.)” SEE BITTER HERBS.

## Heraclius[[@Headword:Heraclius]]

             (Eraclius or Eradius), bishop elect of Hippo, was designed by Augustine, September 26, 426, to become his successor, but owing to some irregularity he was never inaugurated into that office, and the fall of Hippo into the hands of the Vandals abolished the see. There are attributed to Heraclius two sermons found among those of St. Augustine. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v.

## Heraclius (2)[[@Headword:Heraclius (2)]]

             (Eracle or Everard), sixteenth bishop of Liege, was of a distinguished Saxon family, and was educated at Cologne under the care of Rathier, bishop of Liege. He became provost at the Collegiate Church of Bonn, and entered upon the episcopal see of Liege in 959. He devoted his attention entirely to the cause of education, establishing new schools, and placing at their head wise men, whom he called from Germany and from France. In 960 he became involved in political troubles, during which he died in 971. There is extant of him a letter, written about 943, to Rathier, bishop of  Verona, on the miraculous healing of a cancer. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Heranasikha[[@Headword:Heranasikha]]

             (from the Singhalese, herana, a novice, and sikha, a rule or precept), a formulary required to be committed to memory by the Buddhist priest during his novitiate. It contains a number of obligations which the young priest takes upon himself.

## Herbart, Johann Friedrich[[@Headword:Herbart, Johann Friedrich]]

             an eminent German philosopher, was born at Oldenburg May 4, 1776. He became professor of philosophy in the University of Göttingen in 1805, afterwards at Kinigsberg in 1809, and finally returned to Göttingen in 1833. He died there, Aug. 14, 1841. His most important works are: Kurze Darstellung eines Planes z. philosoph. Vorlesungen (Gött. 1804): — Deplatonici systematis fundamento (Gött. 1805): — Allg. praktische Philosophie (Getting. 1808): Hauptpunkte d. Metaphysik (Gött. 1808): — Lehrbuch z. Einleitung in d. Philos. (Konigsb. 1815; 4th ed. 1841): Lehrbuch d. Psychologie (Konigsb. 1816; 3rd ed. 1834): Psychologie als Wissenschaft (Königsberg. 1824,2 parts): — Allg. Metaphysik (Konigsb. 1828, 2 parts; 2nd ed. Halle, 1841): — Gesprache i. d. Bose (Konigsb. 1817): — Encyk. d. Philosophie (Konigsb. 1831; 2nd ed. 1841): —  Analytische Beleuchtung d. Naturrechtes u. d. Moral (Götting. 1836): — Zur Lehre von der Freiheit d. menschl. Willens (Gött. 1836): — Psychologische Untersuchungen (Götting. 1839,2 vols.). Herbart's philosophical essays and pamphlets were published by Hartenstein (Lpz. 1841-43, 3 vols.), who also published a complete collection of his works (Sammtliche Werke, Lpz. 1850-52, 12 vols.).

Herbart was at first a Kantian, but afterwards, influenced by the study of ancient Greek philosophy, he created a philosophical system of his own, which is distinguished by ingenuity above all the other post-Kantian systems. “Although Herbart occasionally professes to be a follower of Kant, still he is of opinion that Kant's Criticism of Pure Reason is almost without any objective value, and that its method must be entirely abandoned if metaphysics are to be founded on a secure and permanent basis. Herbart's realistic tendency further reminds us of the monades of Leibnitz. Philosophy, according to Herbart, has not, like ordinary sciences, any particular set of subjects which are its province, but it consists in the manner and method in which any subject whatsoever is treated. The subjects themselves are supposed to be known, and are called by him ‘notions' (Begriffe), so that philosophy is the methodical treatment and working out of those ‘notions.' The different methods of treatment constitute the main departments of philosophy. The first of them is logic, which considers the nature and clearness of notions and their combinations. But the contemplation of the world and of ourselves brings before us notions which cause a discord in our thoughts. This circumstance renders it necessary for us to modify or change those notions according to the particular nature of each. By the process of modification or change something new is added, which Herbart calls the supplement or complement (Erganzung). Now the second main department of philosophy is metaphysics, which Herbart defines to be the science of the supplementary notions. The method of discovering the supplementary notions which are necessary in order to render given facts which contain contradictory notions intelligible, is, according to him, the method of relations, and it is by this method alone that the other notions of the world and of ourselves can be properly defined. Hence arises what he calls practical metaphysics, which is subdivided into psychology, the philosophy of nature, and natural theology. A third class of notions, lastly, add something to our conceptions, which produces either pleasure or displeasure, and the science of these notions is aesthetics, which, when  applied to given things, forms a series of theories of art, which may be termed practical sciences.

They are founded upon certain model notions, such as the ideas of perfection, benevolence, malevolence, justice, compensation, equity, and the like. In his metaphysics Herbart points out three problems containing contradictions, viz. things with several attributes, change, and our own subjectivity (das Ich). In order to solve these contradictions, and to make the external and internal world agree and harmonize so as to become conceivable, he assumes that the quantity of everything existing (des Seienden) is absolutely simple. Things therefore which exist have no attributes referring to space and time, but they stand in relation to a something, which is the essence of things. Wherever this essence consists of a plurality of attributes there must also be a plurality of things or beings, and these many simple things or beings are the principles of all things in nature, and the latter, consequently, are nothing but aggregates of simple things. They exist by themselves in space so far as it is conceived by our intellect, but not in physical space, which contains only bodies. We do not know the real simple essence of things, but we may acquire a certain amount of knowledge concerning internal and external relations. When they accidentally meet in space they disturb one another, but at the same time strive to preserve themselves; and in this manner they manifest themselves as powers, although they neither are powers nor have powers. By means of these principles Herbart endeavors to reform the whole system of psychology which he found established by his predecessors; for, according to him, the soul, too, is a simple being, and as such it is and remains unknown to us; and it is neither a subject for speculation nor for experimental psychology. It never and nowhere has any plurality of attributes, nor has it any power or faculty of receiving or producing anything; and the various faculties usually mentioned by psychologists such as imagination, reason, etc., which sometimes are at war and sometimes in concord with each other, are, according to Herbart, mere fictions of philosophers. In like manner he denies that it possesses certain forms of thought or laws regulating our desires and actions. The soul as a simple being, and in its accidental association with others, is like the latter subject to disturbance, and exerts itself for its own preservation. The latter point is the principal question in Herbart's psychology, and he endeavors to deduce and calculate the whole life of the soul, with the aid of mathematics, from those mutual disturbances, ‘checks, and from its reactions against them. Hence he is obliged to deny man's moral or transcendental freedom, although he allows him a certain free character. He  maintains the immortality of the soul, because the simple principles of all things are eternal; but he denies the possibility of acquiring any knowledge whatever of the Deity” (English Cyclopedia, s.v.). On the whole, it may be said that Herbart was a careful observer of psychological phenomena; but that speculation, in the proper sense, was not congenial to him. See also Thilo, Die Wissenschaftlich Zeit der mod. specul. Theologie, etc. (Leipsic, 1851, 8vo); Tennemann, Manual Hist. of Philosophy, p. 462; Morell, History of Modern Philosophy, p. 482-489; Schwegler, Epit. Hist. Phil., transl. by Seelye, p. 304 sq.; Hollenberg, in Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 19, 630 sq.

## Herbelot, Bartholomew D (or DHerbelot)[[@Headword:Herbelot, Bartholomew D (or DHerbelot)]]

             a distinguished French Orientalist, was born at Paris Dec. 4, 1625. He studied at the University of his native city, where he acquired a good knowledge of Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, Persian, and Turkish. He then visited Italy, in order to establish relations with the people of the Oriental countries, of which there were a large number at Genoa, Leghorn, and Venice. At Rome he became acquainted with Lucas Holstenius and Leo Allatins, and was highly esteemed by the cardinals Barberini and Grimaldi, as well as by queen Christina of Sweden. On his return to France he received a pension of 1500 francs from Fouquet, and was afterwards appointed royal secretary and interpreter of Oriental languages at Paris. On a second journey to Italy in 1666, the grand duke of Tuscany, Ferdinand II, endeavored to persuade him to remain, and presented him with a number of Eastern MSS., but in vain. He returned to Paris, where Colbert granted him again a pension of 1500 francs, and Louis XIV appointed him professor of Syriac at the College of France, after the death of James d'Auvergne in 169-2. Herbelot died Dec. 8,1695. He wrote Bibliothéque Orientale. ouv Dictionnaire universal contenant tout ce quifait connaitre les peuples dle l'Orient. It was published after his death by Ant. Galland (Paris, 1697, fol.; Maestricht, 1776, fol.; supplement, 1781, etc.; best ed. Par. 1782, 8vo). The title of this work gives a good idea of its character: it is a storehouse of whatever belongs to Oriental literature. The book, however, is merely a translation of passages, alphabetically arranged, from Hadji Khalfah's-bibliographical dictionary, and of some hundred and fifty MSS. Herbelot did not take the trouble to compare their statements with those of other writers, so that it contains only the views of the Mohammedans on themselves and their neighbors. Yet it is a very useful work for students and being the only one of its kind, is still highly  considered. Desessarts has given a popular abridgment of it (Paris, 1782, 6 vols. 8vo); it was translated into German by Schultz (Halle, 1785-1790, 4 vols. roy. 8vo). Herbelot wrote also a catalogue of part of the MSS. contained in the Palatine Library at Florence, which was translated from Italian into Latin, and is to be found in Schellhorn's Amenitates litterarios. See Cousin, Eloge de D'iHerbelot (in the Journal des Savants, Jan. 3rd, 1696); Perratult, Homes illustres, 2, 154-158; Goujet, Mem. sur le College de ,France, 3, 155-158; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 283. (J.N.P.)

## Herberger, Valerius[[@Headword:Herberger, Valerius]]

             a Lutheran theologian was born at Fraustadt, Prussian Poland, April 21, 1562, and died there, May 18, 1627. He was a teacher in his native place in 1584, deacon in 1590, and pastor in 1598. His publications are still highly prized in the German Evangelical Church. He wrote, Evangelische Herzpostille (new ed. Berlin, 1853): — Epistolische Herzpostille (ibid): — Geistreiche Stoppelpostille: — Magnalia Dei De Jesu Scripturie Nucleo et Medulla (Halle, 1854): — Passionszeiger (ibid. 1858): — Geistliche Trauerbinden: — Psalterparadies: — Erklarung des Jesus Sirach. See Lauterbach, Vita, Fama et Fata Valerii Herbergeri (1708); Ledderhose, Leben Valerius Herbergers, in the Sontagsbibliothek, volume 4, parts 5 and 6 (Bielefeld, 1851); Specht, Geschichte der evangelisch lutherischen Genzeinde zu Fraustadt (1855); Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:540; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Herberne[[@Headword:Herberne]]

             bishop of Tours, lived about the 9th century. He had been at first custodian of the Oratory of the Seven Sleepers, a dependency of Marmoutier, afterwards abbot of that monastery, which, however, is said to have been invested by the Normans in 853. He thens travelled through Gaul, but finding no safe asylum, finally reappeared in the city of Tours, where he was received as a saint. Adalard, archbishop of Tours, died in 800, and Herberne was designated to succeed him. After the desolation of Marmoutier, the Regular Canons established themselves in the deserted cloister there, and Herberne failed to drive them away. He died in 916. Some critics attributed to him the Tractatus de Reversione S. Martini, which was published in the Bibliotheique de Cluny. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Herberstein, Johann Carl Graf Von[[@Headword:Herberstein, Johann Carl Graf Von]]

             a German count and prelate, was born in 1722. He became bishop of Laybach in 1772, and was one of the most ardent promoters of the ecclesiastical innovations of his day. Pending negotiations with: the pope for his promotion to the archbishopric, he died, October 7, 1787, leaving his goods to the poor and to the. normal school of his episcopal city. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Herbert[[@Headword:Herbert]]

             a Scotch prelate, was abbot of Kelso, and chancellor of the kingdom. He was consecrated bishop of Glasgow in 1147, by pope Eugenius III. He died bishop of this see, in 1164. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 232.

## Herbert (2)[[@Headword:Herbert (2)]]

             a French prelate, was born at Vouvnay, in Maine. He was at first prior of Clermont, in Maine, and then abbot of Fontaines-les-Blanches, in the diocese of Tours. Having got into a quarrel with Thibauld, count of Blois, he returned to Maine, where he became abbot of Clermont in 1179. Finally, in 1184, he was made bishop of Rennes; in 1190 he accompanied Richard, king of England, to Domfront. While at Rennes he had a difference with Andrew, lord of Vitr, whom he excommunicated until he obtained his entire submission. In 1198 the pope sent him to Bourgueil, on the frontier of Tours, to restore the good order of that monastery. He died at Relnnes, December 11, 1198. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Herbert De Losing[[@Headword:Herbert De Losing]]

             a Norman prelate, was born at Hiesmes (pagus Oximiensis), in Normandy, about the middle of the 11th century. He was a monk, and afterwards prior of the abbey of Fecamp. William Rufus called him to England in 1087, and  made him abbot of Ramsey. By the royal favor, or some other means, Herbert became so rich that, in 1091, he bought from the king, for the price of 1000. livres, the bishopric of Thetford for himself, and the abbey of Winchester for his brother Robert. This most scandalous transaction was generally censured, and Herbert went to Rome to seek absolution from his simony. On his return to England he transferred the episcopal seat of Thetford to Norwich. At Thetford he founded a convent of monks of Cluny, and built a cathedral; also a monastery and two churches at Norwich, three churches at Elmham, at Lynn, and at Yarmouth. The last years of his life Herbert consecrated to the establishment of. ecclesiastical discipline, thus effacing the spot upon his entry into the episcopacy. William of Malmesburv speaks of Herbert as a man of great knowledge, and Henry of Huntingdon makes mention of his writings. He died July 22, 1119. According to Bayle, he composed a book of Sermons, eighteen in number, two treatises, De Prolixitate Temporum et De Fine Mundi, monastic rules, a collection of letters, and a treatise, Ad Anselum, etc., for which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Herbert OF BOSHAM[[@Headword:Herbert OF BOSHAM]]

             was born at Bosham, Sussex, and being a good scholar, was a manuzbus to Thomas a Becket, archbishop of Canterbury. He was present at the murder of that prelate, and wrote an account of it. Going over to Italy, he was by pope Alexander III made archbishop of Beneventum. and in December, 1178, created cardinal. The date of his death is unknown. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 3:244.

## Herbert, Edward (Lord Herbert of Cherbury)[[@Headword:Herbert, Edward (Lord Herbert of Cherbury)]]

             a distinguished English Deist, was born at Eyton, Shrewsbury, in 1581 or 1582. He was educated at Oxford, served with great credit in the war in the Netherlands, and on his return became one of the most accomplished gentlemen at the court of James I, who made him a knight of the Bath, and sent him minister to France in 1618. On a second mission to France he published a work embodying the principles of deism, entitled Tractatus de Veritate, prout distinguitur a Revelatione, etc. (Paris, 1624, 4to). In 1631 he was made a peer. In 1645 he published, a new edition of the Tractatus, adding to it his De Religione Gentilium (also published separately at Amsterdam, 1663, 4to; and in an English translation, by Lewis, The Ancient Religion of the Gentiles, London, 1705, 8vo). He died at London Aug. 20, 1648. His Life, written by himself, and continued to his death, was published by Horace Walpole (London, 1764; new edition, with additions, London, 1826, 8vo).

“Herbert of Cherbury was the contemporary of Hobbes of Malmesbury, to whose principles of philosophizing he was directly opposed, notwithstanding the striking coincidence of many of the results at which they respectively arrived. He maintained the theory of innate ideas, and made a certain instinct of the reason (rationalis instinctus) to be the primary source of all human knowledge. Accordingly he did not, with Aristotle and the Stoics, compare the mind to a pure tablet, or to the tabula rasa of the schoolmen, but to a closed volume which opens itself at the solicitation of outward nature acting upon the senses. Thus acted upon, the mind produces out of itself certain general or universal principles (communes notiones), by reference to which all debatable questions in theology and philosophy may be determined, since upon these principles, at least, all men are unanimous. Consistently with these views, he does: not, with Hobbes, make religion to be founded on revelation or historical tradition, but upon  an immediate consciousness of God and of divine things. The religion of reason, therefore, resting on such grounds, is, he argues, the criterion of every positive religion which claims a foundation in revelation. No man can appeal to revelation as an immediate evidence of the reasonableness of his faith, except those to whom that revelation has been directly given; for all others, the fact of revelation is a matter of mere tradition or testimony. Even the recipient of a revelation may himself be easily deceived, since he possesses no means of convincing himself of the reality or authenticity of his admitted revelation. Herbert made his own religion of reason to rest upon the following grounds: There is a God whom man ought to honor and reverence; a life of holiness is the most acceptable worship that can be offered him; sinners must repent of their sins, and strive to become better; and after death every one must expect the rewards or penalties befitting the acts of this life. Lord Herbert is one of the numerous instances on record of the little influence which speculative opinions exercise upon the conduct of life. Maintaining that no revelation is credible which is imparted to a portion only of mankind, he nevertheless claims the belief of his hearers when he tells them that his doubts as to the publication of his work were removed by a direct manifestation of the divine will” (English Cyclopedia).

He states the phenomena of this revelation as follows: “Thus filled with doubts. I was, on a bright summer day, sitting in my room; my window to the south was open; the sun shone brightly; not a breeze was stirring. I took my book On Truth into my hand, threw myself on my knees, and prayed devoutly in these words: ‘O thou one God, thou author of this light which now shines upon me, thou giver of all inward light which now shines upon me, thou giver of all inward light, I implore thee, according to thine infinite mercy, to pardon my request, which is greater than a sinner should make. I am not sufficiently convinced whether I may publish this book or not. If its publication shall be for thy glory, I beseech thee to give me a sign from heaven; if not, I will suppress it.' I had scarcely finished these words when a loud, and yet, at the same time, a gentle sound came from heaven, not like any sound on earth. This comforted me in such a manner, and gave me such satisfaction, that I considered my prayer as having been heard.” His style is very obscure, and his writings have been but little read, in spite of the talent and subtlety of thought which they evince. He is properly regarded as the founder of the school of English Deists, although he was himself a skeptic of a very high and pure sort rather than an infidel. Herbert did not profess, in his writings, to oppose Christianity, but held that his “five articles” embraced the substance of what is taught in the Scriptures.  “The ideas which his writings contributed to Deistical speculation are two, viz. the examination of the universal principles of religion, and the appeal to an internal illuminating influence superior to revelation, ‘the inward light,' as the test of religious truth. This was a phrase not uncommon in the 17th century. It was used by the Puritans to mark the appeal to the spiritual instincts, the heaven-taught feelings; and, later, by mystics, like the founder of the Quakers, to imply an appeal to an internal sense. But in Herbert it differs from these in being universal, not restricted to a few persons, and in being intellectual rather than emotional or spiritual” (Farrar, Critical History, p. 120). For an examination and refutation of his theory of religion, see Leland, Deistical Writers, letter 1, and Halyburton, Nat. Religion (Works, 1835, 8vo, p. 253). See also Kortholt, De Tribus impostoribus (Herbert, Hobbes, Spinoza; Hamb. 1701, 4to); Van Mildert, Boyle Lectures, 1838; Remusati Revue des deux Mondes, 1854, p. 692; Farrar, Critical Hist. of Free Thought, lect. iv; Shedd, Hist. of Doctrines bk. 2, ch. 4:§ 2; Contemporary Review, July, 1869.

## Herbert, George[[@Headword:Herbert, George]]

             brother of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, was born at Montgomery Castle April 3,1593. He was educated at Cambridge, where he became a fellow in 1615. In the year 1619 he was made university orator, and a letter of thanks which he wrote in that capacity to James I excited the monarch's attention, who declared him to be the jewel of that university, and gave him a sinecure of £120 per eannum. He became intimate with Bacon and Wotton and had prospects of great success in public life, but the death of his friends, the duke of Richmond and the marquis of Hamilton, followed by that of king James, frustrated these expectations, and Herbert determined to devote himself to the ministry. He was accordingly ordained, and in 1626 was made prebendary of Layton, in the diocese of Lincoln. In 1630 he became rector of Bemerton, near Salisbury. A quotidian agile soon destroyed his health, and he died March 3, 1633. George Herbert's piety was humble and profound. He was zealous in his pastoral duties; an undue reverence for ceremonies, as such, was his chief failing. A beautiful sketch of him is given on Walton's Lives (often reprinted). “Men like George Herbert are rare. It is not his wide learning, nor his refined taste; not his high spirit nor his amiability, nor his strictness of life; but the rare combination in one person of qualities so diversely beautiful. He was master of all learning, human and divine; yet his learning is not what strikes the reader most, it is so thoroughly controlled and subordinated by his  lively wit and practical wisdom. He was a man of extraordinary endowments, both personal and such as belonged to his rank, not lost in indolence, nor wasted in trivialities, but all combined and cultivated to the utmost, and then devoted to the highest purposes” (Christian Remembrancer, 1862, p. 137). His writings include The Temple: sacred Poems and private Ejaculations (Lond. 1633,12mo; and many editions since, in various forms): — The Country Parson, his Character and Rule of holy Life (many editions). There are several editions of his complete works, such as, Works, Prose and Verse, with Walton's Life and Coleridge's Notes (London, 1846, 2 vols. 12mo); Works, with Sketch of his Life by Jerdan (1853, small 8vo; not. including all of Herbert's works); Works, Prose and Verse, edited by Willmott (1854, 8vo); Life and Writings of G. Herbert (Boston, 1851, 12mo). The best edition of his Works is Pickering's (Lond. 1850, 2 vols.). See Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 829; Middleton, Evangelical Biography, 3, 48; Christian Examiner, vol. 51; Brit. Quarterly Review, April 1854, art. 2.

## Herbert, William, D.C.L[[@Headword:Herbert, William, D.C.L]]

             an English clergyman, was born at Highclere Castle, Bucks, in 1778, and educated at Eton, and at Christ Church and Merton Colleges, Oxford. He took holy orders in 1814, was presented to the rectory of Spofforth, appointed dean of Manchester in 1840, and died in 1847. He published, The Triumphs of Christianity: — Sermons (1820): — The Spectre of the Tomb, etc. See Allibone, Diet. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Herbinius, John[[@Headword:Herbinius, John]]

             was born at Bitschen, in Silesia, in 1632, and was deputed by the Polish Protestant churches to those of Germany, Holland, etc., in 1664. He died in 1676. Among his works is De Statu Ecclesiarum Augustanae Confessionis im Polonia (1670). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Herbst, Ferdinand Ignatius[[@Headword:Herbst, Ferdinand Ignatius]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born of Protestant parentage at Leipsic in 1798. He studied at Jena and Erlangen, joined the church of Rome in 1832, and was preacher at Munich, where he died, May 11, 1865. He published, Bibliothek Christlicher Denker (Leipsic. 1830-32, 2 vols.): — Die Kirche und ihre Gegner (Ratisbon, 1833): — Antwort auf  das Sendschreiben eines Gliedes der evangelischen Kirche, etc. (Landshut, eod.). See Winer Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:351; Zuchold, Bibl.Theol. 1:541. (B.P.)

## Herbst, Johann George[[@Headword:Herbst, Johann George]]

             a German Benedictine, was born at Rottweil, Wurtemberg, January 13, 1787. In 1812 he received holy orders, was professor of theology at Ellwangen in 1814, in 1817 at Tubingen, and died July 31,1836. He published, Observationes Quaedam de Pezntateucho: — De Lingua Hebr. הבet בה: — Einleitung in die heil. Schriften des Alten Testaments (Freiburg, 1840-42, 2 volumes). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:385; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hercules[[@Headword:Hercules]]

             ( ῾Ηρακλῆς) is mentioned in 2Ma 4:19 as the Tyrian god to whom the Jewish high-priest Jason sent a religious embassy (θεωροί), with the offering of 300 drachmae of silver. That this Tyrian Hercules (Herod. ii, 44) is the same as the Tyrian Baal is evident from a bilingual Phoenician inscription found at Malta (described by Gesenius, Monum. Ling. Phaen. 1, 96), in which the Phoenician words, “To our Lord, to Melkarth, the Baal of Tyre,” are represented by the Greek ῾Ηρακλεῖ Α᾿ρχηγέτει. Moreover, Herakles and Astarte are mentioned together by Josephus (Anf. 8, 5, 3), just in the same manner as Baal and Ashtoreth are in the Old Testament. The further identity of this Tyrian Baal with the Baal whom the idolatrous Israelites worshipped is evinced by the following arguments, as stated chiefly by Movers (Die Phonicier, 1, 178). The worship of Baal, which prevailed in the time of the Judges, was put down by Samuel (1Sa 7:4), and the effects of that suppression appear to have lasted through the next few centuries, as Baal is not enumerated among the idols of Solomon (1Ki 11:5-8; 2Ki 23:13),. nor among those worshipped in Judah (2Ki 23:12), or in Samaria, where we only read of the golden calves of Jeroboam (1Ki 12:28; 1Ki 15:26). That worship of Baal which prevailed in the reign of Ahab cannot, therefore, be regarded as a mere continuation or revival of the old Canaanitish idolatry (although there is no reason to doubt the essential identity of both Baals), but was introduced  directly from Phoenicia by Ahab's marriage with the Sidonian princess Jezebel (1Ki 16:31). In like manner, the establishment of this idolatry in Judah is ascribed to the marriage of the king with a daughter of Jezebel (comp. Josephus, Ant. 8, 13, 1; 9:6, 6).

The power of nature, which was worshipped under the form of the Tyrian Hercules, Melkarth, Baal, Adonis, Moloch, and whatever his other names are, was that which originates, sustains, and destroys life. These functions of the Deity, according to the Phoenicians, were represented, although not exclusively, by the sun, the influence of which both animates vegetation by its genial warmth, and scorches it up by its fervor (see Davis, Carthage, p. 276-9).

Almost all that we know of the worship of the Tyrian Hercules is preserved by the classical writers, and relates chiefly to the Phoenician colonies, and not to the mother state. The eagle, the lion, and the thunny-fish were sacred to him, and are often found on Phoenician coins. Pliny expressly testifies that human sacrifices were offered up every year to the Carthaginian Hercules (Hist. Nat. 36, 5, 12), which coincides with what is stated of Baal in Jer 19:5, and with the acknowledged worship of Moloch. Mention is made of public embassies sent from the colonies to the mother state to honor the national god (Arrian, Alex. 2, 24; Q. Curt. 4:2; Polyb. 31:20), and this fact places in a clearer light the offence of Jason in sending envoys to his festival (2Ma 4:19).

Movers endeavors to show that Herakles and Hercules are not merely Greek and Latin synonymes for this god, but that they are actually derived from his true Phoenician name. This original name he supposes to have consisted of the syllables אר (as found in ארי, lion, and in other words), meaning strong, and כל, from יכל, to conquer; so that the compound means Arconquers. This harmonizes with what he conceives to be the idea represented by Hercules as the destroyer of Typhonic monsters (1. c. p. 430). Melkarth, the Μελίκαρθος of Sanchoniathon, occurs on coins only in the form מלקרת. We must in this case assume that a kaph has been absorbed, and resolve the word into קרתא מלךְ, king of the city, πολιοῦχος. The bilingual inscription renders it by Α᾿ρχηγέτης; and it is a title of the god as the patron of the city. SEE BAAL.

## Herd[[@Headword:Herd]]

             (prop. בָּקָר, of neat cattle; עֵדֶר, a flock of smaller animals; מַקְנֵה, as property; ἀηρλη, a drove). The herd was greatly regarded both in the patriarchal and Mosaic period. Its multiplying was considered as a blessing, and its decrease as a curse (Gen 13:2; Deu 7:14; Deu 28:4; Psa 107:38; Psa 144:14; Jer 51:23). The ox was the most precious stock next to horse and mule, and (since those were rare) the thing of greatest value which was commonly possessed (1Ki 18:5). Hence we see the force of Saul's threat (1Sa 11:7). The herd yielded the most esteemed sacrifice (Num 7:3; Psa 69:31; Isa 66:3); also flesh-meat and milk, chiefly converted, probably, into butter and cheese (Deu 32:14; 2Sa 10:1 to 2Sa 12:29), which such milk yields more copiously than that of small cattle (Arist. Hist. Anim. 3, 20). The full-grown ox is hardly ever slaughtered in Syria; but, both for sacrificial and convivial purposes, the young animal was preferred (Exo 29:1) —perhaps three years might be the age up to which it was so regarded (Gen 15:9) —and is spoken of as a special dainty (Gen 17:8; Amo 6:4; Luk 15:23). The case of Gideon's sacrifice was one of exigency (Jdg 6:25), and exceptional. So that of the people (1Sa 14:32) was an act of wanton excess. The agricultural and general usefulness of the ox in ploughing threshing and as a beast of burden (1Ch 12:40; Isa 46:9, — made such a slaughtering seem wasteful; nor, owing to difficulties of grazing, fattening, etc., is beef the product of an Eastern climate. The animal was broken to service probably in his third year (Isa 15:5; Jer 48:34; comp. Pliny, HI. N. 8, 70, ed. Par.). In the moist season, when grass abounded in the waste lands, especially in the “south” region, herds grazed there; e.g. in Carmel, on the west side of the Dead Sea (1Sa 25:2; 2Ch 26:10). Dothan also, Mishor, and Sharon (Gen 37:17; comp. Robinson, 3:122; Stanley, S. and Pal. p. 247, 260, 484; 1Ch 27:29; Isa 65:10) were favorite pastures. For such purposes Uzziah built towers in the wilderness (2Ch 26:19). Not only grass, but foliage, is acceptable to the ox, and the- woods and hills of Bashan and Gilead afforded both abundantly; on such upland (Psalms 1, 10; Psa 65:12) pastures cattle might graze, as also, of course, by river sides, when driven by the heat from the regions of the “wilderness.”  Especially was the eastern table-land (Eze 39:18; Num 32:4) “a place for cattle,” and the pastoral tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh, who settled there, retained something of the nomadic character and handed down some image of the patriarchal life (Stanley, S. and Pal. p. 324, 325). — Herdsmen in Egypt were a low, perhaps the lowest, caste; hence, as Joseph's kindred, through his position, were brought into contact with the highest castes, they are described as “an abomination;” but of the abundance of cattle in Egypt, and of the care there bestowed on them, there is no doubt (Gen 47:6; Gen 47:17; Exo 9:4; Exo 9:20). Brands were used to distinguish the owners' herds (Wilkinson, 3:8, 195; 4:125-131). So the plague of hail was sent to smite especially the cattle (Psa 78:48), the firstborn of which also were smitten (Exo 12:29). The Israelites departing stipulated for (Exo 10:26) and took “much cattle” with them (Exo 12:38). SEE EXODE. Cattle formed thus one of the traditions of the Israelitish nation in its greatest period, and became almost a part of that greatness. They are the subject of providential care and legislative ordinance (Exo 20:10; Exo 21:28; Exo 34:19; Lev 19:19; Lev 25:7; Deu 11:15; Deu 22:1; Deu 22:4; Deu 22:10; Deu 25:4; Psa 104:14; Isa 30:23; Jon 4:11), and even the Levites, though not holding land, were allowed cattle (Num 35:2-3).

When pasture failed, a mixture of various grains (called, Job 6:5, בְּלַיל, rendered “fodder” in the A.V., and, Isa 30:24, “provender;” compare the Roman farrago and ocymum, Pliny, 18:10 and 42) was used, as also תֶּבֶן, “chopped straw” (Gen 24:25; Isa 11:7; Isa 65:25), which was torn in pieces by the threshing-machine, and used probably for feeding in stalls. These last formed an important adjunct to cattle keeping, being indispensable for shelter at certain seasons (Exo 9:6; Exo 9:19). The herd, after its harvest duty was done, which probably caused it to be in high condition, was especially worth caring for; at the same time, most open pastures would have failed because of the heat. It was then probably stalled, and would continue so until vegetation returned. Hence the failure of “the herd” from “the stalls” is mentioned as a feature of scarcity (Hab 3:17). “Calves of the stall” (Mal 4:2; Pro 15:17) are the objects of watchful care. The Reubenites, etc., bestowed their cattle “in cities” when they passed the Jordan to share the toils of conquest (Deu 3:19), i.e. probably in some pastures closely adjoining, like the “suburbs” appointed for the cattle of the Levites (Num 35:2-3; Jos 21:2). Cattle were ordinarily allowed as a prey in war to the captor (Deu 20:14; Jos 8:2), and the case of Amalek is  exceptional, probably to mark the extreme curse to which that people was devoted (Exo 17:14; 1Sa 15:3). The occupation of herdsman was honorable in early times (Gen 47:6; 1Sa 11:5; 1Ch 27:29; 1Ch 28:1). Saul himself resumed it in the interval of his cares as king; also Doeg was certainly high in his confidence (1Sa 21:7). Pharaoh made some of Joseph's brethren “rulers over his cattle.” David's herd-masters were among his chief officers of state. In Solomon's time the relative importance of the pursuit declined as commerce grew, but it was still extensive (Ecc 2:7; 1Ki 4:23). It must have greatly suffered from the inroads of the enemies to which the country under the later kings of Judah and Israel was exposed. Uzziah, however (2Ch 26:10), and Hezekiah (32:28, 29), resuming command of the open country, revived it. Josiah also seems to have been rich in herds (35:7-9). The prophet Amos at first followed this occupation (Amo 1:1; Amo 7:14). A goad was used (Jdg 3:31; 1Sa 13:21, מִלְמָד, דָּרְבָן), being, as mostly, a staff armed with a spike. For the word Herd as applied to swine, SEE SWINE. On the general subject, Ugolini, 39: De Re Rust. vett. Hebr. c. 2, will be found nearly exhaustive. SEE CATTLE.

## Herder, Felix[[@Headword:Herder, Felix]]

             a Swiss Reformed theologian, was born January 31, 1741, at Zurich, where he studied, and finally died, January 22, 1810. He published, Predigten uber die Geschichte Josephs (Zurich, 1784): — Versuch eines christlichen Religionsunlterrichts (edited by J.J Hess, 1811). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:229, 339. (B.P.)

## Herder, Johann Gottfried von[[@Headword:Herder, Johann Gottfried von]]

             one of the most variously gifted of German writers, was born August 25, 1744, at Mohrungen, in East Prussia, where his father kept a little girls' school. His early training was strict and religious. A preacher named Trescho taught him Greek and Latin; and the pastor's books of theology were devoured by the young student. A complaint in the eyes brought him under the notice of a Russian surgeon, who offered to instruct him in surgery gratis. Herder accepted the offer, but at Konigsberg fainted at the first dissection which he attended, and thereupon resolved to study theology. He gained the acquaintance of persons who appreciated him, and procured him a place as instructor in the Frederick's College at Konigsberg. Here he became intimate with Kant and Hamann, who greatly influenced the development of his mind. With the most indefatigable industry he studied philosophy, natural science, history, and languages, and in 1764 became assistant at the cathedral school at Riga, to which office that also of preacher was attached. Here he laid the foundations of his great celebrity as a pulpit orator. Some literary disputes disgusted him, and he went to France, and was there chosen by the prince of Holstein-  Oldenburg as his traveling companion. He would have gone from France to Italy had he not been arrested by the complaint in his eyes at Strasbourg, where he first became acquainted with Gothe. In 1776 he was called to Weimar as court preacher, and in that little capital, then celebrated as the Athens of Germany, he spent the remainder of his life, respected as a preacher and as an active promoter of education and other public improvements, and laboring unweariedly in his multifarious literary pursuits. He died Dec. 18, 1803. Herder's literary activity was enormous. There is hardly a field of literature which he left unexplored. His collected writings amount to sixty volumes (Sämmtliche Werke, Stuttgardt, 1827-30, 60 vols. 18mo; also 45 vols. 8vo, edited by Heyne and Miller. Tübingen, 1805-1820).

They may be divided into four classes-History, Belles-Lettres, Philosophy, and Theology. In philosophy, Herder was rather an observer than a metaphysician. His reputation in that field rests chiefly on his Ideen zur Geschichte der Menschheit (4th ed. Leips. 1841, 2 vols.), translated into English by Churchill, under the title Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man (2nd edit. London, 1803, 2 vol. 8vo) As a theologian, Herder is noted not for science or system so much as for his freedom of thought and his genial spirit. In some respects he was the precursor of Schleiermacher, and his rationalism, though low enough, was of a totally different school from that of Semler, Paulus, and the neologists generally. He sought especially to render Biblical studies more profitable by making them more free, and by investing them with a human and scientific interest. In his work on the Geist der ebrdischen Poesie (1782; translated by Dr. Marsh, of Vermont, under the title Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, 1833, 2 vols. 12mo), he dwelt especially on the aesthetical and human side of the Bible, which, in his' view, instead of weakening its claims to divine authority, greatly strengthens them. He was the first to show critically the poetical beauties of the Bible, which he did not consider as mere ornaments, but rather as being grounded in the inner nature of the revelation, and not to be separated from a correct view of the inspiration of the contents of the O.T. Though others, Lowth for instance, had already treated this subject of the poetry of the Hebrews, none had seen so deeply into its nature, or shown so plainly the true spirit which pervaded it. By this poetical consideration of the O.T. history, and of the series of religious precepts based on this history, he rid the Bible from the mistakes of such interpreters as Michaelis and others. His älteste Urkunde d. Menschengeschlechts, eine nach Jahrhunderten enthüllte heilige Schrift, which appeared in 1774, revolutionized the system of O.T. exegesis by attempting to treat the  history of creation (Genesis 1) from a different standpoint from the one which generally prevailed. In his Erlaüterungen z. A. T. aus einer neu eröfneten morgenländischen Quelle (the. Zend Avesta), which he published in 1775, he also endeavored to render the exegesis of the N.T. more accurate and profound, by showing the influence of Parseeism on the Hebrew and, incidentally, on the Christian mode of thought. He worked especially on the books of James and Jude, under the title of Briefe zweier Brüder Jesu in unserm Kanon (1775), and on the Apocalypse in Das Buch v. der Zukunft des Herrn (Riga, 1779). In the former work he considers James and Jude as the real brothers of the Lord according to the flesh, while in the second he maintains that the predictions of the Apocalypse were fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem. Herder also wrote on various points of the history of the New-Testament revelation and of Biblical dogmatics, especially in his Christliche Schriften.

In these he treats of the gift of tongues on the first Christian Pentecost; of the resurrection as a point of faith, history, and dogma; of the Redeemer as presented in the three gospels; of the Son of God, the Savior of the world; of the spirit of Christianity; of religion, doctrinal meanings, usages, etc. “One of the chief services of Herder to Christianity was his persistent labor to elevate the pastoral office to its original and proper dignity. He held that the pastor of the church should not be solely a learned critic, but the minister of the common people. In his day the pastor was considered the mere instrument of the state, a sort of theological policeman — a degradation which Herder could hardly permit himself to think of without violent indignation. In his Letters on the Study of Theology, published in 1780, and in subsequent smaller works, he sought to evoke a generation of theologians, who, being imbued with his own ideas of humanity, would betake themselves to the edification of the humble mind. He would eject scholasticism from the study of the Bible, and show to his readers that simplicity of inquiry is the safest way to happy results. He would place the modern pastor, both in his relations to the cause of humanity and in the respect awarded him by the world, close beside the patriarch and prophet of other days; and that man, in his opinion, was not worthy the name of pastor who could neglect the individual requirements of the soul. According to Herder, the theologian should be trained from childhood in the knowledge of the Bible and of practical religion.

Youth should have ever before them the example of pious parents, who were bringing them up with a profound conviction of the doctrines of divine truth. To choose theology for a profession from mercenary aims would preclude all possibility of: pastoral usefulness. ‘Let  prayer and reading the Bible be your morning and evening food,' was his advice to a young preacher. Some of the most eloquent words from his pen were written against the customary moral preaching which so much afflicted him. ‘Why don't you come down from your pulpits,' he asks, ‘for they cannot be of any advantage to you in preaching such things? What is the use of all these Gothic churches, altars, and such matters? No, indeed! Religion, true religion, must return to the exercise of its original functions, or a preacher will become the most indefinite, idle, and indifferent thing on earth. Teachers of religion, true servants of God's word, what have you to do in our century? The harvest is plenteous, but ‘the laborers are few; pray the Lord of the harvest that he will send out laborers who will be something more than bare teachers of wisdom and virtue. More than this, help yourselves!' The counsel given by Herder to others was practiced first by himself. He lived among critical minds, who spurned humble pastoral work, but he felt it his duty, and therefore discharged it to the best of his ability. His preaching was richly lucid, and not directed to the most intelligent portion of his auditors. He took up a plain truth and strove to make it plainer. Yet, while the masses were most benefited by his simplicity of pulpit conversation, those gifted men who thought with him arose from their seats profoundly impressed with the dignity and value of the Gospel. A witty writer of the time, Sturz, gives an account of Herder's preaching that throws some light upon the manner in which the plain, earnest exposition of God's word always affected the indifferent auditor. ‘You should have seen,' says this man, ‘how every rustling sound was hushed and each curious glance was chained upon him in a very few minutes. We were as still as a Moravian congregation. All hearts opened themselves spontaneously; every eye hung upon him and wept unwonted tears; deep sighs escaped from every breast. My dear friend, nobody preaches like him' (Hurst, History of Rationalism, ch. vii). See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 5, 747; Erinnerungen aus d. Leben Hersder's (Tübingen, 1820, 8vo); Quinet, Ideen z. Gesch. (Par. 1834); E.G. Herder, Herder's Character bild (Erlang. 1846, 6 vols.); article by Bancroft, North American Review, July, 1836, p. 216; Menzel, German Literature (American translation, ii, 419); review of Marsh's translation, Christian Examiner, 18:167; Hagenbach, History of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries, translated by Hurst, vol. 2, lectures 1-5.

## Herdman[[@Headword:Herdman]]

             (prop. בּוֹקֵר, a tender of oxen; in distinction from רוֹעֵה, a feeder of sheep; but practically the two occupations were generally united). From the earliest times the Hebrews were a pastoral people. Abraham and his sons were masters of herds and flocks, and were regulated in their movements very much by a regard to the necessities of their cattle, in which their wealth almost entirely consisted. In Egypt the Israelites were known as keepers of cattle. When they left Egypt, they, notwithstanding the oppressions to which they had been subjected, took with them “flocks and herds” (Exo 12:38); and though during their wanderings in the wilderness their stock was in all probability greatly reduced, before they entered Canaan they had so replenished it by their conquests in the pastoral regions beyond Jordan that they took with them a goodly number of animals wherewith to begin their new life in the land that had been promised them. Of that land large tracts were suited for pasturage; certain of the tribes were almost exclusively devoted to pastoral occupations; and traces of a nomadic life among other tribes than those settled on the east of the Jordan are found even as late as the time of the monarchy (compare 1Ch 4:38-43) the pastoral life has always had a charm for the Shemitic peoples; and among them, as well as among other nations, it has always been held in honor.

In the open and spacious fields bordering on the Jordan and in the hill-country of Palestine it is a life of comparative ease and of great independence even in the present day; men possessed of flocks and herds become quietly and gradually rich without any severe exertion or anxiety; and but for feuds among themselves, the oppression of superiors, and the predatory tendency of their less respectable neighbors, their life might flow on in an almost unbroken tranquility. The wealth of sheiks and emirs is measured chiefly by the number of their flocks and herds; and men who would count it an intolerable indignity to be constrained to engage in any handicraft occupation, or even in mercantile adventure, fulfill with pride and satisfaction the duties which their pastoral life imposes upon them. It was the same in ancient times. Job's substance consisted chiefly of cattle, his wealth in which made him the greatest of all the men of the East (Job 1:3). The first two kings of Israel, Saul and David, came from “following the herd” to ascend the throne (1 Samuel 9; 1Sa 11:5; Psa 78:70). Men very great,” like Nabal, derived their riches from their flocks, and themselves superintended the operations connected with the care of them (1Sa 25:2 sq.). Absalom, the prince of Israel, had a sheep-farm,  and personally occupied himself with its duties (2Sa 13:23). Mesha, king of Moab, was “a sheepmaster” (נוקד, 2Ki 3:4). The daughters of chiefs and wealthy proprietors did not think it beneath them to tend the flocks and herds of their family (Gen 29:9 [comp. Gen 24:15; Gen 24:19]; Exo 2:16; comp. Homer, II. 6, 423; Odys. 12, 121; 13, 221; Varro, De Re Rust. 2, 1). The proudest title of the kings of Israel was that of shepherds of the people (Jer 23:4; Eze 34:2, etc.; comp. ποιμένες λᾷῶν in Homer and Hesiod, passim, and Plato, De Rep. 4:15, p. 440, D.), and God himself condescended to be addressed as the Shepherd of Israel (Psa 80:1), and was trusted in by his pious servants as their shepherd (Psa 23:1). In later times the title of shepherd was given to the teachers and leaders of the synagogues, who were called פִּרְנָסַים(Lightfoot, Hor. Hebrews in Mat 4:23); but this was unknown to the times before Christ.

By the wealthier proprietors their flocks and herds were placed under the charge of servants, who bore the designation of מַקְנֶה, מַעֵי, צאֹן, רֹעֵי, רֹעֵי, שֹׁמֵר, or נֹקְדַי. These were sometimes armed with weapons, to protect themselves and their charge from robbers or wild beasts; though, if we may judge from the case of David, their furniture in this respect was of the simplest description. Usually they carried with them a staff (שֶׁבֶט מִקֵּל) furnished with a crook, which might be used for catching an animal by the foot; those who had the charge of oxen carried with them a sharper instrument (Jdg 3:31; 1Sa 13:21). SEE GOAD. They had also a wallet or small bag (יִלְקוּט, πῆρα) in which to carry provisions, ammunition, or any easily portable article (1Sa 17:40; 1Sa 17:43; Psa 23:4; Mic 7:14; Mat 10:10; Luk 9:3; Luk 9:10). Their dress consisted principally of a cloak or mantle (the burnuis of the modern Arabs) in which they could wrap the entire body (Jer 43:12). For food they were obliged to be contented with the plainest fare, and often were reduced to the last extremities (Amo 7:14; Luk 15:15). Their wages consisted of a portion of the produce, especially of the milk of the flock (Gen 30:32 sq.; 1Co 9:7). That they cultivated music is not unlikely, though it hardly follows from 1Sa 16:18, for David's case may have been exceptional; in all countries and times, however, music has been associated with the pastoral life. When the servants belonging to one master existed in any number, they were placed under a chief (שִׂר מַקְנֶה, Gen 47:6; ἀρχιποιμήν, 1Pe 5:4);  and under the monarchy there was a royal officer who bore the title of

אִבֹּיר הָרֹעַים, “chief of the herdsmen” (1Sa 21:7; compare 1Ch 27:29, and “magister regii pecoris,” Livy, 1, 4).

The animals placed under the care of these herdsmen were chiefly sheep and goats; but besides these there were also neat cattle, asses, camels, and in later times swine. It would seem that the keeping of the animals last named was the lowest grade in the pastoral life (Luk 15:15); and probably the keeping of sheep and goats was held to be the highest, as that of horses is among the Arabs in the present day (Niebuhr, Arabie, 1, 226). The herdsman led his charge into the open pasture-land, where they could freely roam and find abundant supply of food; the neat cattle were conducted to the richer pastures, such as those of Bashan, while the sheep, goats, and camels found sufficient sustenance from the scantier herbage of the more rocky and arid parts of Palestine, provided there was a supply of water. While in the fields the herdsmen lived in tents (מַשְׁכְּנוֹת, Son 1:8; Isa 38:12; Jer 6:3), and there were folds (גְּדֵרוֹת, Num 32:16; 2Sa 7:8; Zep 2:6), and apparently in some cases tents (אַהָלַים, 2Ch 14:15) for the cattle. Watch-towers were also erected, whence the shepherd could descry any coming danger to his charge; and vigilance in this respect was one of the shepherd's chief virtues (Mic 4:8; Nah 3:18; Luk 2:8). If any of the cattle wandered he was bound to follow them, and leave no means untried to recover them (Eze 34:12; Luk 15:5); and harsh masters were apt to require at their servants' hands any loss they might have sustained, either by the wandering of the cattle or the ravages of wild beasts (Gen 31:38 sq.), a tendency on which a partial check was placed by the law, that if it was torn by beasts, and the pieces could be produced, the person in whose charge it was should not be required to make restitution (Exo 22:13; comp. Amo 3:12). To assist them in both watching and defending the flocks, and in recovering any that had strayed, shepherds had dogs (Job 30:1), as have the modern Arabs; not, however, “like those in other lands, fine, faithful fellows, the friend and companion of their masters but a mean, sinister, ill-conditioned generation, kept at a distance, kicked about, and half starved, with nothing noble or attractive about them” (Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 301), a description which fully suits Job's disparaging comparison. The flocks and herds were  regularly counted (Lev 27:32; Jer 33:13), as in Egypt (Wilkinson, 2, 177).

The pastures to which the herdsmen conducted their flocks were called חוּצוֹתthe places without, the country, the desert (Job 5:10; Job 18:17; Pro 8:26; compare ἔξω ἐν ἐρήμος, Mar 1:45); also נְאוֹת (Jer 25:37; Amo 1:2), נ8 מַדנְבָּר(Psa 65:13; Jer 9:9, etc.), נָוֶה(1Sa 7:8; Hos 9:13, etc.), מַדנְבָּר(Psa 65:13; Isa 42:11; Jer 23:10; Joe 2:22, etc.). In summer the modern nomads seek the northern and more hilly regions, in winter they betake themselves to the south and to the plain country (D'Arvieux, 3:315; 5, 428); and probably the same usage prevailed among the Hebrews. In leading out the flocks the shepherd went before them, and they followed him obedient to his call; a practice from which our Savior draws a touching illustration of the intimate relation between him and his people (Joh 10:4). The young and the sickly of the flock the shepherd would take in his arms and carry, and he was careful to adapt the rate of advance to the condition and capacity of the feebler or burdened portion of his charge, a practice which again gives occasion for a beautiful illustration of God's care for his people (Isa 40:11; comp. Gen 33:13). These usages still prevail in Palestine, and have often been described by travelers; one of the most graphic descriptions is that given by Mr. Thomson (Land and Book, 1, 301 sq.; compare Wilson. Lands of the Bible, 2, 322). As the Jews advanced in commercial wealth the office of shepherd diminished in importance and dignity. Among the later Jews the shepherd of a small flock was precluded from bearing witness, on the ground that, as such fed their flocks on the pastures of others, they were infected with dishonesty (Maimon. in Denui, 2. 3). SEE SHEPHERD.

## Heredia, Paulus De[[@Headword:Heredia, Paulus De]]

             SEE PAULUS DE HEREDIA.

## Hereford (or Herford), Nicholas[[@Headword:Hereford (or Herford), Nicholas]]

             an English confessor of the 14th century, was educated doctor of divinity at Oxford, became a secular. priest, declared against some practices and principles of the reigning religion, maintaining (1) that in the eucharist, after the consecration of the elements, bread and wine still remained; (2) that bishops and all clergymen ought to be subject to their respective princes; (3) that monks and friars ought to maintain themselves by their own labor; (4) that priests ought to rule their lives, not by the pope's decrees, but by the word of God. From these positions many heretical opinions were drawn by his enemies. From Oxford he was brought to London, and there, with Philip Repington, was made to recant his opinions publicly at St. Paul's Cross in 1382. Repington became a violent renegade, persecuted his party, for which he was rewarded first with the bishopric of Lincoln, then with a cardinal's cap. Hereford's recantation did not much  avail him; as archbishop Arundel's jealousy kept him a prisoner all his life. We know not the date of his death. Hereford by his protest anticipated the Reformation, but he probably had not the stut to make a Wycliffe or Tvndal. See Fuller, Worthies of Lngland (ed. Nuttall), 3:491; Fox, Acts and ,Monuments, 3:26.

## Hereford Use[[@Headword:Hereford Use]]

             a term employed to designate that rite which, taking its name from the cathedral of Hereford, was commonly used in some of the north-west counties of England, and in parts of Wales, prior to the Reformation. It differs only slightly from the use of Salisbury in the prayer of oblation and in the communion of the priest. The service-books of these rites are extremely rare MSS., no doubt, were everywhere destroyed. Only one printed edition is known-that of Rouen, dated 1502.

## Heres[[@Headword:Heres]]

             part of the name of two places, different in the Hebrew. SEE KIR-HERES; SEE TIMNATH-HERES.

1. HAR-CHARES ( הִראּחֶרֶסmountain of the sun; Sept. τρος τὸ ὀσρακώδης,Vulg. mons Hares, quod interpretatur testateceues, i.e. of tiles; Auth. Vers. “mount Heres”), a city (in the valley, according to the text, but in a part of Mt. Ephraim, according to the name) of Dan, near Aijalon, of which the Amorites retained possession (Jdg 1:35). It was probably situated on some eminence bordering the present Merj Ibn- Omeir on the east, possibly near the site of Emmaus or Nicopolis. We may even hazard the conjecture that it was identical with Mt. Jearim (q.d. Ir- Shemesh, i.e. sun-city), i.e. Chesalon (q.v.).

2. IR HA-HIERE (עַיר הִהֶרֶס, city of destruction; Sept. πόλις ἀσεδεκ v.r. αχερἐς; Vulg. civitas solis, evidently reading עַיר הִחֶרֶס, city of the sun), a name that occurs only in the disputed passage Isa 19:18, where most MSS. and editions, as also the versions of Aquila, Theodotion, the Syriac, and the English, read, one (of these five cities) shall be called The city of destruction, i.e. in the idiom of Isaiah, one of these cities shall be destroyed, a signification (from הָרִס, to tear down) for which Iken (Dissert. phil. crit. 16) contends. The Jews of Palestine, who approved this reading, referred it to Leontopolis and its temple, which they abhorred, and the destruction of which they supposed to be here predicted. But instead of הֶרֶס her, heres, the more probable reading is חֶרֶס, cheres, which is read in sixteen MSS. and some editions, and is expressed by the Sept. (Complut.), Symmachus, Vulgate, Saadias, and the margin of the English version, and has also the testimony of the Talmudists (Menachoth, fol. 11.0, A.). If we follow the certain and ascertained usus loquendi, this latter denotes city of the sun, i.e. Helieopolis in Egypt, elsewhere called Beth- Shemnesh, and On The Arabic meaning of the term is to defend, to preserve, and the passage may be rendered, one shall be called A city preserved, i.e. one of those five cities shall be preserved. (See Gesenius, Comment. ad loc.) Whichever interpretation may be chosen, this reading is to be preferred to the other. SEE IR-HA-IEETRES.

## Heres, Mt[[@Headword:Heres, Mt]]

             For this Lieut. Conder suggests (Tent Work, 3:337) Kefr Haris, but he gives no clew to the locality.

## Heresh[[@Headword:Heresh]]

             (Heb. Che'resh, חֶרֶשׁ, silence; Sept. Α᾿ρές), one of the Levites that dwelt in the “villages of the Netophathites” near Jerusalem. on the return from Babylon (1Ch 9:15). B.C. 536.

## Heresiarch[[@Headword:Heresiarch]]

             a leader in heresy, founder of a sect of heretics. SEE HERESY.

## Heresy[[@Headword:Heresy]]

             in theology, is any doctrine containing Christian elements, but along with them others subversive of Christian truth.

I. Origin and early Use of the Word. — The word α7πεατΟ (heresis) originally meant simply choice (e.g. of a set of opinions); later, it was applied to the opinions themselves; last of all, to the sect maintaining them. “Philosophy was in Greece the great object which divided the opinions and judgments of men; and hence the term heresy, being most frequently applied to the adoption of this or that particular dogma, came by an easy transition to signify the sect or school in which that dogma was maintained;” e.g. the heresy of the Stoics, of the Peripatetics, and Epicureans. Josephus also speaks of the three heresies (αἰρέσεις, sects, Ant. 12 5, 9 =φιλοσοφίαι, 18, 1, 2) of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. In the historical part of the New Testament, the word denotes a sect or party, whether good or bad (Act 5:17; Act 15:5; Act 24:5; Act 26:5; Act 28:22). In Act 26:4-5, St. Paul, in defending himself before king Agrippa, uses the same term, when it was manifestly his design to exalt the party to which he had belonged, and to give their system the preference over every other system of Judaism, both with regard to soundness of doctrine and purity of morals. In the Epistles the word occurs in a somewhat different sense. Paul, in Gal 5:20, puts αἱρέσεις, heresies, in the list of crimes with uncleanness, seditions (διχοστασίαι), etc. In 1Co 11:19 (there must also be heresies among you), he uses it apparently to denote schisms or divisions in the Church.

In Tit 3:10 he comes near to the later sense; the “heretical person” appears to be one given over to a self-chosen and divergent form of belief and practice. John Wesley says: “Heresy is not in all the Bible taken for ‘an error in fundamentals' or in any thing else, nor schism for any separation made from the outward communion of others. Both heresy and schism, in the  modern sense of the words, are sins that the Scripture knows nothing of” (Works, N. Y. edit. 7, 286). In the early post-apostolic Church, if “a man admitted a part, or even the whole of Christianity, and added to it something of his own, or if he rejected the whole of it, he was equally designated as a heretic. Thus, by degrees, it came to be restricted to those who professed Christianity, but professed it erroneously; and in later times, the doctrine of the Trinity, as defined by the Council of Nice, was almost the only test which decided the orthodoxy or the heresy of a Christian. Differences upon minor points were then described by the milder term of schism; and the distinction seems to have been made, that unity of faith might be maintained, though schism existed; but if the unity of faith was violated, the violator of it was a heretic.” In general, in the early Church, all who did not hold what was called the Catholic faith (the orthodox) were called heretics. At a very early period the notion of willful and immoral perversity began to be attached to heresy, and thus we may account for the severe and violent language used against heretics. “Charges, indeed, or insinuations of the grossest impurities are sometimes thrown out by the orthodox writers against the early heretics; but we are bound to receive them with great caution, because the answers which may have been given to them are lost, and because they are not generally justified by any authentic records which we possess respecting the lives of those heretics. The truth appears to be this, that some flagrant immoralities were notoriously perpetrated by some of the wildest among their sects, and that these have given coloring to the charges which have been thrown upon them too indiscriminately. But, whatsoever uncertainty may rest on this inquiry, it cannot be disputed, first, that the apostolical fathers, following the footsteps of the apostles themselves, regarded with great jealousy the birth and growth of erroneous opinions; and next, that they did not authorize, either by instruction or example, any severity on the persons of those in error. They opposed it by their reasoning and their eloquence, and they avoided its contagion by removing from their communion those who persisted in it; but they were also mindful that within these limits was confined the power which the Church received from the apostles who founded it over the spiritual disobedience of its members” (Waddington, History of the Church, ch. 5, p. 59).

II. Relations of Heresy to the Church and to Doctrine. — “Heresies, like sin, all spring from the natural man; but they first make their appearance in opposition to the revealed truth, and thus presuppose its existence, as the  fall of Adam implies a previous state of innocence. There are religious errors, indeed, to any extent out of Christianity, but no heresies in the theological sense. These errors become heresies only when they come into contact, at least outwardly, with revealed truth and with the life of the Church. They consist essentially in the conscious or unconscious reaction of unsubdued Judaism or heathenism against the new creation of the Gospel. Heresy is the distortion or caricature of the original Christian truth. But as God in his wonderful wisdom can bring good out of all evil, and has more than compensated for the loss of the first Adam by the resurrection of the second, so must all heresies in the end only condemn themselves, and serve the more fully to establish the truth. The New Testament Scriptures themselves are in a great measure the result of a firm resistance to the distortions and corruptions to which the Christian religion was exposed from the first. Nay, we may say that every dogma of the Church, every doctrine fixed by her symbols, is a victory over a corresponding error, and in a certain sense owes to the error, not, indeed, its substance, which comes from God, but assuredly its logical completeness and scientific form. Heresies, therefore, belong to the process by which the Christian truth, received in simple faith, becomes clearly defined as an object of knowledge. They are the negative occasions, the challenges, for the Church to defend her views of truth, and to set them forth in complete scientific form” (Schaff, Apostolic Church, § 165).

Heresy and Schism. — Near akin to heresy is the idea of schism or Church division, which, however, primarily means a separation from the government and discipline of the Church, and does not necessarily include departure from her orthodoxy… Thus the Ebionites, Gnostics, and Arians were heretics; the Montanists, Novatians, and Donatists, schismatics. By the standard of the Roman Church, the Greek Church is only schismatic, the Protestant both heretical and schismatic. Of course, in different branches of-the Church…there are different views of heresy and truth, heterodoxy and orthodoxy, and likewise of schism and sect” (Schaff. Apost. Church, § 165). “Heresy, as distinguished from schism, consists in the adoption of opinions and practices contrary to the articles and practices of any particular church, whereas schism is secession from that church, the renouncing allegiance to its government, or forming parties within it; for surely Paul (in 1 Corinthians and elsewhere) censures men as causing divisions who did not openly renounce allegianice. Neither schism nor heresy, then, is properly an offence against the Church universal, but  against some particular Church, and by its own members. On the same principle, no Church can be properly called either heretic or schismatic; for churches being independent establishments, may indeed consult each other, but if they cannot agree, the guilt of that Church which is in error is neither schism nor heresy, but corrupt faith or bigoted narrowness. Accordingly, our Reformers, whilst they characterize the Romish Church as one that has erred, have very properly avoided the misapplication of the terms ‘schismatic' and ‘heretic' to it. Nevertheless, if a Church has been formed by the secession of members from another Church on disagreement of principles, each seceder is both a schismatic and a heretic because of his former connection; but the crime does not attach to the Church so formed, and accordingly is not entailed on succeeding members who naturally spring up in it. If the schism was founded in error, the guilt of error would always attach to it and its members, but not that of schism or heresy. He who is convinced that his Church is essentially in error is bound to secede; but, like the circumstances which may be supposed to justify the subject of any realm in renouncing his country and withdrawing his allegiance, the plea should be long, and seriously, and conscientiously weighed; but with respect to distinct churches, as they can form alliances, so they can secede from this alliance without being guilty of any crime. So far from the separation between the Romish and Protestant churches having anything of the character of schism or heresy in it, the Church of England (supposing the Church of Rome not to have needed any reform) would have been justified in renouncing its association with it simply on the ground of expediency” (Hinds, Early Christian Church).

III. List of the principal Early Heresies. — Following list includes the chief heresies of the first six centuries; each will be found in its alphabetical place in this Cyclopaedia: Century I. Nazarenes, who advocated the observance of the Jewish law by the worshippers of Christ. Simonians, followers of Simon Magus, who prided themselves in a superior degree of knowledge, and maintained that the world was created by angels, denied the resurrection, etc. Nicolaitanes, followers of Nicolaus of Antioch. Cerinthians and Ebionites, followers of Cerinthus and Ebion, who denied the divinity of Christ, and adopted the principles of Gnosticism. Many of them were Millenarians. Century I. Elcesaites, the followers of Elxai or Elcesai, who only partially admitted the Christian religion, and whose tenets were mostly of philosophic origin. Gnostics, so called from their  pretences to γνῶσις, superior knowledge: this seems to have been the general name of all heretics.

(1.) Among Syrian Gnostics were the followers of Saturninus, who adopted the notion of two principles reigning over the world, assumed the evil nature of matter, denied the reality of Christ's human body, etc. Bardesanians: their principles resembled those of Saturninus. Tatianists and Encratitae, who boasted of an extraordinary continence, condemned marriage, etc. Apotactici, who, in addition to the opinions of the Tatianists, renounced property, etc., and asserted that any who lived in the marriage state were incapable of salvation.

(2.) Gnostics of Asia Minor. — Cerdonians, who held two contrary principles, denied the resurrection, despised the authority of the Old Testament, and rejected the Gospels. Marcionites, who resembled the Cerdonians, and in addition admitted two Gods, asserted that the Savior's body was a phantasm, etc. The followers of Lucian and Apelles may be classed among the Marcionites.

(3.) Among Egyptian Gnostics were the Basilidians, followers of Basilides, who espoused the heresies of Simon Magus, and admitted the fundamental point on which the whole of the hypotheses then prevalent may be said to hinge, namely, that the world had been created, not by the immediate operation of the divine being, but by the agency of sons. Carpocratians, Antitactae, Adamites, Prodicians, the followers of Secundus, Ptolemy, Marcus, Colobarsus, and Heracleon.

(4.) Inferior sects of Gnostics-Sethians, Cainites, Ophites.

Heresies not of Oriental origin: Patripassians, whose principal leader was Praxeas; Melchizedechians, under Theodotus and Artemon; Hermogenians, Montanists, Chiliasts or Millenarians. Century II. The Manichaeans, the Hieracites, the Patripassians, under Noetus and Sabellius; heresy of Baryllus; Paulianists, under Paul of Samosata, Novatians, under Novatus and Novatian;. the Monarchici, the Arabici, the Aquarians, the Origenists. Century IV. Tha Arians, Colluthians, Macedonians, Agnolete, Apollinarians, Collyridians, Seleucians, Anthropomorphites, Jovinianists, Messalians, Timothe ans, Priscillianists, Photinians, Donatists, Messalians, Bonlosians. Century V. The Pelagians Nestorians, Eutychians, Theopaschites. Century VI. The Aphthartodocetse, Severiani, C:)rrupticohe, Monothelites.

IV. Punishment of Heresy. — Soon after the triumph of Christianity over paganism, and its establishment by the State, the laws became very severe against heretics. Those of the State, made by the Christian emperors from the time of Constantine, are comprised under one title, De Haereticis, in the Theodosian code. (See below.) The principal are the note of infamy affixed to all heretics in common; commerce forbidden to be held with them; privation of all offices of dignity and profit; disqualification to dispose of their property by will, or to receive property; pecuniary mulcts; proscription and banishment; corporal punishment, such as scourging. Heretics were forbidden to hold public disputations; to propagate their opinions; their children could not inherit patrimony, unless they returned to the Church, etc. The laws of the Church consisted in pronouncing formal anathema, or excommunication, against them; forbidding them to enter the church, so much as to hear sermons or the reading of the Scriptures (this was but partially observed); the prohibition of all persons, under pain of excommunication, to join with them in any religious exercises; the enjoining that none should eat or converse familiarly with them, or contract affinity with them; their names were to be struck out of the diptychs; and their testimony was not to be received in any ecclesiastical cause (Bingham, Orig. Eccles. vol. 2). Augustine's view of heresy is deserving of special notice, as it forms the basis of the doctrine and practice of the Middle Ages. In De Civit. Dei, 18, 51, he says; “Qui ergo in ecclesia morbidum aliquid pravumque sapiunt, si correpti, ut sanum rectumque sapiant, resistunt contumaciter, suaque pestifera et mortifera dogmata emendare nolunt, sed defensa repersistunt, heretici funt, et foras exeuntes habentur in exercentibus inimicis.”

The earlier fathers of the Church had steadily refused using force in opposing heresy (Hilarius, Pictav. ad Constant. 1, 2 and 7; contr. Auxent. lib. init.; Athanasius, Hist. Arian. § 33), and at most permitted the secular powers to interfere to prevent the organization of heretical communities (Chrysost. Homil. 29, 46, in Matthew), and even this was often censured (see Socrates, Hist. Ecc 5:19, where it is said that the misfortunes which befell Chrysostom were by many considered as a punishment for his having caused churches belonging to the Quartodecimani and Novatians of Asia to be taken away from them and closed). Augustine, on the contrary (Retractat. 2, c. 5; ep. 93, ad Vincentiuum, § 17; ep. 185, ad Bonifitc. § 21; Opus. inper: 2, 2), basing himself on the passage Luk 14:23 (cogite intrare, etc.), completely reversed his former opinion that heretics and schismatics were not to be brought back by the aid of secular power, and stated explicitly, as a  fundamental principle, that “damnata haeresis ab episcopis non adhuc examimanda, sed coercenda est potestatibus Christianis.' He only rejects the infliction of capital punishment, yet more on account of the general opposition of the ancient Church to this mode of punishment than from leniency towards heresy. It is, consequently, not strange if even this protest against the execution of heretics came subsequently to be disregarded, and the punishment even approved (see Leo M. ep. 15, ad Turribium; Hieronymus, ep. 37, ad Bipar.). In the Middle Ages we find the Roman Church, on the: one hand, condemning capital punishment by its canon law, and at the same time demanding the application of this punishment to heretics from the secular law. Julian the Apostate had long before reproached the Christians of his time for persecuting heretics by force (ep. 52, and alp. Cyrill. c. Julianumm VI). As to the principles which guided the conduct of the secular powers towards heretics, we find that it wavered long between an entire liberty in establishing sects, submitting them to mere police regulations, restricting them in the carrying out of their system of worship, depriving them of some political rights and privileges, formally prohibiting them; and finally punishing them as criminals. Through all these variations the fundamental principle was adhered to that the secular power possesses in general the right to punish, repress, or extirpate heresy.

Hesitation is shown only in the mode of applying this principle, not in the principle itself. Moreover, the exercise of this right was in no way subject to the decision of the Church, and the secular power could by itself decide whether and how far a certain heresy should be tolerated-a right which the states retained without opposition until the Middle Ages. The numerous laws contained in the Codex Theodosianus, 16, tit. 5, De Haereticis, to which we may add 16, Titus 1, 2, 3, are the principal sources for the history of the laws concerning sects in antiquity. History shows us that in the use of compulsion and punishments against heretics the secular power anticipated the wishes of the Church, doing more than the latter was at first disposed to approve. Julian the Apostate granted full freedom to heretics with a view to injure the Church. Augustine first succeeded, in the 5th century, in establishing an agreement between Church and State on this question, yet without contesting the right of the State to use its independent authority. This is proved by Justinian's Institutes (compare cod. 1, tit. 5), which interfere directly with the private rights of heretics; and in case of mixed marriages, they order, regardless of the patrial potestas, that the children shall be brought up in the orthodox faith (cod. 1, tit. 5; 1, 18).  In the Middle Ages the notion of heresy and of its relations to the Church and the State acquired a further development. At one time, in view of the authority of the pope in matters of faith and of the doctrine offides implicita et explicita, the notion of heresy was so modified that the act of disobedience to the pope in refusing to accept or reject some distinction according to his command; was considered almost as its worst and most important feature. The Scholastics treated the doctrine concerning heresy- scientifically.

Finally the Church came to deny to the State the right to tolerate any heresy it had condemned. It even compelled the secular powers to repress and extirpate heresy according to its dictates by threats of ecclesiastical censure, by inviting invasion and revolution in case of resistance, and by commanding the application of secular punishments, such as the sequestration of property, and the deprivation of all civil and political rights, as was especially done by Innocent III. Nevertheless, the Church continued in the practice, whenever it handed over condemned heretics to the secular powers for punishment, of requesting that no penalty should be inflicted on them which might endanger their lives; but this was a mere formality, and so far from being made in earnest that the Church itself made the allowableness of such punishment one of its dogmas. Thus Leo X, in his bull against Luther, in 1520, condemns, among other propositions, that which says that Haereticos comburere est contra voluntatem Spiritus (art. 33), and recommended the use of such punishment himself. About the same time, a special form of proceedings was adopted against heretics, and their persecution was rendered regular and systematic by the establishment of the Inquisition (q.v.). Thus, in course of time, a number of secular penalties came to be considered as inevitably connected with ecclesiastical condemnation, and were even pronounced against heretics by the Church itself without further formalities. The Church, whenever any individual suspected of heresy recanted, or made his peace with the Church, declared him (in full court, after a public abjuration) released either partially or fully from the ecclesiastical and secular punishment he had ipso facto incurred. This implied the right of still inflicting these punishments after the reconciliation (which was especially done in the cases of sequestration of property, deprivation of civil or ecclesiastical offices, and degradation, while a return to heresy after recantation was to be punished by death). See the provisions of the Canon Law as found in X. de haeretic. 5, tit. 7; c. 49; X. de sentent. excommun. 5 39; tit. de Haer. in 6, 5, 2; De haeret. in Clement. 5, 3; De haeret. in Extravag. comm. 5, 3; and comp. the Liber septimus, 5,  3, 4. and the laws against heretics of the emperor Frederick II, which are connected with the ecclesiastical laws (in Pertz, Monurin. 2, 244, 287, 288, 327, 328); and the regulations concerning mixed marriages and the marriage of heretics. All these are yet considered by the Roman Catholic Church as having the force of law, though, under present circumstances, they are not enforced (comp. Benedict XIV, De synod. Dioc. 6, 5; 9, 14, 3; 13, 24, 21).

Even in the 18th century Muratori defended the assertion that the secular power is bound to enforce the most severe secular penalties against heretics (De ingeniorum meoderatione in religiones negotio, 2, 7 sq.). In the beginning of the 19th century, pending the negotiations for the crowning of Napoleon I, pope Pius VII declared that he could not set foot in a country in which the law recognized the freedom of worship of the different religions. The same pope wrote in 1805 to his nuncio at Vienna, “The Church has not only sought to prevent heretics from using the properties of the Church, but has also established, as the punishment for the sin of heresy, the sequestration of private property, in c. 10, X. d. haeret. (5, 7), of principalities, and of feudal tenures, in c. 16, eod.; the latter law contains the canonical rule that the subjects of a heretical prince are free from all oaths of fealty as well as from all fidelity and obedience to him; and there is none at all acquainted with history but knows the decrees of deposition issued by popes and councils against obstinately heretical princes. Yet we find ourselves now in times of such misfortune and humiliation for the bride of Christ that the Church is not only able to enforce these, ifs holiest maxims, against the rebellious enemies of the faith, with the firmness with which they should be, but it even cannot proclaim them openly without danger. Yet, if it cannot exert its right in depriving heretics of their estates, it may,” etc. With this may be compared the permission granted in anticipation, in 1724 (Bullar. Propagande, 2, 54, 56), to the Ruthenes, in case of conversion, to take possession of the properties they had lost by their apostasy; the satisfaction manifested by the Church on the expulsion of the Protestants from Salzburg (Bull. Propag. 2, 246); and many things happening every day in strictly Roman Catholic countries, under the eyes of the Roman See. Quite recently, Philippi, in his Canon Law, honestly acknowledged the validity of the old laws against heretics, and asserted their correctness. Even now, in all countries where the secular power has not put an end to this, the bishops promise, in taking the oath of obedience to the pope, haereticos, schismaticos, et rebelles  eidemn Domnino nostro vel successoribus praedictispro posse persequar et impugnabo. Yet the Roman See has renounced, since Sept. 17, 1824, the use of the expression of “Protestant heretics” in its official acts; and it has even admitted that, under the pressure of existing circumstances, the civil powers may be forgiven for tolerating heretics in their states! Still, as soon as circumstances will permit, the Roman See is prepared to apply again the old laws, which are merely temporarily suspended in some countries, but in nowise repealed.

Governments, however, naturally take a different view of these laws. The secular power, even while it freed itself from its absolute subjection to the Church, still continued to persecute in various ways the Protestants whom the Church denounced as heretics. We even see them deprived under Louis XIV of the right of emigration; while, in refusing to recognize the validity of their marriage, the civil authorities showed themselves even more severe than the Church. But, becoming wiser by experience, and taught by the general reaction which its measures provoked in the 18th century, the State has confined itself to interfering with heresy so far only as is necessary to promote public order and the material good of the State; thus claiming only the right to repress or expel those whose principles are opposed to the existence of government, or might create disorder. This right, of course, has been differently understood in different countries according to local circumstances, and has even become a pretence for persecutions against denominations which a milder construction of it would not have deprived of the toleration of the State, as in the persecution of dissidents in Sweden, etc.

Let us now compare this practice of the Romish Church and of Roman Catholic states with the dogmatic theory of the Middle Ages. Thomas Aquinas treats heresy as the opposite of faith, connecting it with imfidelitas in communi and apostasia a fide. He treats schism, again, as opposed to charitas. He defines heresy as infidelitatis species pertinens ad eos, quifidem Christi profitentur, sed ejus dogmata corrunpunt (1. c., qu. 2, art. 1), yet (art. 2) he remarks at the same time that some holy fathers themselves erred in the early times of the Church on many points of faith. In art. 3 he comes to the question whether heretics are to be tolerated. He asserts that they also have their use in the Church, as serving to prove its faith, and inducing it diligently to search the Scriptures, yet their usefulness in these respects is involuntary. Considered for themselves only, heretics “are not only deserving of being cut off from communion with the Church,  but also with the world by being put to death. But the Church must, in her mercy, first use all means of converting heretics, and only when it despairs of bringing them back must cut them off by excommunication, and then deliver them up to secular justice, which frees the world of them by condemnation to death.” He only admits of toleration towards heretics when persecution against them would be likely to injure the faithful. In this case he advises sparing the tares for the sake of the wheat. He further maintains that such heretics as repent may, on their first offense, be entirely pardoned, and all ecclesiastical and secular punishment remitted, but asserts that those who relapse, though they may be reconciled with the Church, must not be released from the sentence of death incurred, lest the bad example of their inconstancy might prove injurious to others.

The Reformation protested against these doctrines. Luther, from the first, denounced all attempts to overcome heresy by sword and fire instead of the Word of God, and held that the civil power should leave heretics to be dealt with by the Church. On this ground he opposed Carlstadt. Yet it was a fundamental principle with all the Reformers, that governments are bound to prevent blasphemy, to see that the people receive from the Church built on the Word of God the pure teaching of that word, and to prevent all attempts at creating sects. This led to the adoption of preventive measures in the place of the former penalties of confiscation, bodily punishment, and death. These preventive measures confined the heresy to the individual, and extended as far as banishment, when no other means would avail. Luther admitted the use of secular punishment against heretics only in exceptional cases, and then not on account of the heresy, but of the resulting disorders. Even then he considered banishment sufficient, except when incitations to revolution, etc., required more severe punishment, as was the case with the Anabaptists; Vet he often declared against the application of capital punishment to such heretics. Zwingle took nearly the same stand as Luther on this point, yet was somewhat more inclined to the use of forcible means. The Anabaptists were treated in a summary manner in Switzerland. Calvin went further, and with his theocratic ideas considered the state as bound to treat heresy as blasphemy, and to punish it in the severest manner. His approbation and even instigation of the execution of Servetus gave rise to a controversy on the question whether heresy might be punished with the sword (compare Calvini Defensis orthodoxae fidei, etc.). Calvin's views were attacked not only by Bolsec, but also by Castellio, who, under the pseudonym of Martin Bellius, wrote on this occasion his De hereticis  (Magdeb. 1554), quoting against Calvin the opinions of Luther and of Brentius. Lalius Socinus, in his Dialogus inter Calvinum et Vaticanum (1554), also advocated toleration. Among all the German theologians, Melancthon alone sided with Calvin, consistently with the views (Corp. Ref: 2, 18, an. 1530; and 3:195, an. 1536) which he had long previously defended against the more moderate views of Brentius (see Hartmann and Jager, Johanns Brem, 1, 299 sq.).

In England, in the first year of queen Elizabeth, an act of Parliament was passed to enable persons to try heretics, and the following directions were given for their guidance: “And such persons to whom the queen shall by letters patent under the great seal give authority to execute any jurisdiction spiritual, shall not in any wise have power to adjudge any matter or cause to be heresy, but only such as heretofore have been adjudged to be heresy, by the authority of the canonical Scriptures, or by some of the first four general councils, or by any other general council wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of the said canonical Scriptures, or such as hereafter shall be judged or determined to be heresy by, the high court of Parliament, with the assent of the clergy in their convocation.” “This statute continued practically in force, with certain modifications, till the 29 Charles II, c. 9, since which time heresy has been left entirely to the cognizance of the ecclesiastical courts; but, as there is no statute defining in what heresy consists, and as, moreover, much of the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts has been withdrawn by the various toleration acts; and, above all, as the effect of various recent decisions has been to widen almost indefinitely the construction of the doctrinal formularies of the English Church, it may now be said that the jurisdiction of these courts in matters of heresy is practically limited to preventing ministers of the Established Church from preaching in opposition to the doctrine and the articles of the establishment from which they derive their emoluments, and that, even in determining what is to be considered contrary to the articles, a large toleration has been judicially established. See the recent trial of Dr. Rowland Williams, and the judgment given by Dr. Lushington in the Court of Arches” (Chambers, Cyclopaedia, s.v.). The Protestant churches generally, in the 19th century, deny the power of the State to punish heresy. The Roman Church retains its old theories upon the subject, but its power is limited by the progress of civilization. SEE TOLERATION.

The history of the various heresies is given, with more or less fullness, in the Church histories. Walch's Entweiner vollstdnd. Historie d. Ketzereien, etc. (17621785, 11 vols.), gives a history of doctrines and heresies (so- called) up to the 9th century. “As a history of heresies, divisions, and religious controversies, it is still indispensable. Walch is free from polemic zeal, and bent upon the critical and pragmatic representation of his subject, without sympathy or antipathy” (Schaff, Apost. History; §31). See also Lardner, History of the Heretics of the first two Centuries, with additions by Hogg (Lond. 1780, 4to; and in Lardner, Works, 11 vols. 8vo); Füssli, Kirchen-u. — Ketzerhistorien-d. mittlern Zeit (Freft. 1770-1774, 3 vols.); Baumgarten. Geschichte d. Religionsportheien — (Halle, 1766, 4to). Professor Oehler commenced in 1856 the publication of a Corpus Haeresiologicum, designed to contain, in 8 vols., all the principal works on heresies, with notes and prolegomena. See also Burton, Enquiry into the Heresies of the Apostolic Age (Bampton Lecture for 1829, 8vo); Campbell, Preliminary Diss. to Comm. on Four Gospels; Herzog, Real Encyklopadie, 5, 468; Elliott, Delineation of Romanism, bk. 3:ch. 3:et al.; Cramp, Text-book of Popery, p. 252, 480; Dorner, Person of Christ (Edinb. transl.), 1, 344; Neander, History of Dogmas (Ryland's transl.), 1, 16. SEE HAERETICO COIBURENDO; SEE PERSECUTION; SEE TOLERATION.

## Heretic[[@Headword:Heretic]]

             SEE HERESY.

## Heretics, Baptism by[[@Headword:Heretics, Baptism by]]

             When the line between the orthodox and the heretics, SEE HERESY, was clearly drawn in the early Church, the question whether baptism performed by heretics should be regarded as valid by the orthodox began to be mooted. It afterwards became of great moment, especially with regard to the claims of the Church of Rome.

1. As early as the 3rd century heretical baptism was pronounced invalid. Clemens Alexandrinus calls it false and foreign (Stromat. 1, 375). Tertullian declared that it was of no value (De Baptismo, cap. 15). “Cyprian, whose epistles afford the clearest information on this subject, followed Tertullian in rejecting baptism by heretics as an inoperative mock baptism, and demanded that all heretics coming over to the Catholic Church be baptized (he would not say re-baptized). His position here was  due to his High-Church. exclusivism and his horror of schism. As the one Catholic Church is the sole repository of all grace, there can be no forgiveness of sins, no regeneration or communication of the Spirit, no salvation, therefore no valid sacraments, out of her bosom. So far he had logical consistency on his side. But, on the other hand, he departed from the objective view of the Church, as the Donatists afterwards did, in making the efficiency of the sacrament depend on the subjective holiness of the priest. ‘How can one consecrate water,' he asks, ‘who is himself unholy, and has not the Holy Ghost?' He was followed by the North African Church, which, in several councils at Carthage in the years 255-6, rejected heretical baptism; and by the Church of Asia Minor, which had already acted on this view, and now, in the person of the Cappadocian bishop Firmilian, a disciple and venerator of the great Origen, vigorously defended it against the intolerance of Rome. The Roman bishop Stephen (253-257) appeared for the opposite doctrine, on the ground of the ancient' practice of the Church. He offered no argument, but spoke with the consciousness of authority, and followed a catholic instinct.

He laid chief stress on the objective nature of the sacrament, the virtue of which depended neither on the officiating priest nor on the receiver, but solely on the institution of Christ. Hence he considered heretical baptism valid, provided it had been administered in the right form, to wit, in the name of the Trinity, or even of Christ alone; so that heretics coming into the Church needed only confirmation, or the ratification of baptism by the Holy Ghost. ‘Heresy,' says he, ‘produces children and exposes them; and the Church takes up the exposed children, and nourishes them as her own, though she herself has not brought them forth.' The doctrine of Cyprian was the more consistent from the churchly point of view, that of Stephen from the sacramental. The one preserved the principle of the exclusiveness of the Church, the other that of the objective force of the sacraments, even to the borders of the opus-operatum theory. Both were under the direction of the same hierarchical spirit, and the same hatred of heretics; but the Roman doctrine is, after all, a happy inconsistency of liberality, an inroad upon the principle of absolute exclusiveness, an involuntary concession that baptism, and, with it, the remission of sins, and regeneration, therefore salvation, are possible outside of Roman Catholicism. The controversy itself was conducted with great warmth. Stephen, though advocating the liberal view, showed the genuine papal arrogance and intolerance. He would not even admit to his presence the deputies of Cyprian, who brought him the decree of the African Synod, and called this bishop, who in every respect far  excelled Stephen, and whom the Roman Church now venerates as one of her greatest saints, a ‘pseudo-Christum, pseudo-apostolum, et dolosum operarium.' He broke off all intercourse with the African Church, as he had already done with the Asiatic. But Cyprian and Firmilian, nothing daunted, vindicated with great boldness, the latter also with bitter vehemence, their different view, and continued in it to their death. The Alexandrian bishop Dionysius endeavored to reconcile the two parties, but with little success. The Valerian persecution, which soon ensued, and the martyrdom of Stephen (257) and of Cyprian (258), suppressed this internal discord. In the course of the 4th century, however, the Roman practice gradually gained on the other, was raised to a doctrine of the Church by the Council of Nice in 325, and was afterwards confirmed by the Council of Trent, with an anathema on the opposite view” (Schaff, History of the Christian Church, ch. 6 § 104).

2. The decree of the Council of Trent as to baptism by heretics is as follows: “If any man shall say that the baptism which is given by heretics in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the Church doth, is not true baptism, let him be anathema” (sess. 7:Song of Solomon 4). This, at first view, may appear liberal; but the indirect intention of it is to claim all baptized persons as under the jurisdiction of Rome. Canon 8 affirms that the baptized are bound “by all the precepts of the Church, whether written or transmitted.” Canon 14 declares that any one who shall say “that those who have been baptized when infants are to be left to their own will when they grow up, and are not meanwhile to be compelled to a Christian life by any other penalty save exclusion from the Eucharist and the other seven sacraments till they repent,” is to be anathema.

3. Luther admitted the validity of Romish baptism, and in this he is followed by Protestants generally, who do not rebaptize converts from Rome. The Protestant churches (except the Baptist) admit the validity of each other's baptism. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 7:538; Coleman, Anc. Christianity, p. 363; Elliott, Romanism, bk. 2, ch. 2; Guericke, Christl. Symbolik, § 59.

## Herft, Johann Bernhard[[@Headword:Herft, Johann Bernhard]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born April 27, 1745. He studied at Munster, took holy orders in 1769, was in 1774 cathedral. preacher at Osnabriick, canon in 1778, and dean in 1790. He died March 31, 1812. His writings are sermons. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.).

## Heriger[[@Headword:Heriger]]

             SEE LOBBES.

## Hering, Daniel Heinrich[[@Headword:Hering, Daniel Heinrich]]

             a Reformed theologian of Germany, was born at Stolpe. in Pomerania, December 1, 1722. He studied at Halle, was in 1757 preacher at Neustadt- Eberswalde, and accepted in 1759 a call. to Halle. In 1765 he went to Breslau, and died August 21, 1807. He published, De, voce πορμείᾳ in Decreto Agostolico (Halle, 1742): — De Doctrina Bileami Nicolaitarum et Jezabelis (eod.): — Von der Schule des Apostels Johannes zu Ephesus (Breslau, 1774): — Abhandlungen von der Schulen der Propheten (ibid. 1777): — Historische Nachricht von dem ersten Anfang der evaungelisch- reformirten Kirche in Brandenburg und Preussen (Halle, 1778), besides sermons. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:805; 2:222; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:385. (B.P.)

## Heringa, Jodocus[[@Headword:Heringa, Jodocus]]

             a Dutch divine, who died at Utrecht in 1840, doctor and professor of theology, is the author of, Beoordeling van de nieuwe uitgave der Prolegomena in N. Test. van J. Jac. Wetstein (Amsterdam, 1832): — Ueber den Begriff, die Unentbehrlichkleit und den rechten Gebrauch der bibl. kritik. aus dem Hollandischen ubersetzt von Beckhaus (Offenbach, 1804): — Ueber die Lehrart Jesu und seiner Apostel. (from the Dutch, 1792): — Tiental Seerredenen tei aanprijzing van christel. deugden (Amsterdam, 1825): — Opera Exegetica et Hermeneutica (edited by H.E. Vinke, Utrecht, 1845). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:43, 86, 92, 105, 130, 132, 250, 397, 399; 2:111; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:543. (B.P.)

## Heritage[[@Headword:Heritage]]

             denoted by several Heb. words: אֲחֻזָּה, RXI achuzzah', a “possession;” נִחִלָה, nachalah', or נִחִלָת nachalath', “heritage,” etc.; also יְרֻשָּׁה, yerushshah'; מוֹרָשָׁה, morashah'. Only sons (compare Gen 21:10; Gen 31:14 sq.), and, indeed, only those of regular wives (comp. Gen 21:10 sq.; Gen 24:36; Gen 25:5 sq. — Jephthah is no exception, Jdg 11:2; Jdg 11:7; SEE BASTARD ), had any legal title to the paternal inheritance, according to ancient usage among the Israelites; and amongst these the first-born, who might be of the favorite or a less favored wife, enjoyed a double portion (Deu 21:15 sq.). SEE PRIMOGENITURE. Daughters became heiresses, when sons existed, only by the special grant of the father (Jos 15:18 sq.; comp. Job 42:15), but regularly in the absence of male heirs (Num 27:8); yet heiresses (ἐπικληροι — such, according to many, was Mary, the mother of Jesus) were not allowed to marry a man of another tribe (Num 36:6 sq.; comp. Tob 6:12; Tobit cf.7, 14; Josephus, Ant. 4:7, 5; see Michaelis, Mos. Recht, 2, 81; Buxtorf, Sponsal. et Divort. p. 67 sq., in Ugolini Thesaur. 30; Selden, De successione in bona. pat. c. 18), so as not to interrupt the regular transmission of the estate (see Wachsmuth, Hellen. Alterthumsk. 3, 206, 213; Gans, Erbrecht, 1, 337 sq.; comp. Rhode, Rel. Bild. d. Hindu, 2, 608). On the heirship of distant kinsmen, see Num 27:9 sq. (comp. Philo, Works, 2, 172; see Mishna, Baba Bathra, 4, 3, c. 8, 9; Gans, Erbrecht, 1, 152 sq.). Respecting written wills, we find nothing legally prescribed (see S. Rau, De Testamentificatione Hebraeis yet. ignota, praes. L. Van Wolde, Traj. ad Rhen. 1760; also in Oelrich's Collect. Opusc. 1, 305 sq.), and as the heirship-at-law had undisputed force as a legal principle (Num 21:11), it must have operated as a testamentary disposition of the inheritance, to the exclusion of any more formal method of bequest (Gans, Erbrecht, 1, 149 sq.); for the passage in Tobit 8:23 does not refer to a devise by will, and Pro 17:2 only shows that slaves might become heirs by a special arrangement of their masters (see Rosenmüller in loc.; Gesenius, Thes. Heb. 1, 483), while Gen 15:3 refers to an earlier period. But in later times regular testaments must have obtained among the Jews (Gal 3:15; Heb 9:17; comp. Josephus, Ant. 13, 16, 1; 17:3, 2; War, 2, 2, 3), in imitation of the Greeks and Romans (see Smith's Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v. Heres, Testamentum); and in the Talmudical law of heritage they became of effect (Gans, Erbrecht, 1, 171), although not in the extensive sense of  the Roman law. Sometimes the parent divided the inheritance (i.e. a portion of it) among his children during his lifetime (Luk 15:12; comp. Tobit 8:23; see Rosenmüller, l'morgenl. 5, 197). (On the subject generally, see Michaelis, Mos. Recht, 2, 76 sq.; J. Selden, De successione in bona defuncti ad leg. Hebr. Lond. 1636; also in his Uxor. Ebr. and in his Works, 2, 1 sq.) SEE INHERITANCE.

## Herli-Kan[[@Headword:Herli-Kan]]

             in Kalmuck mythology, is the prince of hell; a frightful and evil-minded god, the judge of men, the other gods being too merciful to judge the guilty. To implore his favor large sacrifices are made to him. Sixteen judges assist him, one half being males, the other half females.

## Herman Of Cappenberg[[@Headword:Herman Of Cappenberg]]

             a Jewish convert of the 12th century, was a native of Cologne. His Jewish name was Judah Levi. After his conversion he entered the order of the Premonstratensians, and became abbot of Cappenberg, in Westphalia. He wrote Opusculum de Conversione Sua, preserved in the university library at Leipsic, and printed with Raymund Martin's Pugio Fidei. Herman also wrote Vita S. Godefridi Cappenborgenisis, found in the Acta Sanctorum under January 13. See Bartolocci, Bibl. Rabb. 3:59; Kalkar, Israel und die Kirche, page 84; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Neander, Kirchengeschichte, 5:101 sq.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:352; Basnage, Histoire des Juifs (Taylor's transl.), page 633; Fuirst, Bibl. Jud. 1:387. (B.P.).

## Herman, Lebrecht Prederick, D.D[[@Headword:Herman, Lebrecht Prederick, D.D]]

             one of the earlier ministers of the German Reformed Church, was born .in the principality of Anhalt-Kothen, Germany, October 9, 1761. He prosecuted his literary and theological studies in Europe, and for a while served as assistant pastor in Bremen. In 1786 he emigrated to America, under the auspices of the synods of Holland, to aid in supplying the  German churches in Pennsvlvania with the means of grace. He labored for a short time in and around Easton, Pennysylvania, afterwards in Germantown and Frankford, near Philadelphia, and finally in Montgomery County. He died January 30, 1848. Dr. Herman paid much attention to the training of younsg men for the ministry. He was in his day a prominent minister, and a learned and able theologian. See Harbaugh, Fathers of the Germ. Ref. Church, 2:360. (D.Y.H.) Hermandad, societies in Spain which were accustomed to supply victims to the Inquisition (q.v.).

## Hermann of Cologne[[@Headword:Hermann of Cologne]]

             (prince archbishop), son of Frederick I, count of Wied, was educated for the priesthood, elected archbishop in 1515, and confirmed by pope Leo X as Hermann V. Having imbibed the principles of the Reformation, he first attempted a Roman Catholic reform in Cologne, but, finding this impossible, he at last assumed a Protestant position, and invited Bucer and Melancthon, in 1542, to assist him. Had he succeeded in his plans, the whole Rhine country would probably have become Protestant; but he was excommunicated by the pope, menaced by the emperor, and abandoned by his estates. He finally resigned his office in 1547, and retired to his estates in Wied, where he died Aug. 15, 1552. He was beloved by his people, honored by the emperor Charles V, and esteemed by the great leaders of the Reformation. An account of Hermann's relation to his times is given in Deckers, Hermann von Wied (Cologne, 1840). His Form of Service was made use of in the framing of the English “Book of Common Prayer.” See Hase, Church History, § 337-340; Hardwick, History of the Reformation, p. 65, 213. SEE COMMON PRAYER.

## Hermann of Fritzlar[[@Headword:Hermann of Fritzlar]]

             a mystic, was born at Fritzlar, in Hesse, towards the middle of the 14th century. Nothing certain is known of his position or social relations: it is probable, however, that he was a rich layman, like Nicholas of Basle, who retired from the world to devote himself to reading and writing theological works. One of his earlier works, to which he refers himself, Die Blume der Schauung (doubtless of speculative tendency), appears to have been lost. We have, however, his Heiligenleben (printed in Pfeiffer's Deutschen Hystikern des 14 Jahrh. 1, 1-258, from the Heidelberg MS. executed under his supervision in 1343-1349). It is an extensive work, compiled from sources now mostly lost. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. (J. N. P.)

## Hermann of Lehnin[[@Headword:Hermann of Lehnin]]

             SEE LEHNIN.

## Hermann of Salga[[@Headword:Hermann of Salga]]

             SEE SALGA.

## Hermann of Weid[[@Headword:Hermann of Weid]]

             SEE WIED.

## Hermann or Hermannus[[@Headword:Hermann or Hermannus]]

             abbot of Tours, A.D. 1127, resigned his office in consequence of long- continued illness. He wrote Tractatus de Incarnatione Christi (ed. C. Oudin, Vet. Sac. Lugd. Bat. 1692); three books of the Miracles of Mary of Laon; and a History of the Monastery of St. Martin in Tours, which are given in D'Achery, Spicileg. 2, 888. — Dupin, Ecclesiastical Writers, 10, 181.

## Hermann von der Hardt[[@Headword:Hermann von der Hardt]]

             a German Protestant theologian and philologist, was born at Melle (Westphalia) Nov. 15, 1660. He studied at Osnabruck, Jena, and Hamburg. In 1681 he began to lecture privately at Jena, but, not succeeding as well as he had expected, he went to Leipzig in 1686, where he joined the celebrated Collegiun philobiblicum. In 1688 he became librarian and  secretary of duke Rudolph August of Brunswick, and the latter caused him finally to be appointed professor of Oriental languages at the University of Helmstadt in 1690. He afterwards became senior of the University and provost of the convent of Marienburg. He died Feb. 28, 1746. Hermann was a very active and ingenious scholar, but his tendency to paradoxical assertions caused him to fall into errors, which, however, were perhaps too severely condemned by his adversaries. He wrote. Autographa Lutheri aliorumque celebrim virorum, etc. (Brunsw. 1690-1693, 3 vols. 8vo): — Ephenmerides Philologicae, quibus difciliora quaedam loca Pentateuchi ad Ifebraicorum bntium tenorenm explicata, etc. (Helmstadt, 1693, 1696, and 1703): — Hoseas illustratus chaldaica Jonathanis versione et philologicis celebrium rabbino-rum Raschij Aben Esrae et Kimchi comsmentariis (Helmst. 1702, 1775): — — Magnum cecumenicun Constaninense Concilium de universali Ecclesice reformatione, unione et fide, etc. (Frankf. and Leipz. 1700, 1742, 4 vols. fol.): — Historia litteraria Reformationis (Frankfort and Leipz. 1717): — Evangelicae Rei Integritas in negotio Jonce quatuor libris declarata (Frankf. 1719, 4to): — Enigmata prisci orbis: Jonas in luae in historia Manassis et Josice; Enigmata Graecorum et Latinorum ex caligine; Apocalypsis exc tenebris (Helmst. 1723, fol.). This work attracted great attention when first published: — Tonzus primus in Jobuln, historian populi Israelis in Assyriaco exilio, Samaria eversa et regno extincto, etc. (Helmstadt, 1728. fol.). See J. Fabricius, Hist. Bibloth. pt. 2; p. 342847,351-352; Nova Actea Eruditorum (an. 1746, p. 475480); Breithaupt, Memoria Hern. v. d. Hardt (Helmst. 1746); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23, 362.

## Hermann, Christian Gotthilf Martin[[@Headword:Hermann, Christian Gotthilf Martin]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Erfurt, February 8, 1765. He studied at his native city and Gottingen, was in 1789 catechist, in 1790 professor, and accepted a call in 1803 as general superintendent and member of consistory to Heiligenstadt, in Prussia. In 1816 he went back to Erfurt, was in 1817 senior of the ministry and superintendent of the Erfurt diocese, and died August 26, 1823. His publications are few and of little value. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:236. (B.P.)

## Hermann, Emil[[@Headword:Hermann, Emil]]

             a German Protestant professor of canon law, was born at Dresden, April 9, 1812. He studied at Leipsic, where he also commenced his academical career in 1834. He was professor at Kiel in 1842, in 1847 at Gottingen, and in 1868 at Heidelberg. In 1872 he was called to Berlin as president of the Evaingelical Superior Church Council (Obekirchen-raiths), and occupied this position till 1877. He died at Gotha, April 16,1885. Hermann published, Johaun Freiherr zu Schwarzenberg (Leipsic, 1841): — Autoritat des kirchlichen Symbols (Kiel, 1846): — Ueber die Stellung der Religionsgemeinschafen im Staate (Gottingen, 1849): — Ueber den Entwutfeiner Kirchenordnung fur die Sachsische Landeskirche (Berlin, 1861): — Die nothwendigen Grundlagen einer die consistoriale und synodale Ordnung vereinigenden Kirchenvenfassung (ibid. 1862): — Das staatliche Veto bei Bischofswahlen nach den Rechte der oberrheinischens Kirchenprovinz (Heidelberg, 1869). See Zutchlold, Bibl. Theol. 1:545 sq. (B.P.)

## Hermann, Gottlob[[@Headword:Hermann, Gottlob]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Lohbaut, in Upper Lusatia, May 27, 1721. He studied at Leipsic, was in 17583 archdeacon at Bischofswerda, in 1759 pastor primarius at his native place, and died January 2, 1789. His publications are sermons and ascetical works. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hermann, Johann Gottfried[[@Headword:Hermann, Johann Gottfried]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in Saxony, October 12, 1707. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1733 deacon, received a call in 1738 to Amsterdam as pastor of the German congregation, but accepted the appointment as superintendent at Plauen. In 1746 he was called to Dresden  as court-preacher and member of consistory, and died July 30, 1791. He published, De Pane Azymo et Fermentato in Coena Domini (Leipsic, 1739), besides a number of sermons. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:603. (B.P.)

## Hermann, Nikolaus[[@Headword:Hermann, Nikolaus]]

             one of the earliest evangelical hymnologists, flourished about the middle of the 16th century. His intimate relation with the minister of the church of his place (which he served as organist), Mathesius, the biographer of Luther, gave to his compositions a true reform spirit and the child-like simplicity of a Christian mind. They have been preserved in general use even to our own day. — Brockhaus, Conversations Lexicon, 7, 841; Gervinus, Gesch. d. poetischen Nationalit. d. Deutschen, 3, 10, 32.

## Hermann, or Hermannus, Contractus[[@Headword:Hermann, or Hermannus, Contractus]]

             So called from disease having shrunk up his limbs, was a monk of Reichenau, and one of the learned men of the 11th century, being well skilled in Latin, Greek, and Arabic. He was born in 1013, and was the son of the count of Weringen in Suevia. He wrote a Chronicle (De Sex cetatibus mundi), which commences at the Creation and ends A.D. 1052. The events occurring before the Christian era are very briefly noticed, but afterwards he enters into more details, and amplifies as he approaches nearer to his own times. The “Chronicle” was continued by Berthold of Constance up to 1065, and published at Basle in 1536, and again at St. Blaise in 1790 (2 vols. 4to). It may be found also in Bibl. Max. Patr. vol. 18. Trithemius ascribes the hymns Alma Redemptoris mater and Salve Regina to Hermann. See Dupin, Eccl. Writers, 9, 102.

## Hermansen, Christen[[@Headword:Hermansen, Christen]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born in 1806 in Denmark, and died at Copenhagen, October 19, 1882, doctor and professor of theology. For more than forty years he belonged to the university at Copenhagen, in which he lectured on the Old. Test. He was one of the revisers of the Danish Bible translation. (B.P.)

## Hermant, Godefroy[[@Headword:Hermant, Godefroy]]

             a French theologian, was, born at Beauvais, February 6, 1617. Having completed his, studies, he was appointed in 1642 canon at his native, place, in 1644 prior, and in 1650 doctor of the Sorbonne. In 1651 he took holy orders, and returned to Beauvais to officiate there as priest. In 1690 Hermant went to Paris to see his old friends, and on July 11 died suddenly in the street. Of his many writings we mention, Apologie poura M. Arnauld (1644-48): — La Vie de Saint Jean Chrysostome (1664 and often): — Vie de Saint Athanase (1671, 2 volumes): — Les Ascetiques de Saint Basile avec Remarques (1671-1727): — Vie de Saint Basile et de Saint Gregoire de Nazimaze (1674, 2 volumes): — Vie de Saint Ambroise (1678): — Entretiens Spirituels sur Saint Matthieu (1690, 3 volumes): — Clavis Disciplinae Ecclesiasticae, seu Index Totius Juris Ecclesiastici (1693). See Baillet, La Vie de Godefroy Hermant; Nscrologe des plus l'Celbres Defenseurs et Confesseurs de la Verite, I, 4; Abregg de l'Hist. Ecclesiastes 12; Bayle, Dict. Historique et Critique; Hist. Generale de Port- Royal, 4:8; Biblioth. Jansen.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:655, 659, 702, 728, 884, 885, 887, 902; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hermanubis[[@Headword:Hermanubis]]

             Romans and Greeks sought to make their cultus accord with that of the Egyptians. Thus, Anubis of the Egyptians was confounded with Mercury of  the Romans or Hermes of the Greeks, and thus there originated the compound word Hermanubis-Mercury being represented with the snake- staff, in human form, but with a dog's head, and to designate still closer the country of his worship, with a crocodile at his feet. SEE ANUBIS.

## Hermaphrodite Orders[[@Headword:Hermaphrodite Orders]]

             SEE MONASTICISM.

## Hermas[[@Headword:Hermas]]

             ( ῾Ερμᾶς, from ῾Ερμῆς, the Greek god of gain, or Mercury), the name of a person to whom Paul sends greeting in his Epistle to the Romans (16:14), and consequently then resident in Rome and a Christian (A.D. 55); and yet the origin of the name, like that of the other four mentioned in the same verse, is Greek. However, in those days. even a Jew, like Paul himself, might acquire Roman citizenship. Ireneeus, Tertullian, and Origen agree in making him identical with the author of “the Shepherd” of the following article, but this is greatly disputed. He is celebrated as a saint in the Roman calendar on May 9. — Smith, s.v.

## Hermas (2)[[@Headword:Hermas (2)]]

             one of the so-called apostolical fathers (q.v.), the supposed author of a tract that has come down to us under the name of Ποιμήν, The Shepherd, and generally designated by the title Pastor Hermae. The authorship. of the tract is uncertain, but it is clearly not the work of the Hermas ( ῾Ερμᾶς) mentioned in Rom 16:14, as Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome believed, and as the tract itself seems to pretend. The author appears to have been a layman of the 2nd century, probably a Roman tradesman “who had lost his wealth through his own sins and the misdeeds of his neglected sons” (Hilgenfeld; Schaff, History of the Church, § 121). Others ascribe it to Hermas or Hermes, brother of Pins, bishop of Rome from A.D. 142 to 157. Of the Greek original we have nothing left but fragments, which are given in Fabricius, Cod. Apocryph. N. Test. 3, 378, and in Grabe, Spicileg. 1, 303. M. d'Abbadie claims (1860) to have discovered a third in Ethiopia, which he has transcribed and translated into Latin (Lpz. 1860); but whether the text from which it is taken is correct is a matter for further investigation. The Greek text was at an early period translated into Latin, and, since the beginning of the 15th century, often published (Paris, 1513, fol.; Strasb. 1522, 4to; Basle, 1555 and 1569, fol.; Oxford, 1685, 12mo; with additions by Le Clerc, Amst. 1698, 1724; Paris, 1715, 12mo). It is also inserted in the various collections of the fathers in Cotelier, Patres cevi apostolici (Paris, 1672, fol.), and in French in Desprez's Bible (Paris, 1715, fol. vol. 4). It is also given in the various editions of the Apostolical Fathers (q.v.). Of late years this tract has been the subject of more editing and literary criticism than almost any relic of the early Church. In 1857 Dressel published at Leipzig a new Latin translation of the Pastor which he found in a MS. at Rome, and which differs from the other. The edition  contains also a Greek text of the φλοθστᾷ, revised by Tischendorf. This text, it is claimed, was found in a, convent of Mount Athos by Simonides. Tischendorf considers it, however, only as a retranslation from the Latin into Greek, and places its origin in the Middle Ages. Tischendorf himself discovered, in the Codex. Sinaiticus, the Greek text of book 1 of the Shepherd, and the first four chapters of book 2; this is given in the recent edition of Dressel, Patres Apost. (Lips. 1863); also by Hilgenfeld, who has carefully edited the Pastor Hermae in his Nov. Test. extra Canuonern receptum (fasc. 3, Lips. 1866). The Ante-Nicene Christian Library, vol. 1 (Edinb. 1867), contains a new and good translation of the Shepherd, following the text of Hilgenfeld, who makes use of the text found in the Sinaitic Codex.

The Pastor is written in the form of a dialogue, and is divided into three parts: 1 Visiones; 2. Mandata; 3. Similitudines. Hermas, in his childhood, had been brought up with a young slave. In after life, and when he was married, he met her again, and experienced for her a passion which, however pure in itself, was yet forbidden by the Church under the circumstances. Soon afterwards the young slave died. One day, as Hermas was wandering in the country, thinking of her, he sat down and fell asleep. “During my sleep,” says he, “my mind carried me away to a steep path, which I found great difficulty in ascending on account of rocks and streams. Arriving on a piece of table-land, I knelt down to pray; and as I was praying the heavens opened, and I saw the young maiden I was wishing for, who saluted me from the sky, saying, ‘Good day, Hermas.' And I, looking at her, answered, ‘What art thou doing there?' ‘I have been called here,' she answered, ‘to denounce thy sins before the Lord.' ‘What!' exclaimed I, ‘and wilt thou accuse me?' ‘No; but listen to me...' etc. The conversation goes on with a blending of severity and tenderness. “Pray to the Lord,” says the young girl, as she disappears from his sight; “he will heal thy soul, and will efface the sins of all thy house, as he has done those of all the saints.” One cannot help noticing the striking similarity which exists between this Vision and the celebrated passage in the Divina Commedia where Beatrice appears to Dante. This vision is followed by three others. They are all invitations to penitence, and though in the first it appears as if the invitation was especially directed to Hermas, it clearly applies also to the Church in general. This becomes more evident in the following visions.  The Mandata begin also with a vision. An angel appears to Hermas under the form of a shepherd, wearing' a white cloak, and bearing a staff in his hand. This shepherd is the angel of penitence, and gives Hermas twelve precepts, which embrace the rules of Christian morals. They are given under the different headings:

1. Defide in unum Deum;

2. Defugienda obt-rectatione, et eleemosynafacienda in simplicitate;

3. De fugiendo mendacio.;

4. De dinittenda adultera;

5. De tristitia cordis et patientia;

6. De dgnoscendis uniuscujusque hominis luobus geziis et utriusque inspirationibus;

7. De Deo timendo et daemone non timendo;

8. Declinandum est a malo et facienda bona;

9. Postulandum a Deo assidue et sine haesitatione;

10. De animi tristitia et non contristando Spiritum Dei, qui in nobis est;

11. Spiritus et prophetas probari ex operibus, et de duplici spiritu;

12. De duplici cupiditate. Dei mandata non esse impossibilia et diabolum non meetutendum credentibus.

The Similitudines, finally, are a series of parables and allegories. The vine, with its rich fruits and flexible boughs, is used to symbolize the fruitfulness of the Church. The willow is made the emblem of divine law. This latter image is made by Hermas the ground of a most graceful allegory. Similitudines 1 to 4 are short and simple images or descriptions; Simil. 5 to 9 are visions of the approaching completion of the Church, ‘and of judgment as well as invitations to penitence on that account; Simil. 10, finally, is a sort of conclusion of the whole.

This work was perhaps the most popular book in the Christian Church of the 2nd and 3nd centuries. Yet, while it pleased the masses, it did not always satisfy the teachers. Irenmaus (adv. Haer. 4, 3), Clement of  Alexandria (Strom. 1, 29), and Origen (Explan. Epist. ad Romans 16) held it in high estimation. Eusebius asserts (Hist. Ecclesiastes 3, 3) that many other ecclesiastical writers contested its authenticity. Jerome, after praising Hermas in his Chronicon, accuses him of foolishness (stultitia) in his Comment. in Habakkuk (1, 1), and Tertullian treats him no better, designating the book as apocryphal in De Pudicit. (10). The learned Duguet, in his Conferences ecclesiastiques (1, 7), even claims to find in the Pastor the germ of all heresies which troubled the Church in the 2nd century. Others among modern theologians, and especially Mosheim, have violently attacked the Pastor, and considered Hermas as an impostor. The book “knows little of the Gospel, and less of justifying faith; on the contrary, it talks much of the law of Christ and of repentance, enjoins fasting and voluntary poverty, and teaches the merit, even the supererogatory merit, of good works, and the sin-atoning virtue of martyrdom” (Schaff, 1. c.). See Gratz, Disquisitio in Past. Hermae (Bonn, 1820); Hefele, Patr. Apost. Prolegomena; Hilgenfeld, Apost. Vater (Halle, 1853); Cave, Hist. literaria; Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 7, 18; Tillemont, Memoires eccles. vol. 2, May 9th; Dom. Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs sacrae et eccles. 1, 582; Hosheim, Comment. 1, 208-9; Neander, Ch. Hist. 1, 660, Iase, Ch. Hist. § 39 and Appendix; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 371; Schaff, Church History, § 121; Bunsen, Christianity and Mlci2mkind, 1, 182; E. Gaab, Der Hirt d. Hermas (Basel, 1866, 8vo); Zahn, Der Hirt d. Hermas untersucht (Gotha, 1868, 8vo); Alzog, Patrologie, § 19; Lipsius, in Zeitsch rift J Wissenschftliche Theologie, 1865, heft 3; Hilgenfeld, Delr Hirt d. Hermcas u. sein neuester Bearbeiter, in Zeitsch f. Wiss. Theol. 1869, heft 2; Lipsius (in same journal, 1869, heft 3), Die Polenzik eines Apologeten (a severe review of Zahn's Hernmas).

## Hermeneutics[[@Headword:Hermeneutics]]

             (from ἑρμηνεύω, to explain), the technical or scientific name of that branch of theology which consists in exposition in general, as distinguished from exegesis (q.v.) in particular. Reserving for the more usual and equivalent title INTERPRETATION (OF SCRIPTURE) the history and literature of the subject, we propose to give in the present article only a brief' view of those principles or Canons which should be observed in the elucidation of the meaning of the sacred text.

I. The first and most essential process is to apply the natural and obvious principles of a careful and conscientious exegesis to the passage and all its terms. This may be called the PHILOLOGICO-HISTORICAL rule. It embraces the following elements.

1. The diligent and discriminative use of an accurate and judicious Lexicon.

2. The painstaking and constant reference to the best Grammars.

A well-grounded knowledge of the language is implied in these prescriptions, yet the interpreter needs to confirm or modify his judgment by these independent authorities.

3. An intimate acquaintance with the archaeology involved, including geography, chronology, and Oriental usages,

4. The context should be carefully consulted; and the general-drift of the argument, as well as the author's special design in writing, must be kept in mind.

5. Especially is a cordial sympathy with spiritual truth a prerequisite in this task. A deep religious experience has enlightened many an otherwise ill- instructed mind as to the meaning of much of Holy Writ.

II. PARALLEL AND ILLUSTRATIVE PASSAGES from the same book or writer, or (if these are not to be had) from other parts of Scripture, are to be attentively considered, on the principle that Scripture is its own best interpreter. This is pre-eminently true of types, metaphors, parables, prophetical symbols, and other figurative representations. For this purpose  “reference Bibles” alone are not sufficient: the examination should include an extensive comparison of doctrine, theory, and topic, as well as of example, fact, and expression.

III. When various meanings-are assignable to a given passage or word, that should be selected which is the broadest in its import — and application; if possible, one that is — INCLUSIVE of all or most of the others. This rule should especially be observed in expounding the language of Christ, of God directly, or the more cardinal statements of inspiration.

In prophetical and eschatological passages of Scripture especially must the fact be borne in mind that one event or circumstance is often made the type or image of another; the two being generally related to the same essential principle as proximate and remote, or as personal and national, or as temporal and spiritual manifestations of the divine economy. In some cases this-correlation runs through an entire piece or book, e.g. the Canticles and many of the Psalms. SEE DOUBLE SENSE (OF SCRIPTURE).

IV. The CONSENSUS of the universal Church in past and present time should have its due influence; not as being of absolute authority, but as an exponent of the aggregate and deliberate judgment of good and unprejudiced men. This will guard the expositor against fanciful subtleties and extravagant or dangerous impressions. To this end creeds, confessions, and articles of faith are useful, as well as the study of exploded or living- heresies, but more particularly a collation of the views of preceding commentators. In weighing none of these, however, is any superstitious reverence to be indulged, for the word of God itself is superior to them all, and it is not only possible, but certain, that in some points they have alike erred, as in many they have fluctuated or conflicted with each other. Even the objections and cavils of infidels and rationalists should not be overlooked, for “fas est ab hoste doceri.”

V. Where different interpretations are possible, that must be selected which is most consistent with common sense. Especially must those be set aside which lead to a psychological or theological impossibility or contradiction. Such a principle we always feel bound to apply to the communication of a friend, and to every obscure passage in a rational writer. Interpreters, from overlooking this rule, have often increased rather than explained the difficulties of the sacred text. For example, to understand Paul as meaning in Rom 9:3 that he was willing to forfeit  his title to eternal bliss, is to attribute to him a sentiment incompatible with mental and moral sanity; and to refer the preference in 1Co 7:21 to a state of slavery, is to outrage the spontaneous instincts of the human mind. VI. It will sometimes become necessary to modify our conclusions as to particular passages in consequence of the discoveries and deductions of MODERN SCIENCE. Instances in point are the theories respecting the creation and deluge, arising from the progress of astronomical and geological knowledge. All truth is consistent with itself; and although the Bible was not given for the purpose of determining scientific questions, yet it must not, and need not be so interpreted as to contradict the “elder scripture writ by God's own hand” in the volume of nature. In like manner history is often the best expositor of prophecy.

## Hermengild[[@Headword:Hermengild]]

             (Erminigildus),Visigoth prince of Spain, was the elder of the two sons of the Arian king, Leovigeld, by his first wife, and was made governor of Baetica on his marriage. He rebelled against his father, who finally captured him about A.D. 572, and put him to death. He is commemorated as a. saint by the Roman Church on April 13, as he had embraced the Catholic faith.

## Hermes[[@Headword:Hermes]]

             ( ῾Ερμῆς, i.e. the Greek Mercury [q.v. ]) the name of a man mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans as a disciple at Rome (Rom 16:14). A.D. 55. “According to the Greeks,” says Calmet (Dict. s.v.), “he was one of the seventy disciples, and afterwards bishop of Dalmatia.” His festival occurs in their calendar upon April 8 (Neale, Eastern Church, 2, 774).

## Hermes Trismegistus, or Mercurius[[@Headword:Hermes Trismegistus, or Mercurius]]

             ( ῾Ερμῆς, ῾Ερμῆς, Τρισμέγιστος), the putative author of a large number of Greek works, many of which are still extant. The Greek Hermes was in the time of Plato identified with the Egyptian Thot, Thoth, or Theut (as it was also with the Alexandrian Thoyji), a mythical personage regarded as the discoverer of all sciences, especially as the originator of language, of the alphabet, and of the art of writing; of geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, etc. In Egypt, all works relating to religion or science bore the name of Thot or of Hermes. According to a passage in Clement of Alexandria (Strom. 1. 5), two of Hermes's books contained the hymns of the gods and rules of conduct for the kings, four related to astrology, etc. The  expressions used by Clement of Alexandria imply that there was a much larger number of so-called Hermetic books than he mentions. As for the 36,525 mentioned by lamblichus (De Myst. Egypt.), a number which corresponds to the great sacred period of Egypt, Goerres supposes it to refer to verses, not to books. All this leads to the belief that Hermes Trismegistus was but a personification of the Egyptian priesthood. According to Champollion junior, Hermes Trismegistus was, like Horus, represented by a hawk's head. The surname of Trismegistus (thrice great) appears to have been given to him on account of the many discoveries attributed to him. Looked at in the mystical sense, Thot, or the Egyptian Hermes, was the symbol of divine intelligence, thought incarnate, the living word-the primitive type of Plato's Logos.

It appears clear that a certain number of the books bearing the name of Hermes Trismegistus were translated into Greek about the time of the Ptolemies. The authenticity of the fragments of these translations which have come down to us is more doubtful. It was the time when so many supposititious works of Orpheus, Zoroaster, Pythagoras, etc., were composed. Leaving aside Augustine's testimony (De civitate) ei. 1. 8:c. 26), Champollion junior considers the books of Hermes Trismegistus as containing really the old Egyptian doctrines, of which some traces can be found in the hieroglyphics. Besides, a careful examination of these remaining fragments discloses a theological system somewhat similar from that of Plato in his Tinaeus; a doctrine which differs entirely from those of all the other Greek schools, and which therefore was supposed to have been brought by him from Egypt, where he had been to consult with: the priests of that country. They are written in a barbarous Greek, in which it is easy to perceive the effort made by translators to follow literally the text of the original rather than the sense. Menard, a recent translator of Hermes, views the Hermetic books “as representing the final aspirations of the higher Greek wisdom, dimly anticipating the fuller revelation of the Christian faith; as a mystical system, hovering between the negations of Greek thought and the dogmas of the Christian faith” (An. Pres. Rev. January, 1869, p. 195). The following works, attributed to Hermes, have been published: Λάγος τέλειος; the Greek original, quoted by Lactantius (Div. Instit. 7, 18), is lost, and there remains only a Latin translation of it, attributed to Apuleius of Madaura, and which is entitled Asclepius, or Hermetis Trismegisti Asclepius, sive de natura deorumus diulogns. This work appears to have been written shortly before the time of Lactantius,  and in Egypt, probably at Alexandria. It is in the form of a dialogue between Hermes and Asclepius, his disciple, on God, the universe, nature, etc. The spirit of this work is ‘thoroughly Neo-Platonic, and though the writer directs it against Christianity, he evidently borrowed many Christian doctrines to serve his end. The Asclepius was embodied in several editions of Apuleius, and in those of the Paemander by Ficinus and Patricius. These latter editions, and the Pcemander of Adrian Turnebus, contain Οροι Α᾿σκληπίου πρὸς ῎Αμμωνα βασιλέα, probably a translation by the author of the preceding work, and treating also of God, matter, and' man. ῾Ερμοῦ τοῦ Τρισμεγίστου Ποιμάνδρης is an extensive work. The title Ποιμάνδρης, or Paemander, from Ποιμήν, pastor or shepherd, seems to be imitated from the Ποιμήν or Pastor of Hermas. SEE HERMAS.

Indeed, the latter has sometimes been considered as the author of the Paemander. It is written in the form of a dialogue, and could hardly have been composed before the 4th century. It treats of nature, creation, and God. These different subjects are viewed from the Neo-Platonic stand-point, but intermingled with Christian, Jewish, and Eastern notions. The Paemander was at first published as a Latin translation by Ticinus, under the title Mercurii Trismiegisti Liber de Potestate et Sapientia Dei (Treves, 1471, fol.; often reprinted at Venice). The Greek text, with Ficinus's translation, was first published by Adr. Turnebus (Paris, 1554, 4to; latest edit., with a commentar, Cologne, 1630, fol.). It was translated into French by G. du Prdau, under the title Deux livres de Mercurii Trismesgiste, un De la Puissance et Sapience de Dieu, l'autre De la Volonte de Dieu (Paris, 1557, 8vo); and by others: — Ι᾿ατρομαθηματικὰ ἣ περὶκατακλίσεως νοσούντων προγνωστικὰ ἐκ τῆς μαθηματικῆς ἐπιστήμης πρὸς ῎Αμμωνα Αἰγύπτιον; this treatise, much less important than the preceding one, gives the means of foretelling the issue of a sickness by means of astrology: — De Revolutionibus nativitatum, another treatise on astrology (Basle, 1559, fol.): — Aphorismi, sive centum sententiae astrologicae, called also Centiloquium, supposed to have been written originally in Arabic, but of which we possess but the Latin translation (Venice, 1492, fol.; latest edit. Ulm, 1672, 12mo): — Liberphysicomedicus Kiranidum Kirani, id est regis Persaruns, vere aureus gemeus, another astrological work, which is known to us only in the Latin translation published by Andr. Privinus, though the Greek text is yet extant in MS. at Madrid. Some of the books bearing the name of Hermes Trismegistus were evidently productions of the Middle Ages; these are Tractatus vere aureus de Lapidis philosophici Decreto, i.e. on the philosopher's stone (Latin, by  D. Gnosius, Leipz. 1610,1613, 8vo; and translated into French by G. Joly and F. Habert, Paris, 1626, 8vo); Tabula smaraydina, an essay on the art of gold-making, published in Latin (Nuremburg, 1541,.4to; Strasb. 1566, 8vo); Περὶ βοτανῶν χυλώσεως, published at the end of RBther's edition of L. Lydus's De Miensibus, with notes by Bihr; Περὶ σεισμῶν, a fragment consisting of sixty-six hexameters, attributed by some to Orpheus: it is to be found in Maittaire's Miscellanea (London, 1722, 4to), and in Brunck's Analecta, 2, 127. All the extant fragments of Hermes are given in French by Menard, Hermes Trismegiste (2nd edit. Paris, 1868). See J. H. Ursinus. Exercitatio de Mercurio Trismegisto, etc. (Nuremb. 1661, 8vo); Roeser, De Hermete Trismegisto litterarum inventore (Wittenb. 1686 4to)\*; Colberg, De libris antiqugitatem menteltibus, sibkyllarum, Hermletis, Zoroastris (Greifswald, 1694, 8vo); G. W. — Wedel, De Tabula Hermmetis smaragdina (Jena, 1704,4to); Baumgarten Crusius, De Librorum Hermeticorum Origine, etc. (Jena, 1827, 4to); Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 1, 46, 94; F. Hoefer, Hist. de la Chimie, 1, 244; Pauly, Real-Encyklop.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 377; Smith, Dictionary of Mythology and Biography, vol. 2; Warburton, Divine Legation, 1, 442; Mosheim, Commentaries, 1, 290; Cudworth, True Intellectual System of the Universe.

## Hermes, Georg[[@Headword:Hermes, Georg]]

             a distinguished modem Romanist theologian and philosopher. He was born at Dreierwalde, near Muster, April 22, 1775, became gymnasial teacher in 1798, priest in 1799, and professor of theology at Minster in 1807. The bent of his mind was towards philosophy, and his theological studies were all through his life conducted on philosophical methods. His first publication of this class was the Innere Wahrheit des Christenthums (Münst. 1805, 8vo). In 1819 he published his Philosophische Einleitung in die Christ Katholische Theologie, which passed to a second edition in 1831. In 1819 he was appointed professor of theology in the new University of Bonn, where he soon added greatly to his reputation, and his system, before his death, had found its way into most of the Roman Catholic schools of Prussia. He died at Bonn May 26,1831. His followers have since been called Hermesians. The writings of Hermes published in his lifetime have been mentioned above. After his death appeared his Christliche-Katholische Dogmatik (Münst. 1834-5, 3 vols. 8vo). In 1832 the Hermesians established a journal at Cologne as their organ. During the lifetime of Hermes there had been many complaints of the heretical  tendencies of his system, which, in fact, demanded philosophy, rather than faith, as the basis of theology. Hermes admitted all the dogmas of the Church, but held that the ground of belief in these dogmas could only be laid in a philosophical proof, first, of a divine revelation; and, secondly, that the Roman Church is the medium of that revelation. At Rome the question was put into Perrone's hands, whose report strongly condemned Hermes and his doctrines. On the 26th of September. 1835, a papal brief was issued against them. The Hermesians, however, maintained that the doctrines censured were not contained in the system of Hermes. In accordance with their request to be allowed to present in Rome a Latin translation of the works of Hermes, and to plead their orthodoxy, in 1837 two of their prominent spokesmen, professor Braun, of Bonn, and professor Elvenich, of Breslau, arrived in Rome, but, finding that they would not get an impartial hearing, soon returned. In consequence of the pressure brought upon the Hermesians by the bishops, most of them now gradually submitted; two professors of the University of Bonn who refused to submit, Braun and Achterfeld, were in 1845 forbidden by the archbishop of Cologne to continue their theological lectures. In 1847, Pius IX again sanctioned the, condemnatory brief of 1835, and Hermesianism gradually died out. A sketch of the controversy from the Hermesian side may be found in Elvenich, Der Hermnesianismus unl sein Rdmischer Gegner Perrone (Breslau, 1844, 8vo). Perrone's refutation of Hermes is given in Migne's Demonstrationes Evangeliques, 2, 945 sq.

See also Stupp, Die letzten Hermnesianer (Cologne, 18445); Hagenbach, History of 18th and 19th Centuries, tr by Hurst, 2, 444; and art. SEE GUNTHER.

## Hermes, Hermann Daniel[[@Headword:Hermes, Hermann Daniel]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born January 2, 1734, in Pomerania. He studied at Halle, was teacher at Berlin in 1752, in 1766 professor at the Magdalene gymnasium in Breslau, in 1771 preacher there. In 1791 he was called to Berlin as member of the examination commission of candidates for the ministry, accepted a call as professor of theology to Kiel in 1805, and died November 12, 1807. Besides several volumes of sermons, he published, Der Christ auf dem Krankenbette (Breslau, 1774): — Die Lehre der heiligen Schrift (1775-79, 3 parts): — Schema Examinis Candidatorum S.S. Ministerii Rite Instituendi (Berlin, 1790): — Briefe uber die Lehrbegsriffe des protestantischen Kirche (Leipsic, 1800): — Versuch zweckmasziger Betrachtungen uber die biblischen Weissagungen (1801). See Doring, Deutsche Kanzelredner; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:483. (B.P.)

## Hermes, Johann August[[@Headword:Hermes, Johann August]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Magdeburg, August 24, 1736. He studied at Halle, was in 1757 preacher at Bettendorf, in Mecklenburg, and in 1765 at Wahren. He resigned the pastorate at the latter place on account of his liberal views, which he expressed both in the pulpit and in writing, and accepted a call in 1774 to Jericho, in the duchy of Magdeburg. In 1780 he was appointed first pastor at St. Nicholas, in Quedlinburg, and in 1799 first court-preacher. He died January 6, 1822. He published, Handbuch der Religion (Berlin, 1779; 4th ed. 1791): — Communionbuch (1783, 5th ed. 1798): — Lehrbuch der Religion Jesu  (Quedlinburg, 1798; 3d ed. 1822): — Hat Christus auch fur die zeitlichen Strafen der Sunde genug gethan? (1792). See Doring, Deutsche Kanzeledner; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:9; 2:131, 213, 282, 296, 317, 365. (B.P.)

## Hermes, Johann Timotheus[[@Headword:Hermes, Johann Timotheus]]

             a German theologian, brother of Hermanni Daniel, was born in 1738. He studied at Konigsberg, was for some time preacher in Silesia, accepted a call in 1772 to Breslau, and died July 24, 1821, superintendent aid pastor primarius at St. Elizabeth. His publications are mostly sermons. See Doring, Deutsche Kanzelredner; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:97, 141,163,172, 178, 341, 401. (B.P.)

## Hermesians[[@Headword:Hermesians]]

             SEE HERMES, GEORG.

## Hermetic Books[[@Headword:Hermetic Books]]

             SEE HERMES TRISMEGISTUS.

## Hermias[[@Headword:Hermias]]

             a writer, supposed by some to date from the 2nd century. Nothing is known of his life, but we possess under his name a work entitled Διασυρμὸς τῶν ἔξω φιλοσόφων, “A satirizing of the Heathen Philosophers.” It is written in the form of a dialogue addressed to the author's friends. Hermias reviews the opinions of the philosophers on nature, the universe, God, his essence, his relations to the world, the human soul, etc. He shows their differences and contradictions on all these points, and thus proves the insufficient cy and futility of all their theories. This little work, written in the manner and somewhat in the style of Lucian, is an interesting document for the history of ancient philosophy, but has no other merit, philosophical or theological. It was published, with a Latin translation by Seiler (Zurich, 1553, 8vo; 1560, fol.), and is inserted in several collections of ecclesiastical works, namely, in Morel, Tabula compenediosa (Basle, 1580,. 8vo); in several editions of Justin Martyr; in Worth's edition of Tatian (Oxford, 1700, 8vo); in the Auctarium Bibl. Patr. (Paris, 1624, fol.), and in Gallandii Biblioth. Patr. J. C. Dommerich published a separate edition, with notes by H. Wolf, Gale, and Worth (Halle, 1764, 8vo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 24; 387; Dupin, Eccles. Writers, 2nd cent.; Donaldson, History of Christian Literature, 2, 179.

## Hermit[[@Headword:Hermit]]

             (Gr. ἐρημός, desert), one devoted to religious solitude; properly, the solitude of a wilderness. It became, at a later period, the name of certain classes of monks. SEE MONASTICISM; SEE MONE.

## Hermod[[@Headword:Hermod]]

             in Norse mythology; was the son of Odin, who corresponds to Mercury in the Greek system. He is a herald of the gods, distinguished by his quickness and versatility.

## Hermogenes[[@Headword:Hermogenes]]

             ( ῾Ερμογένης, Merassry-born), a disciple of Asia Minor, and probably companion in labor of the apostle Paul; mentioned, along with Phygellus,  as having abandoned him during his second imprisonment at Rome, doubtless from alarm at the perils of the connection (2Ti 1:15). A.D. 64.' In the Roman Breviary (in Fest. S. Jac. Apost. Pars. aestiva, p. 485, Milan, 1851) the conversion of Hermogenes is attributed to St. James the Great, and in the legendary history of Abdias, the so-called bishop of Babylon (Fabricius, Cod. Apocryph. N.T. p. 517 sq.), Hermogenes is represented as first practicing magic, and converted, with Philetus, by the same apostle. Grotius, apparently misled by the circumstance that the historian or geographer Hermogenes, mentioned by the scholiast of Apollonius Rhodius (2, 722, Frag. Hist. Graec. Didot. ed., 3:523), wrote on primitive history, and incidentally (?) speaks of Nannacus or Anacus- and may therefore probably be the same as the Hermogenes whom Josephus mentions as having treated on Jewish history (Apion, 1, 23) — suggests that he may be the person mentioned by the apostle Paul. This, however, is not likely. Nothing more is known of the Hermogenes in question, and\* he cannot be identified either with Hermogenes of Tarsus, a historian of the time of Domitian, who was put to death by that emperor (Sueton. Domit. 10; Hoffman, Lex. Univ. s.v.; Alford on 2Ti 1:15), nor with Hermogenes the painter, against whom Tertullian wrote (Smith's Dict. of Class. Biography, s.v.), nor with the saints of the Byzantine Church, commemorated on Jan. 24 and Sept. I (Neale, Eastern Church, 2, 770, 781).

Hermogenes

a heretic of the 2nd century. Our knowledge of him is chiefly derived from a treatise against him by Tertullian (adv. Hermogenen), and from an account in the newly-discovered MS. of Hippolytus. He was living, probably in Africa, when Tertullian wrote against him, and was a painter by profession. Tertullian charged that Hermogenes was a believer in the doctrines of the heathen philosophers, and especially in those of the Stoics, and especially that he taught the eternity of matter. Hermogenes argued that God must have made the world either out of his own substance, or out of nothing, or out of pre-existent matter. The first, he thought, was inconsistent with God's immutability; the second with the origin of evil; and therefore the third must be received as true. “He rejected both the Gnostic Emanation doctrine and the Church doctrine of Creation: the former contradicted the unchangeable nature of God, and necessitated attributing to him the origin of evil; the latter was contradicted by the nature of this world; for if the creation of the perfect God had been  conditioned by nothing, a perfect world must have been the result. Hence he believed that creation supposed something conditioning, and this he thought must be the Hyle which he received from Platonism into connection with the Christian system. He did not think that he gave up the doctrine of the μοναρχία as long as he admitted a ruling, all-powerful principle, and ascribed to God such a supremacy over the Hyle. He regarded the Hyle as altogether undetermined, predicateless, in which all the contrarieties that afterwards appeared in the world were as yet unseparated and undeveloped; neither motion nor rest, neither flowing nor standing still, but an inorganic confusion. It was the receptive, God alone the creative; his formative agency called forth from it determinate existence. But with this organization there was a residuum which withstood the divine formative power. Hence the defective and the offensive in nature; hence also evil. Had he been logical he must have admitted a creation without a beginning; he could not have regarded it as a single and transitive act of God, but as immanent, and resulting immediately from the relation of God to matter. He said God was always a ruler, consequently he must always have had dominion over matter” (Neander, Hist. of Dogmas, Ryland's transl., 1, 118). The account in Hippolytus, Κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων (bk. 24), agrees, in the main, with that given above, and adds that Hermogenes taught that Christ, after his resurrection, when he “ascended to heaven, leaving his body in the sun, proceeded himself to his Father.” See Augustine, De Haer. 41; Tertullian, adv. Hermogenem, passim; Ritter, Geschichte d. Philosophie, 5, 178; Neander, Ch. Hist. (Torrey's), 1, 568; Mosheim, Comm. vol. 1; Lardner, Wornks, 2, 203; 8:579; Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, vol. 1, §47.

## Hermogenians[[@Headword:Hermogenians]]

             SEE HERMOGENUS (the heretic).

## Hermon[[@Headword:Hermon]]

             (Heb. Chermon', חֶרְמוֹן, according to Gesenius, from the Arabic Charm- sn, a peak; Sept. Α᾿ερμών), a mountain which formed the northernmost boundary (Jos 12:1) of the country beyond the Jordan (Jos 11:17) which the Hebrews conquered from the Amorites (Deu 3:8), and which, therefore, must have belonged to Anti-Libanus (1Ch 5:23), as is, indeed, implied or expressed in most of the other passages in which it is named (Deu 4:48; Jos 11:3; Jos 11:17; Jos 12:5; Jos 13:5; Jos 13:11; Psa 89:12; Psa 133:3; Son 4:8). It has two or more summits, and is therefore spoken of in the plur. (חֶרְמֹנַים, Psa 42:7; Sept. ῾Εμωνιείμ, Engl. Vers. “Hermonites”). In  Deu 3:9 it is said to have been called by the Sidonians Sirion (שַׂרְיוֹן), and by the Amorites Shenir (שְׁנַיר), both of which words signify “a coat of mail,” as glittering in the sun. In Deu 4:48 it is called Mount Sion (שַׂיאוֹן), meaning “an elevation,” ‘a high mountain”- which it was well entitled to be designated by way of excellence, being (if correctly identified within Jebel es-Sheik) by far the highest of all the mountains in or near Palestine. In the later books of the Old Testament, however (as in 1Ch 5:23; Son 4:8), Shenir is distinguished from Hermon properly so called. Probably different summits or parts of this range bore different names, which were applied in a wider or narrower acceptation at different times (see Schwarz, Palestine, p. 56). SEE HIVITE.

Hermon was a natural landmark. It could be seen from the “plains of Moab” beside the Dead Sea, from the heights of Nebo, from every prominent spot, in fact, in Moab, Gilead, and Bashan — a pale blue, snow- capped peak, terminating the view on the northern horizon. When the people came to know the country better when not merely its great physical features, but its towns and villages became familiar to them, then Baal Gad and Dan took the place of Hermon, both of them being situated just at the southern base of that mountain. Hermon itself was not embraced in the country conquered by Moses and Joshua; their conquests extended only to it (see Jos 11:17; Deu 34:1; 1Sa 3:20). Hermon was also the north-western boundary of the old kingdom of Bashan, as Salcah was the south-eastern. We read in Jos 12:5 that Og “reigned in Mount Hermon, and in Salcah, and in all Bashan” i.e. in all Bashan, from Hermon to Salcah Another notice of Hermon shows the minute accuracy of the topography of Joshua. He makes “Lebanon towards the sun rising,” that is, the range of Anti-Lebanon, extend from Hermon to the entering into Hamath (13, 5). Every Oriental geographer now knows that Hermon is the southern and culminating point of this range. The beauty and grandeur of Hermon did not escape the attention of the Hebrew poets. From nearly every prominent point in Palestine the mountain is visible, but it is when we leave the hill-country of Samaria and enter the plain of Esdraelon that Hermon appears in all its majesty, shooting up on the distant horizon behind the graceful rounded top of Tabor. It was probably this view that suggested to the Psalmist the words “The north and the south thou hast created them: Tabor and Hermon shall rejoice in thy name” (Psa 89:12). The “dew of Hermon” is once referred to in a  passage which has long been considered a geographical puzzle — ” As the dew of Hermon, the dew that descended on the mountains of Zion” (Psa 133:3). Some have thought that Zion (צַיּוֹן) is used here for Sion (שַׂיאֹן), one of the old names of Hermon (Deu 4:48), but this identification is unnecessary. The snow on the summit of this mountain condenses the vapors that float during the summer in the higher regions of the atmosphere, causing light clouds to hover around it, and abundant dew to descend on it, while the whole country elsewhere is parched, and the whole heaven elsewhere cloudless. One of its tops is actually called Abu- Nedy, i.e. “father of dew” (Porter, Handb. 2, 463).

Since modern travelers have made us acquainted with the country beyond the Jordan, no doubt has been entertained that the Mount Hermon of those texts is no other than the present Jebel es-Sheik, or the Sheik's Mountain, or, which is equivalent, Old Man's Mountain. a name it is said to have obtained from its fancied resemblance (being topped with snow, which sometimes lies in lengthened streaks upon its sloping ridges) to the hoary head and beard of a venerable sheik (Elliot, 1, 317). This Jebel es-sheik is a south-eastern, and in that direction culminating, branch of Anti-Libanus. Its top is partially covered with snow throughout the summer, and has an elevation of 9376 feet (Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 170, 176). Dr. Clarke, who saw it in the month of July, says, “The summit is so lofty that the snow entirely covered the upper part of it, not lying in patches, but investing all the higher part with that perfectly white and smooth velvet- like appearance which snow only exhibits when it is very deep.” Dr. Robinson only differs from the preceding by the statement that the snow is perpetual only in the ravines, so that the top presents the appearance of radiant stripes around and below the summit (Bib. Researches, 3:344). At his last visit to Palestine, he observes, under date of April 9 (new ed. of Researches, 3, 48), that “the snow extended for some distance down the sides, while on the peaks of Lebanon opposite there was none.” In August, 1852, Rev. J. L. Porter, of Damascus, ascended Jebel es-Sheik from Rashey, and spent a night near its summit. He describes the highest peak as composed strictly of three peaks, so near each other as to appear one from below. On the south-easternmost of these peaks are some interesting remains, called Kulal Antar, probably relics of an ancient Syro-Phoenician temple, consisting of a circular wall around a rock about 15 feet high, which has a rude excavation upon it, and heaps of beveled stones adjoining it. The snow-banks explain the supply anciently made for cooling drinks in  Tyre and Sidon (Bibliotheca Sac. January 1854). The summit is about 9000 feet above the Mediterranean (Lieut.Warren, in the Quarterly Statement of the “Palestine Exploration Fund,” No. 5, p. 210, where also are a description and cut of the ruined temple).

In two passages of Scripture this mountain is called Baal-hermon (בִּעִל חֶרְמוֹן, Jdg 3:3; 1 Chronicles 5, 23), and the only reason that call be assigned for it is that Baal was there worshipped. Jerome says of it, “Diciturque in vertice ejus insigne templum, quod ab ethnicis cultui habetur e regione Paneadis et Libani” — reference must here be made to the building whose ruins are still seen (Onom. s.v. Hermon). It is remarkable that Hermon was anciently encompassed by a circle of temples, all facing the summit. Can it be that this mountain was the great sanctuary of Baal, and that it was to the old Syrians what Jerusalem was to the Jews, and what Mecca is to the Moslems? (See Porter, Handbook for Syria and Pal. p. 454, 457; Reland, Palaest. p. 323 sq.) The above-described ruins seem to confirm this conjecture. SEE BAAL-HERMON.

It has been suggested that one of the southern peaks of Hermon was the scene of the Transfiguration. Our Lord traveled from Bethsaida, on the northern slope of the Sea of Galilee, “to the coasts of Caesarea-Philippi,” where he led his disciples “into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them;” and afterwards he returned, going towards Jerusalem through Galilee (comp. Mar 8:22-28; Mat 16:13; Mar 9:2-13; Mar 9:30-33). No other mountain in Palestine is more appropriate to the circumstances of that glorious scene, except Tabor, to which many centuries' tradition has assigned this honor (Robinson, Bib. Res. 2, 358); but if it be as, signed to this locality, it will give additional celebrity to the prince of Syrian mountains (Porter's Danascus, 1, 306).

The mention of Hermon along with Tabor Psa 89:12, led to its being sought near the latter mountain, where, accordingly, travelers and maps give us a “Little Hermon.” But that passage, as well as Psa 133:3, applies better to the great mountain already described; and in the former it seems perfectly natural for the Psalmist to call upon these mountains, respectively the most conspicuous in the western and eastern divisions of the Hebrew territory, to rejoice in the name of the Lord. Besides, we are to consider that Jebel es-sheikh is seen from Mount Tabor, and that both together are visible from the plain of Esdraelon. There is no reason to, suppose that the so-called Little Hermon is at all mentioned in Scripture.  Its actual name is Jebel ed-Duhy; it is a shapeless, barren, and uninteresting mass of hills, in the north of the valley of Jezreel and opposite Mount Gilboa (Robinson, Researches, 3, 171).

## Hermon (2)[[@Headword:Hermon (2)]]

             We give the latest account of an ascent of this remarkable mountain (Conder, Tent Work in Palestine, 1:261 sq.):

"We commenced the ascent of some 5000 feet about 10.30 A.M. (from Rasheyah, which is three hours distant), passing first through the fine vineyards, into which the bears often come down, from the summit, to eat grapes; thence among lanes with stone walls, passing clumps of wild rose, of oak, and of hawthorn, and honeysuckle in flower. We thus reached the bottom of the nimainl peak, consisting entirely of gray rocks, worn by snow and rain into jagged teeth and ridges, covered with loose shingle or gravel. It seemed impossible for horses, and still more for laden mules, to toil up; but the breeze grew fresher, and the bracing mountain air seemed to give vigor to  man and beast. Resting at intervals, we gradually clambered up, passing by the little cave where the initiated Druses retire, for three or four months, and perform unknown rites. Ridge above ridge, of rock and gray gravel, appeared, each seemingly the last, each only hiding one above. Not a creature was to be seen, except an occasional vulture, and. not a tree or shrub, for the snow covers all this part of the mountain till late in summer. By two o'clock we reached the summit.

"A glorious panorama repaid us for our labor. South of us lay Palestine, visible as far as Carmel and Tabor, some eighty miles away; eastward a broad plain, with detached hills on the dim horizon beyond; westward the Lebanon and the golden sea northward, mountains as high as Hermon, Lebanon, and Anti- Lebanon. As the sun sank lower, Palestine became more distinct, and appeared wonderfully narrow. The calm, green Sea of Galilee lay, dreamlike, in its circle of dark-gray hills. Tabor was just visible to the south; and from it the plateau ran out east to the Horns of Hattin.

The broken chain of the Upper Galilaean Hills, 4000 feet high, lay beneath the eye, and terminated in the Ladder of Tyre. The mole of Tyre stood out black against the gleaming water; and the deep gorge of the Litany could be Jeen winding past the beautiful fortress of Belfort. Dim and misty beyond, lay the ridge of Carmel, from the promontory to the peak of Sacrifice. The white domes in Tiberias were shining in the sun, and many of the Galilsean towns, including Safed, could be distinguished. The scene presented a great contrast on the east and west. In the brown, desolate, and boundless plain to the east stood the distant green oasis of Damascus, and the white city, with its tall minarets. The flat horizon was broken only by the peaks of Jebel Kuleib, the 'Hill of Bashan,' some seventy miles away.

South-east of Damascus was the terrible Lejja district, a basin of basalt seamed with deep gorges, like rough furrows, and with isolated cones, into which one appeared to look down, so distinctly were the shadows marked inside the hollow, broken craters. No. trees or water relieved the dusky color; but the great dust whirlwillds were swirling slowly along over the plains, the bodies, as the Arabs tell us, of huge malignant spirits, carrying destruction in their path. At the foot of the mountain little villages were perched on the rocks, and a stream  glittered in a green valley. In most of these hamlets there is a temple facing the rising sun, which appears first from behind the great plain on the east. On the west, high mountain walls, ridge behind ridge, reached out towards Beyrut, and, on the north, cedar clumps and ragged peaks, gray and dark, with long, sweeping shadows, were thrown in strong contrast against the shining sea. The sun began to set, a deep ruby fluish came over all the scene, and warm purple shadows crept slowly on. The Sea of Galilee was lit up with a delicate greenish-yellow hue, between its dim walls of hill. The flush died out in a few minutes, and a pale, steel-colored shade succeeded, although to us, at a height of 9150 feet, the sun was still visible, and the rocks around us still ruddy. A long pyramidal shadow slid down to the eastern foot of Hermon, and crept across the great plain; Damascus was swallowed up by it, and finally the pointed end of the shadow stood out distinctly against the sky —a dusky cone of dull color against the flash of the afterglow. It was the shadow of the mountain itself, stretching away for seventy miles across the plain — the most marvellous shadow perhaps to be seen anywhere. The sun underwent strange changes of shape in the thick vapors — low almost square, now like a domed temple — until at length it slid into the sea, and went out like a blue spark.

"Our tent was pitched in the hollow, and six beds crowded into it. Until one in the morning we continued to observe the stars, but the cold was very considerable, though no snow was left, and the only water we had was fetched from a spring about a third of the way down, and tasted horribly of the goat-skin. In the morning. I ran to the peak, and saw the sun emerge behind the distant plain, and the great conical shadow, stretching over the sea and against the western sky, becoming gradually more blunt, until it shrivelled up and was lost upon the hills beneath.

"The top of Hermon consists of three rocky peaks; two, north and south, of equal height — the third, to the west, considerably lower. On the southern peak are the ruins called Kiisr esh-Shabib — a rock-hewn hollow or trench, and a circular dwarf-wall, with a temple just below the peak on the south.: On tile plateau is a rudely excavated cave, with a rock-cut pillar supporting the roof, and a flat space levelled above, probably once the floor of a building over  the cave. Of all these objects of interest we made careful plans, as well of the shape of the summit. "There is one remarkable natural peculiarity of Hermon still to be noticed — namely, the extreme rapidity of the formation of cloud on the summit. In a few minutes a thick cap forms over the top of the mountain, and as quickly disperses and entirely disappears.'

## Hermonite[[@Headword:Hermonite]]

             (Psalm 43:7). SEE HERMON.

## Hernandez[[@Headword:Hernandez]]

             SEE JULIAN THE LITTLE.

## Hernhutters[[@Headword:Hernhutters]]

             SEE MORAVIANS.

## Hero-worship[[@Headword:Hero-worship]]

             SEE IDOLATRY.

## Herod      [[@Headword:Herod      ]]

             ( ῾Ηρώδης, hero-like, a name that appears likewise among the Greeks, Dio. Cass. 71, 35; Philost. Soph. 2, 1, etc.), the name of several persons of the royal family of Judaea in the time of Christ and the apostles (see Noldius, De vita et gestis Herodum, in Havercamp's edit. of Josephus; Reland, Palaest. p. 174 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Israeliten, 1, 160 sq. Other monographs are named by Volbeding, Index Progammatum, p. 16,77, and by Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 1, 386; 2, 127-130. See also De Saulcy, Hist. d'Hierode, Par. 1867; Güder, Ierodes, Bern, 1869), Whose history is incidentally involved in that of the N. Testament, but is copiously detailed by Josephus notices of it also occur in the classical writers, especially Strabo (16, c. 2, 16). We therefore devote a large space to consideration of the subject.

The history of the Herodian family presents one side of the last development of the Jewish nation. The evils which had existed in the hierarchy that grew up after the Return, found an unexpected embodiment in the tyranny of a foreign usurper. Religion was adopted as a policy; and the hellenizing designs of Antiochus Epiphanes were carried out, at least in their spirit, by men who professed to observe the law. Side by side with the spiritual “kingdom of God” proclaimed by John the Baptist, and founded by the Lord, a kingdom of the world was established, which in its external splendor recalled the traditional magnificence of Solomon. The simultaneous realization of the two principles, national and spiritual, which had long variously influenced the Jews, in the establishment of a dynasty and a church, is a fact pregnant with instruction. In the fulness of time a descendant of Esau established a false counterpart of the promised glories of the Messiah.  Various accounts are given of the ancestry of the Herods. The Jewish partisans of Herod (Nicolas Damascenus, ap; Josephus, Ant. 14, 1, 3) sought to raise him to the dignity of a descent from one of the noble families which returned from Babylon; and, on the other hand, early Christian writers represented his origin as utterly mean and servile. Africanus has preserved a tradition (Routh, Rell. Sacr. 2, 235), on the authority of “the natural kinsmen of the Savior,” which makes Antipater, the father of Herod, the son of one Herod, a slave attached to the service of a temple of Apollo at Ascalon, who was taken prisoner by Idummean robbers, and kept by them, as his father could not pay his ransom. The locality (comp. Philo, Leg. ad Caium, § 30), no less than the office, was calculated to fix a heavy reproach upon the name (comp. Routh, 1. c.). This story is repeated with great inaccuracy by Epiphanius (Hoer. 20). Neglecting, however, these exaggerated statements of friends and enemies, it seems certain that the family was of Idumaean descent:'(Josephus, Ant. 14, 1, 3), a fact which is indicated by the forms of some of the names that were retained in it (Ewald, Geschichte, 4, 477, note). But, though aliens by race, the Herods were Jews in faith. The Idumaeans had been conquered and brought over to Judaism by John Hyrcanus (B.C. 130; Josephus, Ant. 13, 9,1); and from the time of their conversion they remained constant to their new religion, looking upon Jerusalem as their mother city, and claiming for themselves the name of Jews (Josephus, Ant. 20, 7, 7; War, 1, 10, 4; 4, 4, 4).

The general policy of the whole Herodian family, though modified by the personal characteristics of the successive rulers, was the same. It centered in the endeavor to found a great and independent kingdom, in which the power of Judaism should subserve the consolidation of a state. The protection of Rome was in the first instance a necessity, but the designs of Herod I and Agrippa I point to an independent Eastern empire as their end, and not to a mere subject monarchy. Such a consummation of the Jewish hopes seems to have found some measure of acceptance at first SEE HERODIAN; and by a natural reaction the temporal dominion of the Herods opened the way for the destruction of the Jewish nationality. The religion which was degraded into the instrument of unscrupulous ambition lost its power to quicken a united people. The high priests were appointed and deposed by Herod I and his successors, with such a reckless disregard for the character of their office (Jost, Gesch. d. Judenthums, 1, 322, 325, 42 1), that the office itself was deprived of its sacred dignity (compare  Act 23:2 sq.; Jost, 1, 430, etc.). The nation was divided, and amidst the conflict of sects a universal faith arose, which more than fulfilled the nobler hopes that found no satisfaction in the treacherous grandeur of a court. See the name of each member of the family in its order in this CYCLOPEDIA.

1. HEROD THE GREAT, as he is usually surnamed, mentioned in Mat 2:1-22; Luk 1:5; Act 23:35 was the second son of Antipater and Cypros, an Arabian lady of noble descent (Josephus, Ant. 14:7, 3). See ANTIPATER. In B.C. 47 Julius Caesar made Antipater procurator of Judea, and the latter divided his territories among his four sons, assigning the district of Galilee to Herod (Josephus, Ant. 14, 9, 3; War, 1, 10, 4). At the time when he was invested with the government he was fifteen years of age, according to Josephus (Ant. 14, 9, 2); but this must be a mistake. Herod died, aged sixty-nine, in B.C. 4, consequently he must have been twenty-six or twenty-five in the year B.C. 47, when he was made governor of Galilee (πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι, given by Dindorf in the ed. Didot, but no stated authority). One of his first acts was to repress the brigands who were infesting his provinces, and to put many of their dealers to death upon his own authority. This was made known to Hyrcanus, and Herod was summoned to take his trial before the Sanhedrim for his deeds of violence. Herod, instead of appearing before the Sanhedrim clothed in mourning, came in purple, attended by armed guards, and bearing in his hands a letter from the Roman commander Sextus Caesar for his acquittal. This overawed the assembly; but Sameas, a just man (Josephus, Ant. 14:9, 4), stepped forward, and, boldly addressing the assembly, predicted that, should the offender escape punishment, he would live to kill all those who were his judges, and would not grant the pardon which the assembly seemed inclined to extend to him. He, however, escaped, and took refuge with Sextus Caesar, who soon appointed him governor (στρατηγός) of Caele-Syria. He then determined to march against Jerusalem, and would have done so had not his father Antipater and his family restrained him from committing any fresh acts of violence. In B.C. 44, after Caesar's death, Cassius took the government of Syria. Herod and his father Antipater willingly assisted Cassius in obtaining the taxes levied upon the Jews for the support of the troops. For this Herod was confirmed in the government of Caele-Syria (Josephus, War, 1, 11, 4). In B.C. 41 Antony came to Syria, and Herod, by making him valuable presents, soon formed with him a close personal intimacy (Josephus, Ant. 14:12,2). Hyrcanus, to  whose beautiful granddaughter Mariamne Herod was betrothed, induced Antony to make Herod and his brother Phasael tetrarchs of Judaea (Josephus, Ant. 14, 13, 1; War, 1, 12, 5). The invasion of the Parthians, who sided with Antigonus the Asmonsean, compelled Herod to give up Judaea and fly to Rome. Antony was then in great power, and took Herod under his protection, and, seeing that he might prove useful to him, obtained a decree of the senate appointing him king of Judaea, to the extinction of all the living Asmonaean princes (Josephus, Ant. 14, 9-14; War, 1, 10-14; Dion Cass. 48). These events took place in B.C. 40, and Herod, only staying seven days at Rome, returned speedily to Jerusalem within three months from the time he had first fled.

It was not, however, so easy for Herod to obtain possession of Jerusalem, or to establish himself as king of Judaea, as it had been to obtain this title from the Romans. The Jews still held firmly to Antigonus as the representative of the Asmonaean line, and it was not for several years that Herod made any material advance whatever. With the assistance of the Romans Herod made preparations to take Jerusalem. — He had endeavored to conciliate the people by marrying Mariamne, thinking that by so doing the attachment of the Jews to the Asmonaean family would be extended to him. After six months' siege the Romans entered the city (B.C. 37), and, to revenge the obstinate resistance they had received, began to ransack and plunder, and it was no easy task for Herod to purchase from the conquerors the freedom from pillage of some part of his capital. Antigonus was taken and conveyed to Antioch, where, having been previously beaten, he was ignominiously executed with the axe by the order of Antony, a mode of treatment which the Romans had never before used to a king (Dion Cass. 69, 22; Josephus, Ant. 15, 1, 2) Thus ended the government of the Asmonaeans, 126 years after it was first set up (Josephus, Ant. 14, 16, 4). Immediately on ascending the throne Herod put to death all the members of the Sanhedrim, excepting Pollio and Sameas (the famous Hillel and Shammai of the Rabbinical writers), who had predicted this result, and also all the adherents of Antigonus who could be found. Having confiscated their property, he sent presents to Antony to repay him for his assistance and to further secure his favor. He then gave the office of high-priest, which had become vacant by the death of Antigonus, and the mutilation of Hyrcanus, whose ears had been cut off by Antigonus (comp. Lev 21:16-24), to an obscure priest from Babylon named Ananel. At this insult Alexandra, the mother of Mariamne  and Aristobulus, to whom the office of high-priest belonged by hereditary succession, appealed to Cleopatra to use her powerful influence with Antony, and Herod was thus compelled to depose Ananel, and to elevate Aristobulus to the high-priesthood. The increasing popularity of Aristobulus, added to the further intrigues of Alexandra, so excited the jealousy of Herod that he caused him to be drowned while bathing, and expressed great sorrow at the accident. SEE ARISTOBULUS.

Alexandra again applied to Cleopatra, who at last persuaded Antony to summon Herod to Laodicea to answer for his conduct. Herod was obliged to obey, but was dismissed with the highest honors (Josephus, Ant. 15:3,1-8; comp. 14 Wa., 1, 22, 2). After the defeat of Antony at Actium, in B.C. 31, Herod had an audience at Rhodes with Octavius, who did not think that Antony was quite powerless while Herod continued his assistance to him (Josephus, War, 1, 20, 1). Herod so conciliated him that he obtained security in his kingdom of Judaea, to which Octavius added Gadara, Samaria, and the maritime cities Gaza and Joppa. Shortly after the regions of Trachonitis, Batanea, and Auranitis were given him (Josephus, Ant. 15:5, 6, 7; 10, 1; War, 1, 20, 3, 4; comp. Tacit. Hist. 5, 9). Herod's domestic life was troubled by a long series of bloodshed. Hyrcanus, the grandfather of his wife Mariamne, was put to death before his visit to Octavius, and Mariamne, to whom he was passionately attached, fell a victim to his jealousy soon after his return. SEE HYRCANUS; SEE MARIAMNE.

His remorse for the deed is well described by Josephus, who says that Herod commanded his attendants always to speak of her as alive (Ant. 15, 7, 7; War, 1, 22, 5). In B.C. 20, when Augustus visited Judaea in person; another extensive addition was made to his territories. The district of Paneas was taken away from its ruler Zenodorus for leaguing himself with the Arabs, and given to Herod. In return, Herod adorned this place by erecting a temple, which he dedicated to Augustus (Josephus, Ant. 15, 10,.3, War, 1, 20, 4; Dion. Cass. 54, 9). Not long after this, the death of his wife was followed by other atrocities. Alexander and Aristobulus, the sons of Mariamne, were put to death; and at last, in B.C. 4, Herod ordered his eldest son, Antipater, to be killed. SEE ALEXANDER; SEE ARISTOBULUS; SEE ANTIPATER.

Herod's painful disease no doubt maddened him in his later years, and in anticipation of his own death he gave orders that the principal Jews, whom he had shut up in the Hippodrome at Jericho, should immediately after his decease be put to death, that mourners might not be wanting at his funeral (Josephus, Ant. 17. 6, 5). Near his death, too, he must have ordered the murder of the  infants at Bethlehem, as recorded by Matthew (Mat 2:16-18). The number of children in a village must have been very few; and Josephus has passed this story over unnoticed; yet it is worthy of remark that he has given an account of a massacre by Herod of all the members of his family who had consented to what the Pharisees foretold, viz. that Herod's government should cease, and his posterity be deprived of the kingdom (Ant. 17, 2, 4). A confused account of the massacre of the children and the murder of Antipater is given in Macrobius: “Augustus cum audisset inter pueros, quos in Syria Herodes, rex Judaeorum, intra bimatum jussit intefici, filium quoque ejus occisum, ait: Melius est Herodis porcum (?ὕν, swine) esse quam filium (? υἱόν, son)” (Sat. 2, 4). Macrobius lived in the 5th century (c. A.D. 420), and the words intra bimatum (a bimatu et infra, Mat 2:16. Vulg.) seem to be borrowed; the story, too, is erong, as Antipater was of age when he was executed (Alford, ad-loc.). Macrobius may have made some mistake on account of Herod's wish to destroy- the heir to the throne of David. The language of the evangelist leaves in complete uncertainty the method in which the deed was effected (ἀποστείλας ἀνεῖλεν). The scene of open and undisguised violence which has been consecrated by Christian art is wholly at variance with what may be supposed to have been the historic reality.

Herod was married to no less than ten wives, by most of whom he had children. He died a few days before the Passover, B.C. 4, his deathbed being the scene of the most awful agonies in mind and body. According to the custom of the times, he made his sons the heirs to his kingdom by a formal testament, leaving its ratification to the will of the emperor. Augustus assenting to its main provisions, Archelaus, became tetrarch of Juduea, Samaria, and Idumnea; Philip, of Trachonitis and Ituraea; and Herod Antipas, of Galilee and Perrua. His body was conveyed by his son Archelaus from Jericho, where he died, to Herodium, a city and fortress 200 stadia distant, and he was there buried with great pomp (Josephus, Ant. 17, 2; War, 1, 38, 9).

On the extirpation of the Asmonaean family, finding that there was then no one who could interfere with him, Herod had introduced heathenish customs, such as plays, shows, and chariot-races, which the Jews condemned as contrary to the laws of Moses (Josephus, Ant. 15, 1); and on the completion of the building of Caesarea he also introduced Olympic games and consecrated them to Caesar, ordering them to be celebrated every fifth year (Josephus, Ant. 15, 9, 6; 16:5, 1). With regard to the  prejudices of the Jews, Herod showed as great contempt for public opinion as in the execution of his personal vengeance. He signalized his elevation to the throne by offerings to the Capitoline Jupiter (Jost, Gesch. d. Judenthums, 1, 318), and surrounded his person by foreign mercenaries, some of whom had formerly been in the service of Cleopatra (Josephus, Ant. 15, 7,3; 17:1, 1; 8, 3). His coins and those of his successors bore only Greek legends; and he introduced heathen games even within the walls of Jerusalem (Josephus, A nt. 15, 8, 1). He displayed ostentatiously his favor towards foreigners (Josephus, Ant. 16, 5, 3), and oppressed the old Jewish aristocracy (Josephus, Ant. 15, 1, 1). The later Jewish traditions describe him as successively the servant of the Asmonaeans and the Romans, and relate that one Rabbin only survived the persecution which he directed against them, purchasing his life by the loss of sight (Jost, 1, 319, etc.).

Notwithstanding that he thus alienated his subjects from him, he greatly improved his country by the number of fine towns and magnificent public buildings which he had erected. He built a temple at Samaria, and converted it into a Roman city under the name of Sebaste. He also built Gaba in Galilee, and Heshbonitis in Persea (Josephus, Ant. 15, 8, 5), besides several other towns, which he called by the names of different members of his family, as Antipatris, from the name of his father Antipater, and Phasaelis, in the plains of Jericho, after his brother Phasael (Josephus, Ant. 16, 5, 2). On many other towns in Syria and Greece he bestowed money, but his grandest undertaking was the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem. It was commenced in the 18th year of his reign (B.C. 21), and the work was carried on with such vigor that the Temple itself (ναός), i.e. the Holy House, was finished in a year and a half (Josephus, Ant. 15:11,1, 6). The cloisters and other buildings were finished in eight years (Josephus, Ant. 15:11, 5). Additions and repairs were continually made, and it was not till the reign of Herod Agrippa II (c. A.D. 65) that the Temple (τὸ ἱερόν) was completed (Josephus, Ant. 20, 9, 7). Hence the Jews said to our Lord, “Forty and six years was this Temple in building [ᾠκοδομήθη — and is not even yet completed], and wilt thou raise it up in three days!” (Joh 2:20). This took place in A.D. 26, not long after our Lord's baptism, who “was about thirty years of age” (Luk 3:23), and who was born some two years before the death of Herod, in B.C. 4, according to the true chronology. This beautiful Temple, though built in honor of the God of Israel, did not win the hearts of the people, as is proved by the revolt which took place shortly before Herod's death, when the Jews tore down the  golden eagle which he had fastened to the Temple, and broke it in pieces (Josephus, Antig. 17, 6, 2, 3)

The diversity of Herod's nature is remarkable. On regarding his magnificence, and the benefits he bestowed upon his people, one cannot deny that he had a very beneficent disposition; but when we read of his cruelties, not only to his subjects, but even to his own relations, one is forced to allow that he was brutish and a stranger to humanity (comp. Josephus, Ant. 16, 5, 4). His servility to Rome is amply shown by the manner in which he transgressed the customs of his nation and set aside many of their laws, building cities and erecting temples in foreign countries, for the Jews did not permit him so to do in Judaea, even though they were under so tyrannical a government as that of Herod. His confessed apology was that he was acting to please Caesar and the Romans, and so through all his reign he was a Jewish prince only in name, with a Hellenistic disposition (comp. Josephus, Ant. 15, 9, 5; 19:7, 3). It has even been supposed (Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. 1, 323) that the rebuilding of the Temple furnished him with the opportunity of destroying the authentic collection of genealogies which was of the highest importance to the priestly families. Herod, as appears from his public designs, affected the dignity of a second Solomon, but he joined the license of that monarch to his magnificence; and it was said that the monument which he raised over the royal tombs was due to the fear which seized him after a sacrilegious attempt to rob them of secret treasures (Josephus, Ant. 16, 7,1). He maintained peace at home during a long reign by the vigor and timely generosity of his administration. Abroad he conciliated the goodwill of the Romans under circumstances of unusual difficulty. His ostentatious display, and even his arbitrary tyranny, was calculated to inspire Orientals with awe. Bold and yet prudent, oppressive and yet profuse, he had many of the characteristics which make a popular hero; and the title which may have been first given in admiration of successful despotism now serves to bring out in clearer contrast the terrible price at which the success was purchased.

Josephus gives Herod I the surname of Great ( ῾Ηρώδης ὁ μέγας). Ewald suggests that the title elder is only intended to distinguish him from the younger Herod (Antipas), and compares the cases of ῾Ελκίας ὸμέγας (Ant. 18:8, 4) and Agrippa the Great, in contradistinction to Helcias, the keeper of the sacred treasure (Ant. 20:11, 1), and to Agrippa II. The title “Agrippa the Great” is confirmed by coins, on which he is styled ΜΕΓΑΣ  (Eckhel, Doct. Nun. Vet. 3, 492; Akerman, Nusm. Chronicles 9:23), and so, says Ewald, “it may similarly have been given upon the coins of Herod, and from this the origin of the surname may have been derived” (Geschichte, 4, 473, note). There are, however, no coins of Herod I with the title great. It is best to suppose that the title in Josephus is merely a distinguishing epithet, and not meant to express greatness of character or achievements.

2. HEROD ANTIPAS ( ῾Ηρώδης, Matt., Mark, Luke; Αντίπας, Josephus) was the son of Herod the Great, by Malthace, a Samaritan (Joseph. Ant. 17, 1, 3; War, 1, 28, 4). His father had already given him “the kingdom” in his first will. but in the final arrangement left him the tetrarchy of Galilee and Persea (Josephus, Ant. 17, 8,1; War, 2, 9,1; Mat 14:1; Luk 3:1; Luk 3:19; Luk 9:1; Act 13:1), which brought him the yearly revenue of 200 talents (Josephus, Ant. 18, 5, 1). On his way to Rome he visited his brother Philip, and commencing an intrigue with his wife Herodias, daughter of Aristobulus, the son of Mariamne, he afterwards incestuously married her. He had previously been married to a daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia Petrsea, who avenged this insult by invading his dominions, and defeated him with great loss (Josephus, Ant. 18, 5, 1). An appeal to the Romans afforded the only hope of safety. Aretas was haughtily ordered by the emperor to desist from the prosecution of the war, and Herod accordingly escaped the expected overthrow. Josephus says that the opinion of the Jews was that the defeat was a punishment for his having imprisoned John the Baptist on account of his popularity, and afterwards put him to death, but does not mention the reproval that John gave him, nor that it was at the instigation of Herodias that he was killed, as recorded in the Gospels (Joseph. Ant. 18, 5, 4; Mat 14:1-11; Mar 6:14-16; Luk 3:19; Luk 9:7-9). The evangelists evidently give the true reason, and Josephus the one generally received by the people. In A.D. 38, after the death of Tiberius, he was persuaded, especially at the ambitious instigation of Herodias. to go to Rome to procure for himself the royal title. Agrippa, who was high in the favor of Caligula, and had already received this title, opposed this with such success that Antipas was condemned to perpetual banishment at Lyons, a city of Gaul (Joseph. Ant. 18, 7, 2), and eventually died in Spain, whither his wife Herodias had voluntarily followed him (War, 2, 9, 6). He is called (by courtesy) kiny by Matthew (Mat 14:9) and by Mark (Mar 6:14). See No. 5.  Herod Antipas was in high favor with Tiberius; hence he gave the name of Tiberias to the city he built on the lake of Gennesareth (Josephus, Ant. 18, 2, 3). He enlarged and improved several cities of his dominions, and also built a wall about Sepphoris, and round Betharamphtha, which latter town he named Julias, in honor of the wife of the emperor (Josephus, Ant. 18; 2,1 1 comp. War, 2, 9, 1).

It was before Herod Antipas, who came up to Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover (comp. Joseph. Ant. 18:6, 3), that our Lord was sent for examination when Pilate heard that he was a Galilaean, as Pilate had already had several disputes with the Galileans, and was not at this time on veer good terms with Herod (Luk 13:1; Luk 23:6-7), and “on the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together” (Luk 23:12; comp. Josephus, Ant. 18, 3, 2; Psa 83:5). The name of Herod Antipas is coupled with that of Pilate in the prayer of the apostles mentioned in the Acts (4, 24-30). His personal character is little touched upon by either Josephus or the evangelists, yet from his consenting to the death of John the Baptist to gratify the malice of a wicked woman, though for a time he had “heard him gladly” (Mar 6:20), we perceive his cowardice, his want of spirit, and his fear of ridicule. His wicked oath was not binding on him, for Herod was bound by the law of God not to commit murder. He was in any case desirous to see Jesus, and “hoped to have seen a miracle from him” (Luk 23:8). His artifice and cunning are specially alluded to by our Lord, “Go ye and tell that fox” (τῇ ἀλώπεκι ταύτῃ, Luk 13:32). Coins of Herod Antipas bear the title TETPAPXOY. SEE ANTIPAS.

3. HEROD ARCHELAUS (Α᾿ρχέλαος, Matt.; Josephus; ῾Ηρώδης, Dion Cassius; coins), son of Herod the Great and Malthace, uterine and younger brother of Herod Altipas, and called by Dion Cassius ῾Ηρώδης Παλαιστηνός (4, 57). He was brought up with his brother at Rome (Josephus, Ant. 17, 1, 3). His father had disinherited him in consequence of the false accusations of his eldest brother Antipater, the son of Doris; but Herod, on making a new will, altered his mind, and gave him “the kingdom,” which had before been left to Antipas (Josephus, Ant. 17, 8, 1). It was this unexpected arrangement which led to the retreat-of Joseph to Galilee (Mat 2:22). He was saluted as “king” by the army, bit refused to accept that title till it should be confirmed by Augustus (Joseph. Ant. 17, 8, 2,4; War, 1, 1). Shortly after this a sedition was raised against him, which he quelled by killing 3000 persons, and he then set sail with his  brother Antipas to Rome (Josephus, Ant. 17, 9, 2, 4; War, 2, 2,3). Upon this the Jews sent an embassy to Augustus, to request that they might be allowed to live according to their own laws under a Roman governor. Our Lord seems to allude to this circumstance in the parable of the nobleman going into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom: “But his citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying, We will not have this man to reign over us” (Luk 19:12-27). While he was at Rome, Jerusalem was under the care of Sabinus, the Roman procurator, and a quarrel ensued in consequence of the manner in which the Jews were treated. Quiet was again established through the intervention of Varus, the president of Syria, and the authors of the sedition were punished (Josephus, Ant. 17, 10). Augustus, however, ratified the main points of Herod's will, and gave Archelaus Judaea, Samaria, and Idumaea, with the cities of Caesarea, Sebaste, Joppa, and Jerusalem, the title of ethnarch, and a promise that he should have the royal dignity hereafter if he governed virtuously (Joseph. Ant. 17, 11, 4; War, 2, 6,3). Archelaus never really had the title of king (βασιλεύς), though at first called so by the people (Josephus, Ant. 17:8, 2), yet we cannot object to the word (βασιλεύει in Matthew, for Archelaus regarded himself as king (Josephus, War, 2, 1, 1), and Josephus speaks of the province of Lysanias, which was only a tetrarchy, as βασιλείαν τὴν Λυσανίου (War, 2, 11, 5). Herod (Antipas) the tetrarch is also called ὁ βασιλεύς (Mat 14:9; Mar 6:14). When Archelaus returned to Judaea he rebuilt the royal palace at Jericho, and established a village, naming it after himself, Archelaus (Joseph. Ant. 17, 13, 1). Shortly after Archelaus's return he violated the Mosaic law by marrying Glaphyra, the daughter of Archelaus, king of Cappadocia, and the Jews complaining again loudly of his tyranny, Augustus summoned him to Rome, and finally, A.D. 6, sent him into exile at Vienna in Gaul, where he probably died, and his dominions were attached to the Roman empire (Josephus, Ant. 17, 13, 2; War, 2, 7; compare Strabo, 16, 765; Dion Cassius, 55, 25, 27). Jerome, however, relates that he was shown the tomb of Archelaus near Bethlehem (Onomasticon, s.v.). Coins with the title CONAPXOY belong to Archelaus. SEE ARCHELAUS.

4. HEROD PHILIP I (Φίλιππος, Mar 6:17; ῾Ηρώδης, Josephus) was the son of Herod the Great by a second Mariamne, the daughter of Simon the high-priest (Josephus, Ant. 18:5, 4), and must be distinguished from Philip the tetrarch, No. 6. He was the husband of Herodias, by whom he had a daughter, Salome. Herodias, however, contrary to the laws of her  country, divorced herself from him, and married her uncle Antipas [see Nos. 2 and 5] (Josephus, Ant. 18:5, 4; Mat 14:3; Mar 6:17; Luk 3:19). — He was omitted in the will of Herod in consequence of the discovery that Mariamne was conscious of the plots of Antipater, Herod the Great's son by Doris (Josephus, War, 1, 30,7). SEE PHILIP.

5. HERODIAS ( ῾Ηρώδιας, Mat 14:1-11; Mar 6:14-16; Luk 3:19) was the daughter of Aristobulus, one of the sons of Herod I by the first Mariamne, and of Berenice, the daughter of Salome, Herod's sister, and was consequently sister of Herod Agrippa I (Josephus, Ant. 18:5,4; War, 1, 28, 1). She was first married to her uncle, Herod Philip I, the son of Herod I and the second Mariamne, by whom she had a daughter Salome, probably the one that danced and pleased Herod Antipas, and who afterwards married her uncle Philip II. Herodias soon divorced herself from him, and married Herod Antipas, who was also her uncle, being the son of Herod I and Malthace, and who agreed, for her sake, to put away his own wife, the daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia (Josephus, Ant. 18:5,1, 4). John the Baptist reproved her for her crimes in thus living in adultery and incest, and she took the first opportunity to cause him to be put to death, thus adding thereto the crime of murder. Her marriage was unlawful for three reasons: first, her former husband, Philip, was still alive (διαστασα ζῶντος, Josephus, Ant. 18, 5,4); secondly, Antipas's wife was still alive; and, thirdly, by her first marriage with Philip she became the sister-in-law of Antipas, who was consequently forbidden by the Jewish law to marry his brother's wife (Lev 18:16; Lev 11:21; comp. Alford on Mat 14:4). When Antipas was condemned by Caius to perpetual banishment, Herodias was offered a pardon, and the emperor made her a present of money, telling her that it was her brother Agrippa (I) who prevented her being involved in the same calamity as her husband. The best trait of her character is shown when, in true Jewish spirit, she refused this offer, and voluntarily chose to share the exile of her husband [No. 2] (Josephus, Ant. 17, 7, 2). SEE HERODIAS.

6. HEROD PHILIP II (Φίλιππος, Luke and Josephus) was son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra of Jerusalem ( ῾Ιεροσολυμῖτις), and was with his half brothers Archelaus and Antipas brought up at Rome (Josephus, Ant. 17, 1,3; War, 1, 28, 4). He received as his share of the empire the tetrarchy of Batanea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, and certain parts about Jamnia, with a revenue of 100 talents (Josephus, Ant. 17, 11, 4; War, 2, 6, 3). He is only mentioned once in the N.T. (Luke 3 :I, Φιλίππου τετραρχοῦντος). He  was married to Salome, the daughter of Herod Philip I and Herodias, but left no children (Joseph. Ant. 18, 5, 4). He reigned over his dominions for 37 years (B.C. 4-A.D. 34), during which time he showed-himself to be a person of moderation and quietness in the conduct of his life and government (Josephus, Ant. 18, 4, 6). He built the city of Paneas and named it Caesarea, more commonly known as Caesarea-Philippi (Mat 16:13; Mar 8:27), and also advanced to the dignity of a city the village Bethsaida, calling it by the name of Julias, in honor of the daughter of Augustus. He died at Julias, and was buried in the monument he had there built (Josephus, Ant. 18, 2, 1; 4,6; War, 2, 9, 1). Leaving no children, his dominions were annexed to the Roman province of Syria (Josephus, Ant. 18 , 56). Coins of Philip II bear the title TETPAPXOY. SEE PHILIP.

7. HEROD AGRIPPA I ( ῾Ηρώδης, Acts; Α᾿γρίππας, Josephus) was the son of Aristobulus and Berenice, and grandson of Herod the Great (Josephus, Ant. 17, 1, 2; War, 1, 28, 1). He is called “Agrippa the Great” by Josephus (Ant. 17, 2, 2). A short time before the death of Herod the Great he was living at Rome and was brought up with Drusus, the son of fiberius, and with Antonia, the wife of Drusus (Josephus, Ant. 18, 6, 1). He was only one year older than Claudius, who was born in B.C. 10, and they were bred up together in the closest intimacy. The earlier part of his life was spent at Rome, where the magnificence and luxury in which he indulged involved him so deeply in debt that he was compelled to fly from Rome, and betook himself to a fortress at Malatha, in Idumaea. Through the mediation of his wife Cypros and his sister Herodias, he was allowed to take up his abode at Tiberias, and received the rank of edile in that city, with a small amnnity (Joseph. Ant. 16:6,2). But, having quarreled with his brother-in-law, he fled to Flaccus, the proconsul of Syria. Soon afterwards he was convicted, through the information of his brother Aristobulus, of having received a bribe from the Damascenes, who wished to purchase his influence with the proconsul, and was again compelled to fly. He was arrested, as he was about to sail to Italy, for a sum of money which he owed to the Roman treasury, but made his escape and reached Alexandria, where his wife succeeded in procuring a supply of money from Alexander the alabarch. He then set sail, and landed at Puteoli. He was favorably received by Tiberius; but he one day incautiously expressed the wish that Caius might soon succeed to the throne, which being reported to Tiberius, he was arrested and thrown into prison, where he remained till the  accession of Cains in A.D. 37 (Josephus, Ant. 18, 6,10).

Caius shortly after gave him the tetrarchy of Philip, the iron chain with which he had been fastened to a soldier being exchanged for a gold one (Josephus, Ant. 18, 6,10). He was also invested with the consular dignity, and a league was publicly made with him by Claudius. He then started to take possession of his kingdom, and at Alexandria was insulted by the people, who dressed up an idiot, and bore him in mock triumph through the streets to deride the new king of the Jews (Philo, in Flaccuns, 6). The jealousy of Herod Antipas and his wife Herodias was excited by the distinctions conferred upon Agrippa by the Romans, and they sailed to Rome in the hope of supplanting him in the emperor's favor. Agrippa was aware of their design, and anticipated it by a countercharge against Antipas of treasonous correspondence with the Parthians. Antipas failed to answer the accusations, and, after his exile, Agrippa received from Caius the tetrarchy of Galilee and Pereea (Josephus, Ant. 18:7, 2); and in A.D. 41, for having greatly assisted Claudius, he received his whole paternal kingdom (Judeea and Samaria), and, in addition, the tetrarchy of Lysanias II (comp. Luk 3:1). Josephus says in one passage that Caius gave him this tetrarchy (Ant. 18, 6, 10), but afterwards, in two places, that Claudius gave it to him (Ant. 19, 5, 1; War, 2, 11, 5). Caius probably promised it, and Claudius actually conferred it. Agrippa now possessed the entire kingdom of Herod the Great. At this time he begged of Claudius the kingdom of Chalcis for his brother Herod (Josephus, Ant. 19, 5, 1; War, 2, 11, 5).

Agrippa loved to live at Jerusalem, and was a strict observer of the laws of his country, which will account for his persecuting the Christians, who were hated by the Jews (Josephus, Ant. 19, 7, 3). Thus influenced by a strong desire for popularity, rather than from innate cruelty, “he stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the Church.” He put to death James the elder, son of Zebedee, and cast Peter into prison, no doubt with the intention of killing him also. This was frustrated by his miraculous deliverance from his jailers by the angel of the Lord (Act 12:1-19). Agrippa I, like his grandfather, displayed great taste in building, and especially adorned the city of Berytus (Josephus, Ant. 19, 7, 5). The suspicions of Claudius prevented him from finishing the impregnable fortifications with which he had begun to surround Jerusalem. His friendship was courted by many of the neighboring kings and rulers. In A.D. 44 Agrippa celebrated games at Caesarea in honor of the emperor, and to make vows for his safety. At this festival a number of the principal  persons, and such as were of dignity in the province, attended. Josephus does not mention those of Tyre and Sidon as recorded in the Acts (Act 12:20). Though Agrippa was “highly displeased,” it does not appear that any rupture worthy of notice had taken place. On the second day Agrippa appeared in the theatre in a garment interwoven with silver. On closing his address to the people, they saluted him as a god, for which he did not rebuke them, and he was immediately seized with violent internal pains, and died five days after (Josephus, Ant. 19, 8, 2). This fuller account of Josephus agrees substantially with that in the Acts. The silver dress (ἐξ ἀργύρου πεποιημένην πᾶσαν,Josephus; ἐσθῆτα βασιλικήν, Acts); and the disease (τῷ τῆς γαστρὸς ἀλγήματι τὁν βίον κατέστπεψεν, Joseph.; γενόμενος σκωληκόβρωτος ἐξέψυξεν, Acts). The owl (Βουβῶνα ἐπὶ σχοινίου τινός), which on this occasion appeared to Agrippa as the messenger of ill tidings (ἄγγελος κάκων, Josephus, Ant. 19:8, 2), though on a former one it had appeared to him as a messenger of good news (Josephus, Ant. 18, 6, 7), is converted by Eusebius (H. E. 2, ch. 10), who professes to quote Josephus, into the angel of the Acts ( ἐπάταξεναὐτὸν ἄγγελος Κυρίου, Act 12:23. For an explanation of the confusion, compare Eusebius, 1. c., ed. Heinichen, Excurs. 2, vol. 3:p. 556; Alford, ad loc.). SEE AGRIPPA.

8. HEROD AGRIPPA II (Α᾿γρίππας, Acts; Josephus) was the son of- Herod Agrippa I and Cypros (War, 2, 11, 6). At the time of his father's death (A.D. 44) he was only seventeen years of age, and the emperor Claudius, thinking him too young to govern the kingdom, sent Cuspius Fadus as procurator, and thus made it again a Roman province (Josephus, Ant. 19, 9, 2; Tacit. Hist. 5, 9). After the death of his uncle Herod in A.D. 48, Claudius bestowed upon him the small kingdom of Chalcis (Josephus, Ant. 20, 5, 2; War, 2, 12,1), and four years after took it away from him, giving him instead the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias (Josephus, Ant. 20, 7, 1; War, 2, 12, 8) with the title of king (Act 25:13; Act 26:2; Act 26:7). In A.D. 55 Nero gave him the cities of Tiberias and Taricheae in Galilee, and Julias, a city of Peraea, with fourteen villages near it (Josephus, Ant. 20, 8, 4; comp. War, 2, 13, 2).

Agrippa II exhibited the Herodian partiality for building. He much enlarged the city of Caesarea Philippi, and in honor of Nero called it Neronias. He also supplied large sums of money towards beautifying Jerusalem (which he encircled with the “third wall”) and Berytus, transferring almost everything that was ornamental from his own kingdom to this latter place.  These acts rendered him most unpopular (Josephus, Ant. 20, 9,4). In A.D. 60 king Agrippa and Bernice (q.v.) his sister, concerning the nature of whose equivocal intercourse with each other there had been much grave conversation (Juvenal, Sat. 6, 155 sq.), and who, in consequence, persuaded Polemo, king of Cilicia, to marry her (Josephus, A nt. 20:7, 3), came to Caesarea (Act 25:13). It was before him and his sister that the apostle Paul made his defense, and somewhat (ἐν ὀλίγῳ) “persuaded him to be a Christian.” Agrippa seems to have been intimate with Festus (Josephus, Ant. 20, 7, 11), and it was natural that the Roman governor should avail himself of his judgment on a question of what seemed to be Jewish law (Act 25:18; Acts cf., 26; comp. Josephus, A t. 20, 8, 7). The “pomp” (πολλὴ φαντασία) with which the king came into the audience chamber (Act 25:23) was accordant with his general bearing.

The famous speech which Agrippa made to the Jews, to dissuade them from waging war with the Romans, is recorded by Josephus (War, 2, 16, 4). At the commencement of the war he sided with the Romans, and was wounded by a sling-stone at the siege of Gamala (Josephus, War, 4, 1, 3). After the fall of Jerusalem he retired with his sister Berenice to Rome, and there died in the seventieth year of his age, and in the third year of Trajan (A.D. 100). He was on intimate terms with Josephus, who gives two of his letters Life, 65), and he was the last Jewish prince of the Herodian line.

As regards his coins, Eckhel gives two with the head of Nero, one with the legend ΕΗΙΙΙ ΒΑΕΙΑΕ ΑΡΠΙΗΗΙΑ ΝΕΠΘΝΙΕ, confirming the account of Josephus as regards the city of Caesarea-Philippi, and the other bearing the pruenomen of Marcus, which he may have received on account of his family being indebted to the triumvir Antony, or else, as Eckhel thinks, more likely from Marcus Agrippa (Eckhel, Doct. Num. Vet. 3:493, 494; comp. Akerman, Num. Chronicles 9:42). There are other coins with the heads of Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian. SEE MONEY. SEE AGRIPPA.

9. BERENICE SEE BERENICE (q.v.).

10. DRUSILLA SEE DRUSILLA (q.v.).

## Herodian[[@Headword:Herodian]]

             (only in the plur. ῾Ηρωδιανοί), the designation of a class of Jews that existed in the time of Jesus Christ, evidently, as the name imports, partisans  of Herod, but whether of a political or religious description it is not easy, for want of materials, to determine. The passages of the New Testament which refer to them are the following: Mar 3:6; Mar 12:13; Mat 22:16; Luk 20:20. From these it appears that the ecclesiastical authorities of Judaea held a council against our Savior, and, associating with themselves the Herodians, sent an embassy to him with the express but covert design of ensnaring him in his speech, that thus they might compass his destruction, by embroiling him. But what additional difficulty did the Herodians bring? Herod Antipas was now tetrarch of Galilee and Persea, which was the only inheritance he received from his father, Herod the Great. As tetrarch of Galilee he was specially the ruler of Jesus, whose home was in that province. The Herodians, then, may have been subjects of Herod, Galilueans, whose evidence the priests were desirous of procuring, because theirs would be the evidence of fellow-countrymen, and of special force with Antipas as being that of his own immediate subjects (Luk 23:7). Herod's relations with Rome were in an unsafe condition. He was a weak prince, given to ease and luxury, and his wife's ambition conspired with his own desires to make him strive to obtain from the emperor Caligula the title of king. For this purpose he took a journey to Rome, but he was banished to Lyons, in Gaul. The Herodians may have been favorers of his pretensions; if so, they would be partial hearers, and eager witnesses against Jesus before the Roman tribunal. It would be a great service-to the Romans to be the means of enabling them to get rid of one who aspired to be king of the Jews.

It would equally gratify their own lord should the Herodians give effectual aid in putting a period, to the mysterious yet formidable claims of a rival claimant of the crown. If the Herodians were a Galilaean political party who were eager to procure from Rome the honor of royalty for Herod (Mar 6:14, the name of king is merely as of courtesy), they were chosen as associates by the Sanhedrim with especial propriety. This idea is confirmed by Josephus's mention of a party as “the partisans of Herod” (οἱ τὰ ῾Ηρώδου φανοῦντες Ant. 14, 15, 10). The deputation were to “feign themselves just men,” that is, men whose sympathies were entirely Jewish, and, as such, anti-heathen: they were to intimate their dislike of paying tribute, as being an acknowledgment of a foreign yoke; and by flattering Jesus, as one who loved truth, feared no man, and would say what he thought, they meant to inveigle him into a condemnation of the practice. In order to carry these base and hypocritical designs into effect, the Herodians were appropriately associated with the Pharisees; for as the latter were the recognized conservators of Judaism, so  the former were friends of the aggrandizement of a native as against a foreign prince. (Comp. Fritzsche and Walch, ad loc. Other hypotheses may be found in Paulus on the passage in Matt.; in Wolff, Curae Phil. 1, 311 sq.; see also Kecher, Analect. in loc. Matt.; Zorn, Hist. fisci. Juzd. p. 127; Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 275. Monographs on this subject are those of Steuch, Diss. de Herod. Lund. 1706; Floder, Diss. de Herod. Upsal, 1764; Schmid, Epist. de Herod. Lipsise, 1763; Leuschner, De Secta Herodianor. Hirschberg, 1751; Stollberg, De Haerodianis, Viteb. 1666; Jensius, id. Jen. 1688.) SEE SECTS, JEWISH.

## Herodias[[@Headword:Herodias]]

             (᾿Ηρωδίας, a female patronymic from ῾Ηρώδης: on patronymics and gentile names in ιας, see Matthise, Gk. Gramm. § 101 and 103), the name of a woman of notoriety in the N.T., daughter of Aristobulus, one of the sons of Mariamne and Herod the Great, and consequently sister of Agrippa I. She first married Herod, surnamed Philip, another of the sons of Mariamne and the first Herod (Ant. 18, 5, 4; comp. War, 1, 29, 4), and therefore her full uncle; then she eloped from him, during his lifetime (ibid,), to marry Herod Antipas, her step-uncle, who had long been married to, and was still living with, the daughter of Eneas or Aretas-his assumed name-king of Arabia (Ant. 17, 9, 4). Thus she left her husband, who was still alive, to connect herself with a man whose wife was still alive. Her paramour was, indeed, less of a blood relation than her original husband; but, being likewise the half brother of that husband, he was already connected with her by affinity — so close that there was only one case contemplated in the law of Moses where it could be set aside, namely, when the married brother had died childless (Lev 18:16; Lev 22:21, and for the exception Deu 25:5 sq.). Now Herodias had already had one child — Salome (the daughter whose dancing is mentioned in the Gospels) —by Philip (Ant. 18, 5, 4), and, as he was still alive, might have had more. Well therefore may she be charged by Josephus with the intention of confounding her country's institutions (Ant. 18, 5, 4); and well may John the Baptist have remonstrated against the enormity of such a connection with the tetrarch, whose conscience would certainly seem to have been a less hardened one (Mat 14:9 says he “was sorry;” Mar 6:20 that he “feared” John, and “heard him gladly”). A.D. 28. The consequences both of the crime and of the reproof which it incurred are well known. Aretas made war upon Herod for the injury done to his daughter, and routed him with the loss of his whole army (Ant. 18, 5,  1).

The head of John the Baptist was granted at the suggestion of Herodias (Mat 14:8-11; Mar 6:24-28). According to Josephus, the execution took place in a fortress called Machaerus, on the frontier between the dominions of Aretas and Herod; according to Pliny (5, 15), looking down upon the Dead Sea from the south (compare Robinson, 1, 570, note). It was to the iniquity of this act, rather than to the immorality of that illicit connection, that, the historian says, some of the Jews attributed the defeat of Herod. In the closing scene of her career, indeed, Herodias exhibited considerable magnanimity, as she preferred going with Antipas to Lugdunum, and there sharing his exile and reverses, till death ended them, to the remaining with her brother Agrippa I, and partaking of his elevation (Ant. 18, 7, 2). This town is probably Lugdunum Convenarum, a town of Gaul, situated on the right bank of the Garonne, at the foot of the Pyrenees, now St. Bertrand de Commines (Murray, Handbook of France, p. 314); Eusebius, H. E. 1, 11, says Vienne, confounding Antipas with Archelaus. Burton on Mat 14:3, Alford, and moderns in general, Lyons. In Josephus (War, 2, 9, 6), Antipas is said to have died in Spain-apparently, from the context, the land of his exile. A town on the frontiers, therefore, like the above, would satisfy both passages. SEE HEROD.

There are few episodes in the whole range of the New Testament more suggestive to the commentator than this one scene in the life of Herodias.

1. It exhibits one of the most remarkable of the undesigned coincidences between the N.T. and Josephus; that there are some discrepancies in the two accounts only enhances their value. More than this, it has led the historian into a brief digression upon the life, death, and character of the Baptist, which speaks volumes in favor of the genuineness of that still more celebrated passage in which he speaks of “Jesus,” that “wise man, if man he may be called” (Ant. 18, 3, 3; comp. 20, 9, 1, unhesitatingly quoted as genuine by Eusebius, Hist, Ecclesiastes 1, 11). SEE JOHN THE BAPTIST.

2. It has been warmly debated whether it was the adultery or the incestuous connection that drew down the reproof of the Baptist. It has already-been shown that, either way, the offence merited condemnation upon more grounds than one.

3. The birthday feast is another undesigned coincidence between Scripture and profane history. The Jews abhorred keeping birthdays as a pagan custom (Bland on Mat 14:6). On the other hand, it was usual with the  Egyptians (Gen 40:20; comp. Josephus, Ant. 12, 4, 7), with the Persians (Herod. 1, 133), with the Greeks, even in the case of the dead, whence the Christian custom of keeping anniversaries of the martyrs (Bahr ad Herod. 4, 26), and with the Romans (Pers. Sat. 2, 1-3). Now the Herods may be said to have gone beyond Rome in the observance of all that was Roman. Herod the Great kept the day of his accession; Antipas-as we read here-and Agrippa I, as Josephus tells us (Ant. 19:7, 1), their birthday, with such magnificence that the “birthdays of Herod” (Herodis dies) had passed into a proverb when Persius wrote (Sat. 5, 180). SEE BIRTHDAY.

4. Yet dancing, on these festive occasions, was common to both Jew and Gentile, and was practiced in the same way: youths and virgins, singly, or separated into two bands, but never intermingled, danced to do honor to their deity, their hero, or to the day of their solemnity, Miriam (Exo 15:20), the daughter of Jephthah (Jdg 11:34), and David (2Sa 6:14) are familiar instances in Holy Writ: the “Carmen Saeculare” of Horace, to quote no more, points to the same custom amongst Greeks and Romans. It is plainly owing to the elevation of woman in the social scale that dancing in pairs (still unknown to the East) has come into fashion. SEE DANCE.

5. The rash oath of Herod, like that of Jephthah in the O.T., has afforded ample discussion to casuists. It is now ruled that all such oaths, where there is no reservation, expressed or implied, in favor of the laws of God or man, are illicit and without force. So Solomon had long since decided (1Ki 2:20-24; see Sanderson, De Juram. Oblig. Praelect. 3, 16). SEE OATH.

## Herodion[[@Headword:Herodion]]

             ( ῾Ηρωδίων, a deriv. from Herod), a Christian at Rome to whom Paul sent a salutation as his kinsman (Rom 16:11). A.D. 55. According to Hippolytus, he became bishop of Tarsus, but according to others, of Patra.

## Herodium[[@Headword:Herodium]]

             ( ῾Ηρώδιον), the name of a fortress (Josephus) or town (Pliny), built on a conspicuous spot by Herod the Great (Reland, Palest. p. 820), probably the site anciently occupied by BETH-HACCEREM (Jer 6:1; Neh 3:14), which the authority of Jerome has led some modern  travelers to identify with the well-known eminence called by the natives Jebel el-Fureidis, and by Europeans “the Frank Mountain.” If this identity be correct, the site has been the scene of many a remarkable change. Two great kings, in different ages and different ways, probably adorned it with magnificent works. From their lofty city the old inhabitants must have seen stretched before them, up the green vale of Urtas, the beautiful gardens and fountains of king Solomon, which suggested to the royal poet some of the exquisite imagery of the Canticles; and nearly a thousand years later, Herod the Great erected, probably on this very hill of Beth-haccerem, “a fortress with its round towers, and in it royal apartments of great strength and splendor” (Josephus, Ant. 15, 9, 4), making it serve as an acropolis amidst a mass of other buildings and palaces at the foot of the hill (IV Car, 1, 21:20). To this city, called after him Herodium, the Idumaean tyrant was brought for burial from Jericho, where he died (Ant. 17, 8, 3). The locality still yields its evidence of both these eras. Solomon's reservoirs yet remain (Stanley, p. 165), and the present state of “the Frank Mountain” well agrees with the ancient description of Herodium (Robinson, Researches, 2, 173; Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 427).

## Herold, Adam[[@Headword:Herold, Adam]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born May 31, 1659, at Dresden. He studied at Wittenberg, Giessen, and Kiel, was in 1683 rector at Reval, in 1692 superintendent in Saxony, and doctor of theology, and died March 2, 1711. He wrote, Palladium Reformatorum a sua Sede cap. 9 ad Rom. Destructum: — Tabula Synoptica Totius Theologiae: — Disp. utrum Christus Ultimum Pascha Eodem an Diverso a Judaeis Die Comederit: — De Judaeorum Excommunicatione: — De Magis Bethlehemum Profectis. See Ranft, Leben der chursachsischen Gelehrten; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Herold, Johann[[@Headword:Herold, Johann]]

             a German divine, was born at Hochstadt, Suabia, in 1511. His early history is not known. In 1539 he made his appearance in Basle as a defender of Protestantism. He was pastor of a parish near Basle for some years, but in 1546 retired from it and returned to Basle to devote his time entirely to literary labors. The date of his death is not ascertained; it was probably about 1570. Among his numerous writings are the following: Heidenwelt und ihrer Gotter anfünglicher Ussprung (Basel, 1544, fol.; also under the title, in a 2nd ed., Theatrum Divum Dearumque (Basil. 1628., fol.): — Orthodoxographi Theologiae Doctores LXXVI, lumina clarissima (Basil. 1555, fol.): — Haeresiologia, sive Syntagma veterum theologorum per quos grassatae in Ecclesia haereses confutantur, etc. (Basil. 1556, fol.).

## Heron[[@Headword:Heron]]

             (אֲנָפָה, anaphah', Lev 11:19; Deu 14:18), an unclean bird, for which the kite, woodcock, curlew, peacock, parrot, crane,  lapwing, and several others have been suggested. But most of these are not found in Palestine, and others have been identified with different Hebrew words. The root אָנָ, anaph', signifies to breathe, to snort, especially from anger, and thence, figuratively, to be angry (Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 127). Parkhurst observes that “as the heron is remarkable for its angry disposition, especially when hurt or wounded, this bird seems to be most probably intended.” But this equally applies to a great number of different species of birds, and would be especially appropriate to the goose, which hisses at the slightest provocation. The heron, though not constantly hissing, can utter a similar sound of displeasure with much meaning, and the common species, Ardea cinerea, is found in Egypt, and is also abundant in the Hauran of Palestine, where it frequents the margins of lakes and pools, and the reedy water courses in the deep ravines, striking and devouring an immense quantity of fish. The herons are wading birds, peculiarly irritable, remarkable for their voracity; frequenting marshes and oozy rivers, and spread over the regions of the East. Most of the species enumerated 2. English ornithology have been recognized in the vicinity of Palestine, and we may include all these under the term in question- “the anaphah after his kind.” One of the commonest species in Asia is Ardea russata which is beautifully adorned with plumage partly white and partly of a rich orange-yellow, while the beak, legs, and all the naked parts of the skin are yellow. Its height is about seventeen inches. This is the caboga, or cow-heron so abundant in India. Several kinds of heron, one of which, from its form, would serve well enough to represent this little golden egret, are commonly depicted on those Egyptian paintings in which the subject-a favorite one-is the fowling and fishing among the paper-reeds of the Nile.

Bochart supposes that anaphah may mean the mountain falcon, called cavorala by Homer (Odgs. 1, 320), because of the similarity of the Greek word to the Hebrew. But if it meant any kind of eagle or hawk, it would probably have been reckoned with one or other of those species mentioned in the preceding verses. Perhaps, under all the circumstances, the traditional meaning is most likely to be correct, which we will therefore trace. The Talmudists evidently were at a loss, for they describe it indefinitely as a “high-flying bird of prey” (Chulin, 63 a).

The Septuagint renders the Hebrew word by χαραδριός. This rendering, however, has been thought to lose what little weight it might otherwise have had from the probability that it originated in a false reading, viz. aguphah, which the translators connected with ayctph, “a bank.” Jerome  adhered to the same word ill a Latin form, caradrym and caradrium. The Greek and Roman writers, from the earliest antiquity, refer to a bird which they call charadrius. It is particularly described by Aristotle (Hist. An. 7, 7), and by Elian (Hist. An. 15, 26). The latter derives its name from xapcApa, a hollow or chasm, especially one which contains water, because, he says, the bird frequents such places. It is, moreover, certain that by the Romans the charadrius was also called icterus, which signifies the jaundice, from a notion that patients affected with that disease were cured by looking at this bird, which was of a yellow color (Pliny, 34; Coel. Aurel. 3, 5), and by the Greeks, χλωρίων; and in allusion to the same fabulous notion, ἴκτιρος (Aristotle, Hist. An. 9, 13, 15, and 22; AElian, Hist. An. 4:47). These writers concur in describing a bird, sometimes of a yellow color, remarkable for its voracity (from which circumstance arose the phrase χαραδριοῦ βίος, applied to a glutton), migratory, inhabiting watery places, and especially mountain torrents and valleys. Now it is certain that the name charadrius has been applied by ornithologists to the same species of birds from ancient times down to the present age. Linnus, under Order IV (consisting of vaders or shore birds), places the genus Charadrius, in which he includes all the numerous species of plovers. The ancient accounts may be advantageously compared with the following description of the genus from Mr. Selby's British Ornithology, 2, 230: “The members of this genus are numerous, and possess a wide geographical distribution, species being found in every quarter of the globe. They visit the East about April. Some of them, during the greater part of the year, are the inhabitants of open districts and wide wastes, frequenting both dry and moist situations, and only retire toward the coasts during the severity of winter. Others are continually resident upon the banks and about the mouths of rivers (particularly where the shore consists of small gravel or shingle). They live on worms, insects, and their larva? The flesh of many that live on the coasts is unpalatable.” The same writer describes one “species, Charadrius pluvialis, called the golden plover from its color,” and mentions the well-known fact that this species, in the course of molting, turns completely black. Analogous facts respecting the charadrius have been established by observations in every part of the globe, viz. that they are gregarious and migratory. The habits of the majority are littoral. They obtain their food along the banks of rivers and the shores of lakes; “like the gulls, they beat the moist soil with their pattering feet, to terrify the incumbent worms, yet are often found in deserts, in green and sedgy meadows, or on upland moors.” Their food consists chiefly of mice,  worms, caterpillars, insects, toads, and frogs, which of course places them among the class of birds ceremonially unclean. On the whole, the evidence seems in favor of the conclusion that the Hebrew word anaphah designates the numerous species of the plover (may not this be the genus of birds alluded to as the fowls of the mountain, Psalm I, II; Isa 18:6?). Various species of the genus are known in Syria and Palestine as the C. pluvialis (golden plover), C. aedicnemus (stone curlew), and C. spinosus (lapwing). (Kitto's Physical History of Palestine, p. 106.) In connection with some of the preceding remarks, it is important to observe that in these species a yellow color is more or less marked.

## Heros[[@Headword:Heros]]

             (Erbs), metropolitan bishop of Arles in the early part of the 5th century, was originally bishop of Tortosa, in Spain, but was expelled by the people from Aries in 412, and fled to Palestine, where he took part in the opposition to Pelagius. After A.D. 417 he is not heard of.

## Herrad Of Landsperg[[@Headword:Herrad Of Landsperg]]

             an abbess of Hohenburg, or Odilienberg, an old, celebrated monastery, said to have been founded by duke Ethicot, whose daughter Odilia was the first abbess. Herrad succeeded the abbess Relindis in 1167, and died July: 25, 1195. She is said to have composed the Hortus Deliciarum, a work containing contributions to Biblical history and to the entire field of theology. A copy of the Hortus, preserved at the Strasburg library, was  destroyed, with other precious documents, at the bombardment of that city, August 24, 1870. See Engelhart, Herrad von Landsperq und ihr Werk Hortus Deliciarum (Stuttgart, 1818); Le Noble, Notice sur le Hortus Deliciarum de Herrade de Landsperg (Paris, 1839); Piper, Die Kalendarien der Angelsachsen und das Martyrologium der Herrad von Landsperg (Berlin, 1862); Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genrale, s.v. (B.P.).

## Herregouts, Henri[[@Headword:Herregouts, Henri]]

             a distinguished Flemish painter of historical subjects, was born at Mechlin about 1666. There are several of his pictures in the churches of Antwerp, Louvain, and Bruges. In the cathedral at Antwerp is The Martyrdom of St. Matthew; and at Bruges, in the Church of St. Anne, is his masterpiece, representing The Last Judgment. He died at Antwerp in 1724. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Herrera, Abraham de[[@Headword:Herrera, Abraham de]]

             a famous Cabalist, who died in 1639, is the author of, בית אלהים, or Casa de Dios, the system of the cabala in seven divisions (transl. into Hebrew by Aboab, Amsterdam, 1655; and into Latin by Rosenroth, in his Cabbala Denudattt, volume 2, Sulzbach, 1678): — שער השמים, or Porta del Cielo, also on the Cabala (Hebrew transl. by Aboab, 1655; Latin, in Cabbala Denudata, volume 1). See Fiirst, Bibl, Jud. 1:386. (B.P.)

## Herrera, Augustin de[[@Headword:Herrera, Augustin de]]

             a Spanish Jesuit, who died in 1649 at Seville, is the author of, Dev Origine et Progressu in Ecclesia Catholica Rituum et Ceremoniarum in SS. Missae Sacrificio: — Comment. in Syntaxi Antonii Nebrissensis. See Alegambe, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Herrgott, Marquard[[@Headword:Herrgott, Marquard]]

             a Benedictine, who. died at Vienna in 1762, is the author of Vetus Disciplina Monastica (Paris, 1726). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:711; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Herrians[[@Headword:Herrians]]

             a heretical sect of the 2nd century, which, according to Augustine, denied baptism by water on the pretence that this was not the kind of baptism instituted by Christ; for John the Baptist, comparing his own baptism with that of our Lord, says, “I baptize you with water; but he that cometh after me shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire” (Augustine, Dee Haer. c. 59). They affirmed that the souls of men consisted of fire and spirit, and therefore a baptism of fire was more suitable to their nature. Early ecclesiastical writers are not agreed as to what was meant by this expression. Clemens Alexandrinus mentions some who, when they had baptized men in water, also made a mark on their ears with fire, so joining  together baptism by water, and, as they imagined, baptism by fire (apud Combefis, Auctarium, 1, 202). Others, by some deceptive art during baptism, made fire to appear on the surface of the water, and confirmed this by a reference to some apocryphal writing of their own invention called “The Preaching of Paul or Peter,” in which it was said that, when Christ was baptized, fire appeared on the water. See Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. 11, ch. 2, § 3.

## Herrick, Marcus A, D.D[[@Headword:Herrick, Marcus A, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was rector of the Church in Woodstock, Vermont, in 1853, and so remained until 1861, when he became rector of Trinity Church, Sanbornton Bridge, N.H. In 1870 he was rector of Trinity Church, in Tilton, and continued to hold this pastorate until his death, October 31, 1875, at the age of fifty-five years. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1876, page 150.

## Herrick, Robert[[@Headword:Herrick, Robert]]

             an English divine and eminient poet, was born in London, August 20, 1591, graduated at Cambridge in 1617, and was presented to the living of Dean Prior, Devonshire, in 1629. In 1648 he was deprived by Cromwell, but was reinstated in his living by Charles II, in 1660. He died in October 1674. His works are, Hesperides; or, The Works, both Humane and Divine, of Robert Herrick (1648). To this volume was appended his Noble Numbers (1647). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Herring, Thomas[[@Headword:Herring, Thomas]]

             archbishop of Canterbury, was born in 1693 at Walsoken, Norfolk, of which his father was rector. He studied at Jesus and Bennet colleges, Cambridge, and was made fellow of Corpus Christi in 1716. After having possessed various livings, he was raised in 1737 to the see of Bangor, whence in 1743 he was translated to York. After the defeat of the king's troops at Preston Pans in 1745, the archbishop exerted himself in his diocese with so much patriotism and zeal that he repressed the disaffected, inspirited the desponding, and procured at a county meeting a subscription of £40;000 towards the defense of the country. His zeal for the Hanoverian cause procured him the facetious title of “the red Herring.” In 1747 he was removed to the see of Canterbury, and he died at Croydon in 1756. Herring was a man of great celebrity as a preacher. His Sermons on Public Occasions were published in 1763 (Lond. 8vo), with a memoir of Herring by Duncombe; followed by his Letters to W. Duncome (1727, 12mo). See Biographica Britannica; Rich, Cyclop. of Biog.

## Herrnhut[[@Headword:Herrnhut]]

             a town of Saxony, in Upper Lusatia, in the circle of Dresden, at the foot of Hutberg Mountain, and about fifty miles from the city of Dresden. It was built by Zinzendorf in 1722 for the Moravian Brethren, who, from this town, are often called Herrnahuters. SEE MORAVIANS.

## Herron, Francis D.D[[@Headword:Herron, Francis D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Shippensburg, Pa., June 28, 1774. His parents were Scotch-Irish. Their high regard for know-ledge induced them to send him to Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., then under the care  of that distinguished Presbyterian, the Rev. Dr. Nesbitt. Here he graduated May 5, 1794. He studied theology with Robert Cooper, D.D., and was licensed by Carlisle Presbytery in 1797. He commenced his work as a missionary in the then backwoods of Ohio. In 1800 he became pastor of the Rocky Spring Church, where he labored for ten years with great success. In June 1811, he was installed pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburg, Penn. He found his new church embarrassed with debt, and the people “conformed to this world” to a degree almost appalling. But his earnestness and activity relieved the church of debt within a few years, and awoke the members to a sense of their spiritual danger. In 1825 the General Assembly resolved to establish a theological seminary in the West. Dr. Herron, with his naturally quick perception, urged Alleghany City, Pa., as the best location, and by great exertions obtained the decision to locate it there. He then undertook the toils and anxieties of its sustenance; and to no one does the Western Theological Seminary owe its success in a greater degree than to Dr. Herron. In 1827 he was elected moderator of the General Assembly held in Philadelphia. In 1828 and 1832 his ministrations were blessed by gracious revivals of religion; and in 1835 another revival occurred, marked by great excitement. In 1850 he resigned his charge, to the great regret of his people. Being then in his seventy-sixth year, he felt that his work was ended. He lived ten years longer; though the infirmities of age grew apace, his serenity and cheerfulness never failed. He died Dec. 6,1860. Such was the estimation in which his character and talents were held by his fellow-citizens, that the courts of Pittsburg adjourned on the announcement of his death, an honor never before paid to any clergyman in that city. — Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 95.

## Herron, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Herron, Robert, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington County, Pennsylvania, April 10, 1817. He graduated from Muskingum College, Ohio, in 1845, and from Allegheny Theological Seminary in 1847; became assistant at Beech Spring Church, Ohio, in 1848 pastor at Ridge Church, resigned in 1876, and died at Scio, June 17, 1884. See Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v.

## Herse[[@Headword:Herse]]

             SEE HEARSE.

## Hertenstein, Johann Friedrich[[@Headword:Hertenstein, Johann Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran. theologian of Germany, was born at Ulm, August 11, 1676. He studied at different universities, was in 1705 teacher at his native place, in 1728 preacher at Munster, and died May 25, 1748. He is the author of, Disp. de Juramentis: — De Cultu Divino Naturali: — De Magno Pisce, qui Jonam Vatem Deglutivit: — De Natura Theologiae Naturalis: — De Studio Sapientiae Veterum, etc. See Neubauer, Jetztlebende Theologem; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:387; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon s.v. (B.P.)

## Hertfelder (von Hettintgen), Bernhard[[@Headword:Hertfelder (von Hettintgen), Bernhard]]

             abbot at Augsburg, was born in 1587. He studied at Rome, was prior at Salzburg, and in 1635 abbot at Augsburg. He died in 1664, leaving, Basilica SS. Udalrici et Afrae (Augsburg, 1653 fol.): — Chronicon Temnpli et SS. Udclrici et Afrae (eod.): — Historia Sacrarum Reliquiarum in Basilica Udalricana (eod., Germ. transl. by Keistler, 1712 fol.): — Scala Coeli Meditationibus Piis et Utilibus Instructa (1655). See Historia Universalis Salisburgensis, page 255; Ziegelbauer, Hist. Litter. Ordinis Benedicini; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:786; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hertford, Council Of[[@Headword:Hertford, Council Of]]

             (Concilium Hertfordiense, or Herutfordiae), was held at Hertford, the principal borough of Herts, England, September 24, 673, by Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury; the bishops of East Anglia (Bise), Rochester (Patta), Wessex (Lutherius), Mercia (Winfred), together with the deputies of Wilfred of Northumbria, and several canonists, being present. Ten canons were drawn up.

1. Commands the observance of Easter day on the Sunday after the fourteenth day of the moon in the first Jewish month.

2. Commands that no bishop shall intrude upon the parish (parochiam) of another bishop, but shall rest contented with the government of the people intrusted to him.

3. Enacts that it shall not be lawful for any bishop in any way to disturb or plunder any monastery.

4. Forbids monks to emingrate from one monastery to another without the permission of the abbot.

5. Forbids clerks to leave their own bishop and to wander about: forbids to receive them anywhere except they shall bring letters commendatory from their bishop.

6. Bishops and other clergy coming from another church to be contented with the hospitality shown to then, and not presume to perform any office in the church without the permission of the bishop of that church.

7. Orders the holding of synods twice in every year and adds, that since many things may operate to hinder this, one shall at any rate be called every year, on the kalends of August, in the place called Cloveshooh (or Cliffshoe).

8. Orders that bishops shall take precedence according to the date and order of their consecration.

9. Declares that the question was raised, whether the number of bishops ought to be increased in proportion to the increase of the faithful, but that nothing was determined.

10. Relates to marriages: forbids all unlawful marriages; forbids incest, and to divorce a wife except for fornication; forbids a man divorced from his wife to marry another woman. See Johnson, Eccles. Canons, A.D. 673; Baronius, A.D. 672; Labbe, Concil. 6:535; Wilkins, Concil. 1:43.

## Hertz, Jens-Michael[[@Headword:Hertz, Jens-Michael]]

             a Danish poet and preacher, was born July 26, 1766, at Oersloev, near Vordingborg. He was appointed bishop of Ribe in 1819, after having passed through all the decrees of the Church hierarchy. He died June 2, 1825, leaving, Det Befriede Jerach (in 18 cantos, Copenhagen, 1804): — De Julio Firmico Materno (ibid. 1817): — Predikener (ibid. 1830): — Sind in den Buchern der Konige Spuren des Pentateuch und der Mosaischen Gesetze zufindena? (Alt on a, 1822): also Memoirs in the Videnskalbelige Parhandlunger ved Sjoellands Stiffs' Landemnode, I, 1-3. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Heruli (Eruli, Aeruli)[[@Headword:Heruli (Eruli, Aeruli)]]

             a German tribe, which first appeared with the Goths on the shores of the Black Sea, and thence took an active part in all the incursions of the Goths in the eastern provinces of the Roman empire. We afterwards find them in Attila's armies with the Scythians and Gepidae. After the death of Attila they established themselves as a powerful nation on the shores of the Danube, and levied tribute on the Lombards. According to Procopius, they were thoroughly barbarous. After the Lombards and other neighboring  nations had long been converted to Christianity, the Heruli still preserved their idolatrous worship, and continued to sacrifice human victims (see Procopius, De bello Goth. 2, c. 11). Under the leadership of Odoacer, they succeeded, in connection with the Turones, the Scythians, and the Rugii, in taking Rome, and from that time dates the downfall of the Western empire. About 495 they were defeated in an important battle by the Lombards. Paulus Diacon., in De gest. Longob., reports a popular tradition, according to which, after this battle, the whole army of the Heruli became so bewildered in consequence of the anger of the gods that they took the green flax-fields for water, and, having got to them, opened their arms to swim, when the Lombards came up and killed them. A part of the nation then established themselves in Rugiland, at the mouth of the Danube, but finally decided to settle in the eastern Roman empire. The emperor Anastasius received them in his dominions, and assigned them a territory in I1-lyria, but was subsequently obliged to send an army against them to put an end to their depredations. Those who remained now subjected themselves to Rome, and aided greatly in overthrowing the power of the Ostrogoths in Italy. They were converted to Christianity under Justinian I, joined the Roman Catholic Church, and were gradually civilized. Their history ceased to present any characteristic features. See Morere, Grand Dictionnaire (ed. Drouet, Paris, 1759), vol. 5.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 15. (J. N. P.)

## Hervaeus (or Huvarnus) Of Brittany[[@Headword:Hervaeus (or Huvarnus) Of Brittany]]

             an abbot of the 6th century, was the son of Huvarnion, a pious and accomplished Gallic noble, was born blind, and educated by his widowed mother for the monastic life. He built a monastery upon some land given him by Clovigonus, in the town of Laungredec, where he presided till extreme old age. He is commemorated as a saint on June 17.

## Hervaeus Of Rheims[[@Headword:Hervaeus Of Rheims]]

             was raised to that archbishopric in the year 900, and showed great energy and fidelity in its administration. He became chancellor of France in 910, and died July 2, 922. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Hervaeus, Natalis[[@Headword:Hervaeus, Natalis]]

             (French, HERVS DE NIEDELLEC), surnamed Brito, a mediaeval French theologian and scholastic philosopher, was a native of Brittany, and died at Narbonne August 1323. He became a member of the Dominican convent at Morlaix, studied also at Paris, then taught in various provinces of France, and afterwards was rector and professor of theology in the University of Paris, where he lectured from 1307 to 1309 upon the Sententiae of Peter Lombard. In 1318 he became general of his order. He was a zealous Thomist, and passed for one of the first theologians of his time. He left numerous writings, of which only the following have been printed: Hervcei Britonis in IV Sententiarum Volumina Scripta subtilissima (best ed. Venice, 1505, fol.); — Quodlibeta Iactgna (Ven. 1486, fol.): — De Beatitudine, De Verbo, De eEternitate Mlundi, De fateria Caeli, De Relationibus, De Pluralitate Formarum, De Virtuttibus, De Motu Angeli- the whole published together by 0. Scot (Venice, 1513, in 1 vol. fol.): — De Secundis Intentionibus (Paris, 1489 and 1544, 4to): — De Potestate  Ecclesiae et Papae (Paris, 1500 and 1647). A list of his MS. writings is given by Quetif and Ichard (Script. ord. Prced. 1, 533). — Haureau, De la Philosophie Scolastique, 2, 396 sq.; Tennemann, Man. Hist. of Phil. p. 241 (Bohn's ed.). (J.W. M.)

## Hervetus, Gentianus[[@Headword:Hervetus, Gentianus]]

             a French theologian, was born in 1499 at Olivet, near Orleans. In word and writing he combated Calvinism; was present at the colloquy of Poissy and at the council of Trent. In 1562 he was made canon of Rheims, and died in 1584. Besides a great many translations, he published of his own, Oratio ad Concilium Tridentinum (Paris, 1556, 1563): — Catechisme ou Sommaire de la Foi (1561): — Traite du Purgatoire, (1562): — Les Ruses et Finesses du Diable pour Tocher a Abolir le Saint Sacrifice de Jesus- Christ (1562). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:888; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Herveus Of Maine[[@Headword:Herveus Of Maine]]

             entered, about the year 1100, the Benedictine monastery at Bourg-Dieu, in Berry, and spent there about fifty years. He devoted himself entirely to the study of the Bible and fathers of the Church, and wrote commentaries, of  which those on Isaiah and the Epistles of Paul have been printed (the former in 1721 and the latter in 1544, among the works of Anselm). Both are found in Migne, Patr. Lat. volume 181. Hervmus belongs to those pious theologians of the early period of the Middle Ages, in whom Christianity had become a living reality, but who, fettered by the traditions of the Church, could not rid himself of the latter. See Chemnitz, Examen Conc. Trid., de Justificatione, art. 7, § 2; Loci Theologici, de Justificatione, cap. I, § 4; Frank, Die Theologie der Konkordienformel, 2:54 sq.; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Hervey, Frederick, D.D[[@Headword:Hervey, Frederick, D.D]]

             an English prelate, fourth earl of Bristol, was born in 1730, and educated at Westminster School and Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. He was originally designed for the bar, but entered into holy orders, was promoted to the see of Clovne in February 1767, and translated to that of Derry in 1768. He expended most of his patrimony in liberality, and travelled extensively over Europe. He died July 8, 1803.

## Hervey, James[[@Headword:Hervey, James]]

             an English divine and popular writer, was born at Hardingstone, near Northampton, Feb. 26, 1714. At eighteen he was sent to Oxford, and there, becoming acquainted with John Wesley, he became seriously impressed with the importance of religion. He afterwards became a Calvinist. At twenty-two he became curate of Weston Favel, and a few years after curate of Biddeford. During that time he wrote his celebrated Meditations and Contemplations (1746, 8vo), which obtained immense circulation. It was followed by Contemplations on the Night and Starry Heavens, and A Winter Piece (1747, 8vo). In 1750, on the death of his father, he succeeded to the livings of Weston and Collingtree; and he devoted himself earnestly to his clerical duties. In 1753 he published Remarks on Lord Bolingbroke's Letters on the Study and Use of History, so far as they relate to the History of the Old Testament, etc., in a Letter to a Lady of Quality (1753, 8vo). In 1755 he published Trieron and Aspasio, or a Series of Dialogues and Letters on the most important Subjects (1755, 3 vols. 8vo), which was attacked by Robert Sandeman, of Edinburgh, on the nature of justifying faith, and other points connected with it, in a work entitled Letters on Theron and Aspasio. SEE SANDETIAN.

John Wesley wrote a brief review of his Theron and Aspasio, and Hervey wrote in reply Eleven Letters to John Wesley, but before his death he directed that the MS. of this work should be destroyed. “His brother, however, judged that it would be a desirable pecuniary speculation to publish it, and placed it in the hands of Cudworth, an erratic dissenting preacher, to be finished, giving him liberty ‘to put out and put in' whatever he judged expedient. Cudworth's Antinomian sentiments led him to abhor Wesley's opinions; he caricatured them relentlessly by his interpolations of Hervey's pages, and sent forth in Hervey's name the first and most reckless and odious caveat against Methodism that ever emanated from any one who had sustained friendly relations to it. It was republished in Scotland, and tended much to forestall the spread of Methodism there. Wesley felt keenly the injustice and heartlessness of this attack, but his sorrow was mitigated by the knowledge that the most of the abuse in the publication was interpolated, and that Hervey, who had  delighted to call him his ‘friend and father,' knew him too well to have thus struck at him from the grave. He answered the book; but time has answered it more effectually — time, the invincible guardian of the characters of great men.” He died Dec. 25, 1758. Mr. Hervey s writings are viciously turgid and extravagant in style. “He was eminently pious, though not deeply learned; habitually spiritually-minded; animated with ardent love to the Savior; and his humility, meekness, submission to the will of God, and patience under his afflicting hand, exemplified the Christian character. and adorned his profession.” His writings were collected and published after his death (London, 1797, 7 vols.). His correspondence was published separately (1760, 2 vols. 8vo). See Ryland, Life of Hervey; Letters of Hervey, and Life prefixed; Chalmers, General Biog. Dict.; Jones, Christian Biography; Stevens, History of Methodism, 1, 372; Wesley's Works, 6, 103, 125; Jackson Life of Charles Wesley, ch. 21: Coke and Moore, Life of Wesley, 3, 2.

## Herxheimer, Salomon[[@Headword:Herxheimer, Salomon]]

             a Jewish rabbi, was born in 1801. He studied at Marburg, and was in 1831 elected land-rabbi of Bernburg, and died December 25, 1884. He  published, יסודי התורה, Israelitische Glaubens. und Pfuchtenlehre (Minden, 1831; 27th ed. 1877): — Praktische Anieitung zum schnellen Erlernen des Hebraischen (Berlin, 1834; 6th ed. 1873): — תורת משהDer Pentateuch, etc. (1841; 3d ed. 1865): — נביאים וכתובים, Die Propheten und Hagiographen, besides a number of Sermons. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:387; Kayserling, Bibliothek Judischer Kanzelredner, 2:1 sq. (B.P.)

## Herzfeld, Levi[[@Headword:Herzfeld, Levi]]

             a Jewish writer of Germany was born in 1810 at Ellrich, Saxony. He studied at Berlin, took the degree as doctor of philosophy in 1836, was appointed land-rabbi of Brunswick in 1842, and died in 1884. He published, Chronologia Judicusm et Primorum Regunt Hebraeorum (Berlin, 1836): — קהלתDas Buch Koheleth (Brunswick, 1838): — Geschikhte des Volkes Israel (1847; 2d ed. 1863): — Meteorologische Untersuchungen, etc. (1863-65): — Handelsgeschichte der Juden des Alterthums (1879): — Predigten (1858; 2d ed. 1863), etc. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:388; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:547; Kayserling, Bibl. Judischer Kanzelredner, 2:206 sq.; Morals, Eminent Israelites of the XIXth Century, page 133 sq. (B.P.)

## Herzlieb, Christian Friedrich Carl[[@Headword:Herzlieb, Christian Friedrich Carl]]

             a Luther an theologian of Germany, was born December 4, 1760. He studied at Halle, was in 1780 professor at the gymnasium there, in 1786 preacher at Brandenburg, and died March 19, 1794. He left several volumes of Sermons. See Dbring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:137, 141, 168, 192. (B.P.)

## Herzog, Eduard[[@Headword:Herzog, Eduard]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born in 1801 at Frankenstein, Silesia. In 1826 he took holy orders, and died April 17, 1867. He published, Kanzelvortrage (Glogau, 1855, 2 vols.): — Der katholische Seelsorger nach seinen Amtsverpflichtungen und Amtsverrichtungen (Breslau, 1839, 3 volumes): — Die Verwaltung des heiligen Busssakraments (Paderborn, 1859). (B.P.)

## Herzog, Johann Jacob, D.D[[@Headword:Herzog, Johann Jacob, D.D]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Basle, September 12, 1805. He entered the university of his native town in 1822, and afterwards studied at Berlin. From 1835 till 1846 he held a professorship of historical theology in the Academy of Lausanne, and was involved with his colleagues, the distinguished Vinet and Chappuis, in the struggles which resulted in the formation of the Free Church of the Canton de Vaud. Here, at Basle, he published his Life of the Basle Reformer, OEcolampadius (1843, 2 volumes). In 1847 Herzog was invited to fill a chair at the University of Halle, where, in 1848, he published in the university programme, De Origine et Pistiss Statu Waldessium. In 1851 he received a commission from the Prussian government to visit Geneva, Paris, London, and Dublin, in order to investigate the sources for the history of the Waldenses. The result of thus mission was his work, Die romanischen Waldenser, etc. (1853). At this time, also, he conceived the plan of his Real Encyklopaedie fur protestantische Theologie und Kirche, which was published in 22 volumes from 1854 to 1868. After beginning this work he had left Halle for Erlangen, to succeed Dr. Ebrard as professor of reformed theology. In 1877 he retired from active academical duties. The last years of his life were occupied with his Abriss der gesammten Kirchengeschichte (1876-82, 3 volumes), and with the preparation of a second edition of his Real-Encyklopadie, which at the time of his death had reached the tenth volume, or the second third of the entire work. He died at Erlangen, September 30, 1882. Besides the works already mentioned, he also published, Les Freres de Plymouth et John Dairby (Lausanne, 1845) Bemerkungen uber Zwingli's Lehre von der Vorsehung und Gnadenwahl (in the Studien und Kritiken, 1839): and a biographical sketch, Johann Calvin (Basle, 1843). (B.P.)

## Hesed[[@Headword:Hesed]]

             (Heb. Che'sed, חֶסֶד, kindness, as often; Sept. ῎Εσεδ), the name of a man whose son (Ben-Hesed) was Solomon's purveyor in the district of Aruboth, Sochoh, and Hepher (1Ki 4:10). B.C. cir. 995. SEE JUSHAH-HESED.

## Heser, George[[@Headword:Heser, George]]

             a German ecclesiastical writer, was born at Weyern, near Passau, Austria, in 1609. He joined the Jesuits in 1625, and taught rhetoric, dialectics and controversy at Munich and Ingolstadt. In 1642 he became preacher at St.Maurice's Church, Augsburg, and in 1649 went in the same capacity to St. Mary's Church, Ingolstadt. In 1662 he retired to Munich, where he was still living in 1676. The exact time of his death is not ascertained. He is especially noted for his efforts in proving Thomas k Kempis (q.v.) as the author of De imitatione Christi. In his Dioptra Kempensis he has gathered a number of testimonies, and describes pretty accurately a number of editions and of translations of Kempis, which appeared during the 16th and 17th centuries. He wrote also Vita et Syllabus omnium Operum Thomea a Kempis ab auctore anonymo, sed coaevo, non longe post obitum illius conscripta (Ingolstadt, 1650,1 2mo; Paris, 1651, 8vo): — Faemonitio nova ad lectorem Thomea a Kempis (Ingolstadt, 1651, 18mo; Paris, 1651, 8vo): — LXX Palmae, seu panegyricus in laudem librorum IV Thoniae a  Kempis, ex hominumpiorum elogiis LXX concidmnatus (Ingolstadt,1651, 8vo), etc. See Veith, Biblioth. Augustana; Ersch und Gruber, Allem. Encyklopadie; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 559.

## Heshbon[[@Headword:Heshbon]]

             (Hebrew Cheshbon', חֶשְׁבּוֹן, intelligence, as in Ecc 7:25, etc.; Sept. Ε᾿σεβών; Josephus), a town in the southern district of the Hebrew territory beyond the Jordan, on the western border of the high plain (Mishor, Jos 13:17). It originally belonged to the Moabites, but when the Israelites arrived from Egypt it was- found to be-in the possession of the Amorites, whose king, Sihon, is styled both king of the Amorites and king of Heshbon, and is expressly said to have “reigned in Heshbon” (Jos 3:10; comp. Num 21:26; Deu 2:9). It was taken by Moses (Num 21:23-26), and eventually became a Levitical city (Jos 21:39; 1Ch 6:81) in the tribe of Reuben (Num 32:37; Jos 13:17); but, being on the confines of Gad, is sometimes assigned to the latter tribe (Jos 21:39; 1Ch 6:81). After the Ten Tribes were sent into exile, Heshbon was taken possession of by the Moabites, and hence is mentioned by the prophets in their declarations against Moab (Isa 15:4; Jer 48:2; Jer 48:34; Jer 48:45). Under king Alexander Janneus we find it again reckoned as a Jewish city (Josephus, Ant. 13, 15, 4). Pliny mentions a tribe of Arabs called Esbonitae (Hist. Nat. 5, 11; comp. Abulfeda, Tab. Syr. p. 11).

In the time of Eusebius and Jerome (Ononmast. s.v. Ε᾿σσεβών) it was still a place of some consequence under the name of Esbus (Ε᾿σβούς), but at the present day it is known by its ancient name, in the slightly modified form of Hesban. The region was first visited in modern times by Seetzen. The site is twenty miles east of the Jordan, on the parallel of the northern end of the Dead Sea. , The ruins of a considerable town still exist, covering the sides of an insulated hill, but not a single edifice is left entire. The view from the summit is very extensive, embracing the ruins of a vast number of cities, the names of some of which bear a strong resemblance to those mentioned in Scripture. These environs, occupying the elevated plain between the mountains of Jazer and the Jabbok, seem to be referred to in Jos 13:16. There are reservoirs connected with this and the other towns of this region. These have been supposed to be the “fish-pools” (בְּרֵכוֹת, cisterns) of Heshbon mentioned by Solomon (Son 7:4) SEE BATH- RABBIAM; but say Irby and Mangles, “The ruins are uninteresting, and the  only pool we saw was too insignificant to be one of those mentioned in Scripture” (p. 472). In two of the cisterns among the ruins they found about three dozen of human skulls and bones, which they justly regarded as an illustration (of Gen 37:20 (Travels, p. 472; see also George Robinson, lord Lindsay, Schwarz, Tristram, etc.). Dr. Macmichael and his party went to look for these pools, but they found only one, which was extremely insignificant. This is probably the reservoir mentioned by Burckhardt (Syria, p. 365). Mr. Buckingham, however, says, “The large reservoir to the south of the town, and about half a mile from the foot of the hill on which it stands, is constructed with good masonry, and not unlike the cisterns of Solomon, near Jerusalem, to which it is also nearly equal in size.” Towards the western part of the hill is a singular structure, whose crumbling ruins exhibit the workmanship of successive ages the massive stones of the Jewish period, the sculptured cornice of the Roman era, and the light Saracenic arch, all grouped together (Porter, Handb. for Palest. p. 298).

## Heshbon (2)[[@Headword:Heshbon (2)]]

             The following is the latest description of this, once famous. place a (T'ristranm; Laid of Moab, page 351):

"A large piece of walling at the west end of the bold, isolated hill on which the old fortress stood, with a square block-house, and a pointed archway adjoining a temple on the crest of the hill, with the pavement and the bases of four columns in situ on the east, in the  plain, just at. the base of the hill, a great cistern, called by some the 'fish-pools of Heshbon,' but more probably only the reservoir for the supply of the city — these are all that remain."

## Heshmon[[@Headword:Heshmon]]

             (Heb. Cheshmon', חֶשְׁמוֹן,faltness; Sept. Α᾿σεμω῎ν), a city on the southern border of Judah (Simeon), near Idumaea, mentioned between Hazor-Gaddah and Beth-Palet (Jos 15:27); hence probably somewhere between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean. It is possibly the same as the AZMON SEE AZMON (q.v.) elsewhere (Jos 15:4) located in.this vicinity. SEE HAZAR-ADDAR.

## Heshmon (2)[[@Headword:Heshmon (2)]]

             is thought by Lieut. Conder (Quar. Statement of the "Pal. Explor. Fund." January 1875, page 25 sq.) to be el-Meshash, at the foot of the white chalk peaks of el-Ghur, three miles west of Tell-Milh, ini the vicinity of Beersheba; and Tristram (Bible Places, page 20) accepts the identification; but it rests nerely upon a presumed order of the names.

## Hesperides[[@Headword:Hesperides]]

             in Greek mythology, were daughters of Atlas and Hesperis, and are mentioned as being from three to seven in number. When Juno married Jupiter, all the gods brought presents. Earth brought forth a tree, on which grew golden apples. Juno commanded the sisters, Hesperides, to guard them. But the latter helped themselves to the apples. She therefore sent a son of Typhon and Echidna, the frightful, never sleeping, hundred-headed dragon Ladon, to the tree, who scared everything away that approached. Hercules was sent there to get three apples out of the garden for Eurystheus. According to Diodorus, the Hesperides were daughters of Atlas, seized by Busiris, and liberated by Hercules, wherefore the latter received the desired Mela (apples) from their father voluntarily.