## Hess, Carl Ernest Christoph[[@Headword:Hess, Carl Ernest Christoph]]

             an eminent German engraver, was born at Darmstadt in 1755. In '776 he settled at Augsburg, and executed several fine plates, which gained him admission to the Academy in 1780. In 1782 the elector palatine appointed him engraver to the court, and in 1787 he visited Italy for improvement. On his return to Germany he remained some time at Munich, and afterwards practiced the art with great success at Dusseldorf until 1794, when he returned to Munich. Among his esteemed productions are The Ascension; The Holy Family; St. Jerome. He died in 1828.

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

             a Jewish rabbi of Germany, father of Mendel and Michael, was born February 12, 1762, and died August 9, 1827. He edited the work of his father Joseph, rabbi at Cassel, entitled בן פורת יוס, a commentary on  the Haphtaroth, homiletically arranged (Furth, 1796), and wrote Ueber den Eid der Juden, etc. (Eisenach, 1824). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:390. (B.P.).

## Hess, Johann[[@Headword:Hess, Johann]]

             one of the German Reformers, was born in Nuremberg about 1490, studied at Leipzig from 1506 to 1510, and at Wittenberg from 1510 to 1512. In 1513 he became secretary to the bishop of Breslau. After traveling and studying in Italy, he returned in 1529 to Wittenberg, and there became connected with Luther and Melancthon. Returning to Breslau with reformatory views, he found no opposition from his bishop, who was imbued with the new humanistic learning, and was a friend of Erasmus. But the bishop (Turzo) died in 1520, and his successor (Jacob of Salza) was a strenuous Romanist. He left Breslau for a time. but the seed had taken root, and the magistrates recalled Hess as pastor in 1523. Thenceforward he was the soul of the Reformation in Breslau. In 1525 he married, and continued his labors in reforming the Church and the schools, and in  providing institutions for the relief of the poor. He died in 1547. — Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 19, 642.

## Hess, Johann Jakob[[@Headword:Hess, Johann Jakob]]

             an eminent Swiss divine, was born at Zurich Oct. 21,1741, where he studied theology with his uncle, the pastor of Neftenbach, to whom he became assistant in 1760. In 1777 he was called to the church of'Notre Dame in Zurich; and in 1795 (contrary to his own wishes) he was chosen, in preference to Lavater, antistes or president of the clergy of the canton. He died May 29,1828. His long life was faithfully devoted to his work as a pastor, and to literary labor. ‘-Hess was to Switzerland what Reinhard was to the Saxon Church, and Storr to that of Wurtemberg. His clear and mild, yet fixed and safe convictions, as expressed in his writings on Biblical history, and especially on the life of our Lord, found a hearty reception in many a pious domestic circle in Germany, and in the soul of many a young theologian” (Hagenbach, Hist. of the Church in 18th and 19th Centuries. transl. by Hurst, 2, 409). In 1767 he published a Geschichte der drei letzten Lebensjahre Jesu (Zurich, 6 vols.). This work was adapted to the use of Roman Catholics by J. A. von Krapf (Munster, 1782, 2 vols.). Hess continued to study the subject, and wrote Jugendgeschichte Jesu (Zurich, 1773), and finally his Leben Jesu (1823, 3 vols.). His other works are Von dem Reiche. Gottes (Zurich, 1774, 2 vols.; 5th edit. 1826): — Gesch. u. Schriften der Apostel Jesu (Zurich, 1775,3 vols.; 4th ed. 1820-1822): this work was also adapted to the use of Roman Catholics (Münster, 1794, 2 vols.; 3rd ed. Salzburg, 1801): — Geschichte d. Israeliten vor d. Zeiten Jesu (Zurich, 1776-1788,12 vols.): — Gesch. — Josua (Zurich, 1779, 2 vols.): — Predigten u. d. Apostelgesch. (Zurich, 1781-1788), a collection of 50 sermons: — Ueber die Lehre, Thaten, und Schicksale unseres Herrn (Zurich, 1782j 2 vols.; 4th ed. 1817): — Gesch. David's u. Salonzo's (Zurich, 1785, 2 vols.): — Bibl. d. heiligen Gesch. (Zurich, 1791-1792, 2 vols.): — Gesch. d. Mienschen (Zurich, 1791-1792, 2 vols.; later ed. 1829): — Ueber die Volks v. Vaterlan-desliebe Jesu (Winterthur, 1794): — Der Christ bei Gefahren d. Vaterlondes, a collection of sermons (Zurich, 1799-1800, 3 vols.). See Ersch u. Gruber, Encyklopädie; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 575.

## Hess, Mendel[[@Headword:Hess, Mendel]]

             a Jewish rabbi of Germany, was born March 17, 1807. He studied at Wiirzburg, and succeeded his father in 1827 in the rabbinate. In 1842 he settled at Eisenach, as land rabbi, but retired from his office on account of bodily infirmities, and died September 21, 1872. From 1839 to 1848 he edited Der Israelit des 19. Jahrhunderts, in which he advocated reformn among the Jews. He also published, Predigten (Eisenach, 1839-48, 3 volumes): — Ausgewahlte Predigten (1871). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:390; Kayserling, Bibliothek jud. Kanznelredner, 2:153 sq. (B.P.)

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

             a Jewish rabbi, brother of Mendel, was born April 9, 1782. He studied at Fiirth and Frankfort, and was professor of the Jewish high-school at the latter place from 1806 to 1855. Hess died February 26, 1860. Like his brother, he belonged to the reform party among the Jews. He published, Freimuthige Prufung der Schrift des Herrn Ruhs uber die Anspruche der Juden an das deutsche Burgerrecht (Frankfort, 1816): — Programmi uber den Religionsunterricht in der Schule der israelit. Gesneinde (1821). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:390; Kayserling, Bibliothek jud. Kanzelredner, 1:383 sq.; Sterii, Michael Hess, ein Lebensbild, in Diesterweg's Pddagog. Joahrbuch, 1862, page 1-38. (B.P.)

## Hess, Salomon[[@Headword:Hess, Salomon]]

             a Reformed minister of Switzerland, was born at Zurich in 1763. In 1801 he was first preacher at St. Peter's, in his native place, but resigned his office in 1830, and died in 1837. He published, Erasmus von Rotterdam nach seinem Leben und Schriften (Zurich, 1790-92): — Ursprung, Gang und Folgen der durch Zwingli in Zurich bewirkten Reformation (1819): — Anna Reinhard, Gattin und Wittwe von Ulrich Zwingli (1819): — Biographien beruhmter Schweizer Reformatoren; volume 1, Lebensgeschichte des OEcolampadius (1793); volumes 2, 3, Lebensgeschichte des H. Bullinger (1828-29): — Andachten und Gebetsubung fur die christliche Jugend (1820). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:579, 740, 748, 749; 2:372. (B.P.)

## Hesse[[@Headword:Hesse]]

             a country in central Germany. The name is for the first time mentioned in a letter of St. Boniface to the pope (783), and the pupils of Boniface introduced Christianity into the country. At the time of Charlemagne it belonged to the dominions of the counts of Franconia; in the 10th century, a number of Hessian nobles established their independence; in the following, all of them recognized the sovereignty of Ludwig I of Thuringia, who had married the daughter of one of the Hessian princes. This line became extinct in 1247; a long civil war ensued; the result was the confirmation of the rule of Heinrich of Brabant, the son-in-law of the; last ruler of the extinct line. His son Heinrich (“the Child of Brabant”) became the ancestor of all the branches of Hessian princes. The Hessian lands, sometimes divided among several princes, were again reunited at the beginning of the 16th century under Wilhelm II. the father of Philip I the Magnanimous, who played so prominent a part in the history of the Reformation of the 16th century. Philip divided his dominions among his four sons, two of whom died childless, thus leaving only two chief lines of the Hessian dynasties, Hesse-Cassel and Hesse-Darnmstadt. The landgraves of Hesse-Cassel in 1803 received the title of elector; but in 1806, in consequence of the German war, in which the elector had taken sides against Prussia, the country was conquered by the Prussians, and annexed to Prussia. The landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt in 1806 received the title of grand duke. From both main lines others branched off from time to time, but at the establishment of the German Confederation in 1815, only one, the land gravate of Hesse-Homburg, a branch of Hesse- Darmstadt, became a member of the Confederation. It became extinct in March 1866, fell to Hesse-Darmstadt, but in September 1866, was ceded by Hesse-Darmstadt to Prussia. Thus, in 1870, the only Hessian line retaining sovereignty was the grand duchy of Hesse-Darmstadt, which was a part of the new North-German Confederation, not for the whole territory, however, but only for one of the three provinces.

The zeal of Philip the Magnanimous for the success of the Reformation made the Hessian territory one of the strongholds of German Protestantism. But the vacillation of the succeeding princes between the Lutheran and the Reformed Creeds caused considerable trouble, especially in Hesse-Cassel, the State Church of which was often left in the dark as to whether it was Lutheran or Reformed. Theological controversies on this subject have been continued up to the present day. In the grand-duchy of  Hesse-Darmstadt, the majority of the Protestant churches, both Lutheran and Reformed, have joined (since 1822) the “Union” or United Evangelical Church. Before the union there were in the grand duchy about 406,000 Lutherans and 173,000 Reformed. According to the census of 1885, there were in the grand duchy in that year 643,881 Evangelical Christians (67.3 per cent. of the total population), 278,440 Roman Catholics (29.1 per cent.), 26,114 Israelites (2.7 per cent.). In the class of “other Christians” were included in 1867, 2987 German Catholics, 626 Mennonites, 119 Baptists, 31 Free Religious, 24 Separatists, 22 Greek Catholics, 20 United Brethren in Christ, 6 Darbyites, 4 Pietists, 2 Orthodox Catholics.

The National Evangelical Church comprises the members of the United Evangelical Church as well as the non-united Lutherans and Reformed. The Church constitution, introduced at the time of the Reformation, with two consistories and four superintendents, was changed in 1803. The office of superintendents was abolished; the two consistories were supplanted by Church and School councils which had no consistorial jurisdiction. The new councils were subordinate to the state ministers of the Interior and of Justice, who, in the exercise of their functions, were aided by inspectors. As in other parts of Germany, the Church lost the last remnant of self- government, and became wholly subject to the state. A reorganization of the constitution took place by a decree of June 6. 1832. The administration of all the affairs of the National Evangelical Church was transferred to a Supreme Consistory (Oberconsistorium) at Darmstadt, which consists of a president (a layman), three ministerial counselors, two lay counselors, and of one or several assessors. Only in rare cases the Supreme Consistory has to report to the state ministry for a final decision. Each of the three provinces of the grand duchy has a superintendent. The superintendents are the organs through whom the Supreme Consistory exercises its functions. Subordinate to the superintendents are the deans, thirty in number, who are appointed by the Supreme Consistory for the term of five years. Ev. ery congregation has a local church council to assist in the management of the external church discipline and of the local church property. This Church council has two official members, the pastor and the burgomaster (or his representative), and from three to five extraordinary members, who are chosen by the former in union with the council of the civil community. Every parish is to receive an official “visitation” from the superintendent or a dean once within every three years. The highest dignitary of the Church is the “prelate' (pralat), who is also, by virtue of his office, a member of the  First Chamber. A theological faculty is connected with the University of Giessen; besides, there is a preachers' seminary at Friedeburg. The theological faculty of Giessen has been and still is (Jan. 1870) under the control of the Rationalistic party; among its best known professors were Credner (q.v.) and Knobel (q.v.). As may therefore be expected, a considerable portion of the clergy belong likewise to the Rationalistic party; of late, however, the reaction in favor of evangelical principles has gained ground.

The Roman Catholics belong to the ancient diocese of Mentz (q.v.), which is now a suffragan see to the archbishop of Freiburg. The diocese, which, besides Hesse-Darmstadt, comprises a few parishes in the former landgraviate of Hesse-Homburg, had (1865) 158 parishes in 17 deaneries. A faculty of Roman Catholic theology was formerly connected with the University of Giessen; but in 1848 the bishop of Mentz forbade all students of theology to attend the theological lectures of the (prominently Protestant) University, and established a new theological seminary at Mentz. The theological faculty, deserted by all the students, had soon to be suppressed. Of monastic institutions, there were in 1865 houses of the Jesuits, Capuchins, Brothers of the Christian Schools, Englische Fraulein, Sisters of Charity, and other female congregations, with 244 members. At the beginning of the century, the most liberal sentiments prevailed among the majority of the clergy, including even the canons of the cathedral church, and the professor of theological faculty of the University; but since the appointment of the ultramontane bishop of Ketteler (1850), these liberal sentiments have been to a very large extent weeded out or repressed. See Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 6, 29; Wiggers, Kirchl. Statistik, 2, 207; Neher, Kirchl. Geographie und Statistik, 2, 311. (A. J.S.)

## Hesse von Hessentein, Johann[[@Headword:Hesse von Hessentein, Johann]]

             born at Nuremberg Sept. 21, 1487, studied theology at Leipzig and Wittenberg, and became a priest during a stay in Italy. On his return to Germany his relations became intimate with Luther, to whose influence is attributed the deep Christian experience which characterize the productions of his pen. Hesse is considered one of the first German sacred poets, and many of his hymns are sung in the German churches of today. — Wolff, Encyklop. d. deutsch. — Nationallit. 4, 83. (J. H. W.)

## Hesse, Johann Heinrich Gottlieb[[@Headword:Hesse, Johann Heinrich Gottlieb]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born November 21, 1779. He studied at Leipsic, was preacher there in 1803, and died June 29, 1823. His best work is Katechisationen uber sittlich-religiose Wahrheiten (Leipsic, 1820). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:269. (B.P.).

## Hesse, Karl Friedrich[[@Headword:Hesse, Karl Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born November 5, 1706. He studied at Wittenberg, was in 1735 preacher at Dresden, in 1747 at Stolpen, in 1760 at Meissen, and died March 22,1775. He published .- Theologische Annalen fur 1731-1750 (Leipsic, 1754). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hesse, Nicolas August[[@Headword:Hesse, Nicolas August]]

             a French painter, was born in Paris, August 28, 1795. He studied under baron Gros at Paris, and then went to Rome, Where he gained the grand prize in 1868. He acquired celebrity by his religious paintings, which may be found in various churches. He succeeded Delacroix in the Academy of Fine Arts in 1863, and died June 14, 1869.

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

             a Belgian controversialist, was born at Mechlin in 1522. In 1556 he was made doctor of theology at Louvain, in 1560 professor of theology, and died November 7, 1566. He is the author of, Comment. in Matthaeum: — Comm. in Epistolas Canonicas Johannis: — Comm. in Priorem ad Timotheum et in Priorem Petri: — Explicatio in Symbolum Apostolorum: — Explicatio Decalogi. See Andreas, Bibliotheca Belgica; Mireus, Elogia Illustrium Belii Scriptorum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hesshusen (Hesshusius), Tillemann[[@Headword:Hesshusen (Hesshusius), Tillemann]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born November 3, 1527, at Wesel, in Cleves. In his youth he traveled over France, England, Denmark, and Germany; after which he went to Wittenberg, where, in 1550, he became Master of Arts and soon made his mark as a preacher. In 1552, when but twenty-five years old, he was appointed pastor of Goslar, and in 1553 was made D.D. But his peculiarities of mind and temper prevented his remaining long in any post. Always in conflict with the authorities, his friend Melancthon in vain procured him several advantageous situations, securing him, when but thirty years old, the nomination as professor of theology at Heidelberg, superintendent of the Palatinate, and president of the Church Council, which he lost again two years after, in 1559, after a bitter controversy with Klebitz (q.v.) on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. He fought the same battle again with A. Hardenberg at Bremen. SEE CRYPTO-CALVINISM.

Having finally sought a refuge in his native city of Wesel, he was driven from it in 1564 for writing his Unterschied zwischen d. wahren katholischen Lehre d. Kirche u. z. d. Irrthümern d. Papisten u. d. rnmischen Antichrists, which highly displeased the government. After varied fortunes, he was in 1573 appointed bishop of Sameland; but, having there awakened great opposition, his doctrines were condemned by a synod in- 1577, and he himself was afterwards driven out of the country. Shortly after he entered on his last situation as the leading professor of theology of the University of Helmstadt, where he died, Sept. 25,1588. During his whole career as a controvertist, Hesshusen was a strong advocate of extreme Lutheranism, against the Melancthonian Synergists. SEE SYNERGISTIC CONTROVERSY. After the promulgation of the Formula of Concord (q.v.), he opposed it (having subscribed it in 1578) on the ground that certain changes had been made in it before publication. Under his influence, the University of Helmstadt withdrew its sanction from the Formula. Among his writings, the most important are his Commnentarii d. Psamen: — De justificatione peccatoris coram Deo (1587): — Examen Theologicum (Helmstadt, 1586). See Jno. Ge. Leuckfeld Hist. Heshusiana (Quedlinburg, 1716); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 49; Planck, Gesch. d. Prot. Theol.; Gass, Geschichte d. Prot. Theol. vol. 2.

## Hessus, Helius Eobanus[[@Headword:Hessus, Helius Eobanus]]

             one of the most excellent Latin poets of Germany during the 16th century, was born January 6, 1488, at Halgehausen, Hesse. He studied at Erfurt, was rector there in 1509, but left that place on account of the then existing troubles. In 1514 he was again at Erfurt, and in 1516 he was professor at  the university. In 1526 he was called to Nuremberg, but returned to Erfurt in 1533, and accepted a call to Marburg in 1536. Hessus died October 4, 1540. He deserves a place here on account of his zeal for the Reformation. He made a metrical version of the Psalms, whence Luther called him the rex poetarum. See Schwertzell, Helius Eobanus Hessus, ein Lebensbild aus der Reformationszeit (Halle, 1874); Krause, Helius Eobanus Hessus, sein Leben und seine Werke (Gotha, 1879). (B.P.)

## Hesus[[@Headword:Hesus]]

             in Gallic and German mythology, was the god of war. His image had the form of a dog. The firstprisoner of war was sacrificed to him. If a forest was to be dedicated, the sturdiest oak-tree was selected, and the name Hesus was cut into it.

## Hesychasts[[@Headword:Hesychasts]]

             (Greek ἡσυχασταί, ἡσυχάζειν, to be quiet), a party of Eastern monks of the 14th century, on Mount Athos. They taught a refined and exaggerated mysticism, or quietism (q.v.), seeking “tranquility of mind and the extinction of evil passions by contemplation.” They believed that all who arrive at the blessedness of seeing God may also arrive at a tranquility of mind entirely free from perturbation, and that all enjoying such a state may have visual perception of divine light, such as the apostles saw when they beheld His glory shining forth in the transfiguration. The monk Barlaam (q.v.), who afterwards became bishop of Gerace, during a visit to the East, learned the doctrines and usages of these quietistic monks, and attacked them violently. They were vigorously defended by Palamas, afterwards bishop of Thessalonica. The charges brought against them were not merely that they professed to seek and obtain a divine and supernatural light not promised in Scripture, but also that the means they used were fanatical and absurd. These means included contemplation, introversion, and ascetic practices; especially it was said that they were accustomed to seat themselves in some secret corner, and fix their eyes steadfastly upon the navel, whence they were called ὀμφαλόψυχοι.

As the fruit of such contemplation, a divine light, they said, such as that which shone on Tabor, was diffused through their souls. Palamas defended this theory by making a distinction between the essence (οὐσία) of God and his activity (ἐνέργεια), asserting that the latter, though eternal and uncreated, is yet communicable. To the charge that they thus claimed directly to see God, inasmuch as this uncreated light must be either of the substance or of the attributes of God, they replied that the divine light radiated from God through ἐνέργεια, but was not God. The whole matter was brought before a council at Constantinople in 1341. and the decision tending favorably to the Hesychasts, Barlaam retreated to Italy. But his cause was taken up by another monk, George Acyndinus, who attacked the doctrine of Palamas and the usages of the Hesychasts. He also lost his case before a synod at Constantinople. After the death of the emperor Andronicus, however, who had favored Palamas and the Hesychasts, things took a different turn for a while in favor of the Barlaamites; but after the triumph of the emperor John Cantacuzenus, who favored the other side, a synod at Constantinople, in 1351, approved the doctrine of the Hesychasts, especially the distinction between οὐσία and ἐνέργεια, and excommunicated Acyndinus and Barlaam. The sources of information on  these proceedings are the Historia of John Cantacuzenus (2, 39; 4,23, etc.), which is on the side of the Hesychasts; and the Historia Byzantina of Nicephorus Gregoras, which takes the other side. See Petavius, De Dogm. Theol. ,lib. 1, c. 12; Schröckh, Kirchengeschichte, 34:431; Mosheim, Church Hist. cent. 14:pt. 2, ch. 5; Gass, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 52 sq.; Engelhardt, in Zeitschrift d. hist. Theol. 8:48; Gieseler, Church History, per. 3:§ 127; Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. 7:chap. 2, § 14; Dorner, Person of Christ, Edinb. translation, div. 2, vol. 1. p. 236. SEE MYSTICISM.

## Hesychius[[@Headword:Hesychius]]

             an Egyptian bishop of the 3rd century, who is mentioned by Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 8, 13) as a reviser of the text of the Septuagint (see also Jerome, De vir. illust. 77). He also published an edition of the New Testament, of which Jerome does not appear to have formed a favorable opinion. He obtained the crown of martyrdom in the Dioclesian persecution about A.D. 311. Nothing of his works is now extant. See Clarke, Succ. of Sac. Literature, s.v.; Lardner, Works, 3, 206; Hody, De Bibl. textibus originalibus (Oxf. 1705).

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

             the grammarian OF ALEXANDRIA, is of uncertain date, but probably lived about the end of the 4th century. He compiled a Greek Lexicon, which has been of inestimable service to philology and literature. The best edition is that of Alberti and Ruhnken (Leyden, 1746-66, 2 vols.), with additions by Schow (Leipsic, 1792, 8vo); newly edited by Schmidt (Jena, 1857-64, 4 vols. 4to). See Ranke, De Lexici Hesychiani vera origine et genuinaformna Commentatio (Leipzig and Quedlinburg, 1831, 8vo).

## Hesychius (3)[[@Headword:Hesychius (3)]]

             (1) Bishop of Spolato, in Dalmatia, A.D. 405-429, wrote a letter of thanks to Chrysostom for his sympathy with the Eastern Church (in the works of the latter, Ep. 183).

(2) Bishop of Castabala, in Cilicia Secunda, censured by the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, for opposition to Cyril.

(3) Patriarch of Jerusalem, A.D. 600.

(4) A noted disciple of Hilarion, and a monk of Cyprus in the middle of the 4th century, commemorated October 3.

## Hesychius of Jerusalem[[@Headword:Hesychius of Jerusalem]]

             a Greek ecclesiastical writer of the 5th century (supposed to have died about A.D. 434). Consecrated priest by the patriarch of Constantinople against his wishes, he spent the remainder of his life in that city. This is about all that is known with any certainty concerning his life. He appears to have enjoyed great reputation, and wrote a number of books, the principal of which are, In Leviticum Libri septem (Latin only, Basle, 1527, foloi; Paris, 1581, 8vo; and in Bibliotheca Patrum, 12, 52: Στιχηρὸν (or Κεφάλαια) τῶν προφητῶν καὶ ᾿Ησαϊvου, Sticheron (or Capita) in  duodecimprophetas minores et Esaiam, published by David Hoeschel with Adrian's Isagoge (Augsburg, 1602, 4to), and inserted in the Critici Sacri (London, 1660), 8, 26: — Α᾿ντιῤῥητικά or Εύτικά, published with Marcus Eremita's Opuscula (Paris, 1563, 8vo), and reprinted in the Bibliotheca veterum Patrum of Fronton Ducueus (Paris, 1624, fol.), 1, 985. A Latin translation of this work was inserted in the Biblioth. Patrum, 12:194, under the title Ad Theodulun Sermo compendiosus animae perutilis de Temperantia et Virtute, etc.: — Homiliae de Sancta Maria deipara, published by F. du Duc in Biblioth. veterum Patrum, 2, 417: — Τὸ εἰς τὸν ἃγιον Α᾿νδρέαν ἐγχώμιον, Oratio demonstrativa in S.Andream Apostolunt: a Latin translation of this work was inserted in the Biblioth. Patr. 12, 188: — De Resurrectione Domini nostri Christi, and De Hora tertia et sexta quibus Dominus fuisse crucifixus dicitur, in Combefis, Novum Auctarium: — Εἰς Ι᾿άκωον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ Δαιδ τὸν θεοπράτορα, of which extracts are given in Photius (cod. 275): — Μαρτύριον τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἐυδόξουμάρτυπος τοῦ Χριστοῦ Λογγίνου τοῦ ἐκατοντάρχου, in Bollandus, Acta Sanct. March, vol. 2, Appendix, p. 736: — ῾Η εὐαγγελικὴ συμφωνία, in Combefis, 1, 773; an extract of it was inserted in Cotelier, Eccles. Grcec. Monument. 3, 1, under the title Συναγωγὴ ἀποριῶν καὶ ἐπιλύσεων ἐκλεγεῖσα ἐν ἐπιτομῇ ἐκ τῆς Εùαγγελικῆς Ευμφωνίας. Part of the extant writings of Hesychius are given in Migne's Patrologia Graeca, vol. 93. See Photius, Bibliotheca; Cave, Hist. Liter. 1, 571; Tillemont, Memoires Ecclesiastiques, 14, 227; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 589.

## Hetaeriae[[@Headword:Hetaeriae]]

             (ἑταιρείαι), associations or secret societies of the Romans, which were forbidden by an edict of Trajan soon after his accession, A.D. 98. Under this commission, Pliny proceeded to severe measures against the assemblies of the Christians about A.D. 105.

## Heterodox[[@Headword:Heterodox]]

             a term “practically limited to belief in something that is contrary to the decision of some church or churches; thus, when a Romanist or a Lutheran, etc., speaks of heterodoxy, he means something in opposition to the teaching, respectively, of the Romish or Lutheran Church, etc., so that what is, or at least is understood by heterodox, at one time or place, will be  orthodox in another. See Martensen, Dogmatics § 28. SEE HERESY; SEE ORTHODOX.

## Heterogeneous[[@Headword:Heterogeneous]]

             SEE DIVERSE.

## Heterousians[[@Headword:Heterousians]]

             (of other essence; ἕτερος οὐσία), a sect, the followers of Aetitis, and from him denominated Aetians. SEE AETIANS; SEE ARIANISM.

## Heth[[@Headword:Heth]]

             (Heb. Chetf, חֶת, dread; Sept. (ὁ Χετταῖος, and so Josephus, Ant. 1, 6, 2), a son (descendant) of Canaan, and the ancestor of the HITTITES (Gen 5:20; Deu 7:1; Jos 1:4), who dwelt in the vicinity of Hebron (Gen 23:3; Gen 23:7; Gen 25:10). The ‘kings of the Hittites” is spoken of all the Canaanitish kings (2Ki 2:6). In the genealogical tables of Genesis 10 and 1 Chronicles 1, Heth is named as a son of Canaan, younger than Zidon the firstborn, but preceding the Jebusite, the Amorite, and the other Canaanitish-families. The Hittites were therefore a Hamitic race, neither of the “country” nor the “kindred” of Abraham and Isaac (Gen 24:3-4; Gen 28:1-2). In the earliest historical mention of the nation the beautiful narrative of Abraham's purchase of the cave of Machpelah they are styled, not Hittites, but Bene-Cheth (A.V. “sons and children of Heth,” Gen 23:3; Gen 23:5; Gen 23:7; Gen 23:10; Gen 23:16; Gen 23:18; Gen 23:20; Gen 25:10; Gen 49:32). Once we hear of the “daughters of Heth” (Gen 27:46), the “daughters of the land,” at that early period still called, after their less immediate progenitor, “daughters of Canaan” (Gen 28:1; Gen 28:8, compared with Gen 27:46, and Gen 26:34-35; see also 1Ki 11:1; Eze 16:3). In the Egyptian monuments the name Chat is said to stand for Palestine (Bunsen, Egypten, quoted by Ewald, Gesch. 1, 317, note). SEE HITTITE.

## Hetherington, William M[[@Headword:Hetherington, William M]]

             a minister of the Free Church of Scotland, was born June 4, 1803, near Dumfries. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, where he distinguished himself in Greek and in moral philosophy. His first service in the ministry was at Hamilton, where he was assistant to Dr. Meek, whose daughter he married. In 1836 he became minister of Torphicken, and in 1844 at St. Andrew's. At the “disruption” he went out with the Free  Church. In 1848 he was appointed to Free St. Paul's Church, Edinburgh, and in 1857 he was called to the chair of Apologetics and Systematic Theology in the Free-Church College, Glasgow, where his labors as lecturer were excessive. In 1862 he was struck by paralysis, and on the 23rd of May 1865, he died. His writings, besides the- editorship of the Free-Church Magazine (1844-48), and numerous contributions to the Presbyterian Review and the North British Review, include the following: Dramatic Sketches (poems, 1829,8vo): — The Fullness of Time (1834), characterized by Southey as a very original and able treatise: — Roman. History (in Encyclop. Brit.; separately printed, 1852, 12mo): — The Minister's Family (1847; 5th edit. 1851, 12mo): — History of the Church of Scotland (1841, 8vo; last edit. 1853, 2 vols. 8vo): — History of the Westminster Assembly (1843, 12mo): — posthumous, The Apologetics of the Christian Faith; being a course of University lectures, with Introduction including a brief biographical sketch of the author by Dr. Alexander Duff (Edinburgh, 1867, 8vo).

## Hethlon[[@Headword:Hethlon]]

             (Heb. Chethlon', חֶתְלֹן, wrappedup, i.e. a hiding-place; Vulg. Hethalon), a place the approach (דֶּרֶךְ, “way”) to which lay on the northern border of Palestine, between the Mediterranean and Zedad, in the direction of Hamath (Eze 47:15; Eze 48:1). In all probability the “way of Hethlon” is the pass at the (N. or S.) end of Lebanon, from the sea-coast of the Mediterranean to the great plain of Hamath, and is thus identical with “the entrance of Hamath” (q.v.)in Num 34:8, etc. See Porter, Five Years in Damascus, 2, 356.

## Hetzel or Hezel, Johann Wilhelm Friedrich[[@Headword:Hetzel or Hezel, Johann Wilhelm Friedrich]]

             a German Orientalist and theologian, was born at Konigsberg May 16, 1754. He studied at the universities of Wittenberg and Jena, and was appointed professor of Oriental languages at Giessen in 1766. In 1800 he was made librarian of the University of that city, and in 1801 was called to the professorship of Oriental literature in the University of Dorpat, which office he held until 1820. He died Feb. 1,1829. Hetzel wrote a number of- works on-the study of Oriental languages, the principal of which are Ausfürliche hebräische Sprachlehre (Halle, 1777, 8vo): — Nominalformenlehre d. hebraischen Sprache (Halle, 1793, 8vo): — Institutio Philologi Hebraei (Halle, 1793, 8vo): — Gesch. d. hebraischen  Literatur (Halle, 1776): — Syrische Sprachlehre (Lemgo, 1788, 8vo): — Arabische Grammatik nebst einer kurzen arabischen Chrestomathie (Jena, 1776,8vo). Among his theological works, the most important are Die Bibel, Altes u. Neues Testament mit vollstandig erklarenden Bemerkungen (Lemgo, 1780-1791, 10 vols.): — Neuer Versuch 2. d. Brief and Hebraer (Lpz. 1795, 8vo): — Biblisches Real lexikon (Lpz. 1783-1785, 3 vols. roy. 8vo): — Geist d. Philosophie u. Sprache d. alten Welt (Lübeck, 1794, 8vo). See Eichhorn, Bibl. d. biblischen Literatur (5, 1022 sq.); Pierer, Universal Lex. 8, 360; Hoefer, Nouv. Biograph. Géneralé, 25, 598.

## Hetzer, Ludwig[[@Headword:Hetzer, Ludwig]]

             was born in the canton Thurgau, Switzerland (date unknown). When the Reformation broke out in-Switzerland he was in the vigor of youth, and he entered into the movement with great zeal and energy. He was chaplain at Wadenschwyl, on Lake Zurich, in 1523, and in September of that year he published a tract against images, under the title Urtheil Gottes wie man sich mit allen Gotzen und Bildnissen halten soil, etc., which ran through several editions, and greatly stirred the popular mind. In October of the same year, when the second conference on the use of images. etc., took place at Zurich, he was appointed to keep the minutes, and to publish an official account of them. Zwingle and AEcolampadius appreciated his talents, especially his Hebrew learning, and, in spite of a certain heat and rashness which marked his character, they hoped much from his activity in the Reformation. In 1524 he went to Augsburg, with a recommendation from Zwingle, and there his learning and eloquence soon made him popular. But within a year, owing to a theological dispute with Urbanus Rhegius, in which Hetzer maintained Anabaptist views, he was compelled to quit Augsburg. Returning to Switzerland, he was kindly received at Basle by AEcolampadius, and was employed early in 1526 in translating Zwingle's reply to Bugenhagen into German. He seems to have satisfied both Zwingle and AEcolampadius on this visit that he was not an Anabaptist; but before the middle of the same year he was expelled from Zurich for preaching the new doctrine. At Strasburg he agreed with Johann Denk (q.v.) to issue a translation of the Prophets of the O.T. It appeared in the spring of 1527, and passed in four years through thirteen editions. This work is now very scarce; two copies, however, belong to the library of the Crozer Theological Seminary, Upland, Pa. Hetzer seems to have imbibed the theological views of Denk, so far, at least, as the doctrine of the Trinity is concerned, and to have aided him in spreading his doctrines in Works,  Landau, and other places. He had previously been charged with looseness of morals, and in 1827 the crime of adultery was charged upon him. He was brought to trial and beheaded at Constance, Feb. 3,1529. Such is the common account of Hetzer's life, founded on contemporary writings and letters of Ambrose Blaurer, Zwingle, and others of the Reformers. See Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. 16, ch. 3 § 5; Trechsel Antitrinitarier, 1, 13; Keim, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 61. Baptist writers, however, deny the charges of Socinianism and immorality, and assert that Hetzer was not only a man of great learning, but of gentle spirit and deep piety; and that he died a martyr to his Baptist principles. See H. Osgood, in Baptist Quarterly Review, July 1869, p. 333.

## Heubner, Heinrich Leonhard[[@Headword:Heubner, Heinrich Leonhard]]

             a German theologian, was born at Lauterbach, Saxony, June 2, 1780, and was educated at Wittenberg. In 1811 he was made professor extraordinary of theology, in 1817 third director of the Theological Seminary at Wittenberg, and in 1832 first director. In this office he served faithfully and laboriously until his death, Feb. 12, 1853. His piety was marked, and saved him from neology and false philosophy. His writings include ‘the following, viz.: Interpretatio Miraculorum Novi Testamenti historico grammatica (Wittenb. 1807): — Kirchenpostille (Halle, 1854, 2 vols.): — Predigten (Berl. 1847; Magdeburg, 1851): — Praktische Erklarung d. N. Test. (Potsdam, 1855): — Katechisnus-Predigten (Halle, 1855); also a revised and much enlarged edition of Buchner's Biblische Handconcordans (Halle, 1840-1853). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 25, 599; Tholuck, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 64.

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

             a Scotch Presbyterian divine, was born at Stirling Aug. 12, 1782. His father was a minister in the Anti-Burgher party of the Secession Church. The son was educated at the College of Edinburgh, and licensed to preach in 1804. In 1806 he was ordained colleague to his venerable father, on whose death in 1810 he became pastor of the Stirling Church. His pastoral duties were performed with great fidelity: he was a preacher of uncommon power, and he aided all benevolent movements both by tongue and pen. In 1821 he became minister of the Regent Place Church in Glasgow, where he remained until his death, June 16, 1846. He published The Importance of Early Piety. (Glasgow, 1826, 8vo): — State of Religion in Geneva and  Pelgium. (Glasgow, 1844, 12mo). After his death Dr. Macgill published his Life and Select Works (Glasgow, 1852, 2nd ed., 2 vols. 12mo). — Jamieson, Religious Biography, p. 262; Kitto, Journal of Sacred Lit. 6, 410.

## Heumann, Christoph August[[@Headword:Heumann, Christoph August]]

             a German theologian, was born at Altstadt (duchy of Weimar) August 3,1681. He studied theology and philosophy at Jena and in 1705 traveled through Germany and Holland. After his return he became inspector of the College of Göttingen in 1717, and in 1734 professor of theology in the University of that city. He died May 1, 1764. His principal works are Lutherus apocalypticus, hoc est historia ecclesiastica ex Johannea Apocalysi eruta (Eisenach, 1714, 8vo; Hannover, 1717, 8vo): — Deutsche Uebersetzung d. Neuen Testaments (Hann. 1748; 2nd edit. 1750, 2 vols. 8vo): — Erklarung des Neuen Testaments (Hann. 1750-1763, 12 parts, 8vo), a work-which contains numerous ingenious explanations, along with many errors and paradoxes: — Ermweis das d. Lehre d. reformirten Kirche von d. heiligen Abendmahldie wahre sei (Eisleben, 1764, 8vo), etc. See Heyne, Memoria Heunanni Göttingen, 1764); Ersch und Gruber, Encyklopädie; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26, 600; Herzog, Real- Encykl. 6, 65.

## Heusde, Philip Wilhelm Van[[@Headword:Heusde, Philip Wilhelm Van]]

             a Dutch historian and philosopher, was born June 17, 1778, at Rotterdam. He studied at Amsterdam and Leyden, was in 1804 professor at Utrecht, and died at Berne, July 28, 1839. He wrote, Initia Philosophiae Platonicae (Utrecht, 182736, 3 volumes; 2d ed. Leyden, 1842): — Brieven over den  Aard en de Strekking van Hooger Onderwijs (ibid. 1829; 3d ed. 1835; Germ. transl. by Weydmann, Krefeld, 1830): — De Socratische School (ibid. 1834-39, 4 volumes; 2d ed. 1840-41): — Brieven over het Beafenen der Wijsgeerte (1837): — Characterismi Principum Philosophorum Veterum (1839). After his death was published De School van Polybius (Amsterdam, 1841). See Rovers. Memoria P. Heusdii Commendata (Utrecht, 1841). (B.P.)

## Heusde, Von[[@Headword:Heusde, Von]]

             SEE HOFSTEDE DE GROOT.

## Heusden, Hugo Franciscus Van[[@Headword:Heusden, Hugo Franciscus Van]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, and vicar to the archbishop of Utrecht, died February 13, 1719, leaving, Batavia Sacra (Brussels, 1724): — Historia Episcopatum Foederati Belgii (Lyons, 1719). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:823 sq.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Heusinger, Jacob Friedrich[[@Headword:Heusinger, Jacob Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1719. He studied at Jena, was in 1750 con-rector, in 1759 rector at Wolfenbuttel, and died Sept. 27, 1778. He wrote, Disp. de Locis Mat 16:13; Mat 16:20; Luk 7:14; Jac. 2:18 (Jena, 1746): — De in Evangeliorum Codice Graeco in Biblioth. Guelferbyt. (Wolfenbuttel, 1752). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:101; Meusel, Gelehrtes Deutschland; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Heusinger, Johann Michael[[@Headword:Heusinger, Johann Michael]]

             a celebrated German divine, was born in September 1690, at Sunderhausen, in Thuringia, and was educated at Gotha, at Halle, and at Jena. He was appointed a professor at Gotha in 1730, and remained there until 1738. He died in March, 1751, leaving many historical works. See Chalmers, Biog, Dict. s.v.

## Heusser, Meta[[@Headword:Heusser, Meta]]

             the best female song-writer and hymnist in the German language, was born April 6, 1797, at Hirzel, canton Zurich, where her father, Diethelm Schweizer, was pastor. In 1821 she married Dr. Heusser, an eminent physician, who died in 1859, and she herself died January 2, 1876. Some of her poems appeared for the first time under the name of Einer Verborgenen (a hidden one). In 1857 the first volume of her poems was published, and in 1867 a second followed. In the English some of her songs  are found in a little volume entitled Hymns from the Land of Luther, and also in Schaff's Christ in Song. A selection of her poems was published at London in 1875, under the title, Alpine Lyrics. See Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 7:377 sq. (B.P.)

## Hewing[[@Headword:Hewing]]

             (חָצִב) OF WOOD, a laborious service, chiefly of slaves and aliens, to which the Gibeonites were condemned for the supply (of the sanctuary by Joshua (Jos 9:23). Some of the Rabbins understood, however, that while the Hebrews remained in camp, and before the land was divided, the Gibeonites performed this service for the whole body of the people; but even they admit that afterwards their service were limited to the sanctuary. This service must have been sufficiently laborious at the great festivals, but not generally so, as they probably undertook the duty by turns. They were not reduced to a condition of absolute slavery, but seem to have been rather domestic tributaries than slaves, their tribute being the required personal service. SEE GIBEONITE. In 1Ki 5:15, we read that Solomon “had fourscore thousand hewers in the mountains.” The forests of  Lebanon only were sufficient to supply the timber required for building the Temple. Such of these forests as lay nearest the sea were in the possession of the Phoenicians, among whom timber was in such constant demand that they had acquired great skill in the felling and transport of it. SEE LEBANON. It was therefore of much importance that Hiram consented to employ large bodies of men in Lebanon to hew timber, as well as others to bring it down to the sea-side, whence it was to be taken along the coast in floats to Joppa. The forests of Lebanon have now in a great measure disappeared, but Akma Dagh and Jaewur Dagh (the ancient Amanus and Rhosus), in the north of Syria, still furnish an abundance of valuable timber, though vast quantities have been felled of late years by the Egyptian government. SEE AXE; SEE WOOD.

## Hewit. Nathaniel, D.D[[@Headword:Hewit. Nathaniel, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister was born in New London, Conn., August 28,1788. He graduated A.B. at Yale College in 1808. He commenced the study of law, but soon became satisfied of his call to the ministry, and devoted himself to theology, under the tuition of Dr. Joel Benedict, of Plainfield, Conn. In 1811 he was licensed to preach by the New-London Congregational Association, and, after preaching for a while in Vermont, went to the new theological seminary at Andover to gain still further preparation for his work. In 1815 he was installed as pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Plattsburg, N. Y. After some years of very successful labor there, he was called to the Congregational Church at Fairfield, Conn. Here he became known as one of “the most eloquent and powerful preachers in the country, and here it was that his pulpit from Sabbath to Sabbath sounded out that clarion blast of God's truth against intemperance, which, with a similar and equally powerful series of sermons at the same time from Dr. Lyman Beecher at Litchfield, soon aroused the whole Church and ministry of the land.” He and Dr. Beecher were apostles of the American Temperance Reformation. In 1828 he resigned his charge at Fairfield to become agent of the American Temperance Society, then newly formed. “He addressed himself to this work with the spirit alike of a hero and a martyr, and prosecuted it with amazing ability and success. Far and wide, as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, with invincible logic, with bold earnestness, with fearless fidelity, with torrents — often cataracts — of burning eloquence, he moved, and fired, and electrified the people. The reform made rapid headway. It enlisted the great majority of the moral and Christian portion of society, the  aged and the young, reclaiming many and guarding multitudes against intemperance. Of the astounding eloquence and effects of these discourses I have often heard, in forms and from quarters so various as to leave little doubt that what Luther was to the Reformation, Whitefield to the Revival of 1740, Wesley to primitive Methodism, that was Nathaniel Hewit to the early Temperance Reformation” (Atwater, Memorial Discourse). In 1830 he became pastor of the Second Congregational Church in Bridgeport, Conn. In 1831 he went to England in behalf of the cause of temperance, and his great powers of eloquence were never more signally displayed than on this visit. In power of logical argument and impassioned delivery few orators of the time exceeded Dr. Hewit. Returning home, he resumed his labors at Bridgeport, where he served until 1853, when he resigned this charge, and assumed that of a new Presbyterian Church formed by members of his old parish. He had always been an adherent to the doctrines of the Westminster Confession. The East Windsor (now Hartford) Theological Seminary owed its existence and maintenance largely to him. In 1862 he was compelled by growing infirmity to withdraw from active duty, and an associate pastor was appointed. He died at Bridgeport February 3, 1867.

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

             an English clergyman, was minister of St. Gregory's, near St. Paul's, London. He was beheaded on Tower Hill in 1658, for a political conspiracy. He published nine select Sermons (1658): Repentacnce and Conversion the Fabrick of Salvation, etc., being several sermons (eod.). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Hexapla[[@Headword:Hexapla]]

             an edition of the Bible prepared by Origen (q.v.).

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

             a learned English divine, was born in 1734, and was educated at Catharine Hall, Cambridge. After holding several preferments, he became Norris professor of divinity at Cambridge in 1780, then pastor of Passenham (Northamptonshire) and of Calvertoin (Buckinghamshire), and died at London in 1815. His writings, which are generally acute and judicious, include Essay on Redemption (1763, 4to): — Lectures in Divinity (Camb. 1796, 4 vols. 8vo; 3rd edit. 1841, 2 vols. 8vo): — Discourses on the Malevolent Sentiments (Newport, 1801, 8vo): — Thoughts on the Athanasian Creed (1790, 8vo): — Observations on the Writings of St. Paul (1811, 8vo). — Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, 1, 1459.

## Hey, Wilhelm[[@Headword:Hey, Wilhelm]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born March 26, 1790. He studied at Jena, was court-preacher at Gotha, and died May 19, 1854. He published, Predigten (Hamburg, 1830, 1832): — Erzahlungen aus dem Leben Jesu fur die Jugend dichterisch bearbeitet (1838). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:552; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:103. (B.P.)

## Heyd, Ludwig Ferdinand[[@Headword:Heyd, Ludwig Ferdinand]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, who died March 6, 1842, is the author of, Melanchthon und Tubingen 1512-1518 (Tubingen, 1839): — Ulrich, Herzog zu Wirtemberg (1841-44, 3 volumes). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:552. (B.P.)

## Heyde, Johann Daniel[[@Headword:Heyde, Johann Daniel]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born April 27, 1714. He studied at Leipsic, was teacher at Gera in 1737, and died August 12, 1785. His publications are sermons, partly his own, partly translations from the French of Massillon and Bourdaloue. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:383; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Heydenreich, Karl Heinrich[[@Headword:Heydenreich, Karl Heinrich]]

             a German philosopher, was born February 19,1764, at Stolpen, in Saxony. He embraced first the philosophy of Spinoza, later that of Kant, and taught the Kantian philosophy as professor at the University of Leipzig from 1789 to 1797. He died April 29, 1801. Among his writings are Naturulnd Gött nach Spinoza (Leipzig, 1788): — Philosophie der natürlichen Religion  (Leipzig, 1791, 2 vols): — Einleitung i. d. Studien der Philosophie (Leipzig, 1793): — Psychologische Entwickelung des Aberglaubens (Leipzig, 1797).Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 24, 621; Krug, Handworterbuch d. philos. Tissenschaff, 2, 422.

## Heylin (or Heylyn), Peter[[@Headword:Heylin (or Heylyn), Peter]]

             was born Nov. 29, 1600, at Burford, Oxfordshire. At fourteen he entered Hart Hall, Oxford, and within two years was chosen demy of Magdalen College. Here he devoted himself to science, particularly to geography, on which he wrote a treatise entitled Microcosmus, which gained him great reputation. In 1623 he was ordained, and about 1625 undertook an academical exercise at Oxford, where he fell into a dispute with Prideaux, then regius professor of divinity. He maintained the visibility and infallibility of the catholic Church (not the Roman), and raised a storm which lasted for a long time in the University. His doctrines recommended him to the notice of Laud, then bishop of Bath and Wells. In 1628 he became chaplain to lord Danby, and, some time after, king's chaplain. He obtained various livings and clerical offices through the patronage of Laud, from which he was expelled by the Republicans; was the editor of the Mercurius Aulicus, the Royalist paper; recovered his preferments at the Restoration; and died May 8,1662. Heylin was a fierce controversialist, and a bitter opponent of the Puritans, and through these qualities he obtained his various rapid preferments.' He even went so far in his opposition to Puritanism as to write a History of the Sabbath, vindicating the employment of the leisure hours and evenings of the Lord's day in sports and recreations. In theology he was an Arminian of the latitudinarian sort (see his Historia Quinq-Articularis, 1659). His Examen Historicum contained an attack on Thomas Fuller which brought on a bitter controversy with that eminent writer. He wrote The History of St. George and of the Order of the Garter (2nd edit. Lond. 1633, 4to): Ecclesia Restaurata: the History of the English Reformation (1674, fol.; new edit. by Robertson, Lond. 1849, 2 vols. 8vo): — Sermons (London, 1659, 4to): — Life of Anp. Land (Lond. 1647, fol.; several editions): — irius Redivivus, a History of the Presbyterians (2nd edit. London, 1672, fol.): — Theologia Veterum., on the Apostles' Creed (Lond. 1673, fol.); with many controversial tracts, etc. His life is prefixed to the Ecclesia Restaurata (edit. of 1849). See Hook, Eccles. Biog. 6, 13 sq.; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 838.

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

             an eminent English divine and prebendary of Westminster. He was deeply read in the Mystic divines, and was himself called “the Mystic doctor.” He died about 1760, leaving Theological Lectures at Westminster Abbey (Lond. 1749-61. 2 vols. 4to), containing an “interpretation of the New Testament” — Sermons (1770, 12mo): — Discourses (1793,2 vols. 8vo). See Blackwood, Magazine, 25:33; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 838.

## Heym, Albert[[@Headword:Heym, Albert]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born in 1801. He studied at Leipsic and Berlin, was tutor of prince Frederick Carl from 1830 to 1844, and preacher at Sakrow from 1844 to 1848. In the latter year he was appointed court-preacher at Potsdam, and he died December 9, 1878. (B.P.)

## Heym, Johann Gottlob[[@Headword:Heym, Johann Gottlob]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born February 25, 1738. He studied at Wittenberg, and died at Dolzig, in Lower Lusatia, January 24, 1788. His publications are several volumes of sermons. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:192, 381; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:553. (B.P.)

## Heyne, Johann[[@Headword:Heyne, Johann]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born in 1804 at Leobschntz, Silesia. He took holy orders in 1827, acted as priest at different places till 1857, when at his own request he was made custos of the cathedral-library at Breslau, with a view of perusing the archives there. He died October 28, 1871. Hevne is the author of Dokumentirte Geschichte des Bisthums und Hochstiftes Breslau (Breslau, 1860-68, 3 volumes). (B.P.)

## Heynlin de Lapide, Johannes[[@Headword:Heynlin de Lapide, Johannes]]

             one of the last eminent representatives of scholasticism, was a native of Germany. He studied at Leipsic, Basle, and Paris, and in the latter place became a doctor of the Sorbonne. In 1473 he settled at Basle, and, as a decided realist, caused, first at Basle, afterwards at Tubingen, whither he moved in 1477, so violent a contest between realism and nominalism that he finally determined to retire altogether from public life, in 1487. He spent the remainder of his life in a Carthusian monastery in Basle, and died in 1496. Heynlin wrote a commentary on Aristotle while at Paris, but it was not published until many years later, by his pupil Amerbach. He also directed the editing of the works of St. Ambrose, which were published by Amerbach in 1492. See Trithemius, Liber de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis (1494); Fischer, Johannes Heynlin, genannt a Lapide (Basle, 1851);  Vischer, Gesch. der Universitat Bdsel, page 158 sq.; Plitt-Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Heywood, Oliver[[@Headword:Heywood, Oliver]]

             an English Nonconformist divine, was born at Bolton, 1629, and admitted at Trinity, Cambridge, 1647. He became rector at Halifax in 1652, and was deprived at the Restoration. After much suffering from poverty, he died in 1702. His writings on practical religion were quite numerous, and may be found in his Whole Works now first collected (Idle, 1827, 5 vols. 8vo). See also Hunter, Life of Heywood (Lond. 1844, 8vo).

## Hezeki[[@Headword:Hezeki]]

             (Heb. Chizki', חְזְקַי, strong; Sept. Α᾿ζακί), one of the “sons” of Elpaal, a chief Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:17). B.C. apparently cir. 598.

## Hezekiah[[@Headword:Hezekiah]]

             (Heb. Chizkiyah', חַזְקַיָּה), whom Jehovah has strengthened, 2Ki 18:1; 2Ki 18:10; 2Ki 18:14-16; 1Ch 3:23; Neh 7:21; Pro 25:1; “Hizkiah,” Neh 10:17; Zep 1:1; also in the prosthetic form Yechiskiyah', יְחַזְקַיָּה, Ezr 2:16; Hos 1:1; Mic 1:1; elsewhere in the prolonged form Chizkiya'hu, חַזְקַיָּהו ּ[in 2Ki 20:10; 1Ch 4:41; 2Ch 28:27; 2Ch 29:1; 2Ch 29:20; 2Ch 29:30-31; 2Ch 29:36; 2Ch 30:1; 2Ch 30:18; 2Ch 30:20; 2Ch 30:22; 2Ch 31:2; 2Ch 31:8-9; 2Ch 11:13; 2Ch 11:20; 2Ch 32:2; 2Ch 32:8-9; 2Ch 32:11-12; 2Ch 32:16-17; 2Ch 32:20; 2Ch 32:22-27; 2Ch 32:30; 2Ch 32:32-33; 2Ch 33:3; Isa 1:1; Jer 15:4, it is both prosthetic and prolonged, YechizlLiya'hu, יְחַזְקַיָּהוּ]; Sept., Josephus, and N. Test. Ε᾿ζεκίας), the name of four men. SEE JEHIZKIAH.

1. The thirteenth king (reckoning Athaliah) of the separate kingdom of Judah, son of Ahaz and Abi or Abijah (2Ki 18:2; 2Ch 29:1), born B.C. 751750 (2Ki 18:2), and his father's successor on. the throne for twenty-nine years, B.C. 726-697. In both the above texts he is stated to have been twenty-five years old at his accession; but some, computing (from a comparison with 2Ch 28:1) that Ahaz died at the age of thirty-six, make Hezekiah only twenty years old at his accession (reading כfor כה), as otherwise he would have been born when Ahaz was a boy eleven years old. This, indeed, is not impossible (Hieron. Ep. cad Vitalern, 132, quoted by Bochart, Geogr. Sacr. p. 920; see Keil on 2Ki 18:1; Knobel, Jes. p. 22, etc.); but others suppose that Ahaz was twenty-five and not twenty years old at his accession (Sept., Syr., Arab., 2Ch 28:1), reading כה for כ in 2Ki 16:2. Neither of these suppositions, however, is necessary, for Ahaz was fifty years old at his death, and the date there given of the accession of Ahaz is simply that of his viceroyship or association with his father. SEE AHAZ.

The history of Hezekiah's reign is contained in 2Ki 18:20; Isaiah 36-39, and 2 Chronicles 29-32, illustrated by contemporary prophecies of Isaiah and Micah. He is represented as a great and good king (2Ki 18:5-6), who set himself, immediately on his accession, to abolish idolatry, and restore the worship of Jehovah, which had been neglected during the careless and idolatrous reign of his father. This consecration was accompanied by a revival of the theocratic spirit, so strict as not even to spare “the high places,” which, though tolerated by many well-intentioned kings, had naturally been profaned by the worship of images and Asherahs (2Ki 18:4). On the extreme importance and probable consequences of this measure, SEE HIGH PLACE.

A still more decisive act was the destruction of a brazen serpent, said to have been the one used by Moses in the miraculous healing of the Israelites (Num 21:9), which had been removed to Jerusalem, and had become, “down to those days,” an object of adoration, partly in consequence of its venerable character as a relic, and partly, perhaps, from some dim tendencies to the ophiolatry common in ancient times (Ewald, Gesch. 3, 622). To break up a figure so curious and so highly honored showed a strong mind as well as a clear-sighted zeal, and Hezekiah briefly justified his procedure by calling the image נֶחֻשְׁתָּן,” a brazen thing,” possibly with a contemptuous play on the word נָחָשׁ, “a serpent.” How necessary this was in such times may be inferred from the fact that “the brazen serpent” is, or was, reverenced in the Church of St. Ambrose at Milan (Prideaux, Connect. 1, 19, Oxf. ed.). The history of this Reformation, of which 2Ki 18:4 sq. gives only a concise summary,  is copiously related, from the Levitical point of view, in 2 Chronicles 29 sq. It commenced with the cleansing of the Temple “in the first month” of Hezekiah's first year, i.e. in the month Nisan next after his accession, and was followed in the next month (because at the regular season neither Levites nor Temple were in a due state of preparation) by a great Passover, extended to fourteen days, to which not only all Judah was summoned, but also the “remnant” of the Ten Tribes, some of whom accepted the invitation. Some writers (as Jahn, Keil, and Caspari) contend that this passover must have been subsequent to the fall of Samaria, alleging that the mention of the “remnant” (2Ch 30:6) is unsuitable to an earlier period, and that, while the kingdom of Samaria still subsisted, Hezekiah's messengers would not have been suffered to pass through the land, much less would the destruction of the high places in Ephraim and Manasseh have been permitted (2Ch 31:1). But the intention of the chronicler at least is plain enough: the connection of 2Ch 29:17 “the first month,” with 2Ch 30:2, “the second month,” admits of but one construction that both are meant to belong to one and the same year, the first of the reign. Accordingly, Thenius, in the Kgf. exeg. Hdb. 2 Kings, p. 379, urges this as an argument against the historical character of the whole narrative of this passover, which, he thinks, “rendered antecedently improbable by the silence of the Book of Kings, is perhaps completely refuted by 2Ki 23:22. The author of the story, wishing to place in the strongest light Hezekiah's zeal for religion, represents him, not Josiah, as the restorer of the Passover after long desuetude, and this in the very beginning of his reign, without, perhaps, caring to reflect that the final deportation of the Ten Tribes, implied in 2Ch 30:6, had not then taken place.” But 2Ki 23:22, taken in connection, as it ought to be, with the preceding verse, is perfectly compatible with the account in the Chronicles. It says: “Surely such a Passover” — one kept in all respects “as it is written in the Book of the Covenant” “was not holden from the time of the Judges,” etc. whereas Hezekiah's Passover, though kept with even greater joy and fervor than Josiah's, was held neither at the appointed season, nor in strict conformity with the law. Nor is it necessary to suppose that by “the remnant” the chronicler understood those who were left by Shalmaneser. Rather, his view is, that the people of the Ten Tribes, untaught by the judgments brought upon them by former reverses and partial deportations (under Tiglath-Pileser), with respect to which they might well be called a “remnant” (comp. the very similar terms in which even Judah is spoken of,  39:8,9), and scornfully rejecting the last call to repentance, brought upon themselves their final judgment and complete overthrow (Bertheau, Kgf. exeg. 11db. 2 Chronicles p. 395 sq.). Those, however, of the Ten Tribes who had taken part in the solemnity were thereby (such is evidently the chronicler's view of the matter, 31:1) inspired with a zeal for the true religion which enabled them, on their return home, in defiance of all opposition on the part of the scorners or of Hoshea, to effect a destruction of the high places and altars in Ephraim and Manasseh, as complete as was effected in Jerusalem before, and in Judah after the Passover.

That this prudent and pious king was not deficient in military qualities is shown by his successes against the Philistines, seemingly in the early part of his reign, before the overthrow of Sennacherib (2Ki 18:8), and by the efficient measures taken by him for the defense of Jerusalem against the Assyrians. Hezekiah also assiduously cultivated the arts of peace, and by wise management of finance, and the attention which, after the example of David and Uzziah, he paid to agriculture and the increase of flocks and herds, he became possessed, even in troubled times, of an ample exchequer and treasures of wealth (2Ch 32:27-29; 2Ki 20:13; Isa 39:2). Himself a sacred poet, and probably the author of other psalms besides that in Isaiah 38; he seems to have collected the psalms of David and Asaph for the Temple worship, and certainly employed competent scribes to complete the collection of Solomon's Proverbs (Pro 25:1). He appears also to have taken order for the preservation of genealogical records (Browne, Review of Lepsius on Bible Chronology, in Arnold's Theological Critic, 1, 59 sq.).

By a rare and happy providence, this most pious of kings was confirmed in his faithfulness and seconded in his endeavors by the powerful assistance of the noblest and most eloquent of prophets. The influence of Isaiah was, however, not gained without a struggle with the “scornful” remnant of the former royal counselors (Isa 28:14), who in all probability recommended no the king such alliances and compromises as would be in unison rather with the dictates of political expediency than with that sole unhesitating trust in the arm of Jehovah which the prophets inculcated. The leading man of this cabinet was Shebna, who, from the omission of his father's name, and the expression in Isa 22:16 (see Blunt, Uindes. Coincidences), was probably a foreigner, perhaps a Syrian (Hitzig). At the instance of Isaiah, he seems to have been subsequently degraded from the high post of prefect of the palace (which office was given to Eliakim,  Isa 22:21), to the inferior, though still honorable station of state secretary (סֹפֵר, 2Ki 18:18); the further punishment of exile with which Isaiah had threatened him (2Ki 22:18) being possibly forgiven on his amendment, of which we have some traces in Isaiah 37, sq. (Ewald, Gesch. 3:617).

At the head of a repentant and united people, Hezekiah ventured to assume the aggressive against the Philistines, ‘and in a series of victories not only re-won the cities which his father had lost (2Ch 28:18), but even dispossessed them of their own cities except Gaza (2Ki 18:8) and Gath (Josephus, Ant. 9:13,3). It was perhaps to the purposes of this war that he applied the money which would' otherwise have been used to pay the tribute exacted by Shalmaneser, according to the agreement of Ahaz with his predecessor, Tiglath-Pileser. When the king of Assyria applied for this impost, Hezekiah refused it, and omitted to send even the usual presents (2Ki 18:7), a line of conduct to which he does not appear to have been encouraged by any exhortations of his prophetic guide.

Instant war was averted by the heroic and long-continued resistance of the Tyrians under their king Eluloeus (Josephus, Ant. 9, 14), against a siege, which was abandoned only in the fifth year (Grote, Greece, 3, 359, 4th edit.), when it was found to be impracticable. This must have been a critical and intensely anxious period for Jerusalem, and Hezekiah used every available means to strengthen his position, and render his capital impregnable (2Ki 20:20; 2Ch 32:3-5; 2Ch 32:30; Isa 22:8-11; Isa 33:18; and to these events Ewald also refers, Psa 48:13). But while all Judaea trembled with anticipation of Assyrian invasion, and while Shebna and others were relying “in the shadow of Egypt,” Isaiah's brave heart did not fail, and he even denounced the wrath of God against the proud and sinful merchant city (Isaiah 23), which now seemed to be the main bulwark of Judaea against immediate attack.

At what time it was that Hezekiah “rebelled against the king of Assyria, and served him not,” we do not learn from the direct history: in the brief summary, 2Ki 18:7-8 (for such it clearly is), of the successes with which the Lord prospered him, that particular statement only introduces what is more fully detailed in the sequel (2Ki 18:13; 2Ki 19:37). That it precedes the notice of the overthrow of Samaria (2Ki 19:9 sq.), does not warrant the inference that the assertion of independence belongs to the  earliest years of Hezekiah's reign (see Winer, Real Wörterbuch 1, 497, n. 2). Ewald, however, thinks otherwise: in the absence of direct evidence, makings history, as his manner is, out of his own peremptory interpretation of certain passages of Isaiah (ch. 1 and Isa 22:1-14), he informs us that Hezekiah, holding his kingdom absolved by the death of Ahaz from the obligations contracted with Tiglath-Pileser, prepared himself from the first to resist the demands of Assyria, and put Jerusalem in a state of defense. (It matters not to Ewald that the measures noted in 2Ki 20:20; 2Ch 32:3-5; 2Ch 32:30, are in the latter passage expressly assigned to the time of Sennacherib's advance upon Jerusalem.) “From Shalmaneser's hosts at that time stationed in Phoenicia and elsewhere in the neighborhood of Judah, forces were detached which laid waste the land in all directions: an army sent against them from Jerusalem, seized with panic at the sight of the unwonted enemy, took to flight, and, Jerusalem now lying helplessly exposed, a peace was concluded in all haste upon the stipulation of a yearly tribute, and the ignominious deliverance was celebrated with feastings in Jerusalem” (Gesch. des V. Israel, 2, 330 sq.): all of which rests upon the supposition that Ewald's interpretation of Isa 1:22 is the only possible one it cannot be said to be on record as history.

As gathered from the Scriptures only, the course of events appears to have been as follows: Ahaz had placed his kingdom as tributary under the protection of Tiglath-Pileser (2Ki 16:7). It would seem from Isa 10:27; Isa 28:22, that in the time of Shalmaneser, to which the latter passage certainly, and the former probably, belongs, Judah was still under the yoke of this dependence. The fact that Sargon (whether or not the same with the Shalmaneser of the history), in his expedition against Egypt, left Judah untouched (Isaiah 20), implies that Judah had not yet asserted its independence. A powerful party, indeed, was scheming for revolt from Assyria and a league with Egypt; but there appears no reason to believe that Hezekiah all along favored a policy which Isaiah in the name of the Lord, to the last, strenuously condemned. It was not till after the accession of Sennacherib that Hezekiah refused the tribute, and at the instigation of his nobles made a league with Egypt by ambassadors sent to Zoan (Tanis) (Isa 30:31; compare Isa 36:6-9). (Some, indeed [as Ewald and Caspari], place Isaiah 29-32 before the fall of Samaria, to which time ch. 28 must unquestionably be assigned. Possibly ch. 29 may belong to the same time, and Isa 29:1 to Isa 32:15 may refer to plottings for a league with Egypt already carried on in secret. Knobel, Kyf: exeg. Hdb. p. 215, 223, decides  too peremptorily that such must be the reference, and consequently that ch. 29 falls only a little earlier than the following chapters, where the league is openly denounced, viz. in the early part of the reign of Sennacherib.)

The subsequent history, as gathered from the Scriptures, compared with the notices on the ancient monuments, is thought to be as follows. Sargon was succeeded by his son Sennacherib, whose two invasions occupy the greater part of the Scripture records concerning the reign of Hezekiah. The first of these took place in the third year of Semnacherib, and occupies only three verses (2Ki 18:13-16), though the route of' the advancing Assyrians maybe traced in Isa 10:5; Isaiah 11. The rumor of the invasion redoubled Hezekiah's exertions, and he prepared for a siege by providing offensive and defensive armor, stopping up the wells, and diverting the watercourses, conducting the water of Gihon into the city by a subterranean canal (Sir 48:17). For a similar precaution taken by the Mohammedans, see Will. Tyr. 8:7, Keil). But the main hope of the political faction was the alliance with Egypt, and they seem to have sought it by presents and private entreaties (Isa 30:6), especially with a view to obtaining chariots and cavalry (Isa 32:1-3), which was the weakest arm of the Jewish service, as we see from the derision which it excited (2Ki 18:23). Such overtures kindled Isaiah's indignation, and Shebna may have lost his high office for recommending them. The prophet clearly saw that Egypt was too weak and faithless to be serviceable, and the applications to Pharaoh (who is compared by Rabshakeh to one of the weak reeds of his own river) implied a want of trust in the help of God. But Isaiah did not disapprove of the spontaneously proffered assistance of the tall and warlike Ethiopians (Isa 18:2; Isa 18:7, ace. to Ewald's transl.), because he may have regarded it as a providential aid.

The account given of this first invasion in the cuneiform “Annals of Sennacherib” is that he attacked Hezekiah because the Ekronites had sent their king Padiya (or” Haddiya,” ace. to Col. Rawlinson) as a prisoner to Jerusalem (comp. 2Ki 18:8); that he took forty-six cities (“all the fenced cities” in 2Ki 18:13 is apparently a general expression; compare 19:8) and 200,000 prisoners; that he besieged Jerusalem with mounds (comp. 2Ki 19:32); and although Hezekiah promised to pay 800 talents of silver (of which perhaps only 300 were ever paid) and 30 of gold (2Ki 18:14; but see Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 148), yet, not content with this, he muleted him of a part of his dominions, and gave them to the kings of Ekron, Ashdod, and Gaza (Rawlinson, Herod. 1, 475 sq.).  So important was this expedition that Demetrius, the Jewish historian, even attributes to Sennacherib the Great Captivity (Clem. Alexand. Stron. 1 p. 147, ed. Sylb.). In almost every particular this account agrees with the notice in Scripture, and we may see a reason for so great a sacrifice on the part of Hezekiah in the glimpse which Isaiah gives us of his capital city driven by desperation into licentious and impious mirth (Isa 22:12-14). This campaign must at least have had the one good result of proving the worthlessness of the Egyptian alliance; for at a place called Altagft (the Eltekon of Jos 15:59?) Sennacherib inflicted an overwhelming defeat on the combined forces of Egypt and Ethiopia, which had come to the assistance of Ekron. But Isaiah regarded the purchased treaty as a cowardly defection, and the sight of his fellow-citizens gazing peacefully from the housetops on the bright array of the car-borne and quivered Assyrians filled him with indignation and despair (Isa 22:1-7, if the latest explanations of this chapter be correct).

Hezekiah's bribe (or fine) brought a temporary release, for the Assyrians marched into Egypt, where, if Herodotus (2, 141) and Josephus (Ant. 10, 1-3) are to be trusted, they advanced without resistance to Pelusium, owing to the hatred of the warrior-caste against Sethos, the king-priest of Pthah, who had, in his priestly predilections, interfered with their prerogatives. In spite of this advantage, Sennacherib was forced to raise the siege of Pelusium, by the advance of Tirhakah or Tarakos, the ally of Sethos and Hezekiah, who afterwards united the crowns of Egypt and Ethiopia. This magnificent Ethiopian hero, who had extended his conquests to the Pillars of Hercules (Strabo, 15, 472), was indeed a formidable antagonist. His deeds are recorded in a temple at Medinet-Abu, but the jealousy of the Memphites (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 1, 141) concealed his assistance, and attributed the deliverance of Sethos to the ‘miraculous interposition of an army of mice (Herod. 2, 141). This story may have had its source, however, not in jealousy, but in the use of a mouse as the emblem of destruction (Horapoll. Hierogl. 1, 50; Rawlinson, Herod. ad loc.), and of some sort of disease or plague (? 1Sa 6:18; Jahn, Archi. Bibl. § 185). The legend doubtless gained ground from the extraordinary circumstance which ruined the army of Sennacherib.

Returning from his futile expedition (ἄπρακτος ἀνεχώρησε, Josephus, Ant. 10, 1, 4), Sennacherib “dealt treacherously” with Hezekiah (Isa 33:1) by attacking the stronghold of Lachish. This was the commencement of that second invasion, respecting which we have such full details in 2  Kings 18:17 sq.; 2Ch 32:9 sq.; Isaiah 36. That there were two invasions (contrary to the opinion of Layard, Bosanquet, Vance Smith, etc.) is clearly proved by the details of the first given in the Assyrian annals (see Rawlinson, Herod. 1, 477). Although the annals of Sennacherib on the great cylinder in the British Museum reach to the end of his eighth year, and this second invasion belongs to his fifth year, yet no allusion to it has been found. So shameful a disaster was naturally concealed by national vanity. From Lachish he sent against Jerusalem an army under two officers and his cup-bearer, the orator Rabshakeh, with a blasphemous and insulting summons to surrender, deriding Hezekiah's hopes of Egyptian succor, and apparently endeavoring to inspire the people with distrust of his religious innovations (2Ki 18:22; 2Ki 18:25; 2Ki 18:30). The reiteration and peculiarity of the latter argument, together with Rabshakeh's fluent mastery of Hebrew (which he used to tempt the people from their allegiance by a glowing promise, 2Ki 18:31-32), give countenance to the supposition that he was an apostate Jew. Hezekiah's ministers were thrown into anguish, and dismay; but the undaunted Isaiah hurled back threatening for threatening with unrivalled eloquence and force. He even prophesied that the fires of Tophet were already burning in expectancy of the Assyrian corpses which were destined to feed their flame. Meanwhile Sennacherib, having taken Lachish (an event possibly depicted on a series of slabs at Mosul, Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 148-152), was besieging Libnah, when, alarmed by a “rumor” of Tirhakah's advance (to avenge the defeat at Altaglf?), he was forced to relinquish once more his immediate designs, and content himself with a defiant letter to Hezekiah. Whether on the occasion he encountered and defeated the Ethiopians (as Prideaux precariously infers from Isaiah 20, Connect. 1, 26), or not, we cannot tell. The next event of the campaign about which we are informed is that the Jewish king, with simple piety, prayed to God with Sennacherib's letter outspread before him (comp. 1Ma 3:48), and received a promise of immediate deliverance. Accordingly “that night the angel of the Lord went out and smote in the camp of the Assyrians 185.000 men.”

There is no doubt that some secondary cause was employed in the accomplishment of this event. We are certainly “not to suppose,” as Dr. Johnson observed, “that the angel went about with a sword in his hand stabbing them one by one, but that some powerful natural agent was employed.” The Babylonish Talmud and some of the Targums attribute it to storms of lightning (Vitringa, Vogel, etc.); Prideaux, Heine (De causa  Strag. Assyr. Berl. 1761), Harmer, and Faber to the simoom; R. Jose (in Seder Olam Rabba), Marsham, Usher, Preiss (De causa clad. Assyr. Göttingen, 1776), to a nocturnal attack by Tirhakah; Paulus to a poisoning of the waters; and, finally, Josephus (Ant. 10, 1, 4 and 5), followed by an immense majority of ancient and modern commentators (including Michaelis, Ddderlein, Dathe, Heusler, Bauer, Ditmar, Gesenius, Maurer, Knobel, etc., and even Keil), to the pestilence (compare 2Sa 24:15-16). This would be a cause not only adequate (Justin, 19:11; Diodor. 19:434; see the other instances quoted by Rosenmüller, Keil, Jahn, etc.), but most probable in itself, from the crowded and terrified state of the camp. There is, therefore, no necessity to adopt the ingenious conjectures by which Doderlein, Koppe, and Wessler endeavor to get rid of the large number 185,000. It is not said where the event occurred: the prophecies concerning it, Isaiah 10-37, seem to denote the neighborhood of Jerusalem, as would Psalms 76, if it was written at that time. On the other hand, the narrative would probably have been fuller had the overthrow, with its attendant-opportunities of beholding the bodies of their dreaded enemies and of gathering great spoil, befallen near Jerusalem, or even within the immediate limits of Judah. That version of the story which reached Herodotus (2, 140) —for few after Josephus will hold with Ewald (Gesch. 3:336) that the story is not substantially the same-indicates the frontier of Egypt, near Pelusium, as the scene of the disaster. The Assyrian army would probably break up from Libnah on the tidings of Tirhakah's approach, and advance to meet him. In ascribing it to a vast swarm of field- mice, which, devouring the quivers and bow-strings of the Egyptians, compelled them to flee in the morning, Herodotus may have misinterpreted the symbolical language of the Egyptians, in which the mouse denotes annihilation (ἀφανισμός, Horapoll. 1, 50): though, as Knobel (u. s. p. 280) has shown by apposite instance, an army of mice is capable of committing such ravages, and also of leaving pestilence behind it. That the destruction was effected in the course of one night is clearly expressed in 2Ki 19:35, where “that night” is plainly that which followed after the delivery of Isaiah's prophecy, and is evidently implied alike in Isa 37:36 (“when men arose early in the morning”), and ice the story of Herodotus.

After this reverse Sennacherib fled precipitately to Nineveh, where he revenged himself on as many Jews as were in his power (Tob 1:18), and, after many years (not fifty-five days, as Tobit says, 1:21), was murdered by  two of his sons as he drank himself drunk in the house of Nisroch (Assarac?) his god. He certainly lived till B.C. 695, for his 22nd year is mentioned on a clay tablet (Rawlinson, 1. c.); he must therefore have survived Hezekiah by at least one year. It is probable that several of the Psalms (e.g. 46-48, 76) allude to his discomfiture.

“In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death.” So begins, in all the accounts, and immediately after the discomfiture of Sennacherib, the narrative of Hezekiah's sickness and miraculous recovery (2Ki 20:1; 2Ch 32:24; Isa 38:1). The time is defined, by the promise of fifteen years to be added to the life of Hezekiah, to the fourteenth year complete, or fifteenth current, of his reign of twenty-nine years. But it is stated to have been in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah that Sennacherib took the fenced cities of Judah, and thereafter threatened Jerusalem and came to his overthrow. The two notes of time, the express and the implied, fully accord, and place beyond question, at least, the view of the writer or last redactor in 2 Kings 18, 19; Isaiah 36, 37, that the Assyrian invasion began before Hezekiah's illness, and lies in the middle of his reign. In the received chronology, as the first year of Hezekiah precedes the fourth of Jehoiakim=-first of Nebuchadnezzar (i.e. B.C. 604 in the Canon, B.C. 606 in the Hebrew reckoning) by 29, 55, 2, 31, 3-120 years, the epoch of the reign is B.C. 724 or 726, and its 14th year B.C. 711 or 713.

But it is contended that so early a year is irreconcilable with definite and unquestionable data of contemporary history, Egyptian, Assyrrian, and Babylonian. From these it has been inferred that during the siege of Samaria Shalmaneser died, and was succeeded by Sargon, who, jealous of Egyptian influence in Judaea, sent an army under a Tartan or general (Isa 20:1), which penetrated Egypt (Nah 3:8-10) and destroyed No-Amon; although it is clear from Hezekiah's rebellion (2Ki 18:7) that it can have produced but little permanent impression. Sargon, in the tenth year of his reign (which is regarded as parallel with the fourteenth year of the reign of Hezekiah), made an expedition to Palestine; but his annals make no mention of any conquests from Hezekiah on this occasion, and he seems to have occupied himself in the siege of Ashdod (Isa 20:1), and in the inspection of mines (Rosenmüller, Bibl. Geogr. 9). This is therefore thought to be the expedition referred to in 2Ki 18:13; Isa 36:1; an expedition which is merely alluded to, as it led to no result. But if the Scripture narrative is to be reconciled with the records of Assyrian history, it has been thought necessary to make a transposition  in the text of Isaiah (and therefore of the book of Kings). That some such expedient must be resorted to, if the Assyrian history is trustworthy, is maintained by Dr. Hincks in a paper On the rectification of chronology, which the newly-discovered Apostles render necessary (in Jour. of Sac. Lit. Oct. 1858). “The text,” he says, “as it originally stood, was probably to this effect (2Ki 18:13): Now in the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah the king of Assyria came up [alluding to the attack mentioned in Sargon's “Annals”], 20:1-19. In those days was king Hezekiah sick unto death, etc., 18:13. And Sennacherib, king of Assyria, came up against all the fenced cities of Judah, and took them, etc., 18:13; 19:37.” It has been conjectured that some later transcriber, unaware of the earlier and unimportant invasion, confused the allusion to Sargon in 2Ki 18:13 with the detailed story of Sennacherib's attack (2Ki 18:14 to 2Ki 19:37), and, considering that the account of Hezekiah's illness broke the continuity of the narrative, removed it to the end. According to this scheme, Hezekiah's dangerous illness (2 Kings 20; Isaiah 38; 2Ch 32:24) nearly synchronized with Sargon's futile invasion, in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah's reign, eleven years before Sennacherib's invasion. That it must have preceded the attack of Sennacherib has also been inferred from the promise in 2Ki 20:6, as well as from modern discoveries (Layard, Nin. and Bab. 1, 145); and such is the view adopted by the Rabbis (Seder Olam, cap. 23), Usher, and by most commentators, except Vitringa and Gesenius (Keil, ad loc.; Prideaux, 1, 22). It should be observed, however, that the difficulties experienced in reconciling the scriptural date with that of the Assyrian monuments rests on the synchronism of the fall of Samaria with the 1st or 2nd year of Sargon (q.v.). Col. Rawlinson has lately given reasons himself (Lond. Athenceum, No. 1869, Aug. 22, 1863, p. 246) for doubting this date; and it is probable that further researches and computations may fully vindicate the accuracy of the Biblical numbers.

Tirhakah is mentioned (2Ki 19:9) as an opponent of Sennacherib shortly before the miraculous destruction of his army in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, corresponding to B.C. 713. It has lately been proved from the Apis tablets that the first year of Tirhakah's reign over Egypt was the vague year current in B.C. 689 (Dr. Hincks, in the our. Sac. Lit. October, 1858, p. 130). There is, therefore, a prima' facie discrepancy of several years. Bunsen (Bibelwerk, 1, p. 306) unhesitatingly reduces the reign of Manasseh from fifty-five to forty-five years. Lepsius (Konigsbuch, p. 104)  more critically takes the thirty-five years of the Sept. as the true duration. Were an alteration demanded, it would seem best to make Manasseh's computation of his reign commence with his father's illness in preference to taking the conjectural number forty-five, or the very short one thirty-five. The evidence of the chronology of the Assyrian and Babylonian-kings is, however, we think, conclusive in favor of the sum of fifty-five. In the Bible we are told that Shalmaneser laid siege to Samaria in the fourth year of Hezekiah, and that it was taken in the sixth year of that king (2Ki 18:9-10). The Assyrian inscriptions indicate the taking of the city by Sargon in his first or second year, whence we must suppose either that he completed the enterprise of Shalmaneser, to whom the capture is not expressly ascribed in the Scriptures, or that he took the credit of an event which happened just before his accession. The first year of Sargon is shown by the inscriptions to have been exactly or nearly equal to the first of Merodach-Baladan, i.e. Mardocempadus: therefore it was current B.C. 721 or 720, and the second year, 720 or 719. This would place Hezekiah's accession B.C. 726, 725, or 724, the first of them being the very date the Hebrew numbers give. Again, Merodach-Baladan sent messengers to Hezekiah immediately after his sickness, and therefore in about his fifteenth year, B.C. 712. According to Ptolemy's Canon, Mardocempadus reigned 721-710, and, according to Berosus, seized the regal power for six months before Elibus, the Belibus of the Canon, and therefore in about 703, this being, no doubt, a second reign. SEE MERODACH-BALADAN.

Here the preponderance of evidence is in favor of the earlier dates of Hezekiah. Thus far the chronological data of Egypt and Assyria appear to clash in a manner that seems at first sight to present a hopeless knot, but not on this account to be rashly cut. An examination of the facts of the history has afforded Dr. Hincks (Jour. of Sac. Literature, Oct. 1858) what he believes to be the true explanation. Tirhakah, he observes, is not explicitly termed Pharaoh or king of Egypt in the Bible, but king of Cush or Ethiopia, from which it might be inferred that at the time of Sennacherib's disastrous invasion he had not assumed the crown of Egypt. The Assyrian inscriptions of Sennacherib mention kings of Egypt, and a contemporary king of Ethiopia in alliance with them. The history of Egypt at the time, obtained by a comparison of the evidence of Herodotus send others with that of Manetho's lists, would lead to the same or a similar conclusion, which appears to be remarkably confirmed by the prophecies of Isaiah. He holds, therefore, as most probable, that, at the time of Sennacherib's disastrous expedition, Tirhakah was king of Ethiopia in alliance with the king or kings  of Egypt. In fact, in order to reconcile the discrepancy between the date of the fourteenth year of Hezekiah in B.C. 713, and its contemporaneousness with the reign of Tirhakah, who did not ascend the Egyptian throne till B.C. 689, we have only to suppose that the latter king was the ruler of Ethiopia some years before his accession over Egypt itself. SEE TIRHAKAH.

In this way, however, we again fall into the other difficulty as to the coincidence of this date with that of Sennacherib's invasion. It is true, as above seen, that the warlike operations of Sennacherib recorded in the Bible have been conjectured (Rawlinson, Herodotus, 1, 383) to be those of two expeditions. SEE SENNACHERIB.

The fine paid by Hezekiah is recorded in the inscriptions as a result of an expedition of Sennacherib's third year, which, by a comparison of Ptolemy's Canon with Berosus, must be dated B.C. 700, and this would fall so near the close of the reign of the king of Judah (B.C. 697) that the supposed second expedition, of which there would naturally be no record in the Assyrian annals on account of its calamitous end, could not be placed much later. The Biblical account would, however, be most reasonably explained by the supposition that the two expeditions were but two campaigns of the same war, a war but temporarily interrupted by Hezekiah's submission. Now as even the former (if there were two) of these expeditions of Selnacherib fell in B.C. 700, it would be thirteen years later than the synchronism of Tirhakah and Hezekiah as above arrived at. It is probable, therefore, that there is some miscalculation in these dates from the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments, as indeed seems to be betrayed by the discrepancy between Sennacherib's invasion (B.C. 700) and Tirhakah's reign (not earlier than B.C. 689), as thereby determined, whereas the above Biblical passage makes them contemporaneous. Dr. Hincks (ut sup.), however, proposes to solve this difficulty also by the uncritical supposition that the name of Sennacherib has been inserted in the Biblical account of the first Assyrian invasion of Judah (2Ki 18:13; Isa 26:1; 2 Chronicles 32) by some copyist, who confounded this with the later invasion by that monarch, whereas the Assyrian king referred to was Sargon (Isa 20:1), his predecessor. A less violent hypothesis for the same purpose of reconcilement, and one in accordance with the custom of these Oriental kings, e.g. in the case of Nebuchadnezzar, is that Sargon sent Sennacherib as viceroy to execute this campaign in Palestine, and that the annals of the  reign of the latter refer to different and later expeditions when actually king. SEE CHRONOLOGY.

Some writers have thought to find a note of time in 2Ki 19:29; Isa 37:30, “Ye shall eat this year such as groweth of itself,” etc., assuming that the passage is only to be explained as implying the intervention of a sabbath-year, or even of a sabbath-year followed by a year of jubilee. All that can be said is that the passage may be interpreted in that sense; and it does happen that according to that view of the order of sabbatic and jubilaean years which is the best attested, a sabbath-year would begin in the autumn of B.C. 713 (Browne, Ordo Saeclorum, sec. 272-280), i.e. on the perhaps precarious assumption that the cycle persisted without interruption. At most, however, this no more fixes the fourteenth of Hezekiah to the year B.C. 713, than it does to 706, or 699, or any other year of the series. But, in fact, it is not necessary to assume any reference to a sabbath-year. Suppose the words to have been spoken in the autumn, then, the produce of the previous harvest (April, May) having been destroyed or carried off by the invaders, there remained only that which sprang naturally from the dropped or trodden-out seed (סָפַיח), and as the enemy's presence in the land hindered the autumnal tillage, there could be no regular harvest in the following spring (only the סָחַישׁ, αὐτόματα). Hence there is no need to infer with Thenius, ad loc. that the enemy must have been in the land at least eighteen months. or, with Ewald, that Isaiah, speaking in the autumn, anticipated that the invasion would last through the following year (Die Propheten des A. B. 1, 301, and similarly Knobel, u. s. p. 278).

There seems to be no ground whatever for the vague conjecture so confidently advanced (Jahn, Hebr. Common. § 41), that the king's illness was the same plague which had destroyed the Assyrian army. The word שְׁחַיןis not elsewhere applied to the plague, but to carbuncles and inflammatory ulcers (Exo 9:9; Job 2:1, etc.). Hezekiah, whose kingdom was still in a dangerous state from the fear lest the Assyrians might return, who had at that time no heir (for Manasseh was not born till long afterwards, 2Ki 21:1), and who regarded death as the end of existence (Isaiah 38), “turned his face to the wall and wept sore” at the threatened approach of dissolution. God had compassion on his anguish, and heard his prayer. Isaiah had hardly left the palace when he was ordered to promise the king immediate recovery, and a fresh lease of life, ratifying  the promise by a sign, and curing the boil by a plaster of figs, which were often used medicinally in similar cases (Gesenius, Thes. 1, 311; Celsius, Hierobot. 2, 377; Bartholinus, De Morbis Biblicis, 10:47). What was the exact nature of the disease we cannot say; according to Meade, it was fever terminating in abscess. On this remarkable passage we must here be content to refer the reader to Carpzov, App. Crit. p. 351 sq.; Rawlinson, Herod. 2, 332 sq.; the elaborate notes of Keil on 2 Kings 20; Rosenmüller and Gesenius on Isaiah 38, and especially Ewald, Geschichte 3, 638.

The sign given to Hezekiah in the going back of the shadow on the “sun- dial of Ahaz” can only be interpreted as a miracle. The explanation proposed by J. von Gumpach (Alt. Test. Studien, p. 181 sq.) is as incompatible with the terms of the narrative (Isa 38:8, especially the fuller one, 2Ki 20:8-11) as it is insulting to the character of the prophet, who is represented to have managed the seeming return of the shadow by the trick of secretly turning the movable dial from its proper position to its opposite! Thenius (u. s. p. 403 sq.) would naturalize the miracle so as to obtain from it a note of time. The phenomenon was due, he thinks, to a solar eclipse, very small, viz. the one of 26th September, B.C. 713. Here, also, the prophet is taxed with a deception, to be justified by his wish to inspire the despairing king with the confidence essential to his recovery. The prophet employed for this purpose his astronomical knowledge of the fact that the eclipse was about to take place, and of the further fact that “at the beginning of an eclipse the shadow (e.g. of a gnomon) goes back, and at its ending goes forward:” an effect, however, so minute that the difference amounts at most to sixty seconds of time; but then the “degrees” would mark extremely small portions of time, possibly even 1080 to the hour (like the later Hebrew Chakim), and the so-called “dial” was enormously large! Not more successfully, Mr. Bosanquet (Trans. of R. Asiat. Soc. 15, 277) has recourse to the same expedient of an eclipse on Jan. 11, 689 B.C., which, in this writer's scheme, lies in the fourteenth of Hezekiah. “Whoever truly believes in the Old Testament, as Mr. Bosanquet evidently does, must also be prepared to believe in a miracle,” is the just comment made by M. Niebuhr, Gesch. Assurs und Babels, p. 49. Mr. Greswell's elaborate attempt to prove from ancient astronomical records that the day of this miracle was preternaturally lengthened out to thirty-six hours will scarcely convince any one but himself (Fasti Temporis Catholici, etc., and Browne's “Remarks” on the same, 1852, p. 23 sq.). SEE DIAL.

Various ambassadors came with letters and gifts to congratulate Hezekiah on his recovery (2Ch 32:23), and among them an embassy from Merodach-Baladan (or Berodach, 2Ki 20:12; ὁ Βάλαδας, Josephus, 1. c.), the viceroy of Babylon, the Mardokempados of Ptolemy's canon. The ostensible object of this mission was to compliment Hezekiah on his convalescence (2Ki 20:12; Isa 39:1), and “to inquire of the wonder that was done in the land” (2Ch 32:31), a rumor of which could not fail to interest a people devoted to astrology. But its real purpose was to discover how far an alliance between the two powers was possible or desirable, for Mardokempados, no less than Hezekiah, was in apprehension of the Assyrians. In fact, Sargon expelled him from the throne of Babylon in the following year (the 16th of Hezekiah), although after a time he seems-to have returned and re-established himself for six months, at the end of which he was murdered by Belibos (Dr. Hincks, 1. c.; Rosenmüller, uibl. Geograph. ch. 8; Layard, Nin. and Bab. 1, 141).

Community of interest made Hezekiah receive the overtures of Babylon with unconcealed gratification; and, perhaps, to enhance the opinion of his own importance as an ally he displayed to the messengers the princely treasures which he and his predecessors had accumulated. These stores remained even after the largesses mentioned in 2Ki 18:14; 2Ki 18:16. If ostentation were his motive it received a terrible rebuke, and he was informed by Isaiah that from the then tottering and subordinate province of Babylon, and not from the mighty Assyria, would come the ruin and captivity of Judah (Isa 39:5). This prophecy and the one of Micah (Mic 4:10) are the earliest definition of the locality of that hostile power, where the clouds of exile so long threatened (Lev 26:33; Deu 4:27; Deu 30:3) were beginning to gather. It is an impressive and fearful circumstance that the moment of exultation was chosen as the opportunity for warning, and that the prophecies of the Assyrian deliverance are set side by side with those of the Babylonian captivity (Davidson, On Prophecy, p. 256). The weak friend was to accomplish that which was impossible to the powerful foe. But, although pride was the sin thus vehemently checked by the prophet, Isaiah was certainly not blind to the political motives (Joseph. Ant. 10:2, 2) which made Hezekiah so complaisant to the Babylonian ambassadors. Into those motives he had inquired in vain, for the king met that portion of his question (“What said these men?”) by emphatic silence. Hezekiah's meek answer to the stern denunciation of future woe has been most unjustly censured as “a false resignation which combines selfishness with silliness” (Newman, Hebr.  Mon. p. 274). On the contrary, it merely implies a conviction that God's decree could not be otherwise than just and right, and a natural thankfulness for even a temporary suspension of its inevitable fulfillment.

After this embassy we have only a general account of the peace and prosperity in which Hezekiah closed his days. No man before or since ever lived under the certain knowledge of the precise length of the span of life before him. “He was buried in the going up (מָעִלֶה) to the sepulchers of the sons of David,” 2Ch 32:33 : from this, and the fact that the succeeding kings were laid in sepulchers of their own, it may be inferred that after Ahaz, thirteenth from David, there was no more room left in the ancestral sepulcher (Thenius, u. s. p. 410). In later times, he was held in honor as the king who had “after him none like him among all the kings of Judah, nor any that were before him” (2Ki 18:5); in Jer 26:17 the elders of the land cite him as an example of pious submission to the word of the Lord spoken by Micah; and the son of Sirach closes his recital of the kings with this judgment-that of all the kings of Judah, “David, Hezekiah, and Josiah alone transgressed not, nor forsook the law of the Most High” (Sir 49:4).

Besides the many authors and commentators who have written on this period of Jewish history (on which much light has been recently thrown by Mr. Layard, Sir G. Wilkinson, Sir H. Rawlinson, Dr. Hincks, and other scholars who have studied the Nineveh remains), see for continuous lives of Hezekiah, Josephus (Ant. 9:13-10, 2), Prideaux (Connect. 1, 16-30), Jahn (Hebr. Corn. 41), Ewald (Gesch. 3, 614-644, 2nd ed.), Stanley (Jewish Church, 2,305-540), Nicholson (Lectures on Hezekiah, Lond. 1839), Rochah Meditations on Hez. tr. by Hare, Lond. 1839), Michaelis (De Ezechia, Hal. 1717), Scheid (Canticum Ezechiae, Leyd. 1769), Nicolai (De terroribus Hiskiae, Helmst. 1749), Taddel (Precatio Chiskiae Tittenb. 1704). For sermons, etc., see Darling, Cyclopedia Bibliographica, col. 330, 340, 341.

## Hezekiahs Pool[[@Headword:Hezekiahs Pool]]

             the modern traditionary name of a cistern or reservoir in the western part of the city of Jerusalem, referred by Robinson (Later Researches, p. 112) and Bartlett (Walks about Jerusalem, p. 82) to the military preparations of that king (2Ch 32:3 sq.; compare 2Ki 20:20; Sir 48:17 sq.; Isa 22:9-11; Psa 48:12-13), but disputed by Ritter (Erdk. 17, 371 sq.). SEE JERUSALEM.

2. The great-great-grandfather of the prophet Zephaniah (Zep 1:1, where the name is Anglicized “Hizkiah”), supposed by some to be the same with the foregoing (see Huetius, Denostr. Evang. Lips. p. 512; contra Rosenmüller, Proleg. ad Zeph.). B.C. much ante 635.

3. A person mentioned in connection with Ater (but whether as father or otherwise is not clear), which latter was the father (or former residence) of ninety-eight Israelites who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh 7:21). In Neh 10:17 his name (Anglicized “Hizkijah”) appears in a similar connection (but without the connective “of”) among those who subscribed the covenant of Nehemiah. B.C. ante 536.

4. The second of the three sons of Neariah, a descendant of Salathiel (1Ch 3:23); probably a brother of the Esli of Luk 3:25, and also of the Azor of Mat 1:13. (See Strong's Harm. and Expos. of the Gosp. p. 16.) B.C. post 536.

## Hezel[[@Headword:Hezel]]

             SEE HETZEL.

## Hezer[[@Headword:Hezer]]

             SEE HETZER.

## Hezion[[@Headword:Hezion]]

             (Heb. Chezyon', חֶזְיוֹן, visionz; Sept. Α᾿ζιών), the father of Tabrimon and grandfather of the Ben-hadad I, king of Damascene-Syria, to whom Asa sent a largess to conciliate his aid against Baasha (1Ki 15:18). B.C. ante 928. A question has long been raised whether this name (which only occurs in the above passage) indicates the same person as the REZON of 1Ki 11:23. Thenius, after Ewald, suggests that the successful adventurer who became king of Damascus, and was so hostile a neighbor to Solomon throughout his reign, was really called Hezion, and that the designation Rezon (רְזוֹן, “prince”) was either assumed by him, or bestowed on him by his followers after he was seated on his new throne. There is, of course, no chronological difficulty in this supposition. Less  than forty years intervened between the death of Solomon, when Rezon was reigning at Damascus (1Ki 11:25), and the treaty between Asa and Ben-hadad I (1Ki 15:18-19), during which interval there is no violence to probability in assuming the occurrence of the death of Rezon or Hezion, the accession and entire reign of Tabrimon his son, who was unquestionably king of Syria and contemporary with Asa's father (1Ki 15:19), and the succession of Tabrimon's son, Beni-hldad I. This identity of Hezion with Rezon is an idea apparently as old as the Sept. translators; for they associated in their version with Solomon's adversary the Edomite Hadad [or, as they called him, Ader, τὸν ῎Αδερ], “Es-rom, the son of Eliadah” (see the Sept. of 1Ki 11:14); a name which closely resembles our Hezion, though it refers to Rezon, as the patronymic proves (1Ki 11:23).

The later versions, Peshito (Hedron) and Arabic (Hedron), seem to approximate also more nearly to Hezion than to Rezon. Of the old commentators, Junius, Piscator, Malvenda, and Menochius have been cited (see Poli Synops. ad loc.) as maintaining the identity. Kohler also, and Marsham (Can. Chronicles p. 346), and Dathe have been referred to by Keil as in favor of the same view. Keil himself is uncertain. According to another opinion, Hezion was not identical with Rezon, but his successor; this is propounded by Winer (B. R. W. 1, 245, and 2, 322). If the account be correct which is communicated by Josephus (Ant. 7, 5, 2) from the fourth book of Nicolaus Damascenus to the effect that the name of the king of Damascus who was contemporary with David was Hadad (῎Αδαδος), we have in it probably the dynastic name which Rezon or Hezion adopted for himself and his heirs, who, according to the same statement, occupied the throne of Syria for ten generations. According to Macrobius (Saturnalia, 1, 23), Adad was the name of the supreme god of the Syrians; and as it was a constant practice with the kings of Syria and Babylon to assume names which connected them with their gods (comp. Tabrimon of 1Ki 15:18, the son of our Hezion, whose name= רַמּוֹן+טָב, “good is Rimmon,” another Syrian deity, probably the same with Adad; see 2Ki 5:18, and Zec 12:11), we may not unreasonably conjecture that Hezion, who in his political relation called himself Rezon, or “prince,” adopted the name Hadad [or, rather. Ben-hadad, “Son of the supreme God”] in relation to the religion of his country and to his own ecclesiastical supremacy. It is remarkable that even after the change of dynasty in Hazael this title of Ben- hadad seemed to survive (see 2Ki 13:3). If this conjecture be true, the energetic marauder who passes under the names of Rezon and Hezion  in the passages which we quoted at the commencement of this article was strong enough not only to harass the great Solomon, but to found a dynasty of kings which occupied the throne of Syria to the tenth descent, even down to the revolution effected by Hazael, “near two hundred years, according to the exactest chronology of Josephus” (Whiston's note on Ant. 7 5, 2). SEE REZON.

## Hezir[[@Headword:Hezir]]

             (Heb. Chezi-r', חֵזַיר, a swine, or, according to First, strong; Sept. Ι᾿εζείρ and ᾿Ηζείρ 5.r. Χηζίν), the name of two men.

1. The head of the seventeenth course of priests as established by David (1Ch 24:15). B.C. 1014.

2. A chief Israelite who subscribed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:20). B.C. cir. 410.

## Hezrai[[@Headword:Hezrai]]

             (2Sa 23:35). SEE HEZRO. Hez'ro (Heb. Chetsro', הֶצרוֹ, i. q. Hezron; Sept. Α᾿σαραί,Vulg. Hezro), a Carmelite, one of David's distinguished warriors (1Ch 11:37). He is called in the margin and in 2Sa 23:35, HEZRAI (Chetsray', חֶצְרִי, Sept. Α᾿σαρί,Vulg. Hesrai). B.C. 1046. Kennicott, however (Dissertation, p. 207). decides, on the almost unanimous authority of the ancient version, that Hezrai is the original form of the name.

## Hezron[[@Headword:Hezron]]

             (Heb. Chetsron', הֶצְרוֹן, enclosed [Gesen.] or blooming [Furst]; Sept. Α᾿σρών, Α᾿σερών), the name of two men, and also of a place.

1. The third son of Reuben (Gen 46:9; Exo 6:14; 1Ch 4:1; 1Ch 5:3). His descendants were called HEZRONITES (Chetsroni', חֶצְרֹנַי, Sept. Α᾿σρωνί, Num 26:6; Num 26:21). B.C. 1874.

2. The oldest of the two sons of Pharez and grandson of Judah (Gen 46:12; Rth 4:18-19; 1Ch 2:5; 1Ch 2:9; 1Ch 2:18; 1Ch 2:21; 1Ch 2:24-25); called ESROM (Ε᾿σρώμ) in Mat 1:3. B.C. 1856.  3. A place on the southern boundary of Judah, west of Kadesh-Barnea, and between that and Adar (Jos 15:3); otherwise called HAZOR (Jos 15:25). The punctuation and enumeration, however, require us to connect the associated names thus: Kerioth-hezron = Hazoranam. SEE HAZOR.

## Hezronite[[@Headword:Hezronite]]

             (Num 26:6; Num 26:21). SEE HEZRON I.

## Hi[[@Headword:Hi]]

             the second member of a mystic triad composed by Lao-Tseu, the celebrated Chinese philosopher. It is described as follows: "That which you look at and do not see is called I; that which you hearken after and do not hear is called Hi; that which your hand reaches after and cannot grasp is called Wei. These are three beings which cannot be comprehended, and which together make but one."

## Hiadi[[@Headword:Hiadi]]

             in Hindui mythology, is the collective name of the three highest castes of the Hindus — the Brahmins, Kshetrias, and Banians — priests, warriors, and business men.

## Hiadninger[[@Headword:Hiadninger]]

             in Norse mythology, are the warriors who fall in a battle, incited by the beautiful shieldmaiden, Hildur. They fight until the destruction of the world.

## Hibbard, Billy[[@Headword:Hibbard, Billy]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Norwich, Conn., Feb. 24, 1771, united with the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1792, entered the New York Conference in 1798, in 1821-2-3 was superannuated, became effective in 1824, was finally superannuated in 1828, and died Aug. 17, 1844, having preached forty-six years. He was an eccentric but very able man. His wit and humor, and his long, able, and abundantly successful labors in the Church, furnish the material of an interesting biography. He possessed a vigorous intellect, and acquired a sound and effective store of theological and general knowledge. His piety was deep and cheerful. See Minutes of Conferences, 3, 600; Stevens, History of the Methodist Episcopal Church; Sherman's New-England Divines, p. 285; Life of Billy Hibbard (N. Y. 12mo); Sprague, Annals, 7, 298.

## Hickes, George, D.D[[@Headword:Hickes, George, D.D]]

             a nonjuring divine of great learning, was born June 20, 1642, at Newsham, in Yorkshire; was educated at St. John's College, Oxford, and in 1644 was elected fellow of Lincoln College. He became chaplain to the duke of Lauderdale in 1676, king's chaplain in 1682, and dean of Worcester in 1683. He was disappointed of the bishopric of Bristol by the death of Charles II. After the Revolution of 1688 refusing to take the, oaths to William III, he was deprived in 1689, and became an active enemy of the government. He was consecrated bishop of Thetford by the Nonjurors in 1694, and died in 1715. His scholarship is shown in his valuable Antique Litteraturae Septentrionalis Thesaurus (Oxford, 1705, 3 vols. fol.), and his Institutiones Gramnaticae Anglo-Saxoniae (Oxford, 1689, 4to). Among his theological and controversial writings, which were very numerous, are The Christian Priesthood, and the Dignity of the Episcopal Order (new ed. Oxford, 1847, 3 vols. 8vo): — Bibliotheca Script. Ecclesiae Anglicanae (London, 1709, 8vo): — Sermons (London, 1713, 2 vols.  8vo). See Hook, Eccles. Biog. 6:32 sq.; Lathhury, History of the Nonjurors.

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

             an English clergyman, was a native of Northamptonshire, and was a student of Christchurch College, Oxford, in 1667. He was minister of St. Ebbe's Church, Oxford, and lecturer of St. James's, Westminster, in 1692; subsequently rector of Hpgsnorton, Leicestershire, and finally bishop of Derry in 1702. He died in 1713, leaving some Sermons (1680-1713). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

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

             an English Nonconformist divine, was a native of Worcestershire, and educated at Cambridge. He was a fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford,  was deprived at the Restoration, and became preacher to the English congregation at Leyden, where he died in 1692. He published several controversial theological treatises (1659-74), the best of which appeared without his name — Apologia pro Ministris in Anglia (vulgo) Non- conformistis, etc. (1664). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Hickok, Laurens Perseus, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Hickok, Laurens Perseus, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Bethel, Connecticut, December 29, 1798. He graduated from Union College in 1820, and studied theology with Reverend William Andrews and Bennet Tyler, D.D.; was pastor at Kent, Connecticut, 1824-29; Litchfield, 1829-36; professor of theology, Western Reserve College, 1836-44; Auburn Theological Seminary, 1844- 52; professor of mental and moral philosophy, and vice-president of Union College, 1852-66; president of the same, 1866-68; and thereafter without charge at Amherst, Massachusetts, until his death, May 6, 1888. He was moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly in 1856, and corporate member of the A.B.C.F.M. from 1848. He wrote Rational Psychology (1848): — System of Moral Science (1853): — Empirical Psychology (1854): — Creator and Creation (1872): — Humanity, Immortal (eod.): — Logic of Reason (1875).

## Hickok, Milo Judson, D.D[[@Headword:Hickok, Milo Judson, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at New Haven, Vermont, August 22, 1809. He graduated from Middlebury College in 1835; was professor in Delaware College three years; graduated from Union Theological Seminary, N.Y., in 1841; became a tutor in Middlebury College; and was ordained a Congregational minister, May 4, 1842. He became professor in Marietta College, Ohio, and pastor of the Church in Harmar; two years thereafter he accepted a call as stated supply to the Presbyterian Church of Utica, N.Y., and in 1845 was installed pastor of a Church in Rochester. In 1854 he was stated supply of a Presbyterian Church in Montreal, Canada; the next year he was installed pastor of the Church in Scranton, Pennsylvania, where he remained until 1868. His health failing, he removed to Marietta, Ohio, where he died, July 19, 1873. See Genesis Cat. of Union Theol. Seon. 1876, page 19. (W.P.S.)

## Hicks, Elias[[@Headword:Hicks, Elias]]

             a member of the Society of Friends, or Quakers, and the author of a schism in that body, was born at Hempstead, L.I., March 19, 1748, and in early life became a preacher in the society. Imbibing Socinian opinions as to the Trinity and the Atonement, he began to preach them, cautiously at first, and with little sympathy from his brethren. By “degrees, however, the boldness of his views and the vigor with which he repelled assailants began to attract attention, and to win hearers over to his opinions, which, proclaimed without faltering, in public and private for years, at length found large numbers of sympathizers, who, with Mr. Hicks himself, unable to impress their convictions upon the denomination at large, in 1827 seceded from that body, and set up a distinct and independent association, but still holding to the name of Friends. In this secession were members from the Yearly Meetings of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Ohio, Indiana, and New England.” He was a man of great acuteness and energy of intellect, and of elevated personal character. He died at Jericho Feb. 27, 1830. He published Observations on Slavery (New York, 1811, 12mo): — Journal of Lift and Labors (Philadelphia, 1828): — Sermons (1828, 8vo): — Letters relating to Doctrines (1824, 12mo). See Christian Examiner, 51, 321; Senneff, Answer to Elias Hicks's Blasphemies (1837, 2nd ed. 12mo); Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 842; Janney, Hist. of the Friends (4 vols. 12mo); Gibbons, Review and Refutation (Philadelphia, 1847, 12mo); and the article FRIENDS (No. 2).

## Hicksites[[@Headword:Hicksites]]

             SEE HICKS.

## Hictas[[@Headword:Hictas]]

             ('Iciral), a sect of orthodox ascetics about the time of the emperor Marcian, who lived in monasteries, and spent their time in singing 'hymns, accompanied with religious dances.

## Hidalgo[[@Headword:Hidalgo]]

             however, unfortunately halted in his advance on the capital, the royalists had time to rally, and he was utterly defeated at Puente de Calderon, Jan. 17, 1811, and after in vain endeavoring to rally the national army, was captured by treachery while endeavoring to escape to the United States. He was executed ten days afterwards. On his death, Morelos, another priest, assumed the command; a congress of forty members was called, but after  the defeat and execution of Morelos. it was dissolved by general Teran, who succeeded him. The revolt was entirely quelled in 1819. Mexico gained its independence in 1822, which, amid anarchy and continual turmoil, it has retained until the present, barring the French occupation of 1862 to 1867. Today the grateful republic of Mexico repeats in her decorations and uses on her postage-stamp the mild features of her illustrious son, the priest-patriot, Michael Hidalgo y Costillas. See (N.Y.) Cath. Almanac, 1876, page 105.

## Hidalgo, Michael Y Costillas[[@Headword:Hidalgo, Michael Y Costillas]]

             called the "Washington of the Mexican Revolution," was parish priest at Dolores, department of Guanajuato, Mexico. He appealed to his parishioners, raised the standard of Mexican freedom, headed the dissentients, and was proclaimed generalissimo, September 17, 1810. He was joined by adherents from every side, and in six weeks was marching on Mexico city at the head of eighty thousand men. Five provinces recognised his authority;

## Hiddai[[@Headword:Hiddai]]

             (Heb. Hidday', הַדִּי, exuberant or mighty; Sept. Alex. MS. Α᾿θθαί, Vat. MS. omits; Vulg. Heddai), one of the thirty-seven heroes of David's guard (2Sa 23:30), described as “of the torrents of Gaash.” In the parallel list of 1 Chronicles (11:32) the name is given as HURAI SEE HURAI (q.v.), in favor of which reading Kennicott (Dissert. p. 194) decides. — Smith.

## Hiddekel[[@Headword:Hiddekel]]

             (Heb. Chidde'kel, חַדֶּקֶל, in pause Chid, da'kel, חַדּ קֶל; Sept. Τίγρις, to which in Dan 10:4 it adds Ε᾿νδεκέλ v.r. Ε᾿δδεκέλ; Vulg. Tigris), the name of the third of the four rivers of Paradise, being that which runs on the border (קַדנְמִת) of Assyria (Gen 2:14), and “the great river” on the banks of which Daniel received his remarkably minute vision, or, rather, angelic prediction of the mutual history of Egypt and Syria (Daniel 2, 4). There has never been much dispute of the traditional interpretation which identifies the Tigris with the Hiddekel. According to Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 448), this river in Aramsean is called Digla, in Arabic Diglat, in Zendl Teger, in Pehlvi Teyera, “stream;” whence have arisen both the Aramaean and Arabic forms, to which also we trace the Hebrew Dekel divested of the prefix Hid. This prefix denotes activity, rapidity, vehemence, so that Hid-dekel signifies “‘he rapid Tigris.” From the introduction of the prefix, it would appear that the Hebrews were not entirely aware that Teger, represented by their דקל, Dekel, by itself signified velocity; so in the language of Media, Tigris meant an arrow (Strabo, 2, 527; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 6:27; comp. Persic teer, “arrow;” Sanskrit tigra, “sharp,” “swift”); hence arose such pleonasms as “king Pharaoh” and “the Al-coran.” First, however (Heb. Lex. s.v.), regards the last syllable as a mere termination to an original form חַדֵּק, Hiddek, from חָדִק, to be sharp, hence to flow swiftly. “The form Diglath occurs in the Targums of Onkelos and, Jonathan, in Josephus (Amnt. 1, 1), in the Armenian Eusebius (Chronicles Can. pt. 1, c. 2), in Zonaras (Ann. 1, 2), and in the Armenian version of the Scriptures. It is hardened to Diglit (Diglito) by Pliny (Hist. Nat. 6, 27). The name now in use among the inhabitants of Mesopotamia is Dijleh. It has generally been supposed that Higla is a mere Shemitic corruption of Tigra, and that this latter is the true name of the stream; but it must be observed that the two forms are found side by side in the Babylonian transcript of the Behistun inscription, and that the ordinary name of the stream in the inscriptions of Assyria is Tiggar. Moreover, if we allow the Dekel of Hid-dekel to mean the Tigris, it would seem probable that this was the more ancient of the two appellations. Perhaps, therefore, it is best to suppose that there was in early Babylonian a root dik, equivalent in meaning, and no doubt connected in origin, with the Arian tig or tij, and that from these two roots were formed independently the two names, Dekel, Dikla, or Digla, and Tiggar, Tigra,  or Tigris. The stream was known by either name indifferently; but, on the whole, the Arian appellation predominated in ancient times, and was that most commonly used even by Shemitic races. The Arabians, however, when they conquered Mesopotamia, revived the true Shemitic title, and this (Dijleh) continues to be the name by which the river is known to the natives down to the present day.”

The Tigris rises in the mountains of Armenia, about fifteen miles south of the sources of the Euphrates, and pursues nearly a regular course south- east till its junction with that river at Korna, fifty miles above Basrah (Bassorah). The Tigris is navigable for boats of twenty or thirty tons' burden as far as the mouth of the Odorneh, but no further; and the commerce of Mosul is consequently carried on by rafts supported on inflated sheep or goats' skins. SEE FLOAT.

These rafts are floated down the river, and when they arrive at Baghdad the wood of which they are composed is sold without loss, and the skins are conveyed back to Mosul by camels. The Tigris, between Baghdad and Korna, is, on an average, about two hundred yards wide; at Mosul its breadth does not exceed three hundred feet. The banks are steep, and overgrown for the most part with brushwood, the resort of lions and other wild animals. The middle part of the river's course, from Mosul to Korna, once the seat of high culture and the residence of mighty kings, is now desolate, covered with the relics of ancient greatness in the shape of fortresses, mounds, and dams, which had been erected for the defense and irrigation of the county. At the ruins of Nimrud, eight leagues below Mosul, is a stone dam quite across the river, which, when the stream is low, stands considerably above the surface, and forms a small cataract; but when the stream is swollen, no part of it is visible, the water rushing over it like a rapid, and boiling up with great impetuosity. It is a work of great skill and labor, and now venerable for its antiquity. The inhabitants, as usual, attribute it to Nimrod. It is called the Zikr ul-Aawaze. At some short distance below there is another Zikr (dike), but not so high, and more ruined than the former. The river rises twice in the year: the first and great rise is in April, and is caused by the melting of the snows in the mountains of Armenia; the other is in November, and is produced by the periodical rains. (See Kinneir, Geog. Mem. of Persian Empire, p. 9, 10; Rich's Koordistan; Chesney's Euphrates Expedition; Sir R. K. Porter's Travels; etc.) SEE TIGRIS.

## Hiel[[@Headword:Hiel]]

             (Heb. Chiel', חַיאֵל, life of, i.e. from God, or perh. for יְחַיאֵל, God shall live; Sept. Α᾿χιήλ), a native of Bethel, who rebuilt Jericho (B.C. post 915), above 700 years after its destruction by the Israelites, and who, in so doing (1Ki 16:34), incurred, in the death of his eldest son Abiram and his youngest son Segub, the effects of the imprecation pronounced by Joshua (Jos 6:26):

“Accursed the man in the sight of Jehovah, Who shall arise and build this city, even Jericho; With the loss of] his first-born shall he found it, And with [the loss of] his youngest shall he fix its gates.” SEE JERICHO. Strabo speaks of such cursing of a destroyed city as an ancient custom, and instances the curses imprecated by Agamemnon and Croesus (Grotius, Asnnot. ad Jos 6:26); Masius compares the cursing of Carthage by the Romans (Poli Syn.). The term Bethelite (בֵּית הָאֵַלי) here only is by some rendered fanily of cursing (Pet. Martyr), and also house or place of cursing (Ar., Syr., and Chald. verss.). qu. בֵּית אָלָה; but there seems no reason for questioning the accuracy of the Sept. ὁ Βαιθηλίτης,- which is approved by most commentators, and sanctioned by Gesenius (Lex. s.v.). The rebuilding of Jericho was an intrusion upon the kingdom of Jehoshaphat, unless, with Peter Martyr, we suppose that Jericho had already been detached from it by the kings of Israel. SEE ACCURSED.

## Hieracas[[@Headword:Hieracas]]

             SEE HIERAX.

## Hieracites[[@Headword:Hieracites]]

             a heretical sect which sprang up at the end of the 3d or beginning of the 4th century, founded by Hieracas or Hierax (q.v.).

## Hierapolis[[@Headword:Hierapolis]]

             ( ῾Ιεράπολις, sacred city), a city of Phrygia, situated above the junction of the rivers Lycus and Maeander, not far from Colossse and Laodicea, where there was a Christian church under the charge of Epaphras as early as the time of the apostle Paul, who commends him for his fidelity and zeal (Col 4:12-13). The place is visible from the theatre at Laodicea, from which it is five miles distant northward. Its association with Laodicea and Colossee is just what we should expect, for the three towns were all in the basin of the Mseander, and within a few miles of one another. It is probable that Hierapolis was one of the “illustres Asiue urbes” (Tacitus,  Ann. 14, 27) which, with Laodicea, were simultaneously desolated by an earthquake about the time when Christianity was established in this district. There is little doubt that the church of Hierapolis was founded at the same time with that of Colossae, and that its characteristics in the apostolic period were the same. Smith, in his journey to the Seven Churches (1671), was the first to describe the ancient sites in this neighborhood.

He was followed by Pococke and Chandler; and more recently by Richter, Cockerell, Hartley, Arundel, etc. The place now bears the name of Pambuk-Kalek (Cotton-Castle), from the white appearance of the cliffs of the mountain on the lower summit, or, rather, an extended terrace, on which the ruins are situated. It owed its celebrity, and probably the sanctity indicated by its ancient name, to its very remarkable thermal springs of mineral water (Dio Cass. 68, 27; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 2, 95), the singular effects of which, in the formation of stalactites and incrustations by its deposits, are shown in the accounts of Pococke (2, pt. 2, c. 13) and Chandler (Asia Minor, c. 68) to have been accurately described by Strabo (13, 629). A great number and variety of sepulchers are found in the approaches to the site, which on one side is sufficiently defended by the precipices overlooking the valleys of the Lycus and Maeander, while on the other sides the town walls are still observable. The magnificent ruins clearly attest the ancient importance of the place.

The main street can still be traced in its whole extent, and is bordered by the remains of three Christian churches, one of which is upwards of 300 feet long. About the middle of this street, just above the mineral springs, Pococke, in 1741, thought that he distinguished some remains of the Temple of Apollo, which, according to Damascus, quoted by Photius (Biblioth. p. 1054), was in this situation. But the principal ruins are a theatre and gymnasium, both in a state of uncommon preservation; the former 346 feet in diameter, the latter nearly filling a space 400 feet square. Strabo (loc. cit.) and Pliny (Hist. Nat. 5, 29) mention a cave called the Plutonium, filled with pestilential vapors, similar to the celebrated Grotto del Cane in Italy. High up the mountain-side is a deep recess far into the mountain; and Mr. Arundell says that he should have supposed that the mephitic cavern lay in this recess, if Mr. Cockerell had not found it near the theatre, the position anciently assigned to it; and he conjectures that it may be the same in which Chandler distinguished the area of a stadium (Arundell, Asia Minor, 2, 210). The same writer gives, from the Oriens Christianus, a list of the bishops of Hierapolis down to the time of the emperor Isaac Angelus. (See Col. Leake's Geogr. of Asia Minor, p. 252, 253; Hamilton's Res. in Asia Minor, 1, 514, 517 sq.;  Fellows, Lycia, p. 270; Asia Minor, p. 283 sq.; Cramer's Asia Minor, 2, 37 sq.).

## Hierapolis, Council Of[[@Headword:Hierapolis, Council Of]]

             held about A.D. 197 by Apollinarius, bishop of the see, and 26 other bishops, who excommunicated Montanus, Maximilian, and Theodotus. — Landon, Man. of Councils, p. 265.

## Hierarchy[[@Headword:Hierarchy]]

             (ἱεραρχία, from ἱερός, sacred, and ἄρχων, ruler), a term used to denote, in churches in which the whole ruling power is held by the priesthood, a sacred principality instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ 1, his Church, and consisting of orders of consecrated persons, with gradations of rank and power, who constitute exclusively the governing and ministering body in the Church. It implies the transmission, under what is called the Apostolical Succession, SEE SUCCESSION, of the authority to teach and govern given by Christ to his apostles; and thus the hierarchy, as a corporation, perpetuates itself. The hierarchy on earth is supposed to correspond with the hierarchy of “angels and archangels, and all the hosts” of heaven, with the Virgin Mary at their head. The Christian hierarchy, again, is supposed to correspond to the Jewish gradations of the priesthood. SEE CHURCH.

The notion of a “continuity of plan running on from the Jewish hierarchical system into the Christian, i.e. the Romish spiritual monarchy, is an ideal analogy which has captivated” many an ardent imagination, from Cyprian down to Manning and Newman. For an exposure of its fallacy, see Taylor, Ancient Christianity (Lond. 1844, 2 vols. 8vo), 2, 403.

I. Roman Catholic. — According to the Roman Catholic theory, the hierarchy is divinely ordained, and was established in the Church by Christ, who gave the primacy of authority to Peter, and instituted, in subordination to the primacy, the three orders bishops, priests, and deacons. The primacy of Peter is perpetuated in the popes, from whom bishops hold their authority to govern their dioceses, and to ordain priests and deacons. This monarchico-hierarchical system grew up gradually in the Latin Church by a series of usurpations of power on the part of the bishops of Rome in succeeding centuries. In the Greek Church the hierarchy is oligarchical, not monarchical, no patriarch having supreme authority over all other prelates (see Schaff, in Brit. and Foreign Evangelical Review, Oct. 1865 and Jan. 1866). The Roman hierarchy is divided into the hierarchy of orders and the  hierarchy of jurisdiction. The hierarchy of orders, again, includes the hierarchy by divine right (juris divini) and the hierarchy by ecclesiastical right (juris ecclesiastici).

(I.) Hierarchy of Orders. —

(1.) The hierarchy juris divini includes,

1. Bishops (sacerdotes primi ordinis, apices et principes omnium), who are successors of the apostles, and by whom alone, through ordination, the ministry of Christ is preserved among men. As to order, the bishops are only a fuller form of the order of priests, with governing and ordaining power superadded. Some Roman Catholics hold that bishops have their authority by divine right immediately, others (and these are now the majority) that they have it mediately through the pope. SEE EPISCOPACY.

2. Priests (presbyters), who receive from the bishop, by ordination, the power to administer the sacraments, to change the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and to absolve penitents from their sins. The place in which they shall exercise these functions is not ‘optional with themselves, but depends entirely upon the will of the bishop.

3. Deacons, who serve as helpers to bishops and priests in the administration of the sacraments, and in the pastoral care of the sick and poor.

(2.) The hierarchy of ecclesiastical right includes the minor orders of subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, lictors, and doorkeepers, being all extensions of the diaconate downwards, so to speak.

(II.) Hierarchy of Jurisdiction. — This embraces the manifold “principalities and powers” which have been constituted in the Church in the course of her progress towards universal dominion. It includes archdeacons, archpresbyters, deans, vicars, inferior prelates, and cardinals. In the order of bishops, again, there are archbishops, metropolitans, exarchs, and patriarchs. The pope is at the head of all, the bearer of all the functions of every office, and the source of authority for each. SEE PAPAL SYSTEM.

The Roman hierarchy is a vast politico-ecclesiastical corporation, with the pope at its head, claiming universal dominion over all men and over all governments. SEE CURIA ROMANA; SEE POPE. It is a great power, more important, as De Maistre, one of the greatest modern Roman  writers remarks, than sound doctrine, inasmuch as it is “more indispensable to the preservation of the faith” (Lettres, 2, 285). This idea of a hierarchy with a universal dominion, and with an infallible head, constituting a visible principality on earth, and therefore necessarily using secular means of support, and “therefore also unavoidably offering the highest possible excitements to carnal ambition,” is a magnificent one, considered merely as a human organization seeking power over men; but it is utterly out of harmony with Scripture, and with the character and claims of Christianity as a spiritual religion.

II. After the Reformation, the churches on the Continent of Europe relinquished the hierarchy, although it might have been retained with ease in Germany, Sweden, and Denmark, as numerous bishops became Protestants. The Church of England, however, retained it, and, in fact, she is distinguished from all other European Protestant churches by her claim to a regular hierarchy, in full apostolical succession. The High-Church notion of the hierarchy is stated by J. H. Blunt (Dictionary of Historical and Doctrinal Theology, s.v.) as follows: “Our Lord, the chief bishop, chose out twelve apostles and seventy disciples, corresponding to the twelve princes of tribes and the seventy elders, who, with Moses, governed God's ancient people, in order to show that his Church is the true spiritual Israel of God. St. Paul gave authority to Timothy and Titus to constitute bishops and deacons; St. Paul exercised visitation over the priests summoned to Ephesus; with Barnabas he ordained priests (Act 14:23). St. Peter gave charge to priests and deacons (1Pe 5:1-5), and St. John received divine commission to exercise authority over the seven angels or bishops of the churches of Asia. In order to preserve the unity of the Church, Christendom was divided into dioceses, each with a number of priests and deacons under one head, the bishop, to regulate the faith and manners of the people, and to minister to them in God's name. The hierarchy embraces the power of jurisdiction and of order, considered as a principality. The hierarchy of order was established to sanctify the Body of Christ, and is composed of all persons in orders. The hierarchy of jurisdiction was established for the government of the faithful, and to promote their eternal holiness, and is composed of prelates. The hierarchy of order by ministration of the sacraments and preaching the Gospel aims at elevating and hallowing the spiritual life; the hierarchy of jurisdiction is for the promotion of exterior discipline. The hierarchy of order confers no jurisdiction, but simply power to perform ecclesiastical functions and  administer sacraments, whereas the other hierarchy bestows jurisdiction, and consequently the right of making ordinances concerning the faith and ecclesiastical discipline, and to correct offenders. The principal duty of ministers of the Church is to lead men to the knowledge and worship of God, and the Church therefore requires laws and rules for the guidance of her ministers. The hierarchy of order, that of the ministration of the Word and sacraments, appertains to all clergy according to the measure of their power; the hierarchy of jurisdiction, which is, in fact, the hierarchy, being the chief power of the Church, pertains to prelates alone, but cannot exist without the other hierarchy, although the latter can be without jurisdiction, which it presupposes, and is its foundation. In the one the clerical character or order, i.e. the ecclesiastical office, only is regarded; in the other the degree, the rank' in jurisdiction of a prelate, is alone considered. Both have one origin and one object, and both flow from the clerical character; but order is of divine right, jurisdiction an ecclesiastical necessity, with its differences of chief bishops, prelacies, and ranks of ministers.” The Protestant Episcopal Church retains the hierarchy of order, viz. bishops, priests, and deacons, together with the claim of apostolical succession. But the power of jurisdiction is divided with the laity, who are represented in the highest judicatory, the General Convention, and in this view that Church is not hierarchical. The Methodist Episcopal Church preserves the order of bishops, presbyters or elders, and deacons, but does not claim that her episcopacy retains the so-called apostolical succession; and she admits the laity to many of her offices, especially to those in which temporalities are concerned. The Presbyterian and Congregational churches of America are not hierarchical in government. SEE BISHOPS; SEE CHURCH; SEE EPISCOPACY; SEE LAITY; SEE ORDERS; SEE PAPAL SYSTEM; SEE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH; SEE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

## Hieratic Writing[[@Headword:Hieratic Writing]]

             a species of sacred writing used by the ancient Egyptian priests, especially the Hierogrammatists (q.v.). It is found chiefly on the papyri, and is an abbreviated form of the hieroglyphic (q.v.). The matter of these manuscripts consists almost entirely of texts in reference to purely religious or scientific description, and of religious inscriptions.

## Hierax or Hieraoas[[@Headword:Hierax or Hieraoas]]

             an Egyptian ascetic philosopher, native of Leontus or Leontopolis, classed among the heretics of the 3rd century. Epiphanius, Photius, and Peter of Sicily considered him a Manichaean. “He was, at all events, a perfectly original phenomenon, distinguished for his varied learning, allegorical exegesis, poetical talent, and still more for his eccentric ascetism. He taught that, as the business of Christ on earth was to promulgate a new law, more perfect and strict than that of Moses, he prohibited the use of wine, flesh, matrimony, and whatever was pleasing to the senses. Hierax  denied the historical reality of the fall and the resurrection of the body; excluded children dying before years of discretion from the kingdom of heaven; distinguished the substance of the Son from that of the Father; taught that Melchizedec was the Holy Ghost; obscured the sacred volume with allegorical interpretations; and maintained that paradise was only the joy and satisfaction of the mind. His followers were sometimes called Abstinents, because of their scrupulously abstaining from the use of wine and certain meats. He wrote some commentaries on Scripture, and hymns, which are only known by quotations in Epiphanius. See Lardner, Works, 3, 285; Mosheim, Comm. 2, 404; Neander, Church History, 1, 713; Schaff, History of the Christian Church, p. 510; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 647.

## Hiereel[[@Headword:Hiereel]]

             ( ῾Ιερεήλ), given (1Es 9:21) as the name of one of the “sons of Emmer” who divorced their heathen wives after the Captivity; evidently the JEHIEL SEE JEHIEL (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezr 10:21).

## Hieremoth[[@Headword:Hieremoth]]

             ( ῾Ιερεμώθ), the name of two men in the Apocrypha.

1. A” son of Ela,” who divorced his Gentile wife after the Captivity (1Es 9:27); the JERIMOTH SEE JERIMOTH (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezr 10:26).

2. A “son of Mani” who did the same (1 Esdr. 10:30); the RAMOTH SEE RAMOTH (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezr 10:29).

## Hierielus[[@Headword:Hierielus]]

             (Ι᾿ερίηλος v.r. Ι᾿εζριῆλος), another of the “sons of Ela” who in like manner divorced his wife (1Es 9:27); the JEHIEL SEE JEHIEL (q.v.) of Ezr 10:26.

## Hiermas[[@Headword:Hiermas]]

             ( ῾Ιερμάς), one of “the sons of Phoros” who did the same (1 Esdr. 10:26); the RAMIAH SEE RAMIAH (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezr 10:25).

## Hiermeneutae[[@Headword:Hiermeneutae]]

             (ἑρμηνευταί,d inmtepreteers), officers in the ancient Church, whose business it was to render one language into another, as there was occasion, both in reading the Scriptures, and in the homilies that were made to the people; an office chiefly used in those churches where the people spoke different languages, as in Palestine, where some spoke Syriac, others Greek; and in the churches of Africa, where some spoke Latin and others Punic. “So far was the primitive Church from encouraging ignorance, by locking up the Scriptures in an unknown tongue, that she not only translated them into all languages, but also appointed a standing office of interpreters, who were viva voce to make men understand what was read,  and not suffer them to be barbarians in the service of God, which is a tyranny that was unknown to former ages.” — Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. 3. ch. 13:§ 4.

## Hierocles[[@Headword:Hierocles]]

             governor of Bithynia, and afterwards of Alexandria (A.D. 306), is said by Lactantius (Inst. Divin. 5, 2; De Morte Persec. c. 17) to have been the principal adviser of the persecution of the Christians in the reign of the emperor Diocletian (A.D. 302). He also wrote two books against Christianity, entitled Λᾠγοι φιλαλήθεις πρὸς τοὺς Χριστιανούς (Truth-loving Words to the Christians), which, like Porphyry's (q.v.) work, have been destroyed by the mistaken zeal of the later emperors, and they are known to us only by the replies of Eusebius of Caesarea. In these, according to Lactantius, “he endeavored to show that the sacred Scriptures overthrow themselves by the contradictions with which they abound; he particularly insisted upon several texts as inconsistent with each other; and indeed on so many, and so distinctly, that one might suspect he had some time professed the religion which he now attempted to expose. He chiefly reviled Paul and Peter, and the other disciples, as propagators of falsehood. He said that Christ was banished by the Jews, and after that got together 900 men, and committed robbery. He endeavored to overthrow Christ's miracles, though he did not deny the truth of them, and aimed to show that like things, or even greater, had been done by Apollonius of Tyana” (Inst. Divin. 5, 2, 3). Eusebius's treatise above referred to is “Against Hierocles;” in it he reviews the Life of Apollonius written by Philostratus (published by Olearius, — with Latin version, Leips. 1709). See Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graeca, 1, 792; Cave, Hist. Lzt. anno 306; English Cyclopedia; Farrar, History of Free Thought, p. 62. 64; Neander, Ch. Hist. 1, 173; Schaff, Ch. History, 1, 194; Brockhaus, Encyklop. 7, 916; Lardner, Works, 7, 207, 474, etc.

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

             a Neo-Platonist of the 5th century at Alexandria. He is said to be the author of a Commentary upon the Golden Verses of Pythagoras, which is still extant; and also a Discourse on Foreknowledge and Fate, of which Photius has preserved large extracts. Stobeeus has also preserved the fragments of several other works which are ascribed to Hierocles. The Greek text of the Commentary on the Golden Verses of Pythagoras was first published by Curterius (Paris, 1583; reprinted at London, 1654; also 1742; and Padua, 1744). The fragments of the Discourse on Foreknowledge and Fate, in which Hierocles attempts to reconcile the free-will of man with the foreknowledge of God, have been edited by  Morell (Paris, 1593, 1597), and by Pearson (London, 1655, 1673); the latter edition contains the fragments of the other works of Hierocles. A complete edition of his works was published by Needham (Cambridge, 1709). Both Pearson and Needham confound this Hierocles with Hierocles, the prefect of Bithynia. The Discourse on Foreknowledge and Fate was translated into French by Regnaud (Lyons, 1560). Grotius translated part of this work into Latin in his Sententiae Philosophorum de Fato (Paris, 1624; Amst. i648; reprinted in the third volume of his theological works, 1679). The Commentary on the Golden Verses has been translated into English by Hall, London, 1657: Norris, London, 1682; Rayner, Norw. 1797; and into French (with life) by Dacier, Paris, 1706. See English Cyclopedia, s.v.; Smith, Dictionary of Biography and Mythology, 2, 453; Augusti, Dogmengeschichte, 1 and 2; Lardner, Works, 8, 127.

## Hierodfili[[@Headword:Hierodfili]]

             in Greek cultus, were persons employed it the service of a temple, especially in Syria, Phoenicia, and Asia Minor. They were females, living near temples, who hired themselves out to strangers. They were obliged to care for the decorations of the temple, knitting and cleansing the veils, wreathing the altars, etc. The priests had no other income than the presents which pilgrims to the sanctuary brought, and in order to draw as many of them as possible, the surroundings of the temple were occupied by numbers of priestesses, who gave the presents they received to the temple, as is still the case in India with the Dewadashies (Bajaderes). In Cappadocia, in the temple-woods of the Comanian goddess, Strabo met over six thousand. This custom came to Greece and Sicily, especially in connection with the worship of Venus, and many a beautiful temple was built with the money thus obtained. SEE DIANA; SEE VENUS.

## Hierodiaconi[[@Headword:Hierodiaconi]]

             (from ἱερός, sacred, and διάκονος, a deacon), monks of the Russo- Greek Church (q.v.), who are also deacons.

## Hieroglyphics[[@Headword:Hieroglyphics]]

             (from ἱερός, sacred, and γλύφω, to carve), the term usually applied to the inscriptions in the so-called sacred or symbolical characters on the Egyptian monuments. SEE EGYPT. “They were either engraved in relief, or sunk below the surface on the public monuments and hard materials suited for the glyptic art, or else traced in outline with a reed pen on papyri, wood, slices of stone, and other objects. The scribe indeed, wrote from a. palette or canon called pes, with pens, kash, from two little ink- holes in the palette, containing a black ink of animal charcoal, and a red mineral ink. The hieroglyphics on the monuments are sometimes sculptured and plain; at others, decorated with colors, either one simple tone for all the hieroglyphs, which are then called monochrome, or else ornamented with a variety of colors, and then called polychrome; and those painted on coffins and other objects are often first traced out, and then colored in detail. On the papyri and some few inferior materials they are simply sketched in outline, and are called linear hieroglyphs. The hieroglyphs are arranged in perpendicular columns, separated by lines, or in horizontal, or distributed in a sporadic manner in the area of the picture to which they refer. Sometimes all these modes of arrangement are found together. One peculiarity is at once discernible, that all the animals and representations face in the same direction when they are combined into a text; and when mixed up with reliefs and scenes, they usually face in the direction of the figures to which they are attached. When thus arranged, the reliefs and hieroglyphs resemble a MS., every letter of which should also be an illumination, and they produce a gay and agreeable impression on the  spectator. They are written very square, the spaces are neatly and carefully packed, so as to leave no naked appearance of background.

“The invention of hieroglyphs, called Neter kharu, or ‘divine words,' was attributed to the god Thoth, the Egyptian Logos, who is repeatedly called the scribe of the gods and lord of the hieroglyphs. Pliny attributes their invention to Menon. The literature of the Egyptians was in fact called Hermaic or Hermetic, on account of its supposed divine origin, and the knowledge of hieroglyphs was, to a certain extent, a mystery to the uninitiated, although universally employed by the sacerdotal and instructed classes. To foreign nations, the hieroglyphs always remained so, although Moses is supposed to have been versed in the knowledge of them (Philo, vita Moysis); but Joseph is described (Gen 42:23) as conversing with his brethren through interpreters, and does not appear to allude to hieroglyphic writing. The Greeks, who had settled on the coast as early as the 6th century B.C., do not appear to have possessed more than a colloquial knowledge of the language (Diod. Sic. 81, 3, 4); and although Solon, B.C. 538, is said to have studied Egyptian doctrines at Sebennytus and Heliopolis, and the doctrines of Pythagoras are said to have been derived from Egypt, these sages could only have acquired their knowledge from interpretations of hieroglyphic writings. Hecatseus (B.C. 521) and Herodotus (B.C. 456), who visited Egypt in their travels, obtained from similar sources the information they have afforded of the language or monuments of the country (Herod. 2, 36).

Democritus of Abdera, indeed, about the same period (B.C. 459), had described both the Ethiopian hieroglyphs and the Babylonian cuneiform, but his work has disappeared. After the conquest of Egypt by Alexander, the Greek rulers began to pay attention to the language and history of their subjects, and Eratosthenes, the keeper of the museum at Alexandria, and Manetho, the high-priest of Sebennytus, had drawn up accounts of the national chronology and history from hieroglyphic sources. Under the Roman Empire, in the reign of Augustus, one Chaeremon, the keeper of the library at the Serappeum, had drawn up a dictionary ‘of the hieroglyphs; and both Diodorus and Strabo mention them, and describe their nature. Tacitus, later under the empire, gives the account of the monuments of Thebes translated by the Egyptian priests to Germanicus; but after his time, the knowledge of them beyond Egypt itself was exceedingly limited, and does not reappear till the third and subsequent centuries A.D., when they are mentioned by Ammianus Marcellinus, who cites the translation of one of the obelisks at Rome by  one Hermapion, and by Julius Valerius, the author of the apocryphal life of Alexander, who gives that of another. Heliodorus, a novelist who flourished A.D. 400, describes a hieroglyphic letter written by queen Candace (4, 8). The first positive information on the subject is by Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 211), who mentions the symbolical and phonetic, or, as he calls it, cyriologic nature of hieroglyphics (Strom. 5). Porphyry (A.D. 304) divides them also into coenologic or phonetic, and cenigmatic or symbolic. Horapollo or Horus-Apollus, who is supposed to have flourished about A.D. 500, wrote two books explanatory of the hieroglyphics, a rude, ill-assorted confusion of truth and fiction, in which are given the interpretation of many hieroglyphs, and their esoteric meaning. After this writer, all knowledge of them disappeared till the revival of letters. At the beginning of the 16th century these symbols first attracted attention, and, soon after, Kircher, a learned Jesuit, pretended to interpret them by vague esoteric notions derived from his own fancy, on the supposition that the hieroglyphs were ideographic, a theory which barred all progress, and was held in its full extent by the learned, till Zoega, at the close of the 18th century (De Ornine Obeliscorum, fol. Romans 1797), first enunciated that the duals or cartouches contained royal names, and that the hieroglyphs, or some of them, were used to express sounds” (Chambers, Cyclopedia).

“The knowledge of hieroglyphics which we at present possess owes its origin to the Rosetta stone, which is now in the British Museum. This stone was found by the French among the ruins of Fort St. Julien, which is situated near the mouth of the Rosetta branch of the Nile, and was given up to the English in accordance with the terms of the treaty of Alexandria. It is supposed to have been sculptured about B.C. 195, and contains a decree in honor of Ptolemy V (Epiphanes) written in three different characters. One of these is Greek, and a part of it has been explained to state that the decree was ordered to be written in Sacred, Enchorial, and Greek writing. Dr. Young (Archaeologia, 1817) was the first that attempted to decipher this inscription, in which he partially succeeded by counting the recurrence of the more marked characters in the hieroglyphics, and comparing them with those that occurred about the same number of times in the Greek. Champollion and Wilkinson have followed up Dr. Young's discoveries with great ingenuity, and we can now partially read inscriptions which before were wholly unintelligible to us. Among other obstacles, however, this remains in the way, viz. that the  Rosetta stone was sculptured about B.C. 195, and in Lower Egypt; while the major part of the inscriptions were written during the twelve previous centuries, and are found in Upper Egypt. Hieroglyphics are written either from left to right or right to left, according to the direction in which they face; though sometimes the columns are so narrow that they may be almost said to be written from top to bottom. They are partly pictorial; thus ‘ox,' ‘goose,' temple' are represented by pictures or pictorial symbols of an ox, etc. At other times they are phonetic, and written by an alphabet of about 140 letters, of which many are synonymous; some being adapted for writing, others for sculpture; some in use at an earlier period, others at a later. The powers of these letters are determined by the names of the kings in which they are found; but, as this cannot be done very exactly, they are generally arranged under about twelve of our primary letters. We cannot, however, distinguish accurately between the vowels, or P and PH, and other cognate letters. The names of sovereigns are always written within a- ring or cartouche: those of any other person are distinguished by a sitting figure following them: besides these there is nothing to mark the difference between a letter and a pictorial symbol. In some words the meaning is expressed twice; once by a phonetic combination, and again by a pictorial symbol; in others the more important part is symbolical, and the grammatical termination is spelled. Sometimes also we find a species of abbreviation; thus the word ox would be expressed by the first letter of the Coptic word signifying ox.

“But for the purpose of writing, strictly so called, there was a less ornamental and more rapid way of forming the characters, which is always found in the AISS., and which would be the natural consequence of using the pen or stylus. This is called by Strabo and Pliny hieratic writing, the hieroglyphics being, as the name imports, peculiar to sculpture. It is chiefly by means of the hieroglyphics that we are enabled to read the hieratic writing, the latter being, for the most part an abbreviated way of writing the former. The Rosetta stone contained the inscription in yet another set of characters, the denotic or enchorial. It is to Dr. Young that we owe the greater part of our knowledge on this subject. He was greatly assisted by the discovery of two or three papyri written in this character with Greek translations, the earliest of which dates in the reign of Psammeticus, about B.C. 650. An alphabet has been formed from Greek proper names, from which it appears that the few words which we can decipher are Coptic. In  this writing the hieroglyphics have almost wholly disappeared, though some still appear scattered here and there.”

A popular account of the mode in which the Rosetta stone was used as a key for deciphering the hieroglyphics may be found in Dr. Hawks's Egypt and its Monuments (N. Y. 1850, 8vo), and a more critical statement in Osburn's Monumental History of Egypt (London, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo). A complete set of the cartouches of the kings is given by Poole in his Horae Egyptiacae (Lond. 1851, 8vo). Great progress has of late been made in ,the decipherment of these records, another stone having quite recently been discovered with a bilingual inscription (Lepsius, Das bilingue Decret von Kanopus, texts and interlineal translations, etc., Berl. 1867 sq., 4to), and many papyri having been brought to light and read by European Egyptologists, among whom Wilkinson, Lepsins, Dumichen, and Brugsch may be especially named. The annexed view of the hieroglyphical alphabet is taken from Gliddon's Lectures on Egyptian History (N. Y. 1843, imp. 8vo), and will be found sufficient for deciphering most of the royal names. A brief account of the language which these characters represent may be found in Rawlinson's Herodotus, vol. 2. A tolerably complete view of the subject and its literature is contained in Appleton's New American Cyclopedia, s.v. The following are some of the latest works of importance on the subject: Sharpe, Egyptian Hieroglyphics (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Parrot, Nouvelle Traduction des Hieroglyphes (Par. 1857, fol.); Tattam, Grammar of the Egyptian Language (London, 1863, 8vo); Brugsch, Hieroglyphisches-Demotisches Wörterbuch (of an extensive character, with a full hieroglyphical grammar, Leips. 1867 sq.). SEE INSCRIPTIONS.

## Hierogrammatists[[@Headword:Hierogrammatists]]

             (from ἱερός, sacred, and γραμματεύς, a scribe), the sacred scribes among the ancient Egyptians. They employed the hieratic writing (q.v.), in transcribing religious writings on prapyri. and in giving an account of religious rites and ceremonies. It was their duty also to expound the sacred mysteries as far as they were allowed to be made known to the people. They carried a wand, and were dressed in linen garments. SEE SCRIBE.

## Hieromancy[[@Headword:Hieromancy]]

             (from ἱερός, sacred, and μαντεία, divination), a species of divination among the ancient Greeks and Romans, which consisted in predicting future events by observing the various appearances which presented themselves in the act of offering sacrifices. SEE DIVINATION.

H

ierom

onach

i (from ἱερός sacred, and μοναχός, a monk), monks of the Russo-Greek Church (q.v.), who are priests. They are considered sacred monks, and never officiate except on solemn festival occasions.

## Hieromax[[@Headword:Hieromax]]

             a river of Palestine (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 5, 16), the Jarmoch of the Talmud; now Nahr Yarmuk (Edrisi and Abulfeda), or Sheriat el-Mandhur (Ritter, 15, 372). The principal sources are near Mezarib, where they form a lake of half an hour in circumference. — Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 321.

## Hieromnemon[[@Headword:Hieromnemon]]

             (Gr. ἱερομνήμων). I. The title m ancient history of that one of the two deputies sent by each tribe to the Amphictyonic Council who superintended the religious rites. II. An officer in the Greek Church, who, during service, stands behind the bishop, and points out to him in order the  psalms, prayers, etc. He also dresses the patriarchs, and shows the priests to their places. — Pierer, 8, 368; Brande, 2, 124. (J. W. M.)

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

             a clergyman of the Church of England, somewhat inclined to Puritanism, was born in 1572, was educated at King's College, Cambridge, and was presented to the living of Modbury, Devonshire, which he held till his death in 1617. He was very eloquent as well as pious. His sermons, in two volumes, were published in 1635. — Darling, Cyclop. Biog. 1, 1470.

## Hieronymi, Wilhelm[[@Headword:Hieronymi, Wilhelm]]

             a preacher of the German Catholics, was originally a Protestant, but joined the movement of the German Catholics in 1845, and died at Mayence, Sept. 14,1884. He published, Kein Papstthum! Kein Symbolwang (Magdeburg, 1845): — Die Hegelianer als Lichtfreunde (Darmstadt, 1846): — Zeugnisse deutsch-katholischen Geistes (1847): — Freheit oder Autoriftdt, written against bishop Ketteler (1862); See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:554 sq. (B.P.)

## Hieronymites[[@Headword:Hieronymites]]

             or Eremites of the Order of Jerome, a monkish order which was first established about 1370 by the Portuguese Vasco and the Spaniard Peter Fred. Pecha, and was accredited by Gregory XI in 1373. Their dress is a white habit and a black scapulary. In Spain and the Netherlands this order became very opulent, being possessed of many convents; Charles V belonged to this order after his abdication. They spread also into the West Indies and Spanish America. At present they exist only in the latter country. Besides these, there exists also another order by the same name, with, however, but few members, founded by Peter Gambacorti, of Pisa, about 1380. — Helyot, Ord. Monast. ed. Migne, 3, 568; Brockhaus, Encyklop. 8, 916. (J. H.W.)

## Hieronymus[[@Headword:Hieronymus]]

             ( ῾Ιερώνυμος, sacred in name, Vulg. Hieronymus), a Syrian general in the time of Antiochus V. Eupator (2Ma 12:2). The name was made distinguished among the Asiatic Greeks by Hieronymus of Cardia, the historian of Alexander's successors. Smith.

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

             SEE JEROME, ST.

## Hieronymus A Sancta Fide[[@Headword:Hieronymus A Sancta Fide]]

             (originally Joshua Lorki) was a famous Talmudist and physician. When rabbi Salomon. afterwards bishop Paulus Burgensis (q.v.), had embraced and was preaching the Christian faith in Spain, Joshua Lorki wrote against him. But soon this zealous enemy of the gospel became himself an ardent confessor of the truth, and failed not to declare openly the reason which had given rise to this change in his religious opinions, by publishing two tracts against the Jews, Probationes Novi Test. ex Vetere Testamento (reprinted in the Bibl. Mag. Vet. Patrum, 29). At the instigation of Hieronymus, who, after his baptism, entered the service of pope Benedict  XIII, being appointed his physician, the famous conference was held at Tortosa (February 7, 1413, to November 12, 1414), under the presidency of the pope. The assembly was convened to discuss sixteen points, which were proposed by Hieronymus. Prominent among the Jewish disputants was Joseph Albo (q.v.). The result of this conference is passed over by Jewish historians with remarkable silence. According to the Christians, all the rabbis present declared themselves vanquished, and signed an act to that effect, with the exception of Albo and rabbi Ferrer. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:392; Kalkar, Israel und die Kirche, page 28 sq.; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, page 328 sq. (B.P.)

## Hierophant or Mystagogus[[@Headword:Hierophant or Mystagogus]]

             (Gr. ἱεροφάντης, μυσταγωηός).

I. The high-priest of Demeter who conducted the celebration of the Eleusinian Mysteries and initiated the candidates, being always one of the Eumolpidae, and a citizen of Attica. The office was for life, and regarded  of high religious importance, and the hierophant was required to be of mature age to be without physical defects, to possess a fine, sonorous voice suited to the character and dignity of the office, and was forbidden to marry, though that prohibition may have applied only to contracting marriage after his installation. He was distinguished by a peculiar cut of his hair, by the strophion, a sort of diadem, and by a long purple robe. In the Mysteries he represented the Demiurge or World-creator, was the only authorized custodian and expositor of the unwritten laws (hence also styled προφήτης), and the utterance of his name in the presence of the uninitiated was forbidden.

II. The name is also given in the Greek Church to the prior of a monastery. — Chambers, s.v.; Pierer, 8, 370; Smith, Dict. of Grk. and Romans Antiq. s.v. Eumolpidue; Brande. Dict. 2, 125. SEE HIEROMNEMON. (J.W. M.)

## Hieropoioi[[@Headword:Hieropoioi]]

             (from ἱερός, sacred, and ποιέω, to make), persons anciently employed at Athens to superintend the oblations and sacrifices. Ten of these officers were appointed annually, and they wore at their girdles a consecrated axe as an emblem of their office.

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

             a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Berks County, Pa., Oct. 11, 1770. In youth he learned the trade of carpenter. He pursued his classical and theological studies with Rev. Daniel Wagner, of York, Pa. He was licensed and ordained in 1799. For a short time he served several congregations in Lancaster County, Pa., when he was called to Lebanon, Lebanon County, Pa., in which charge he labored till his death, Feb. 8, 1828. He is remembered in the German Reformed Church for his earnest piety, great zeal in his pastoral work, and the active interest he took in the establishment of its Theological Seminary. He preached both in the German and English languages. (H. H.)

## Higbert[[@Headword:Higbert]]

             (Hygbehrt), 14th bishop of Lichfield, A.D. 779, and the only one entitled archbishop of that see. See Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v.

## Higbie, Elnathan Elisha[[@Headword:Higbie, Elnathan Elisha]]

             a German Reformed minister and educator, was born at St. George, Vermont, March 27, 1830. He graduated from the University of Vermont in 1849, and completed his theological course at Mercersburg, Pennsylvania. In 1864, while Dr. Philip Schaff was in Europe, he occupied the chair of church history and exegesis, and in 1866 was elected to succeed him. In 1871 he was made president of Mercersburg College, and in 1881 appointed superintendent of public instruction for Pennsylvania, which position he held until his death, December 13, 1888. He was a frequent contributor to the Mercersburg Review.

## Higden, Ranulph or Ralph[[@Headword:Higden, Ranulph or Ralph]]

             an English writer of the 14th century, was a Benedictine monk of the monastery of St. Werberg, in Cheshire, who died at a very advanced age in 1367 according to Bale, or in 1373 according to Pits. His Polychronicon, a chronicle of events from the Creation to A.D. 1357, was written originally in Latin, and translated into English in 1387 by John of Trevisa. From this translation Caxton made his version, and, continuing in an eighth book the Chronicle to 1460, published the whole under the title of The: Polycronycon, conteynag the Barngqes and Dedes of many Times, in eight Books, etc. (1482, fol.). Trevisa's translation “contains many rare words and expressions, and is one of the earliest specimens of English prose.” The first volume of a new edition (containing also a translation by an unknown  writer of the 15th century), edited by C. Babington, B.D., appeared in 1865. The Polychronicon is frequently cited by English historians. Bale published the part relating to the Britons and Saxons in his Scriptores Quindecim, etc. (Oxford, 1691). Some have assigned the authorship of the Chester Mysteries (1382) to Higden, but on doubtful grounds. — Bale, Illust. Maj. Brit. Script. Summe.; Pits, De illust. An Script.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 656; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. 6, 83; Westminster Review, July, 1865, p. 128. (J.W. M.)

## Higgaion[[@Headword:Higgaion]]

             (Heb. higgayon', הַגָּיוֹן) occurs in Psa 92:3, where, according to Gesenius, it signifies the murmuring (Farst, low or solemn) tone of the harp, Sept. μετ᾿ ᾠδῆς ἐν κιθάρᾷ. In Psa 9:17, Higgaion Selah is a musical sign, prob. for a pause in the instrumental interlude, Sept. ᾠδὴ διὰ ψάλματος; and so Symn. Aqu. and Vulg. SEE SELAH. In Psalm 19:15 the term signifies (and is rendered) meditation, in Lam 3:62 a device. “Mendelsson translates it meditation, thought, idea. Knapp (Die Psalmen) identifies it in Psa 9:17 with the Arabic הגי, and הגא, ‘to mock,' and hence-his rendering ‘What a shout of laughter!' (because the wicked are entrapped in their own snares); but in Psa 92:4 he translates it by ‘Lieder' (songs). R. David Kimchi likewise assigns two separate meanings to the word; on Psa 9:17, he says, This aid is for us (a subject of) meditation and thankfulness,' while in his commentary on the passage, Psa 92:4, he gives to the same word the signification of melody, This is the melody of the hymn when it is recited (played) on the harp.' ‘We will meditate on this forever' (Rashi, Comment. on Psa 9:17). In Psalms 9; Psalms 17, Aben Ezra's comment on ‘Higgaion Selah' is, ‘this will I record in truth:' on Psa 92:4 he says, ‘Higgaion means the melody of the hymn, or it is the name of a musical instrument.' It would seem, then, that Higgaion has two meanings, one of a general character implying thought, reflection, from הגה(comp. יהגיון לבי, Psa 9:17, and והגיונם עלי כל היום, Lam 3:62), and another in Psa 9:17, and Psa 92:4, of a technical nature, bearing on the import of musical sounds or signs well known in the age of David, but the precise meaning of which cannot at this distance of time be determined.” SEE PSALMS.

## Higgins, Solomon[[@Headword:Higgins, Solomon]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Maryland in January, 1792. In his twenty-second year he began to preach, but failing health compelled him to quit the ministry, and for several years he was employed as a clerk in Philadelphia. In 1821 he resumed his pastoral connections, and the remainder of his life was spent in the service of the Church as pastor and as Sunday-school agent. He was several times stationed in Philadelphia, and was a member of the General Conferences of 1828, 1892, 1836, and 1840. He died Feb. 12, 1867. — Minutes of Conferences, 1867, p. 24.

## Higgins, William, D.D[[@Headword:Higgins, William, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Church of Ireland, was born at Greenfield, Lancaster, England, in 1793, and was educated at the Lancaster and Manchester grammar schools, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, from which he graduated in 1817. His first clerical duty in Ireland was as chaplain to the Richmond Penitentiary, in 1820, subsequently he was chaplain to the Magdalen Asylum, rector of Roscrea in 1828, vicar-general of Killaloe in 1834, dean of Limerick in 1844, bishop of Limerick in 1849, and bishop of Derry in 1853. The same year he was appointed commissioner of national education, and he succeeded bishop Plunket as an ecclesiastical commissioner. He died at Derry, July 12, 1867. See Amer. Quar. Rev. October 1867, page 505.

## Higginson, Francis[[@Headword:Higginson, Francis]]

             a Congregational minister and first pastor of Salem, Mass., was born in England in 1587, graduated at Emanuel College, Cambridge, and was appointed minister of a church in Leicester. After some time he became a nonconformist, and was excluded from the parish church. In 1629 he received letters from the governor and company of Massachusetts inviting him to proceed with them to New England. He accordingly sailed, and on his arrival at Salem he was appointed pastor of the church. He died of hectic fever in August, 1630. He wrote New England's Plantation, or a short and true Description of the Commodities and Discommodities of that Country, (Lond. 1630, 4to). See Allen, Am. Biog. Dictionary Sprague, Annals, 1, 6.

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

             son of the preceding, was born in England in August, 1616, and came to Massachusetts with his parents in 1629. In 1636 he removed to Connecticut, engaging in teaching and in theological studies. From 1659 until his death in 1708 he was minister of the church at Salem, Mass. He was zealously engaged in controversy with the Quakers, but subsequently regretted his ardor in persecution. He published several sermons and pamphlets. See Sprague, Annals, 1, 91.

## Higgs, Griffin (Or Griffith), D.D[[@Headword:Higgs, Griffin (Or Griffith), D.D]]

             an English clergyman, was born at Stoke Abbot, or South Stoke, near Henley, Oxfordshire, in 1589, and was educated at Reading School and St. John's College, Oxford. In 1627 he was sent to the Hague as chaplain to  the queen of Bohemia. On his return he was presented to the living of Cliffe, near Dover, and was also made chanter of St. David's. In 1638 he was made dean of Lichfield. He lost all his preferments when the Church establishment was overthrown. He died December 16, 1659. His published works are, Problemata Theologica (1630): — Miscellaneae Theses Theologicae (eod.).

## High Altar[[@Headword:High Altar]]

             is the chief, central, or principal altar of a church. Other altars, in old documents, are often called "low altars," to distinguish them from that which is the chief altar. When there are many chapels in a church, clustering on either side of the chief chapel or chancel, the principal chancel, containing the high. altar, is sometimes called the "high chancel." SEE ALTAR.

## High Commission, Court of[[@Headword:High Commission, Court of]]

             a court established in England in 1559 to take cognizance of spiritual or ecclesiastical offences, and to inflict penalties for the same. The Puritans complaining loudly of the jurisdiction of this court, a bill passed for putting down both it and the Star-Chamber in the year 1641. — Neal, Hist. of Puritans, 1, 89 sq.

## High Mass[[@Headword:High Mass]]

             The Mass in the Church of Rome consists in the “consecration of the bread and wine ‘into the body and blood of Christ,' as they say, and the offering up of the same body and blood to God by the ministry of the priest for a perpetual memorial of Christ's sacrifice upon the cross, and a continuation of the same unto the world's end.” High Mass is the same service, accompanied by all the ceremonies which custom and authority have annexed to its celebration, and read before the high altar on Sundays, fast- days, and particular occasions. SEE MASS.

## High place[[@Headword:High place]]

             (בָּמָה, bamah'; often in the plural, בָּמוֹת; Sept. in the historical books, τὰ ὑψηλά, τὰ ὕψη; in the Prophets, βωμοί; in the Pentateuch, στήλαι, Lev 26:30, etc.; and once εἴδωλα, Eze 16:16; Vulg. excelsa, fana) often occurs in connection with the term grove. By “high places” we understand natural or artificial (בָּתֵּי בָמוֹת, 1Ki 13:32; 1Ki 16:29; comp. 1Ki 11:7; 2Ki 23:15) eminences where worship by sacrifice or offering was made, usually upon an altar erected thereon; and by a “grove” we understand a plantation of trees around a spot in the open air set apart for worship and other sacred services, and therefore around or upon the “high places” which were set apart for the same purposes. SEE GROVE.

We find traces of these customs so soon after the deluge that it is probable they existed prior to that event. It appears that the first altar after the deluge was built by Noah upon the mountain on which the ark rested (Gen 8:20). Abraham, on entering the Promised Land, built an altar upon a mountain between Beth-el and Hai (Gen 12:7-8). At Beersheba he planted a grove, and called there upon the name of the everlasting God (Gen 21:33). The same patriarch was required to travel to the Mount Moriah, and there to offer up his son Isaac (Gen 22:2; Gen 22:4). It was upon a mountain in Gilead that Jacob and Laban offered sacrifices before they parted in peace (Gen 31:54). In fact, such seem to have been the general places of worship in those times; nor does any notice of a temple, or other covered or enclosed building for that purpose, occur. Thus far all seems clear and intelligible. There is no reason in the mere nature of things why a hill or a grove should be an objectionable, or, indeed, why it should not be a very suitable place for worship. Yet by the time the Israelites returned from Egypt, some corrupting change had taken place, which caused them to be repeatedly and strictly enjoined to overthrow and destroy the high places and groves of the Canaanites wherever they found them (Exo 34:13; Deu 7:5; Deu 12:2-3). That they were not themselves to worship the Lord on high places or in groves is implied in the fact that they were to have but one altar for regular and constant sacrifice; and it was expressly enjoined that near this sole altar no trees should be planted (Deu 16:21). SEE ALTAR. The external religion of the patriarchs was in some outward observances different from that subsequently established by the Mosaic law, and therefore they should not be condemned for actions which afterwards became sinful only because they were forbidden (Heidegger, Hist. Patr. II, 3 § 53). It is, however, quite obvious that if every grove and eminence had been suffered to become a place for legitimate worship, especially in a country where they had already been defiled with the sins of polytheism, the utmost danger would have resulted to the pure worship of the one true God (Havernick, Einl. 1, 592). It would infallibly have led to the adoption of nature- goddesses and “gods of the hills” (1Ki 20:23). It was therefore implicitly forbidden by the law of Moses (Deu 12:11-14), which also gave the strictest injunction to destroy these monuments of Canaanitish idolatry (Lev 26:30; Num 33:52; Deu 33:29; where Sept. τραχήλων), without stating any general reason for this command beyond the fact that they had been  connected with such associations. It seems, however, to be assumed that every Israelite would perfectly understand why groves and high places were prohibited, and therefore they are only condemned by virtue of the injunction to use but one altar for the purpose of sacrifice (Lev 17:3-4; Deuteronomy 12, passim; 16:21; Joh 4:20). This practice, indeed, was probably of great antiquity in Palestine. Upon the summit of lofty Hermon are the remains of a small and very ancient temple, towards which faced a circle of temples surrounding the mountain. SEE HERMON.

That a temple should have been built on a summit of bare rock perpetually covered with snow shows a strong religious motive, and the position of the temples around the mountain indicates a belief in the sanctity of Hermon itself. This inference is supported by a passage in the treaty of Rameses II with the Hittites of Syria, in which, besides gods and goddesses, the mountains and the rivers, both of the land of the Hittites and of Egypt, and the winds, are mentioned, in a list of Hittite and Egyptian divinities. The Egyptian divinities are spoken of from a Hittite point of view. for the expression ‘the mountains and the rivers of the land of Egypt” is only half applicable to the Egyptian nature-worship, which had, in Egypt at least, but one sacred river (Lepsius, Denk Eanler, 3, 146; Brugsch, Geographische Inschriften, 2, 29; De Rouge, in Rev. Arch. nouv. ser. 4:372). SEE HITTITE.

That Hermon was worshipped in connection with Baal is probable from the name Mount Baal-Hermon (Jdg 3:3), Baal- Hermon (1Ch 5:23) being apparently given to it, Baal being, as the Egyptian monuments indicate, the chief god of the Hittites. That there was such a belief in the sanctity of mountains and hills seems evident from the great number of high places of the old inhabitants, which is clearly indicated in the prohibition of their worship as compared with the statement of the disobedience of the Israelites. SEE HILT.

The injunctions, however, respecting the high places and groves were very imperfectly obeyed by the Israelites; and their inveterate attachment to this mode of worship was such that even pious kings, who opposed idolatry by all the means in their power, dared not abolish the high places at which the Lord was worshipped. It appears likely that this toleration of an acknowledged irregularity arose from the indisposition of the people living at a distance from the Temple to be confined to the altar which existed there; to their determination to have places nearer home for the chief acts of their religion-sacrifice and offering; and to the apprehension of the kings that if they were prevented from having places for offerings to the Lord in  their own neighborhood they would make the offerings to idols. Moreover, the Mosaic command was a prospective one, and was not to come into force until such times as the tribes were settled in the Promised Land, and “had rest from all their enemies round about.” Thus we find that both Gideon and Manoah built altars on high places by divine command (Jdg 6:25-26; Jdg 13:16-23), and it is quite clear from the tone of the book of Judges that the law on the subject was either totally forgotten or practically obsolete.

Nor could the unsettled state of the country have been pleaded as an excuse, since it seems to have been most fully understood, even during the life of Joshua, that burnt-offerings could be legally offered on one altar only (Jos 22:29). It is more surprising to find this law absolutely ignored at a much later period, when there was no intelligible reason for its violation-as by Samuel at Mizpeh (1Sa 7:10) and at Bethlehem (1Sa 16:5); by Saul at Gilgal (1Sa 13:9) and at Ajalon (1Sa 14:35); by David on the threshing floor of Ornan (1Ch 21:26); by Elijah on Mount Carmel (1Ki 18:30); and by other prophets (1Sa 10:5). It will, however, be observed that in these cases the parties either acted under an immediate command from God, or were invested with a general commission of similar force with reference to such transactions. It has also been suggested that greater latitude was allowed in this point before the erection of the Temple gave to the ritual principles of the ceremonial law a fixity which they had not previously possessed. This is possible, for it is certain that all the authorized examples occur before it was built, excepting that of Elijah; and that occurred under circumstances in which the sacrifices could not possibly have taken place at Jerusalem, and in a kingdom where no authorized altar to Jehovah then existed.

The Rabbins have invented elaborate methods to account for the anomaly: thus they say that high places were allowed until the building of the tabernacle; that they were then illegal until the arrival at Gilgal, and then during the period while the tabernacle was at Shiloh; that they were once more permitted while it was at Nob and Gibeon (compare 2Ch 1:3), until the building of the Temple at Jerusalem rendered them finally unlawful (R. Sol. Jarchi, Abarbanel, etc., quoted in Carpzov, App. Crit. p. 333 sq.; Relanid, Ant. Hebrews 1, 8 sq.). ‘Others content themselves with saying that until Solomon's time all Palestine was considered holy ground, or that there existed a recognized exemption in favor of high places for private and spontaneous, though not for the stated and public sacrifices. Such explanations are sufficiently unsatisfactory; but it is at any rate certain that,  whether from the obvious temptations to disobedience, or from the example of other nations, or from ignorance of any definite law against it, the worship in high places was organized and all but universal throughout Judaea, not only during (1Ki 3:2-4), but even after the time of Solomon. The convenience of them was evident, because, as local centers of religious worship, they obviated the unpleasant and dangerous necessity of visiting Jerusalem for the celebration of the yearly feasts (2Ki 23:9). The tendency was engrained in the national mind; and, although it was severely reprehended by the later historians, we have no proof that it was known to be sinful during the earlier periods of the monarchy, except, of course, where it was directly connected with idolatrous abominations (1Ki 11:7; 2Ki 23:13). In fact, the high places seem to have supplied the need of synagogues (Psa 74:8), and to have obviated the extreme self-denial involved in having but one legalized locality for the highest forms of worship. Thus we find that Rehoboam established a definite worship at the high places, with its own peculiar and separate priesthood (2Ch 11:15; 2Ki 23:9), the members of which were still considered to be priests of Jehovah (although in 2Ki 23:5 they are called by the opprobrious term כְּמָרַים). It was therefore no wonder that Jeroboam found it so easy to seduce the people into his symbolic worship at the high places of Dan and Bethel. at each of which he built a chapel for his golden calves. Such chapels were, of course, frequently added to the mere altars on the hills, as appears from the expressions in 1Ki 11:7; 2Ki 17:9, etc. Indeed, the word בָּמוֹתbecame so common that it was used for any idolatrous shrine even in a valley (Jer 7:31), or in the streets of cities (2Ki 17:9; Eze 16:31). These chapels were probably not structures of stone, but mere tabernacles hung with colored tapestry (Eze 16:16; Aqu., Theod. ἐμβόλισμα; see Jeremiah ad loc.; Sept. εἴδωλον ῥαπτόν), like the σκηνὴ ἱερά of the Carthaginians (Diod. Sic. 20:65; Creuzer, Symbol. 5, 176), and like those mentioned in 2Ki 23:7; Amo 5:26. Many of the pious kings of Judah were either too weak or too ill-informed to repress the worship of Jehovah at these local sanctuaries, while they of course endeavored to prevent it from being contaminated with polytheism. It is therefore appended as a matter of blame or a (perhaps venial) drawback to the character of some of the most pious princes, that they tolerated this disobedience to the provisions of Deuteronomy and Leviticus. On the other hand, it is mentioned as an aggravation of the sinfulness of other kings that they built or raised high places (2Ch 21:11; 2Ch 28:25), which are generally said to have been dedicated to idolatrous purposes. It is almost inconceivable that so direct a violation of the theocratic principle as the public existence of false worship should have been tolerated by kings of even ordinary piety, much less by the highest sacerdotal authorities (2Ki 12:3). When, therefore, we find the recurring phrase, “Only the high places were not taken away; as yet the people did sacrifice and burn incense on the high places” (2Ki 14:4; 2Ki 15:5; 2Ki 15:35; 2Ch 15:17, etc.), we are forced to limit it (as above) to places dedicated to Jehovah only. The subject, however, is made more difficult by a seeming discrepancy, for the assertion that Asa “took away the high places” (2Ch 14:3) is opposite to what is stated in the first book of Kings (1Ki 15:14), and a similar discrepancy is found in the case of Jehoshaphat (2Ch 17:6; 2Ch 20:33). Moreover, in both instances the chronicler is apparently at issue with himself (14:3; 15:17; 17:6; 20:33). It is incredible that this should have been the result of carelessness or oversight, and we must therefore suppose, either that the earlier notices expressed the will and endeavor of these monarchs to remove the high places, and that the later ones recorded their failure in the attempt (Ewald, Gesch. 3, 468; Keil, Apolog. Versuch. p. 290), or that the statements refer respectively to Bamoth dedicated to Jehovah and to idols (Michaelis, Schulz, Bertheau on 2Ch 17:6, etc.). “Those devoted to false gods were removed, those misdevoted to the true God were suffered to remain. The kings opposed impiety, but winked at error” (bishop Hall). At last Hezekiah set himself in good earnest to the suppression of this prevalent corruption (2Ki 18:4; 2Ki 18:22), both in Judah and Israel (2Ch 31:1), although, so rapid was the growth of the evil, that even his sweeping reformation required to be finally consummated by Josiah (2 Kings 23), and that, too, in Jerusalem and its immediate neighborhood (2Ch 34:3). The measure must have caused a very violent shock to the religious prejudices of a large number of people, and we have a curious and almost unnoticed trace of this resentment in the fact that Rabshakeh appeals to the discontented faction, and represents Hezekiah as a dangerous innovator who had provoked God's anger by his arbitrary impiety (2Ki 18:22; 2Ch 32:12). After the time of Josiah we find no further mention of these Jehovistic high places.  As long as the nations continued to worship the heavenly bodies themselves, they worshipped in the open air, holding that no walls could contain infinitude. Afterwards, when the symbol of fire or of images brought in the use of temples, they were usually built in groves and upon high places, and sometimes without roofs. The principle on which high places were preferred is said to have been that they were nearer to the gods, and that on them prayer was more acceptable than in the valleys (Lucian, De Sacrif. 1, 4). SEE HILL.

The ancient writers abound in allusions to this worship of the gods upon the hill-tops; and some of their divinities took their distinctive names from the hill on which their principal seat of worship stood, such as Mercurius Cyllenius, Venus Erycina, Jupiter Capitolinus, etc. (see especially Sophocles, Trachin. 1207, 1208; Appian, De Bello Mlithrid. § 131; compare Creuzer. Symbol. 1, 150).  We find that the Trojans sacrificed to Zeus on Mount Ida (II. 10, 171), and we are repeatedly told that such was the custom of the Persians, Greeks, Germans, etc. (Herod. 1, 131; Xenoph. Cyrop. 8, 7; Mem. 3, 8, § 10; Strabo, 15, 732). To this general custom we find constant allusion in the Bible (Isa 65:7; Jer 3:6; Eze 6:13; Eze 18:6; Hos 4:13), and it is especially attributed to the Moabites (Isa 15:2; Isa 16:12; Jer 48:35). Evident traces of a similar usage are depicted on the Assyrian monuments. The groves which ancient usage had established around the places of sacrifice for the sake of shade and seclusion, idolatry preserved, not only for the same reasons, but because they were found convenient for the celebration of the rites and mysteries, often obscene and abominable, which were gradually superadded. According to Pliny (book 12), trees were also anciently consecrated to particular divinities, as the esculus to Jove, the laurel to Apollo, the olive to Minerva, the myrtle to Venus, the poplar to Hercules. It was also believed that as the heavens have their proper and peculiar deities, so also the woods have theirs, being the Fauns, the Sylvans, and certain goddesses. To this it may be added that groves were enjoined by the Roman law of the Twelve Tables as part of the public religion. Plutarch (Nuna, 1, 61) calls such groves. ἄλση θεῶν, “groves of the gods,” which he says Numa frequented, and thereby gave rise to the story of his intercourse with the goddess Egeria. In fact, a degree of worship was, as Pliny states, transferred to the trees themselves. They were sometimes decked with ribbons and rich cloths, lamps were placed on them, the spoils of enemies were hung from them, vows were  paid to them, and their branches were encumbered with votive offerings. Traces of this arborolatry still exist everywhere, both in Moslem and Christian countries; and even the Persians, who abhorred images as much as the Hebrews ever did, rendered homage to certain trees. The story is well known of the noble plane-tree near Sardis, before which Xerxes halted his army a whole day while he rendered homage to it, and hung royal offerings upon its branches (Herod. 5, 31). There is much curious literature connected with this subject which we leave untouched, but the reader may consult Sir W. Ouseley's learned dissertation on Sacred Trees, appended to the first volume of his Travels in the East. SEE IDOLATRY.

Mr. Paine remarks (Solomon's Temple, etc., Bost. 1861, p. 21), “the ‘high place, בָּמָה, mound, was small enough to be made and built in every street, at the head of every way (Eze 16:24-25), in all their cities (2Ki 17:9), and upon every high hill, and under every green tree (1Ki 14:23). It could be torn to pieces, beaten small as dust, and burnt up (2Ki 23:15). Thus it [often] was of combustible materials.... These mounds, with their altars, were built in the streets, where people could assemble around them. When on the hills out of the city they lasted many years; for' the mounds built by Solomon on the right hand or south side of the Mount of Destruction before Jerusalem, were destroyed by Josiah (2Ki 23:13; 1Ki 11:7), nearly four hundred years after they were built. But mounds of earth no larger than Indian-corn or potato-hills will last a great number of years, and those somewhat larger for centuries (compare the Indian mounds in the West). That the mounds destroyed by Josiah had lasted so many centuries is a proof that they were not wholly of wood; that they could be burnt is a proof that they were not wholly of stone; that they could be beaten to dust indicates that they were made of anything that came readiest to hand, as earth, soil, etc. For the houses of the mounds, or high places, in which were images of their gods, see 2Ki 17:29; priests of these places of worship, 1Ki 12:32; 1Ki 13:2; 1Ki 13:33; 2Ki 17:32; 2Ki 23:9; 2Ki 23:20; beds for fornication and adultery, in the tents about the mounds, Isa 57:3-7; Eze 16:16; Eze 16:25, etc. Some of these houses were tents, for women wove them (2Ki 23:7). The peoplemen, women, children, and priests-assembled in groves, on hills and mountains, or in the streets of their cities; threw up a mound, on which they built their altar; set up the wooden idol [Asherah] before the altar;  pitched their tents around it under the trees; sacrificed their sons and daughters, sometimes on the altar (Eze 16:20), and committed fornication and adultery in the tents, where also they had the images of their gods.”

## High-Churchmen[[@Headword:High-Churchmen]]

             a name first given (circa 1700) to the nonjurors in England who refused to acknowledge William III as their lawful king. It is now usually applied to those in the Church of England and in the American Protestant Episcopal Church who hold exalted notions ( f Church prerogatives, and of the  powers committed to the clergy, and who lay much stress upon ritual observances and the traditions of the fathers. See Walcott, Sacred Archceology, p. 312; Hurst, Hist. Rationalism, p. 512 sq.; Kurtz, Ch. History, 2, 339; Baxter, Ch. Hist. 2, 549; Skeats, Hist. of Free Churches, p. 289, 317, 318, 343; Rose, Hist. Chr. Ch. p. 370; Eden, Theol. Dictionary; and articles SEE ENGLAND, CHURCH OF; and SEE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

## High-priest[[@Headword:High-priest]]

             (הִכֹּהֵן, hak-kohen', the ordinary word for “priest,” with the article, i.e. “the priest;” and in the books subsequent to the Pentateuch with the frequent addition הִגָּדֹל, the great, and הָרֹאשׁ, “the head? Lev 21:10 seems to exhibit the epithet גָּדֹל [as ἐπίσκοπος and διάκονος in the N.T.] in a transition state, not yet wholly technical; and the same may be said of Num 35:25, where the explanation at the end of the verse, “which was anointed with the holy oil,” seems to show that the epithet כֹּהֵןwas not yet quite established as distinctive of the chief priest [comp. Num 35:28]. In all other passages of the Pentateuch it is simply “the priest,” Exo 29:30; Exo 29:44; Lev 16:32; or yet more frequently “Aaron,” or “Aaron the priest,” as Num 3:6; Num 4:33; Lev 1:7, etc. So, too, “Eleazar the priest,” Num 27:22; Num 31:26; Num 31:29; Num 31:31, etc. In fact- there could be no such distinction in the time of Moses, since the priesthood was limited to Aaron and his sons. In the Sept. ὁ ἀρχιερεύς, or ἱερεύς, where the Heb. has only ,;.3. So likewise in the N.T. ἀρχιερεύς, often merely a “chief priest.” Vulgate, Sacerdos magnus, or primus pontifex, princeps sacerdotum), the head of the Jewish hierarchy, and a lineal descendant of Aaron.

I. The legal view of the high-priest's office comprises all that the law of Moses ordained respecting it. The first distinct separation of Aaron to the office of the priesthood, which previously belonged to the firstborn, was that recorded in Exodus 28. A partial anticipation of this call occurred at the gathering of the manna (Exodus 16), when Moses bade Aaron take a pot of manna, and lay it up before the Lord: which implied that the ark of the Testimony would thereafter be under Aaron's charge, though it was not at that time in existence. The taking up of Nadab and Abihu with their father Aaron to the Mount, where they beheld the glory of the God of Israel, seems also to have been intended as a preparatory intimation of Aaron's hereditary priesthood. See also Exo 27:21. But it was not till the completion of the directions for making the tabernacle and its furniture that the distinct order was given to Moses, “Take thou unto thee  Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him. from among the children of Israel, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office, even Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, Aaron's sons” (Exo 28:1). So after the order for the priestly garments to be made “for Aaron and his sons,” it is added, “and the priest's office shall be theirs for a perpetual statute; and thou shalt consecrate Aaron and his soils,' and “I will sanctify both Aaron and his sons to minister to me in the priest's office,” Exo 29:9; Exo 29:44.

We find from the very first the following characteristic attributes of Aaron and the high-priests his successors, as distinguished from the other priests.

1. Aaron alone was anointed. “He poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him to sanctify him” (Lev 8:12) ‘whence one of the distinctive epithets of the high-priest was הִמָּשַׁיח

הִכֹּהֵן, “the anointed priest” (Lev 4:3; Lev 4:5; Lev 4:16; Lev 21:10; see Num 35:25). This appears also from Exo 29:29-30, where it is ordered that the one of the sons of Aaron who succeeds him in the priest's office shall wear the holy garments that were Aaron's for seven days, to he anointed therein, and to be consecrated in them. Hence Eusebius (Hist. Ecclesiastes 1, 6; Dem. Evang. 8) understands the Anointed (A.V. “Messiah,” or, as the Sept. reads, χρίσμα) in Dan 9:26, the anointing of the Jewish high-priests: “It means nothing else than the succession of high-priests, whom the Scripture commonly calls χρισταύς, anointed” and so, too, Tertullian and Theodoret (Rosenm. ad loc;) The anointing of the sons of Aaron, i.e. the common priests, seems to have been confined to sprinkling their garments with the anointing oil (Exo 29:21; Exo 28:41, etc.), though, according to Kalisch on Exo 29:8, and Lightfoot, following the Rabbinical interpretation, the difference consists in the abundant pouring of oil (יָצִק) on the head of the high-priest. from whence it was drawn with the finger into two streams, in the shape of a Greek X, while the priests were merely marked with the finger dipped in ail on the forehead (מָשִׁח), But this is probably a late invention of the Rabbins. The anointing of the highpriest is alluded to in Psa 133:2, “It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard, that went down to the skirts of his garments.” The composition of this anointing oil, consisting of myrrh, cinnamon, calamus, cassia, and olive oil, is prescribed Exo 30:22-25; and its use for any other purpose but that of anointing the priests, the  tabernacle, and the vessels, was strictly prohibited, on pain of being “cut off from his people.” The manufacture of it was entrusted to certain priests, called apothecaries (Neh 3:8). But this oil is said to have been wanting under the second Temple (Prideaux, 1, 151; Selden, cap. 9). SEE ANOINTING OIL.

2. The high priest had a peculiar dress, which, as we have seen, passed to his successor at his death. This dress consisted of eight parts,. as the Rabbins constantly note, the breastplate, the ephod with its curious girdle, the robe of the ephod, the miter, the broidered coat or diaper tunic, and the girdle, the materials being gold, blue, red, crimson, and fine (white) linen (Exodus 28). To the above are added, in Exo 28:42, the breeches or drawers (Lev 16:4) of linen; and to make up the number eight, some reckon the high-priest's miter, or the plate (צַיוֹ) separately from the bonnet; while others reckon the curious girdle of the ephod separately from the ephod. In Lev 8:7-12, there is a complete account of the putting on of these garments by Aaron, and the whole ceremony of his consecration and that of his sons. It there appears distinctly that, besides the girdle common to all the priests, the high-priest also wore the curious girdle of the ephod. Of these eight articles of attire, four, viz. the coat or tunic, the girdle, the breeches, and the bonnet or turban, מַגְבָּעָה, instead of the miter, מַצְנֶפֶת(Josephus, however, whom Bahr follows, calls the bonnets of the priests by the name of מַצְנֶפֶת. See below), belonged to the common priests.

It is well known how, in the Assyrian sculptures, the king is in like manner distinguished by the shape of his headdress; and how in Persia none but the king wore the cidaris, or erect tiara. Bahr compares also the apices of the flamen Dialis. Josephus speaks of the robes (ἐνδύματα) of the chief priests, and the tunics and girdles of the priests, as forming part of the spoil of the Temple ( War, 6:8,3). Aaron, and at his death Eleazar (Num 20:26; Num 20:28), and their successors in the high- priesthood, were solemnly inaugurated into their office by being clad in these eight articles of dress on seven successive days. From the time of the second Temple, when the sacred oil (said to have been hid by Josiah, and lost) was wanting, this putting on of the garments was deemed the official investiture of the office. Hence the robes, which had used to be kept in one of the chambers of the Temple, and were by Hyrcanus deposited in the Baris, which he built on purpose, were kept by Herod in the same tower, which he called Antonia, so that they might be at his absolute disposal. The Romans did the same till the government of Vitellius, in the reign of  Tiberius, when the custody of the robes was restored to the Jews (Ant. 15:11, 4; 18:4,3). Taking the articles of the high-priest's dress in the order in which they would naturally be put on, we have

(1.) The “breeches” or drawers, מַכְנְסַים, miknesim', of linen, covering the loins and thighs, for purposes of modesty, as all the upper garments were loose and flowing. Their probable form is illustrated by the subjoined cut, from Braun (De Vestitu Sacerdotum Hebrceorum, p. 364), who calls attention to the bands (Talmud, שנצים) for drawing the top together, and the absence of any opening either before (בית העריה, apertura ad pudenda) or behind (בית הנקב, apertura ad anum).

(2.) The inner “coat,” כֻּתּנֶת. kutto'neth, was a tunic or long shirt of linen, with a tesselated or diaper pattern, like the setting of a stone (תִּשְׁבֵּוֹ,tashbets', “broidered”). The subjoined cut (also from Braun, p. 378) will illustrate its probable form (not different from that of the ordinary Oriental under-garment), with its sleeves and mode of fastening around the neck. SEE COAT.

(3.) The girdle, אִבְנֵט, abnet', also of linen, was wound round the body several times from the breast downwards, and the ends hung down to the ankles. Its form and mode of wearing may be illustrated by the subjoined cuts (from Braun, p. 404). SEE GIRDLE.

(4.) The “robe,” מְעיל, m'eil', of the ephod. This was of inferior material to the ephod itself, being all of blue (Exo 28:31), which implied its being only of “woven work” (מִעֲשֵׂה אֹרֵה, Exo 39:22). It was worn immediately under the ephod, and was longer than it. though not so long as the broidered coat or tunic. (כְּתֹנֶת תִּשְׁבֵּוֹ), according to most statements (Bahr, Winer, Kalisch, etc.).  Nor do the Sept. explanation of מְעיל, ποδήρης, and Josephus's description of it (War, 5, 5, 7), seem to outweigh the reasons given by Bahr for thinking that the robe only came down to the knees, for it is highly improbable that the robe should thus have swept the ground.. Neither does it seem likely that the sleeves of the tunic, of white diaper linen, were the only parts of it which were visible, in the case of the high- priest, when he wore the blue robe over it; for the blue robe had no sleeves, but only slits in the sides for the arms to come through. It had- a hole for the head to pass through, with a border round it of woven work, to prevent its being rent. The skirt of this robe had a remarkable trimming of pomegranates in blue, red, and crimson, with a bell of gold between each pomegranate alternately. The bells were to give a sound when the high priest went in and came out of the Holy Place. Josephus, in the Antiquities, gives no explanation of the use of the bells, but merely speaks of the studied beauty of their appearance. In his Jewish War, however, he tells us that the bells signified thunder, and the pomegranates lightning. For Philo's very curious observations, see Lightfoot's Works, 9, 25. Neither does the son of Sirach very distinctly explain it (Sirach 45), who, in his description of the high-priest's attire, seems chiefly impressed with its beauty and magnificence, and says of this trimming, “He compassed him with pomegranates and with many golden bells round about, that as he went there might be a sound, and a noise made that might be heard in the Temple, for a memorial to the children of his people.” Perhaps, however, he means to intimate that the use of the bells was to give notice to the people outside when the high-priest went in and came out of the sanctuary, as Whiston, Vatablus, and many others have supposed. SEE ROBE.

(5.) The ephod, אֵפוֹן, consisted of two parts, of which one covered the back, and the other the front, i.e. the breast and upper part of the body, like the ἐπωμίς of the Greeks (see Smith, Dict. of Antiquities, s.v. Tunica). These were clasped together on the shoulder with two large onyx stones, each having engraved on it six of the names of the tribes of Israel. It was further united by a “curious girdle” of gold, blue, purple, scarlet, and fine twined linen round the waist. Upon it was placed the breastplate of judgment, which in fact was a part of the ephod, being included in the term in such passages as 1Sa 2:28; 1Sa 14:3; 1Sa 23:9, and was fastened to it just above the curious girdle of the ephod. Linen ephods were also worn by other priests (1Sa 22:18), by Samuel, who was only a Levite (1Sa 2:18), and by David when bringing up the ark (2Sa 6:14),  The expression for wearing an ephod is “girded with a linen ephod.” The ephod was also frequently used in the idolatrous worship of the Israelites (see Jdg 8:27; Jdg 17:5, etc.). SEE EPHOD.

(6.) The breastplate, חשֶׁן, cho'shen, or, as it is further named, Exo 28:15; Exo 28:29-30, the breastplate of judgment, הִחשֶׁן מַשְׁכָּט, λογεῖον τῶν κρίσεων (or τῆς κρίσεως) in the Sept., only in Exo 28:4 περιστήθιον. It was, like the inner curtains of the tabernacle, the veil, and the ephod, of “cunning work,” מִעֲשֵׂה חשֵׁב(Vulg. opus plumariunn and arte plumaria). SEE EMBROIDER. The breastplate was originally two spans long and one span broad, but when doubled it was square, the shape in which it attached to the lower corners of the plate for passing through the other two rings of the linen, and then tying to the hip-rings of the ephod, as at g, tig 3. 3. The EPHOD SEE EPHOD (q.v.); with the breastplate inserted, and the two straps, constituting the girdle, חֵשֶׁב, che'sheb (belt), of the ephod. was worn. It was fastened at the top rings and by chains of wreathen gold to the two onyx stones on the shoulders, and beneath with two other rings and a lace of blue to two corresponding rings in the ephod, to keep it fixed in its place, above the curious girdle. But the most remarkable and most important part of this breastplate were the twelve precious stones, set in four rows, three in a row, thus corresponding to the twelve tribes, and divided in the same manner as their camps were, each stone having the name of one of the children of Israel engraved upon it. Whether the order followed the ages of the sons of Israel, or, as seems most probable, the order of the encampment, may be doubted; but, unless some appropriate distinct symbolism' of the different tribes be found in the names of the precious stones, the question can scarcely be decided. According to the Sept. and Josephus, and in accordance with the language of Scripture, it was these stones which constituted the Urim and Thummim, nor does the notion advocated by Gesenius after Spencer and others, that these names designated two little images placed between the folds of the breastplate, seem to rest on any sufficient ground, in spite of the Egyptian analogy brought to bear upon it. (For an account of the image of Thmei worn by the Egyptian judge and priest, see Kalisch's note on Exodus 28; Hengstenberg's Egypt and the Books of Moses; Wilkinson's Egyptians, 2, 27, etc.) Josephus's opinion, on the other hand, improved upon by the rabbins, as to the manner in which the stones gave out the oracular answer,  by preternatural illumination appears equally destitute of probability.

It seems to be far simplest, and most in agreement with the different accounts of inquiries made by Urim and Thummim (1Sa 14:3; 1Sa 14:18-19; 1Sa 23:2; 1Sa 23:4; 1Sa 23:9; 1Sa 23:11-12; 1Sa 28:6; Jdg 20:28; 2Sa 5:23, etc.), to suppose that the answer was given simply by the Word of the Lord to the highpriest (comp. Joh 11:51), when he had inquired of the Lord, clothed with the ephod and breastplate. Such a view agrees with the true notion of the breastplate, of which it was not the leading characteristic to be oracular (as the term λογεῖον supposes, and as is by many thought to be intimated by the descriptive addition “of judgment,” i.e. as they understand it,; decision”), but. only an incidental privilege connected with its fundamental meaning. What that meaning was we learn from Exo 28:30, where we read, “Aaron shall bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart before the Lord continually.” Now מַשְׁפָּטis the judicial sentence by which any one is either justified or condemned. In prophetic vision, as in actual Oriental life, the sentence of justification was often expressed by the nature of the robe worn. “He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth herself with her jewels” (Isa 61:10), is a good illustration of this; comp. Isa 62:3. In like manner, in Rev 3:5; Rev 7:9; Rev 19:14, etc., the white linen robe expresses the righteousness or justification of saints. Something of the same notion may be seen in Est 6:8-9, and on the contrary Est 6:12. The addition of precious stones and costly ornaments expresses glory beyond simple justification. So, in Isa 62:3, “Thou shalt be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God.” Exactly the same symbolism of glory is assigned to the precious stones in the description of the New Jerusalem (Rev 21:11-21), a passage which ties together with singular force the arrangement of the tribes in their camps and that of the precious stones in the breastplate. But, moreover, the high priest being a representative personage, the fortunes of the whole people would most properly be indicated in his person. A striking instance of this, in connection, too, with symbolical dress, is to be found in Zechariah 3 : “Now Joshua (the high-priest, Zec 3:1) was clothed with filthy garments and stood before the angel.

And he answered and spake unto those that stood before him, saying, Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment. And I said, Let them set a fair miter  (צָנַי) upon his head. So they set a fair miter upon his head, and clothed him with garments.” Here the priest's garments, בְּגָדַיַם, and the miter, expressly typify the restored righteousness of the nation. Hence it seems to be sufficiently obvious that the breastplate of righteousness or judgment, resplendent with the same precious stones which symbolize the glory of the New Jerusalem, and on which were engraved the names of the twelve tribes, worn by the high-priest, who was then said to bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart, was intended to express by symbols the acceptance of Israel grounded upon the sacrificial functions of the high- priest. The sense of the symbol is thus nearly identical with such passages as Num 23:21, and the meaning of the Urim and Thummim is explained by such expressions as קוּמַי אוֹרַי כַּיאּבָא אוֹרֵךְ, “Arise, shine; for thy light is come” (Isa 60:1). Thummim expresses alike complete prosperity and complete innocence, and so falls in exactly with the double notion of light (Isa 60:1; Isa 62:1-2). The privilege of receiving an answer from God bears the same relation to the general state of Israel symbolized by the priest's dress that the promise in Isa 54:13, “All thy children shall be taught of the Lord,” does to the preceding description, “I will lay thy stones with fair colors, and lay thy foundations with sapphires, and I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones,” Isa 54:11-12; comp. also Isa 54:14; Isa 54:17 (Heb.). It is obvious to add how entirely this view accords with the blessing of Levi in Deu 33:8, where Levi is called God's holy one, and God's Thummim and Urim are said to be given to him, because he came out of the trial so clear in his integrity. (See also Baruch 5, 2.) SEE BREASTPLATE.

(7.) The “bonnet,” מַגְבָּעָה, migbaah', was a turban of linen covering the head, but not in the particular form which that of the high-priest assumed when the mitre was added to it. SEE BONNET.

(8.) The last article peculiar to the high priest is the miter, מַצְנֶפֶת, mitsne'pheth, or upper turban, with its gold plate, engraved with “Holiness to the Lord,” fastened to it by a ribbon of blue. Josephus applies the same Heb. term (μασναεμφθής) to the turbans of the common priests as well, but says that in addition to this, and sewn upon the top of it, the high-priest had another turban of blue; that besides this he had outside the turban a  triple crown of gold, consisting, that is, of three rims one above the other, and terminating at the top in a kind of conical cup, like the inverted calyx of the herb hyoscyamus. Josephus doubtless gives a true account of the high-priest's turban as worn in his day. It may fairly be conjectured that the crown was appended when the Asmoneans united the temporal monarchy with the priesthood, and that this was continued, though in a modified shape, after the sovereignty was taken from them. Josephus also describes the πεταλον, the lamina or gold plate, which he says covered the forehead of the high priest. In Ant. 7, 3, 8, he says that the identical gold plate made in the days of Moses existed in his time; and Whiston adds in a note that it was still preserved in the time of Origen, and that the inscription on it was engraved in Samaritan characters (Ant. 3, 3, 6). It is certain that R. Eliezer, who flourished in Hadrian's reign, saw it at Rome. It was doubtless placed, with other spoils of the Temple, in the Temple of Peace, which was burnt down in the reign of Commodus. These spoils, however, are especially mentioned as part of Alaric's plunder when he took Rome. They were carried by Genseric into Africa, and brought by Belisarius to Byzantium, where they adorned his triumph. On the warning of a Jew the emperor ordered them back to Jerusalem, but what became of them is not known (Reland, de Spoliis Templi). SEE MITRE.

3. Aaron had peculiar functions. To him alone it appertained, and he alone was permitted, to enter the Holy of Holies, which he did once a year, on the great day of atonement, when he sprinkled the blood of the sin-offering on the mercy-seat, and burnt incense within the veil (Leviticus 16). He is said by the Talmudists, with whom agree Lightfoot, Selden, Grotius, Winer, Bahr, and many others, not to have worn his full pontifical robes on the occasion, but to have been clad entirely in white linen (Lev 16:4; Lev 16:32). It is singular however, that, on the other hand, Josephus says that the great fast-day was the chief, if not the only day in the year when the high-priest wore all his robes (War, 5, 5, 7), and, in spite of the alleged impropriety of his wearing his splendid apparel on a day of humiliation, it seems far more probable that on the one occasion when he performed functions peculiar to the high-priest he should have worn his full dress. Josephus, too, could not have been mistaken as to the fact, which he repeats (cont. Revelation 2, 7), where he says the high priests alone might enter into the Holy of Holies, “propria stola circumamicti.” For although Selden, who strenuously supports the Rabbinical statement that the high-priest only wore the four linen garments when he entered the Holy of Holies,  endeavors to make Josephus say the same thing, it is impossible to twist his words into this meaning. It is true, on the other hand, that Leviticus 16 distinctly prescribes that Aaron should wear the four priestly garments of linen when he entered into the Holy of Holies, and put them off immediately he came out, and leave them in the Temple; no one being present in the Temple while Aaron made the atonement (Lev 16:17). Either, therefore, in the time of Josephus this law was not kept in practice, or else we must reconcile the apparent contradiction by supposing that in consequence of the great jealousy with which the high-priest's robes were kept by the civil power at this time, the custom had arisen for him to wear them, not even always on the three great festivals (Ant. 18, 4, 3), but only On the great day of expiation. Clad in this gorgeous attire, he would enter the Temple in presence of all the people, and, after having performed in secret, as the law requires, the rites of expiation in the linen dress, he would resume his pontifical robes, and so appear again in public. Thus his wearing the robes would easily come to be identified chiefly with the day of atonement; and this is, perhaps, the most probable explanation. In other respects, the high priest performed the functions of a priest, but only on new moons and other great feasts, and on such solemn occasions as the dedication of the Temple under Solomon, under Zerubbabel, etc. SEE ATONEMENT, DAY OF.

4. The high priest had a peculiar place in the law of the manslayer, and his taking sanctuary in the cities of refuge. The manslayer might not leave the city of refuge during the lifetime of the existing high-priest who was anointed with the holy oil (Num 35:25; Num 35:28). It was also forbidden to the high priest to follow a funeral, or rend his clothes for the dead, according to the precedent in Lev 10:6. SEE MANSLAYER.

5. The other respects in which the high-priest exercised superior functions to the other priests arose rather from his position and opportunities than were distinctly attached to his office, and they consequently varied with the personal character and abilities of the high priest. Such were reforms in religion, restorations of the Temple and its service, the preservation of the Temple from intrusion or profanation, taking the lead in ecclesiastical or civil affairs, judging the people, presiding in the Sanhedrim (which, however, he is said by Lightfoot rarely to have done), and other similar transactions, in which we find the high-priest sometimes prominent,  sometimes not even mentioned. (See the historical part of this article.) Even that portion of power which most naturally and usually fell to his share, the rule of the Temple; and the government of the priests and Levites who ministered there, did not invariably fall to the share of the high-priest. For the title “Ruler of the House of God,” נְגַיד בֵּיתאּהָאֵֹלהַים, which usually denotes the high-priest, is sometimes given to those who were not high-priests, as to Pashur, the son of Immer, in Jer 20:1; compare 1Ch 12:27. The Rabbins speak very frequently of one second in dignity to the high priest, whom they call the Sagan, and who often acted in the high-priest's room. He is the same who in the O.T. is called “the second priest” (2Ki 23:4; 2Ki 25:18). They say that Moses was sagan to Aaron. Thus, too, it is explained of Annas and Caiaphas (Luk 3:2) that Annas was sagan. Ananias is also thought by some to have been sagan, acting for the high-priest (Act 23:2). In like manner they say Zadok and Abiathar were high priest and sagan in the time of David. The sagan is also very frequently called Menmunneh, or prefect of the Temple, and upon him chiefly lay the care and charge of the Temple services (Lightfoot, passin). If the high priest was incapacitated from officiating by any accidental uncleanness, the sagan or vice-high priest took his place. Thus the Jerusalem Talmud tells a story of Simon, son of Kamith, that “on the eve of the day of expiation he went out to speak with the king, and some spittle fell upon his garments and defiled him: therefore Judah his brother went in on the day of expiation, and sent in his stead; and so their mother Kamith saw two of her sons high-priests in one day. She had seven sons, and they all served in the high-priesthood” (Lightfoot, 9:35). It does not appear by whose authority the high-priests were appointed to their office before there were kings of Israel; but, as we find it invariably done by the civil power in later times, it is probable that, in the times preceding the monarchy, it was by the elders, or Sanhedrim. The installation and anointing of the high-priest, or clothing him with the eight garments, which was the formal investiture, is ascribed by Maimonides to the Sanhedrim at all times (Lightfoot, 9:22).

It should be added that the usual age for entering upon the functions of the priesthood, according to 2Ch 31:17, is considered to have been twenty years (by the later Jews thirty, Num 4:3; 1Ch 23:2), though a priest or high-priest was not actually incapacitated if he had attained to puberty, as appears by the example of Aristobulus, who was high-priest at the age of seventeen. Onias, the son of Simon the Just,  could not be high priest, because he was but a child at his father's death. Again, according to Leviticus 21 no one that had a blemish could officiate at the altar. Moses enumerates eleven blemishes, which the Talmud expands into 142. Josephus relates that Antigonus mutilated Hyrcanus's ears, to incapacitate him for being restored to the high priesthood. Illegitimate birth was also a bar to the high priesthood, and the subtlety of Jewish distinctions extended this illegitimacy to being born of a mother who had been taken captive by heathen conquerors (Josephus, c. Apion, 1, 7). Thus Eleazar said to John Hyrcanus (though, Josephus says, falsely) that if he was a just man, he ought to resign the pontificate, because his mother had been a captive, and he was therefore incapacitated. Lev 21:13-14, was taken as the ground of this and similar disqualifications. For a full account of this branch of the subject the reader is referred to Selden's learned treatises De Successionibus, etc., and De Success. in Pontif. Ebraeor.; and to Prideaux, 2, 306. It was the universal opinion of the Jews that the deposition of a high priest, which became so common, was unlawful. Joseph. (Ant. 15, 3) says that Antiochus Epiphanes was the first who did this, when he deposed Jesus or Jason; Aristobulus, who deposed his brother Hyrcanus the Second; and Herod, who took away the high-priesthood from Ananelus to give it to Aristobulus the Third. See the story of Jonathan, son of Ananus, Ant. 19, 6, 4.

II. The theological view of the high priesthood will be treated under the head of PRIEST. It must suffice here to indicate the consideration of the office, dress, functions, and ministrations of the high priest, as typical of the priesthood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and as setting forth under shadows the truths which are openly taught under the Gospel. This has been done to a great extent in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and is occasionally done in other parts of Scripture, as Rev 1:13, where the ποδήρης, and the girdle about the paps, are distinctly the robe, and the curious girdle of the ephod, characteristic of the high-priest. It also embraces all the moral and spiritual teaching supposed to be intended by such symbols. Philo (De vita Mosis), Origen (Homnil. in Levit.), Eusebius (Denzonst. Evang. lib. 3), Epiphanius (cont. Melchized. 4, etc.), Gregory Nazianzen (Orat. 1, Eliae Cretens. and Comment. p. 195), Augustine (Quaest. in Exodus), may be cited among many others of the ancients who have more or less thus treated the subject. Of moderns, Bahr (Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus), Fairbairn (Typology of Script.), Kalisch (Comment. on Exodus), have  entered fully into this subject, both from the Jewish and the Christian point of view.

III. The history of the high-priests embraces a period of about 1727 years, according to the opinion of the best chronologers, and a succession of about 83 high-priests, beginning with Aaron, and ending with Phannias. “The number of all the high-priests (says Josephus, Ant. 20,: 10) from Aaron… until Phanas… was 83,” where he gives a comprehensive account of them. They naturally arrange themselves into three groups —

(a.) those before David;

(b.) those from David to the Captivity;

(c.) those from the return from the Babylonian captivity till the cessation of the office at the destruction of Jerusalem.

The two former have come down to us in the canonical books of Scripture, and so have a few of the earliest and the latest of the latter; but for by far the larger portion of the latter group we have only the authority of Josephus, the Talmud, and occasioned notices in profane writers.

(a.) The high priests of the first group who are distinctly made known to us as such are,

1. Aaron;

2. Eleazar;

3. Phinehas;

4. Eli;

5. Ahitub (1Ch 9:11; Neh 11:11; 1Sa 14:3);

6. Ahiah;

7. Ahimelech. Phinehas, the son of Eli, and father of Ahitub, died before his father, and so was not high-priest.

Of the above the first three. succeeded in regular order, Nadab and Abihu, Aaron's eldest sons, having died in the wilderness (Leviticus 10). But Eli, the 4th, was of the line of Ithamar. What was the exact interval between the death of Phinehas and the accession of Eli, what led to the transference of the chief priesthood from the line of Eleazar to that of Ithamar, and whether any or which of the descendants of Eleazar between Phinehas and Zadok (seven in number, viz. Abishua, Bukki, Uzzi, Zerahiah, Meraioth,  Amariah, Ahitub), were high-priests, we have no positive means of determining from Scripture. Jdg 20:28 leaves Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, priest at Shiloh, and 1Sa 1:3; 1Sa 1:9 finds Eli high priest there, with two grown-up sons priests under him. The only clew is to be found in the genealogies, by which it appears that Phinehas was 6th in succession from Levi, while Eli, supposing him to be the same generation as Samuel's grandfather, would be 10th. Josephus asserts (Ant. 8, 1, 3) that the father of Bukki-whom he calls Joseph, and (Ant. 5, 11, 5) Abiezer, i.e. Abishua- was the last high priest of Phinehas's line before Zadok. This is a doubtful tradition, since Josephus does not adhere to it in the above passage of his 5th book, where he makes Bukki and Uzzi to have been both high priests, and Eli to have succeeded Uzzi; or in book 20:10, where he reckons the high-priests before Zadok and Solomon to have been thirteen (a reckoning which includes apparently all Eleazar's descendants down to Ahitub), and adds Eli and his son Phinehas, and Abiathar, whom he calls Eli's grandson.

If the last of Abishua's line died leaving a son or grandson under age, Eli, as the head of the line of Ithamar, might have become high priest as a matter of course, or he might have been appointed by the elders. His having judged Israel 40 years (1Sa 4:18) marks him as a man of ability. If Ahiah and Ahimelech are not variations of the name of the same person, they must have been brothers, since both were sons of Ahitub. Of the high priests, then, before David's reign, seven are said in Scripture to have been high priests, and one by Josephus alone. The bearing of this on the chronology of the times from the Exodus to David is too important to be passed over in silence. As in the parallel list of the ancestors of David (q.v.), we are compelled by the chronology to count as incumbents of the office in regular order the four others who are only named in Scripture as lineal descendants of the pontifical family. The comparative oversight of these incumbents receives an explanation from the nature of the times. It must also be noted that the tabernacle of God, during the high-priesthood of Aaron's successors of this first group, was pitched at Shiloh in the tribe of Ephraim, a fact that marks the strong influence which the temporal power already had in ecclesiastical affairs, since Ephraim was Joshua's tribe, as Judah was David's (Jos 24:30; Jos 24:33; Jdg 20:27-28; Jdg 21:21; 1Sa 1:3; 1Sa 1:9; 1Sa 1:24; 1Sa 4:3-4; 1Sa 14:3, etc.; Psa 78:60). This strong influence and interference of the secular power is manifest throughout the subsequent history. This first period was also marked by the calamity which befell the high-priests as the guardians of the ark, in its capture by the Philistines. This probably suspended all inquiries by Urim  and Thummim, which were made before the ark (1Ch 13:3; comp. Jdg 20:27; 1Sa 7:2; 1Sa 14:18), and must have greatly diminished the influence of the high-priests, on whom the largest share of the humiliation expressed in the name Ichabod would naturally fall. The rise of Samuel as a prophet at this very time, and his paramount influence and importance in the state, to the entire eclipsing of Ahiah the priest, coincides remarkably with the absence of the ark, and the means of inquiring by Urim and Thummim.

(b.) Passing to the second group, we begin with the unexplained circumstance of there being two priests in the reign of David, apparently of nearly equal authority, viz. Zadok and Abiathar (1Ch 15:11; 2Sa 8:17). Indeed it is only from the deposition of Abiathar, and the placing of Zadok in his room by Solomon (1Ki 2:35), that we learn certainly that Abiathar was the high-priest, and Zadok the second. Zadok was son of Ahitub, of the line of Eleazar (1Ch 6:8), and the first mention of him is in 1Ch 12:28, as “a young man, mighty in valor,” who joined David in Hebron after Saul's death, with 22 captains of his father's house. It is therefore not unlikely that after the death of Ahimelech. and the secession of Abiathar to David, Saul may have made Zadok priest, as far as it was possible for him to do so in the absence of the ark and the high-priest's robes, and that David may have avoided the difficult of deciding between the claims of his faithful friend Abiathar and his new and important ally Zadok (who, perhaps, was the means of attaching to David's cause the 4600 Levites and the 3700 priests that came under Jehoiada their captain, 1Ch 12:26-27). by appointing them to a joint priesthood: the first place, with the ephod, and Urim and Thummim, remaining with Abiathar, who was in actual possession of them. Certain it is that from this time Zadok and Abiathar are constantly named together, and, singularly, Zadok always first, both in the book of Samuel and that of Kings. We can, however, trace very clearly up to a certain point the division of the priestly offices and dignities between them, coinciding as it did with the divided state of the Levitical worship in David's time. For we learn from 1Ch 16:1-7; 1Ch 16:37, compared with 39, 40, and yet more distinctly from 2Ch 1:3-5, that the tabernacle and the brazen altar made by Moses and Bezaleel in the wilderness were at this time at Gibeon, while the ark was at Jerusalem, in the separate tent made for it by David. SEE GIBEON.

Now Zadok the priest and his brethren the priests were left “before the tabernacle at Gibeoin” to offer burnt offerings  unto the Lord morning and evening, and to do according to all that is written in the law of the Lord (1Ch 16:39-40). It is therefore obvious to conclude that Abiathar had special charge of the ark and the services connected with it, which agrees exactly with the possession of the ephod by Abiathar, and his previous position with David before he became king of Israel, as well as with what we are told 1Ch 27:34, that Jehoiada and Abiathar were the king's counselors next to Ahithophel. Residence at Jerusalem with the ark, and the privilege of inquiring of the Lord before the ark, both well suit his office of counselor. Abiathar, however, forfeited his place by taking part with Adonijah against Solomon, and Zadok was made high priest in his place. The pontificate was thus again consolidated and transferred permanently from the line of Ithamar to that of Eleazar. This is the only instance recorded of the deposition of a high-priest (which became common in later times, especially under Herod and the Romans) during this second period. It was the fulfillment of the prophetic denunciations of the sin of Eli's sons (1 Samuel 2, 3).

Another considerable difficulty that meets us in the historical survey of the high-priests of the second group is to ascertain who was high-priest at the dedication of Solomon's Temple: Josephus (Ant. 10, 8, 6) asserts that Zadok was, and the Seder Olam makes him the high priest in the reign of Solomon. Otherwise we might deem it very improbable that Zadok, who must have been very old at Solomon's accession (being David's contemporary), should have lived to the 11th year of his reign; and, moreover, 1Ki 4:2 distinctly asserts that Azariah, the son of Zadok, was priest under Solomon; and 1Ch 6:10 tells us of an Azariah, grandson of the former, “he it is that executed the priest's office in the Temple that Solomon built in Jerusalem,” as if meaning at its first completion. If, however, either of these Azariahs (if two) was the first high-priest of Solomon's Temple, the non-mention of him in the account of the dedication of the Temple, where one would most have expected it (as 1Ki 8:3; 1Ki 8:6; 1Ki 8:10-11; 1Ki 8:62; 2 Chronicles 5, 7, 11, etc.), and the prominence given to Solomon-the civil power-would be certainly remarkable. Compare also 2Ch 8:14-15.

In constructing the list of the succession of priests of this group, our method must be to compare the genealogical list in 1Ch 6:8-15 (A.V.) with the notices of high-priests in the sacred history, and with the list given by Josephus, who, it must be remembered, had access to the lists preserved in the archives at Jerusalem, testing the whole by the application  of the ordinary rules of genealogical succession. Now, as regards the genealogy, it is seen at once that there is something defective; for whereas from David to Jechoniah there are 20 kings, froth Zadok to Jehozadak there are but 13 priests. Moreover, the passage in question is not a list of high priests, but the pedigree of Jehozadak. Then, again, while the pedigree in its first six generations from Zadok inclusive seems at first sight exactly to suit the history-for it makes Amariah the sixth priest, while the history (2Ch 19:11) tells us he lived in Jehoshaphat's reign, who was the sixth king from David, inclusive; and while the same pedigree in its last five generations also seems to suit the history-inasmuch as it places Hilkiah, the son of Shallum, fourth from the end, and the history tells us he lived in the reign of Josiah, the fourth king from the end-yet is there certainly at least one great gap in the middle. For between Amariah, the high priest in Jehoshaphat's reign, and Shallum, the father of Hilkiah, the high-priest in Josiah's reign-an interval of about 240 years-there are but two names. Ahitub and Zadok, and these liable to suspicion from their reproducing the same sequence which occurs in the earlier part of the same genealogy-Amariah, Ahitub, Zadok. Besides, they are not mentioned by Josephus, at least not under the same names. This part, therefore, of the pedigree is useless for our purpose. But the historical books supply us with four or five names for this interval, viz. Jehoiada, in the reigns of Athaliah and Joash, and probably still earlier; Zechariah, his son; Azariah, in the reign of Uzziah; Urijah, in the reign of Ahaz; and Azariah, in the reign of Hezekiah.

If, in the genealogy-of 1 Chronicles 6, Azariah and Hilkiah have been accidental transposed, as is not impossible, then the Azariah who was high-priest if Hezekiah's reign would be the Azariah of 1Ch 6:13-14. Putting the additional historical names at four, and deducting the two suspicious names from the genealogy, we have 15 high-priests indicated in Scripture as contemporary with the 20 kings, with room, however, for one or two more in the history. Turning to Josephus, we find his list of 17 high-priests (whom he reckons as 18 [Ant. 20, 10], as do also the Rabbins) in places exceedingly corrupt, a corruption sometimes caused by the end of one name adhering to the beginning of the following (as in Axioramus), sometimes apparently by substituting the name of the contemporary king or prophet for that of the high-priest, as Joel and Jotham (both these, however, confirmed by the Rabbinical list). Perhaps, however, Sudeas, who corresponds to Zedekiah, in the reign of Amaziah, in the Seder Olam, and Odeas, who corresponds to Hoshaiah, in the reign of Manasseh, according to the same Jewish chronicle, may really represent  high priests whose names have not been preserved in Scripture. This would bring up the number to 17, or, if we retain Azariah as the father of Seraiah, to 18, which, with the addition of Joel and Jotham, finally agrees with the 20 kings.

Reviewing the high priests of this second group, the following are some of the most remarkable incidents:

(1.) The transfer of the seat of worship from Shiloh, in the tribe of Ephraim, to Jerusalem, in the tribe of Judah, effected by David, and consolidated by the building of the magnificent Temple of Solomon.

(2.) The organization of the Temple service under the high-priests, and the division of the priests and Levites into courses, who resided at the Temple during their term of service all which necessarily put great power into the hands of an able high-priest.

(3.) The revolt of the ten tribes from the dynasty of David, and from the worship at Jerusalem, and the setting up of a schismatical priesthood at Dan and Beersheba (1Ki 12:31; 2Ch 13:9, etc.).

(4.) The overthrow of the usurpation of Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab, by Jehoiada the high-priest, ‘whose near relationship to king Joash, added to his zeal against the idolatries of the house of Ahab, stimulated him to head the revolution with the force of priests and Levites at his command.

(5.) The boldness and success with which the high-priest Azariah withstood the encroachments of the king Uzziah upon the office and functions of the priesthood.

(6.) The repair of the Temple by Jehoiada, in the reign of Joash; the restoration of the Temple services by Azariah in the reign of Hezekiah; and the discovery of the book of the law, and the religious reformation by Hilkiah in the reign of Josiah. SEE HILKIAH.

(7.) In all these great religious movements, however, excepting the one headed by Jehoiada, it is remarkable how the civil power took the lead. It was David who arranged all the Temple service, Solomon who directed the building and dedication of the Temple, the high-priest being not so much as named; Jehoshaphat who sent the priests about to teach the people, and assigned to the high-priest Amariah his share in the work; Hezekiah who headed the reformation, and urged on Azariah and the priests and Levites;  Josiah who encouraged the priests in the service of the house of the Lord. On the other hand, we read of no opposition to the idolatries of Manasseh by the high priest, and we know how shamefully subservient Urijak the high-priest was to king Ahaz, actually building an altar according to the pattern of one at Damascus, to displace the brazen altar, and joining the king in his profane worship before it (2Ki 16:10-16). The preponderance of the civil over the ecclesiastical power, as a historical fact, in the kingdom of Judah, although kept within bounds by the hereditary succession of the high-priests, seems to be proved from these circumstances.

The high-priests of this series ended with Seraiah, who was taken prisoner by Nebuzar-adan, and slain at Riblah by Nebuchadnezzar, together with Zephaniah, the second priest or sagan, after the burning of the Temple and the plunder of all the sacred vessels (2Ki 25:18). His son Jehozadak or Josedech was at the same time carried away captive (1Ch 6:15).

The time occupied by these (say) eighteen high priests who ministered at Jerusalem between the times of David and the exile was about 424 years, which gives an average of something more than twenty-three years to each high-priest. It is remarkable that not a single instance is recorded after the time of David of an inquiry by Urim and Thummim as a means of ascertaining the Lord's will. The ministry of the prophets seems to have. superseded that of the high-priests (see e.g. 2 Chronicles 15; 2 Chronicles 18; 2Ch 20:14-15; 2Ki 19:1-2; 2Ki 22:12-14; Jer 21:1-2). Some think that Urim and Thummim ceased with the theocracy; others with the division of Israel into two kingdoms. Nehemiah seems to have expected the restoration of it (Neh 7:65), and so perhaps did Judas Maccabaeus (1Ma 4:46; comp. 14:41), while Josephus affirms that it had been exercised for the last time 200 years before he wrote, viz. by John Hyrcanus (Whiston, note on Ant. 3:8; Prideaux, Connect. 1, 150,151). It seems, therefore, scarcely true to reckon Urim and Thummim as one of the marks of God's presence with Solomon's Temple which was wanting to the second Temple (Prid. 1, 138,144, sq.). This early cessation of answers by Urim and Thummim, though the high-priest's office and the wearing of the breastplate continued in force during so many centuries, seems to confirm the notion that such answers were not the fundamental, but only the accessory uses of the breastplate of judgment.

(c.) An interval of about fifty-three years elapsed between the high-priests of the second and third group, during which there was neither temple, nor altar, nor ark, nor priest. Jehozadak, or Josedech, as it is written in Haggai (Hag 1:1; Hag 1:14, etc.), who should have succeeded Seraiah, lived and died a captive at Babylon. The pontifical office revived in his son Jeshua, of whom such frequent mention is made in Ezra and Nehemiah, Haggai and Zechariah, 1 Esdr. and Ecclus.; and he therefore stands at the head of this third and last series, honorably distinguished for his zealous co-operation with Zerubbabel in rebuilding the Temple and restoring the dilapidated commonwealth of Israel His successors, as far as the O.T. guides us, were Joiakim, Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan (or Jonathan), and Jaddua. Of these we find Eliashib hindering rather than seconding the zeal of the devout Tirshatha Nehemiah for the observance of God's law in Israel (Neh 13:4; Neh 13:7); and Johanan, Josephus tells us, murdered his own brother Jesus or Joshua in the Temple, which led to its further profanation by Bagoses, the general of Artaxerxes Mnemon's army (Ant. 11:7). Jaddua was high-priest in the time of Alexander the Great. Concerning him, Josephus relates the story that he went out to meet Alexander at Sapha (probably the ancient Mizpeh) at the head of a procession of priests; and that when Alexander saw the multitude clothed in white, and the priests in their linen garments, and the high-priest in blue and gold, with the miter on his head, and the gold plate, on which was the name of God, he stepped forward alone and adored the Name, and hastened to embrace the high- priest (Ant. 11, 8, 5). Josephus adds many other particulars in the same connection; and the narrative, though sometimes disputed as savoring of the apocryphal, derives support from the circumstances of the times, especially the leniency of Alexander toward the Jews. SEE ALEXANDER THE GREAT. It was the brother of this Jaddua. Manasseh, who, according to the same authority, was, at the request of Sanballat, made the first high priest of the Samaritan temple by Alexander the Great. (See on this whole period, Herzfeld, Gesch. d. Volkes Israel, 1865, 1, 368 sq.)

Jaddua was succeeded by Onias I, his son, and he again by Simon the Just, the last of the men of the great synagogue, as the Jews speak, and to whom is usually ascribed the completion of the Canon of the O.T. (Prid. Connect. 1, 545). Of him Jesus, the son of Sirach, speaks in terms of most glowing eulogy in Sirach 1, ascribing to him the repair and fortification of the Temple, with other works. The passage (1-21) contains an interesting account of the ministrations of the high priest. Upon Simon's death, his son  Onias being under age, Eleazar, Simon's brother, succeeded him. The high priesthood of Eleazar is memorable as being that under which the Sept. version of the Scriptures is said to have been made at Alexandria for Ptolemy Philadelphus, according to the account of Josephus taken from Aristeas (Ant. 12, 2). This translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, valuable as it was with reference to the wider interests of religion, and marked as was the providence which gave it to the world at this time as a preparation for the approaching advent of Christ, yet, viewed in its relation to Judaism and the high-priesthood, was a sign, and perhaps a helping cause of their decay. It marked a growing tendency to Hellenism utterly inconsistent with the spirit of the Mosaic economy. Accordingly, in the high-priesthood of Eleazar's rival nephews, Jesus and Onias, we find their very names changed into the Greek ones of Jason and Meenelaus, and with the introduction of this new feature of rival high-priests we find one of them, Menelaus, strengthening himself and seeking support from the Syro- Greek kings against the Jewish party by offering to forsake their national laws and customs, and to adopt those of the Greeks. The building of a gymnasium at-Jerusalem for the use of these apostate Jews, and their endeavor to conceal their circumcision when stripped for the games (1Ma 1:14-15; 2Ma 4:12-15; Joseph. Ant. 12, 5, 1), show the length to which this spirit was carried. The acceptance of the spurious priesthood of the temple of Onion from Ptolemy Philometor by Onias (the son of Onias the high priest), who would have been the legitimate high priest on the death of Menelaus, his uncle, is another striking indication of the same degeneracy. By this flight of Onias into Egypt the succession of high- priests in the family of Jozadak ceased; for although the Syro-Greek kings had introduced much uncertainty into the succession, by deposing at their will obnoxious persons, and appointing whom they pleased, yet the dignity had never gone out of the one family. Alcimus, whose Hebrew name was Jakim (1Ch 24:12), or perhaps Jachin (1Ch 9:10; 1Ch 24:17), or, according to Ruffinus (ap. Selden), Joachim, and who was made high-priest by Antiochus Eupator on Menelaus being put to death by him, was the first who was of a different family. One, says Josephus, that “was indeed of the stock of Aaron, but not of this family” of Jozadak.

What, however, for a time saved the Jewish institutions, infused a new life and consistency into the priesthood and the national religion, and enabled them to fulfill their destined course till the advent of Christ, was the cruel and impolitic persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. This thoroughly aroused  the piety and national spirit of the Jews, and drew together in defense of their Temple and country all who feared God and were attached to their national institutions. The result was that after the high priesthood had been brought to the lowest degradation by the apostasy and crimes of the last Onias or Menelaus, and after a vacancy of seven years had followed the brief pontificate of Alcimus, his no less infamous successor. a new and glorious succession of high-priests arose in the Asmonsean family, who united the dignity of civil rulers, and for a time of independent sovereigns, to that of the high-priesthood. Josephus, who is followed by Lightfoot, Selden, and others, calls Judas Maccabneus “high-priest of the nation of Judah” (Ant. 12, 10, 6), but, according to the far better authority of 1Ma 10:20, it was not till after the death of Judas Maccabmeus that Alcimus himself died, and that Alexander, king of Syria, made Jonathan, the brother of Judas, high-priest. Josephus himself, too, calls Jonathan the “first of the sons of Asmonaeus, who was high-priest” (Life, 1).

It is possible, however, that Judas may have been-elected by the people to the office of high-priest, though never confirmed in it by the Syrian kings. The Asmonoean family were priests of the course of Joiarib, the first of the twenty-four courses (1Ch 24:7), whose return from captivity is recorded 1Ch 9:10; Neh 11:10. They were probably of the house of Eleazar, though this cannot be affirmed with certainty; and Josephus tells us that he himself was related to them, one of his ancestors having married a daughter of Jonathan, the first high priest of the house. The Asmonaean dynasty lasted from B.C. 153 till the family was damaged by intestine divisions, and then destroyed by Herod the Great. Aristobulus, the last high priest of his line, brother of Mariamne, was murdered by order of Herod, his brother-in-law, B.C. 35. The independence of Judaea, under the priest-kings of this race, had lasted till Pompey took Jerusalem, and sent king Aristobulus II (who had also taken the high-priesthood from his brother Hyrcanus) a prisoner to Rome. Pompey restored Hyrcanus to the high-priesthood, but forbad him to wear the diadem. Everything Jewish was now, however, hastening to decay. Herod made men of low birth high priests, deposed them at his will, and named others in their room. In this he was followed by Archelaus, and by the Romans when they took the government of Judaea into their own hands; so that there were no fewer than twenty-eight high-priests from the reign of Herod to the destruction of the Temple by Titus, a period of 107 years. (Josephus tells us of one Ananus and his five sons who all filled the office of high-priest in turn. One of these, Ananus the younger, was deposed by king Agrippa for the part he  took in causing “James, the brother of Jesus who was called Christ,” to be stoned [Ant. 20, 9,.1].)

The N.T. introduces us to some of these later and oft-changing high-priests, viz. Annas and Caiaphas the former high-priest at the commencement of John Baptist's ministry, with Caiaphas as second priest; and the latter high-priest himself at our Lord's crucifixion (see Sommel, De Anna et Caiapha, Lund. 1772) — and Ananias (erroneously thought to be the Ananus who was murdered by the Zealots just before the siege of Jerusalem), before whom Paul was tried, as we read Acts 23, and of whom he said, “God shall smite thee, thou whited wall.” The same Caiaphas was the high-priest from whom Saul received letters to the synagogue at Damascus (Act 9:1; Act 9:14). Both he and Ananias seem certainly to have presided in the Sanhedrim, and that officially; nor is Lightfoot's explanation (8, 450 and 484) of the mention of the high-priest, though Gamaliel and his son Simeon were respectively presidents of the Sanhedrim, at all probable or satisfactory (see Act 5:17,.etc.). The last high-priest was appointed by lot by the Zealots from the course of priests called by Josephus Eniachim (probably a corrupt reading for Jachim).

He is thus described, by the Jewish historian. “His name was Phannias: he was the son of Samuel, of the village of Aphtha, a man not only not of the number of the chief priests, but who, such a mere rustic was he, scarcely knew what the high-priesthood meant. Yet did they drag him reluctant from the country, and, setting him forth in a borrowed character as on the stage, they put the sacred vestments on him, and instructed him how to act on the occasion. This shocking impiety, which to them was a subject of merriment and sport, drew tears from the other priests, who beheld from a distance their law turned into ridicule, and groaned over the subversion of the sacred honors” (War, 4, 3, 8). Thus ignominiously ended the series of high-priests which had stretched in a scarcely broken line through more than seventeen, or, according to the common chronology, sixteen centuries. The Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Grecian, and Roman empires, which the Jewish high-priests had seen in turn overshadowing the world, had each, except the last, one by one withered away and died-and now the last successor of Aaron was stripped of his sacerdotal robes, and the temple which he served laid level with the ground, to rise no more. But this did not happen till the true High-priest and King of Israel, the Minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man, had offered his one sacrifice, once for all, and had taken his place at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, bearing on his breast the judgment of his redeemed people, and  continuing a Priest forever, in the sanctuary which shall never be taken down!

Annexed is a list of the high priests from Aaron to the final overthrow of Jerusalem, derived from the Scriptures, Josephus, and an old Jewish chronicle, the Seder Olam. Details may be found under their respective names.

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

             an English painter, was born at London in 1692, and was articled to an attorney in 1707, against his inclination. He employed his leisure hours in painting, finally commenced it as a profession, and soon met with employment. Shortly after he was commissioned by the duke of Richmond to do some work. In 1732 he visited the continent for the purpose of seeing the Dusseldorf Gallery, and two years after he went to France in order to examine the galleries there. He executed a series of pictures, which were engraved and published in 1745. Among his sacred subjects were, The Good Samaritan; The Finding of Moses; Hagar and Ishmael. He died in 1780. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.; Rose, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Hight, John J., D.D[[@Headword:Hight, John J., D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Bloomington, Indiana, December 4, 1834. In 1854 he joined the Indiana Conference, and spent two years in circuits, eleven in stations, three in the army as chaplain, one as agent for the centenary fund, four as presiding elder, and eleven as assistant editor of the Western Christian Advocate. He died December 18, 1886. See Minutes of Annual Conferences (Fall), 1887, page 350.

## Highway[[@Headword:Highway]]

             (usually מְסַלָּה, mesillah', or [Isa 35:8] מִסְלוּל, meslul', a raised road, SEE CAUSEWAY for public use; elsewhere simply אֹרִח, o'rach, a path. or דֶּרֶךְ, de'rek, ὁδός, a “way” in general; once [Amo 5:16] חוּוֹ, chuts, outside). Travelers have frequently noticed the lack of roads in Palestine. Travel and transport being all performed on the backs of beasts of burden, which usually move in single file, the most important routes are only marked by narrow winding paths; and the soil is often so hard as to take no impression from the feet of animals, so that the eye of an unpracticed traveler there perceives, even upon a common thoroughfare, no evidence that others have passed along the same way. No repairs are ever made, no labor employed to remove obstacles. — Bastow. Hence the striking character of the figure by which the preparation for the return of the captives and the Messiah's advent are announced as the construction of a grand thoroughfare for their march (Isa 11:16; Isa 35:8; Isa 40:3; Isa 62:10). The Romans, however, during their occupancy of Palestine, constructed several substantial roads, which are laid down in the ancient itineraries, and remains of which subsist to this day. De Saulcy (Dead Sea, 1, 392) fancied he discovered traces of the old Moabitish highways (Num 20:17). SEE ROAD.

## Higuerra, Hieronymus Romanus de la[[@Headword:Higuerra, Hieronymus Romanus de la]]

             a Spanish Jesuit and historian, was born at Toledo in 1538. He established his reputation by fabricating supposed histories. Thus he composed Cronicones, fragments, which he announced as copies of MSS. found at Worms, and the work of Flavius Lucius Dexter, Marcus Maximus, and others, purporting to throw light on the introduction of Christianity into Spain.. Father Bivar, who believed these chronicles genuine, added a commentary, and published them at Saragossa in 1619. They were reprinted at Cadiz (1627), at Lyons (1627), and at Madrid (1640, fol.). —  Ticknor, Hist. of Spanish Lit. 3. 153; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé. 24, 658 sq.

## Hilaire[[@Headword:Hilaire]]

             SEE HILARIUS.

## Hilali Codex of the O.T[[@Headword:Hilali Codex of the O.T]]

             SEE MANUSCRIPTS.

## Hilaria[[@Headword:Hilaria]]

             a festival among the ancient Romans, which they observed in the Kalends, April 8, or on March 25, in honor of the goddess Cybele. Its name it derived from the occasion, which was one of general mirth and joy. The citizens went in processions through the streets, carrying the statue of Cybele. Masquerades, and all sorts of disguises, were also permitted. The day preceding the festival, in contrast with the festive day which was to follow, was a day of mourning. The reason for this is that “Cybele represented the earth, which at that time of the year begins to feel the kindly warmth of the spring, and to pass from winter to summer; so that this sudden transition from' sorrow to joy was an emblem of the vicissitudes of the seasons, which succeeded one another.” — Broughton, Biblioth. Historico Sacra, 1, 494.

## Hilarianus[[@Headword:Hilarianus]]

             a youthful martyr of the 2nd century, one of a band of Christians in an inland town of Numidia who were arraigned before the Roman proconsul for attending the Christian meetings. The proconsul supposed that the child would be easily intimidated; but, when threats were applied, he said, “Do what you please; I am a Christian.” — Neander, Ch. Hist. 1, 152.

## Hilario or Hilarianus, Q. Julius[[@Headword:Hilario or Hilarianus, Q. Julius]]

             an ecclesiastical writer of the 4th century. We have no details concerning his life, as none are given either in his own works or in those of his contemporaries. He is considered as the author of Expositum de die Paschce et Mensis, at the end of Lactantius's works (Par. 1712), and in Galland, Bibl. Patrums (vol. 8:app. 2, p. 745, Venice, 1772, fol): — De Mulndi Duratione, or De Curszu Temporum, first published by Pithou in  the Appendix to his Biblioth. Patrum (Paris, 1579), and afterwards reprinted in Galland, 8:235. See Fabricius, Biblioth. Lat. med. et infim. cetatis, 3, 251; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 665.

## Hilarion, St[[@Headword:Hilarion, St]]

             of Palestine, was born near Gaza about 291. He had been a heathen, but at Alexandria he frequented the Christian schools, and was baptized there in 306. The accounts of him, which abound in incredible stories, are to the following purport: Returning home in 307, he gave away all he had, and retired to a desert near Magum, not far from Gaza, where he led a strictly ascetic life. His protracted fasts and religious exercises gained him the reputation of a saint, and attracted a large number of disciples. When their numbers became too great, he formed colonies of them in various parts of Palestine and Syria, and thus established several monasteries, which he continued to visit and govern. Having gone to Alexandria for the anniversary of the death of St. Anthony, he was on his return reputed to work miracles, such as producing rain, ridding the country of snakes, etc. An attempt having been made against his life by the inhabitants of Gaza, Hilarion retired to Libya, and afterwards to Sicily, but his miracles everywhere betrayed him(!). He afterwards went to Epidaurus (now Raguse), in Dalmatia, where the legend says he prevented an inundation of the town. To avoid the popularity this miracle had gained him, he embarked secretly for Cyprus with his disciple Hesychius, and hid himself in the neighborhood of Paphos. Here again he was discovered, and from all sides' they brought sick people to him, whom he cured by the laying on of hands. He died in the island in 371, and his remains, brought back to Palestine by Hesychius, were buried near Magum. The Roman Catholic Church commemorates him on the 21st of October. See Jerome, Vita Hilarioni; Sozomen, Hist. Eccles. lib. 3:cap. 14; lib. 5, cap. 9; Baillet, Vies des Saints, vol. 3:21 Oct.; Richard et Geraud, Biblioth. Sacr.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 666; Taylor, Ancient Christianity, 1, 308, 309; Neander, Ch. Hist. vol. 2; Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. d. KirchenGesch. s.v.; Tillemont, Mèm. 8, 987.

## Hilarius Arelatensis, St[[@Headword:Hilarius Arelatensis, St]]

             (HILARY, bishop OF ARLES), was born about A.D. 403, of a noble family, and at an early age attached himself to Honoratus, first abbot of Lerins. When about twenty-five years of age he accompanied Honoratus to  his see of Aries, but shortly left it to pursue a monastic life, removed from the cares and bustle of the world. His patron Honoratus dying A.D. 430, Hilary was elected bishop, but he accepted the office with great reluctance. In discharging its functions he conducted himself as an humble and charitable man, but as a rather severe and haughty ecclesiastic. A.D. 455 Hilary deposed the bishop of Vasontis, Chelidonius, on a charge of having violated the canon law in becoming a priest notwithstanding he had formerly married a widow. Chelidonius referred the matter to pope Leo, but Hilary refused to acknowledge the papal jurisdiction in the matter. Pope Leo, jealous of his own authority, and always anxious to extend his power, was very wrathful at Hilary's summary proceedings, nor could Leo be appeased, though the bishop of Arles took a journey on foot to Rome in order to set matters right. Each saint adhered to his own opinion, and they parted with mutual ill will, and by a rescript of Valentinian in 445, the metropolitan of Gaul was made virtually subordinate to the papal see. Hilary died A.D. 449. His works extant are, Vita Sancti Honorati, a panegyric: Epistola ad Eucharium both of which may be found in Bib. Max. Patr. vol. 7. Waterland attributes the composition of the Athanasian Creed to Hilary (Treatise on Athan. Creed). See Cave, Hist. Lit.; Hook, Eccl. Biog. 6, 54; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. 1, 340; Clarke, Succession of Sacred Literature, 2, 191; Waterland, Works, 1, 8; 3:214 sq.; Mihner, Hist. Ch. Christ, 2, 317; Riddle, Christ. Antiquities; Milman, Latin Christianity, 1, 272 sq.

## Hilarius Diaconus[[@Headword:Hilarius Diaconus]]

             a deacon of the Church of Rome in the 4th century, who was sent by pope Liberius, with Lucifer of Cagliari and others, to plead the cause of the orthodox faith before Constantius at the Council of Milan. His boldness was so offensive that he was scourged and banished by order of the emperor. He afterwards supported the violent opinion of Lucifer (q.v.) that, all Arians and heretics must be rebaptized upon applying to be restored to communion in the Church. Two treatises, of doubtful authenticity, are ascribed to him: (1.) Comm. in Epist. Pauli (published often with the works of Ambrose); (2.) Quaest. in Vet. et Nov. Test., published with the works of Augustine (Benedictine edit. 3, App.). The Benedictine editors of St. Ambrose inform us that the manuscripts of the “Commentary” on St. Paul's Epistles differ considerably, and that in some parts there appear t6 be interpolations of long passages. This commentary is said by Dupin to be “clear, plain, and literal, and to give the meaning of  the text of St. Paul well enough; but it gives very different explanations from St. Augustine in those places which concern predestination, provocation, grace, and free will.” — Lardner, Works, 4, 382; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. 4, pt. 2, ch. 2, n. 43; Dupin, Eccles. Writ. cent. 4; English Cyclopedia.

## Hilarius Pictaviensis[[@Headword:Hilarius Pictaviensis]]

             (HILARY, ST., bishop or POITIERS), one of the most distinguished opponents of Arianism in the 4th century, was a native of the city whose name he bears. He was of noble descent, but a heathen. Having become a convert to the Christian faith, he was baptized, together with his wife and daughter. He was subsequently made bishop, about 350, notwithstanding his being a married man. In 356 he defended Athanasius, in the Council of Bziers, against Satunlinus, bishop of Arles (said to have been an Arian, and to have held communion with Ursatius and Valens). For this defense he was, by order of Constantius, exiled to Phrygia, but he still continued to defend the principles of the Church against the Eastern bishops, most of whom were Arians. “In 359 he attended the Council of Seleucia, in Isauria, which had been summoned by order of Constantius, and boldly defended the doctrine of the Trinity against the Arian bishops, who formed the majority of the council.' He afterwards followed the deputies of the council to the emperor's court, and presented a petition to Constantius, in which he desired permission to dispute publicly with the Arians in the emperor's presence. In order to get rid of so formidable an opponent, the Arians, it is said, induced the emperor to send him away from the court; but previous to his departure, Hilarius wrote an invective against Constantius, in which he denounced him as Antichrist, and described him as a person who had only professed Christianity in order that he might deny Christ. After the Catholic bishops had recovered their liberty under Julian, Hilarius assembled several councils in Gaul for the reestablishment of the Catholic faith and the condemnation of Arian bishops. He also traveled in Italy for the same purpose, and used every exertion to purify the churches of that country from all Arian heresies.

When Auxentius was appointed bishop of Milan by the emperor Valentinian in 364, Hilarius presented a petition to the emperor, in which he denounced Auxentius as a heretic. Though this charge was denied by Auxentius, Hilarius still continued his attacks upon him for heterodoxy, and created so much confusion in the city that he was at length ordered to retire to his own diocese, where he died in the year 367.”  In theology, Hilary maintained the Athanasian doctrines with so much vigor that he acquired the name of Malleus Arianorum. His exegetical writings show evident marks of the influence of Origen. Of his commentary on the Psalms, Jerome says, “In quo opere imitatus Origenern, nonnulla etiam de suo addidit.” His theological system is to be gathered chiefly from his De Trinitate, lib. 12. He maintains the essential oneness and equality of the Son with the Father. As to the Holy Spirit, he teaches that “faith in him is necessarily connected with confessing the Father and the Son, and to know this is sufficient. If any one ask what the Holy Spirit is,” and is not satisfied with the answer that he is through him and from him through whom are all things; that he is the Spirit of God, and his gift to believers, even apostles and prophets will not satisfy such a person, for they only assert this of him, that he is (De Trinit. 2, 29).

He does not venture to attribute to him the-name of God, because the Scripture does not so call him expressly, yet it says that the Holy Spirit searches the deep things of God and it therefore follows that he partakes the divine essence (De Trinit. 12, 55). His view of the body of Christ is not entirely free from Docetism; and in speaking of thee human soul, he seems to think that the idea of a creature includes that of corporeity (Com. in Matthew 5, 8). As to predestination, he “emphatically asserted the harmonious connection between grace and free-will, the powerlessness of the latter, and yet its importance- as a condition of the operation of divine grace. ‘As the organs of the human body,' he says (De Trinit. 2, 35), ‘cannot act without the addition of moving causes, so the human has, indeed, the capacity for knowing God; but if it does not receive through faith the gift of the Holy Spirit, it will not attain to that knowledge. Yet the gift of Christ stands open to all, and that which all want is given to every one as far as he will accept it.' ‘It is the greatest folly,' he says in another passage, ‘not to perceive that we live in dependence on and through God, when we imagine that in things which men undertake and hope for, they may venture to depend on their own strength. What we have, we have from God; on him must all our hope be placed' (Comm. in Psalms 57). Accordingly, he did not admit an unconditional predestination; he did not find it in the passages in Romans 9 respecting the election of Esau, commonly adduced in favor of it, but only a predestination conditioned by the divine foreknowledge of his determination of will; otherwise every man would be born under a necessity of sinning (Comm. in Psalms 57).”  As a writer Hilary is copious, and fertile in thought and illustration, but often turgid and obscure in style. A pretty full analysis of his writings is given in Clarke, Succession of Sacred Literature, 1, 302 sq. The chief among them are,

1. Ad Constantium Augustum Liber Primus, written, it is believed, A.D. 355, to demand from the emperor protection against the persecutions of the Arians: —

2. Commentarius (s. Tractatus) in Evangelium Matthaei (A.D. 356), in the tone and spirit of Origen: it is repeatedly quoted by Jerome and Augustine. The preface, quoted in Cassianus (De Incarn. 7, 24), is lost: —

3. De Synodis Fidei Catholicae contra Arianos, etc., or Epistola (A.D. 358), explaining the views of the Eastern Church on the Trinity, and showing that their difference from the Western Church lay more in the expressions than in the dogma: —

4. De Trinitate Libri 12 s. Contra Arianos, s. De Fide, etc. (A.D. 360), his most important work, and the first great controversial treatise on the Trinity in the Latin Church: —

5. Ad Constantinum Augustum Liber secundus (A.D. 360), a petition concerning his banishment, and a vindication of his principles: —

6. Contra Constantium Augustum Liber, a virulent attack against Constantius, which has been mentioned above. It is remarkable, inasmuch as it confines the creed to the words of Scripture, and proves that some of the fundamental doctrines of the Romish Church, as opposed to the Protestant, had already been called in question at that time: —

7. Commentarii (s. Tractatus, s. Expositiones) in Psalmos, general reflections upon the spirit of different psalms, written in the manner of Origen —

8. Fragmenta Hilarii, containing passages from a lost work on the synods of Seleucia and Ariminum, etc., first published by Faber in 1598. Some of his works are lost, and others have been erroneously attributed to him. The works of Hilarius have been published by Mireeus (Paris, 1544), Erasmus (Basel, 1523; reprinted 1526, 1535, 1550, 1570), Gillot (Paris, 1572; reprinted, with several improvements, 1605, 1631, 1652); by Dom Constant, of the Benedictines (Paris, 1693, deemed by some the best  edition), the Marquis de Maffei (Verona, 1730), and Oberthir (178188, 4 vols. 8vo). See Vita S. Hilarii, operibus ejus a Dom. Constant collectis praefixa; Gallia Christiana, vol. 2, col. 1038; Hist. litter. de la France, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 139; Cave, Scriptores Eccles. 1, 213; Tillemont, Memoires, 7, 432; Oudin, Script. Ecclesiastici, 1, 426; Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques, 5, 1; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 660; Smith, Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biogr. vol. 2; English Cyclopaedia; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 6, 84 sq.; Dorner, Lehre 5. d. Person Christi, 1, 1037; Dupin, Ecclesiastical Writers, cent. 4; Neander, History of Dogmas; Neander, Ch. History, 2, 396, 419, 427, 559; Waterland, Works; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. 1, 248; Lecky, Rationalism in Europe, 2, 13, 151; Shedd, Guericke's Ch. History, p. 294,322, 372; Miler, Hist. Ch. Christ, 2, 81; Hook, Eccl. Biog. 6:46; Gibbon, Decline and Fall, Milman's ed., 2, 320; Schaff, Hist. Chr. Church. 3:589, 664, 959 sq.; Bibliotheca Sacra, 1, 399; 11:299; Lardner, Works, 4:178; Riddle, Christian Antiquities; Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. 1, 1476; Milman, Hist. Christianity, 2, 437 sq.; 3:106,286,356; Baur, Dogmengeschichte; Taylor, Ancient Christianity, 1, 223, 326; Christian Remembrancer, July, 1853, p. 241; Brit. and For. Evangel, Rev. Oct. 1866, p. 689.

## Hilarius or Hilarus I, Pope[[@Headword:Hilarius or Hilarus I, Pope]]

             or, rather, bishop of Rome, was a Sardinian by birth, and succeeded Leo the Great in the year 461. “He had been employed by Leo in important affairs; among others, he was sent as legate to the Robber Council of Ephesus (q.v.) in 449, against the Entychians, and was well versed in matters concerning the discipline of the Church, which he displayed great zeal in enforcing. He interfered in the election and consecration of bishops by their metropolitans in France and Spain, and justified his interference by alleging the pre-eminence of the see of Rome over all the sees of the West, a pre-eminence which he, however, acknowledged, in one of his letters, to be derived from the emperor's favor. He also forbade bishops nominating their successors, a practice which was then frequent. He, however, did not declare elections or nominations to be illegal merely from his own authority, but assembled a council to decide on those questions. Hilarius died at Rome in 467.” See English Cyclopaedia, s.v.; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 2, 141 sq.; Jaffe, Regesta Pont. Romans p. 48, 933.

## Hilary[[@Headword:Hilary]]

             SEE HILARIUS.

## Hilary, Thomas Hudson, D.D[[@Headword:Hilary, Thomas Hudson, D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born near Mocksville, N.C., November 15, 1823. He entered Randolph-Macon College, but did not finish his course. Joining the North Carolina Conference, he served several churches, laboring in the pastorate until his death, June 20, 1892. In 1872 he was associate editor of the Raleigh Christian Advocate. He served twice as presiding elder, and was a member of two general conferences of his Church. He was the author of Methodist Armor: — Shield of the Young Methodist: — and other works. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church, South, 1892.

## Hilbsch, Abraham[[@Headword:Hilbsch, Abraham]]

             a Jewish rabbi, was born in Hungary in 1831. He studied at Prague, where he also acted for some time as rabbi-preacher of the Meisel synagogue. In 1866 he was called to New York by the congregation Ahavath-Chesed, and died in October, 1884. Hibsch is knownas the author of תרגום סזוי חמש מגלות עם, i.e., Die funf Megioth, etc. (Prague, 1866). (B.P.)

## Hilda, St[[@Headword:Hilda, St]]

             the celebrated abbess of Whitby, was grand-niece of Edwin, king of Northumbria, and conspicuous for piety and devotion to the Christian faith from the age of thirteen. When, after the death of Edwin, the Northumbrians relapsed into idolatry, Hilda withdrew, probably, into East Anglia, but returned to Northumbria on the accession of Oswald, and, devoting herself to a life of celibacy, founded a small nunnery on the Wear. She subsequently (about A.D. 650) became abbess of Heorta, now Hartlepool, where she remained seven years. Oswy, the brother and successor of the gentle and virtuous Oswald, when marching to defend his throne and faith against Penda, the pagan king of Mercia, vowed that if the Lord vouchsafed to him the victory, he would devote to his service in ‘holy virginity his infant daughter, the princess Elfleda. Having defeated and slain his dreaded foe near Leeds, in Yorkshire, Oswy, in pursuance of his vow, committed Elfleda, with princely gifts in lands, etc., to the care of Hilda. Soon afterwards Hilda purchased ten “hides” of land at Streoneshalb, now Whitby, and erected a new monastery, in which she, as abbess, took up her abode with her royal charge. The wealth of this monastery, and the dignity and high religious character of Hilda, made it the most celebrated in England, and a nursery of eminent men, among whom may be mentioned Hedda, Wilfrid, and Caedmon, the poet. Dugdale (as quoted by Mrs. Jameson) says that Hilda “was a professed enemy to the extension of the papal jurisdiction in this country, and opposed with all her might the tonsure of priests and the celebration of Easter according to the Roman ritual.” She died in November, 680, aged sixty-three years, and was succeeded as abbess by Elfleda. Among the marvels related of her are that a nun at Hakenes saw angels conveying her soul to bliss, and that certain fossils found near Whitby having the form of coiled snakes were those reptiles thus changed by the power of her prayers. Smith, Rel. of Anc. Brit. p. 343-47; Butler, Lives of the Saints, Nov. 18; Wright, Biog. Brit. Lit. (Anglo-Saxon Period), see Index; Jameson, Legends of the Monastic Orders, p. 58-62. (J.W.M.)

## Hildebert of Tours (Hildebertus Turonensis)[[@Headword:Hildebert of Tours (Hildebertus Turonensis)]]

             in 1097 bishop of Mans, and in 1125 archbishop of Tours, was born about 1055 at Lavardin. Though accused of licentiousness before his admission to the Church, he became one of its brightest ornaments for piety and learning. During the time of his being bishop of Mans, he and his church suffered much from the contests of William Rufus and Helie, count of Mans; nor was he much more fortunate in his archbishopric, for he fell under the displeasure of Louis the Fat because he refused to dispose of his Church patronage as the king desired: the disagreement was at last settled, and Hildebert restored to favor; He wrote with great severity against the vices of the court of Rome. Hildebert had great “independence of mind, practical sense, and a degree of taste which preserved him from falling into the vain and puerile discussions of his contemporaries.” His Tractatus Philosophicus and his Moralis Philosophia, which are considered his best productions, are the first essays towards a popular system of theology. He died A.D. 1134. His epistles and sermons were quite numerous; they are collected in the best edition of his works, Opera tam edita quam inedita, studio Beaugendre (Benedictine, Paris, 1708, fol.). See Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. 11:pt. 2, ch. 2, n. 74; Vita Hildeberti, prefixed to his works (complete list of his works to be found in Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. 1 vol.); Gallia Christiana, t. xiv; Brockhaus, Conversations-Lexikon, 7:919; Bayle, Hist. Dict. p. 454; Neander, Ch. Hist.; Neander, Hist. Christ. Dogmas, p. 533; Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. d. Christl. Religions und Kirchengesch. 2, 300 sq.; Tennemann, Man. of Philos. p. 218.

## Hildebrand[[@Headword:Hildebrand]]

             SEE GREGORY VII.

## Hildebrand, Joachim[[@Headword:Hildebrand, Joachim]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born November 10, 1623. He studied at different universities, was in 1652 professor of theology at  Helmstadt, in 1662 doctor of theology and general superintendent at Celle, and died October 18, 1691. He wrote, Diss. de Donatione Constantini Magsni (Helmstadt, 1661): — Sacra Publica Veteris Ecclesiae in Compendium Redacta (1699): — Exercit. de Veterum Concionibus (1661): — Rituale Baptismi Veteris, Publicis Lectionibus Olim Dicatum (ed. Schmid, 1699): — Rituale Eucharistiae Veteris Ecclesiae (ed. Schmid, 1712): — De Nuptiis Veterum Christianorum Libellus (ed. Schmid, 1714), etc. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:574, 627, 628, 630, 631, 634, 635, 638, 699; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Just von Einem, Commentarius de Vita et Scriptis Joach. Hildebrandi (1743); Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:393. (B.P.)

## Hildegarde or Hildegardis[[@Headword:Hildegarde or Hildegardis]]

             abbess of St. Rupert's Mount, on the Rhine, was born at Bockelhein, in Germany, A.D. 1098. She attracted much attention by her pretended revelations and visions, which were held to be supernatural, and obtained the countenance of Bernard and others, and at last the approval of Eugenius III and the three succeeding popes, together with numerous prelates. She wrote Three Books of Revelations (Coloniae, 1628): — Life of St. Robert: — three Epistles, various Questions, and an Exposition of St. Benedict's Rule (all Colon. 1566). Most of them may also be found in Bibl. Max. Patrum, vol. 23. She died A.D. 1180. — Neander, Ch. Hist. 4,  217, 586; Mosheim. Ch. Hist. cent. 12, pt. 2, ch. 2, n. 71; Baillet, Vies des Saints, Sept. 17; Brockhaus, Conversations-Lexikon, 7:921.

## Hildegonde[[@Headword:Hildegonde]]

             a female saint of the Romish Church, whose history is, in fact, a satire on Romish saintship. She is said to have been born at Nuitz, in the diocese of Cologne, towards the middle of the 12th century. Her father having made a vow to visit the Holy Land, she accompanied him, dressed in man's clothes, under the name of Joseph. Her father dying, however, on the way, he entrusted her to a man who, after conducting her to Jerusalem and back to Ptolemais, abandoned her in a state of destitution. After various vicissitudes, she came back to Cologne, entered the service of a canon, and finally, in 1185, retired to a Cistercian convent near Heidelberg, where she died April 20, 1188. She was known to the other monks only as Brother Joseph, and her sex was not discovered until after her death. The Cistercians commemorate her on the 20th of April. Her life was written by Caesarius of Heisterbach. See Baillet, Vies des Saints, April 20; the Bollandists Acta Sanct.; Richard et Giraud, Biblioth. Sacrae; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 675.

## Hildersham, Arthur[[@Headword:Hildersham, Arthur]]

             a pious and learned Puritan divine, was born at Stechworth, Cambridgeshire, October 6, 1563, of an honorable family. He was brought up a papist, and educated at Christ's College, Cambridge; but while there he avowed himself a Protestant, and was, in consequence, cast off by his father. The earl of Huntingdon, a distant kinsman, on hearing of the circumstance, became his patron, and carried him through the university. In 1587 he was settled as preacher at Ashby de la Zouch, in Leicestershire, where (though often persecuted, and forced to change his dwelling) he lived for the most part of forty-three years, with great success in his ministry, beloved and revered by all classes. He suffered for conscience' sake in 1598, 1605, 1611, 1612, 1616, and 1630, being repeatedly silenced, deprived, censured, and fined to the amount of two thousand pounds by the Court of High Commission. He died March 4, 1631. His character was rich in Christian excellence. His published works consist of One Hundred and Eight Lectures on John 4 (2nd edit. Lond. 1632, fol.): — Eight Sermons on Psalms 75 (1632, fol.): — One Hundred and Fifty- two Sermons on Psalms 51 (London, 1635, fol.): — A Treatise on the  Doctrine of the Lord's Supper: — Sermons on Fasting, etc. (Lond. 1633, fol.). — Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, 1, 329, 546; Middleton, Biog. Evangel. 3, 25;. Hook, Eccl. Biog. 6, 70.

## Hildesley, Mark[[@Headword:Hildesley, Mark]]

             a clergyman of the Church of England, was born in 1698 at Murson, Kent. Educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, lie became, in 1735, after filling several minor positions, rector of Holwell, Bedfordshire, and in 1755 bishop of Sodor and Man. He died December 7, 1772. He was instrumental in the translation of the Scriptures into the Manx language. See Weeden Butler, Life; Hook, Eccl. Biog. 6, 71.

## Hildreth, Hosea[[@Headword:Hildreth, Hosea]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Massachusetts, January 2, 1782. He was graduated at Harvard College in 1805, and was engaged for a number of years in teaching, being professor of mathematics in Phillips Exeter Academy from 1811 to 1825. He had studied divinity in the mean time, and was installed minister of First Parish, Gloucester, Mass., on leaving Exeter Academy; His liberal views, and his persistence in exchanging with Unitarians, caused his separation from the Essex Association. He was an active pioneer in the Temperance reform. His death occurred in 1835. He was the author of various essays and sermons. — Sprague, Annals, 8, 445.

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

             an English clergyman, was rector of Wath, near Rippon, Yorkshire. He died in 1756, leaving a number of sermons, theological treatises, etc. (1711-52). His miscellaneous works appeared in 1754. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Hildulf, also Hidulf, of St. Idon[[@Headword:Hildulf, also Hidulf, of St. Idon]]

             flourished in the second half of the 7th century, and is said to have been bishop of Trier under king Pepin. This position he resigned, and founded a monastery in the Vogese mountains. Rettberg (Kirchken-Gesch. Deutschl. 1, 467 sq.; 522 sq.) is inclined to think that Hildulf never held a bishopric. Many biographies have been published of him. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 96. (J. H.W.)

## Hile, (1)[[@Headword:Hile, (1)]]

             an old English word, signifying to put on a roof or cover. In old documents it is sometimes spelled "helye," "hylle," and "hyle;" (2) the covering of a church roof.

## Hilen[[@Headword:Hilen]]

             (1Ch 6:58). SEE HOLON.

## Hilgers, Bernhard Joseph[[@Headword:Hilgers, Bernhard Joseph]]

             a Roman Catholic divine of Germany, was born in 1803. In 1827 he took holy orders, was pastor at Siegburg in 1828, took the degree as doctor of theology at Munster in 1834, commenced his academical career at Bonn in 1835, and died February 7, 1874. He published, Ueber das Verhaltniss zwischen Leib und Seele ion Menschen (Bonn, 1834): — Symbolische Theologie (1841): — Kritische Darstellung der Haresien, etc. (1837): — Homilien (published after his death, 1874). (B.P.)

## Hilgod (or Hilgot)[[@Headword:Hilgod (or Hilgot)]]

             a French prelate, was at first canon of St. Genevieve, and afterwards bishop of Sois'sons in 1085. But grave difficulties arose against his appointment, in consequence of which he resigned about the year 1087, and retired to the monastery of Marmoustier. He died August 4, 1104. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Hilkiah[[@Headword:Hilkiah]]

             (Heb. Chilkiyah', חַלְקַיָּה, portion of Jehovah; often in the prolonged form Chilkiya'hu, חלְקַיָּהוּ, 2Ki 18:18; 2Ki 18:26; 2Ki 22:4; 2Ki 22:8; 2Ki 22:14; 2Ki 23:4; 2Ki 23:24; 1Ch 26:11; 2Ch 34:9; 2Ch 34:14-15; 2Ch 34:18; 2Ch 34:20; 2Ch 34:22; Isa 22:20; Isa 36:3; Jer 1:1; Sept. Χελκίας), the name of a number of men, all priests or Levites.

1. The son of Amzi and father of Amaziah, the sixth in descent from Merari, son of Levi (1Ch 6:45). B.C. long ante 1014.

2. The second son of Hosah, of the family of Merari, appointed by David as a doorkeeper of the tabernacle (1Ch 26:11). B.C. cir. 1014.

3. The father of Eliakim, which latter was overseer of the house (Temple) at the time of Sennacherib's invasion (2Ki 18:18; 2Ki 18:26; 2Ki 18:37; Isa 22:20; Isa 36:3). B.C. ante 713.

4. The father of Gemariah and companion of Elasab, who were sent with a message to the captives at Babylon (Jer 29:3). B.C. long ante 587. He was possibly identical with the foregoing.

5. The father of the prophet Jeremiah (Jer 1:1). B.C. ante 628.

6. Son of Shallum (1Ch 6:13; Ezr 7:1), or Meshullam (1Ch 9:11; Neh 11:11), and father of Azariah, the high priest who assisted Josiah in his work of reformation (2Ki 22:4-14; 2Ki 23:4; 2Ki 23:24; 2Ch 34:9-22; 2Ch 35:8). B.C. 623. “He is especially remarkable for the discovery which he made in the house of the Lord of a book which is called The Book of the Law' (2Ki 22:8), and The Book of the Covenant' (2Ki 23:2). That this was some well known book is evident from the form of the expression” (Kitto). “Kennicott (Heb. Teax. 2, 299) is of opinion that it was the original autograph copy of the Pentateuch written by Moses which Hilkiah found. He argues from the peculiar form of expression in 2Ch 34:14, סֵפֶר תּוֹרִת יְהוָֹה בַּיִד משֶׁה, ‘the book of the law of Jelhovah by the hand of Moses;' whereas in the fourteen other places in the O.T. where the law of Moses or the book of Moses is mentioned, it is either ‘the book of Moses,' or ‘the law of Moses,' or ‘the book of the law of Moses.' But the argument is far from conclusive, because the phrase in question may quite as properly signify ‘the book of the law of the Lord given through Moses.' Compare the expression ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου (Gal 3:19), and בְּיִד משֶׁה (Exo 9:35; Exo 35:29; Neh 10:29; 2Ch 35:6; Jer 1:1).

Though, however, the copy cannot be proved to have been Moses's autograph from the words in question, it seems probable that it  was such, from the place where it was found, viz. in the Temple; and, from its not having been discovered before, but only being brought to light on the occasion of the repairs which were necessary, and from the discoverer being the high-priest himself, it seems natural to conclude that the particular part of the Temple where it was found was one not usually frequented, or ever by any but the high-priest. Such a place exactly was the one where we know the original copy of the law was deposited by command of Moses, viz. by the side of the ark of the covenant within the veil, as we learn from, Deu 31:9; Deu 31:26” (Smith). “That it was the entire Pentateuch is the opinion of Josephus, Von Lengerke, Keil, Ewald, Havernick, etc.; but others think it was only part of that collection, and others that it was simply a collection of laws and ordinances appointed by Moses, such as are given in the Pentateuch, and especially in Deuteronomy.

The objection to its being the whole Pentateuch is the improbability of that being read in the audience of the people at one time, as was this book (Deu 23:2); and there are many circumstances which render it probable that what was read to the people was the look of Deuteronomy, as the apparent allusion to Deu 29:1; Deu 30:2, in Deu 23:2-3, and the special effect which the reading of the book had on the king, who did, in consequence, Just what one impressed by such passages as occur in Deu 16:18, etc., would be likely to do. At the same time, even if we admit that the part actually read consisted only of the summary of laws and institutions in Deuteronomy, it will not follow that that was the only part of the Pentateuch found by Hilkiah; for, as the matter brought before his mind by Huldah the prophetess (2Ki 22:15 sq.) respected the restoration of the worship of Jehovah, it might be only to what bore on that that the reading specially referred. The probability is that the book found by Hilkiah was the same which was entrusted to the care of the priests, and was to be put in the side of the ark (Deu 31:26); and that this was the entire body of the Mosaic writing, and not any part of it, seems the only tenable conclusion (Hengstenberg, Beitrigye, 2, 159 sq.)”

7. One of the chief priests (contemporary with Jeshua as high-priest) who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh 12:7). His son Hashabiah is named in Neh 12:21. B.C. 536.

8. One of those who supported Ezra on the right hand while reading the law to the people (Neh 8:4). B.C. cir...410. It is somewhat uncertain whether he even belonged to the Levitical family; the date of the  events with which he is associated seems to forbid his identification with the foregoing.

## Hill[[@Headword:Hill]]

             is the rendering of the following original words in the Auth. Vers. of the Bible. SEE PALESTINE.

1. Gib'ah,', גַּבְעָה, from a root akin to גָּבִע, to be high, which seems to have the force of curvature or humpishness. A word involving this idea is peculiarly applicable to the rounded hills of Palestine, and from it are derived, as has been pointed out under GIBEAH, the names of several places situated on hills. Our translators have been consistent in rendering gib'ah by “hill:” in four passages only qualifying it as “little hill,” doubtless for the more complete antithesis to “mountain” (Psa 65:12; Psa 72:3; Psa 114:4; Psa 114:6). SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

2. But they have also employed the same English word for the very different term bar, הִר, which has a much more extended sense than gib'ah, meaning a whole district rather than an individual eminence, and to which our word “mountain” answers with tolerable accuracy. This exchange is always undesirable, but it sometimes occurs so as to confuse the meaning of a passage where it is desirable that the topography should be unmistakable. For instance, in Eze 24:4, the “hill” is the same which is elsewhere in the same chapter (Eze 24:12-13; Eze 24:18, etc.) and book consistently and accurately rendered “mount” and “mountain.” In Num 14:44-45, the “hill” is the “mountain” of Num 14:40, as also in Deu 1:41; Deu 1:43, compared with  Deu 1:24; Deu 1:44. In Jos 15:9, the allusion is to the Mount of Olives, correctly called “mountain” in the preceding verse; and so also in 2Sa 16:13. The country of the “hills,” in Deu 1:7; Jos 9:1; Jos 10:40; Jos 11:16, is the elevated district of Judah, Benjamin, and Ephraim, which is correctly called “the mountain” in the earliest descriptions of Palestine (Num 13:29), and in many subsequent passages. The “holy hill” (Psa 3:4), the “hill of Jehovah” (Psa 24:3), the “hill of God” (Psa 68:15). are nothing else than “Mount Zion.” In 2Ki 1:9; 2Ki 4:27, the use of the word “hill” obscures the allusion to Carmel, which in other passages of the life of the prophet (e.g. 1Ki 18:19; 2Ki 4:25) has the term “mount” correctly attached to it. Other places in the historical books in which the same substitution weakens the force of the narrative are as  follows: Gen 7:19; Deu 8:7; Jos 13:6; Jos 18:13-14; Jdg 16:3; 1Sa 23:14; 1Sa 25:20; 1Sa 26:13; 2Sa 13:34; 1Ki 20:23; 1Ki 20:28; 1Ki 22:17, etc. SEE MOUNTAIN.

3. On one occasion the word ma'aleh', מִעֲלֶה, is rendered “hill,” viz. 1Sa 9:11, where it would be better to employ “ascent,” or some similar term. SEE MAALEH.

4. In the N.T. the word “hill” is employed to render the Greek word βουνός; but on one occasion it is used for ὄρος, elsewhere “mountain,” so as to obscure the connection between the two parts of the same narrative. The “hill” from which Jesus was coming down in Luk 9:36, is the same as “the mountain” into which he had gone for his transfiguration the day before (comp. Luk 9:28). In Mat 5:14, and Luk 4:29, ὄρος is also rendered “hill,” but not with the inconvenience just noticed. In Luk 1:39, the “hill country” (ἡ ὀρεινή) is the same “mountain of Judah” to which frequent reference is made in the Old Testament. SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF.

## Hill, Benjamin M., D.D[[@Headword:Hill, Benjamin M., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Newport, R.I., April 5, 1793. He entered the preparatory department of Pennsylvania University, but was soon called to New Orleans as a clerk; and subsequently studied medicine for a time in Philadelphia. He was converted in 1812; licensed in February 1815; for two years preached in Leicester and Spencer, Massachusetts; in 1818 was ordained in Stafford, Connecticut, where he remained three years, and was then called to the pastorate of the First Church in New Haven, where he continued from 1821 to 1829. The next ten years of his ministry were with the First Church in Troy, N.Y. In 1840, he became corresponding secretary of the American Baptist Home Mission Society, which position he held for twenty-two years. He died in New Haven, January 15, 1881. See Christian Secretary, January 19, 1881. (J.C.S.)

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

             a Baptist minister, was born in Kings County, Ireland, January 6, 1800. In 1822 he became a student in Horton College, completing the course in two years, and then became pastor of the Church at Middleton. In 1834 he was appointed secretary of the Home Mission Society; in 1842 he became pastor of the Heneage Street Church, Birmingham, where he remained until 1851, when he removed to the United States; was pastor in Belvidere, Illinois; chaplain, for a time, in the Federal army; connected for a short period with the University of Chicago, and finally took up his residence in Belvidere, where he died in 1872. See (Lond.) Baptist Hand-book, 1873, page 273. (J.C.S.)

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

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Charleston, S. C., February 20,1797, was converted about 1817, entered the South Carolina Conference in 1820, was presiding elder on Savannah District in 182627- 28, and then stationed at Milledgeville, where he died, August 22,1829. Mr. Hill possessed, in rare combination, great firmness and great mildness, which, coupled with vigorous ability, made him an excellent administrative officer. He was studious, and deeply pious, “and was universally acknowledged to be a bold, powerful, and eminently successful minister.” — Min. of Confer. 2, 117.

## Hill, George, D.D[[@Headword:Hill, George, D.D]]

             a divine of the Church of Scotland, born at St. Andrews in 1748. He was educated at the university of his native place, where he obtained the Greek professorship, and afterward that of divinity. He subsequently became  principal of St. Mary's, chaplain to the king for Scotland, and fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, and was long an ornament of the Church of Scotland. He died in 1819. Among his publications are, Sermons (1796, 8vo): — Theological Institutes (Edinb. 1803, 8 vo): — Lectures on portions of the Old Testament illustrative of the Jewish History (Lond. 1812, 8 vo). But his greatest work is his Lectures in Divinity, delivered to the students while principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews. Dr. Hill's doctrinal sentiments were, in consonance with the standards of the Church of Scotland, strongly Calvinistic. He was the successor of Dr. Robertson (1779) in the high office of moderate leader of the Assembly. The best editions of his Lectures in Divinity are those of Edinburgh (1825, 3 vols. 8vo) and New York (Carter & Brothers, 8vo). See Jones, Christian Biog.; Chalmers, Posth. Works, 9:125; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 846; Hetherington, Hist. Ch. of Scotland, 2, 337.

## Hill, Green[[@Headword:Hill, Green]]

             a colonel in the Revolutionary army, and one of the pioneer preachers of Methodism in Tennessee, was born in North Carolina in 1741. The year 1780 is given as the first record of his preaching. The first Conference in North Carolina was held at his house in 1785. In 1799 he removed to Tennessee. He died in 1825. See McFerrin, Methodism in Tennessee, p. 302.

## Hill, John Henry, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Hill, John Henry, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born in New York city, Sept. 11, 1791. He graduated from Columbia College in 1807, in 1830 was appointed missionary to Greece, also (1845-51) chaplain to the British Legation in Athens. He died there, July 1, 1882. He translated several works into modern Greek.

## Hill, Noah[[@Headword:Hill, Noah]]

             a learned Independent minister, was born at Cradley, England, 1739, and educated at Daventry, where he was classical master for ten years. He became rector of the Gravel Lane Chapel, London, 1 771, and preached  there thirty-seven years. He died in 1815. His Sermons (Lond. 1822, 8vo) are said to abound in felicitous illustrations.

## Hill, Rowland[[@Headword:Hill, Rowland]]

             brother of Sir Richard Hill, a popular and pious, though eccentric minister, was born at Hawkestone Aug. 13th or 23rd, 1744. His views were early directed towards the ministry in connection with the Church of England, and his religious life was greatly developed during his residence as a student at Eton and St. John's College, Cambridge, where he imbibed the principles of Whitefield and the Calvinistic Methodists, which he strenuously maintained through life. His religious zeal at college was strongly marked, but he did not allow it to interfere with his studies. He experienced the greatest difficulty in obtaining admission into the Church-  six bishops refused in turn to ordain him, and he succeeded at length only through family affluence. After his ordination he resumed itinerancy, much against the wishes of his father. In 1773 he obtained the parish of Kingston, Somerset, and was married in the same year, yet still kept up his itinerant ministry. His vigor of thought, earnestness, eccentricity, and wit drew thousands to listen to him. In 1780 his father's death left him wealth; and, with the aid of his numerous friends, he built Surrey Chapel, London, in 1782. Here he preached to vast congregations for many years. He died April 11, 1833. In the controversy between the Arminian and Calvinistic Methodists Hill took an active part, and wrote several bitter pamphlets against John Wesley, especially Imposture detected (Bristol, 1777): — Full Answer to John Wesley (Bristol, 1777). When the strife ended Hill regretted his severe language, and suppressed one of his bitterest publications. See Sidney, Life of Rowland Hill (Lond. 1835, 8vo); Stevens, History of Methodism, vol. 2, ch. 1 and 2; Wesley, Works, 4, 473; 6:193, 199.

## Hill, Sir Richard[[@Headword:Hill, Sir Richard]]

             one of a family distinguished for piety, eccentricity, and usefulness, son of Sir Rowland Hill of Hawkestone, was born in 1733, and was educated at Westminster School and Magdalen College, Oxford. “In youth he was subject to deep religious impressions; he endeavored to remove them by dissipation on! the Continent,” but they were only deepened. On his return he sought advice from Fletcher of Madeley, and was converted. He became a zealous promoter of Methodism. When the “Methodist students” were expelled from Oxford, he wrote, in rebuke of that intolerant measure, a large pamphlet, entitled, Pietas Oxoniensis: a full Account of the Expulsion of Six Students from St. Edmund's Hall (Lond. 1768, 8vo). When the Calvinistic controversy arose among the Methodists, Hill took sides against Wesley and Fletcher, and wrote a number of virulent Letters to Mr. Fletcher (answered in Fletcher's Checks to Antinommiancism). He also wrote, against Wesley, The Farrago Double Distilled: a Review of Wesley's Doctrines; The Finishing Stroke, and other pamphlets, answers to which may be found in Fletcher, as above, and in Wesley, Works, vol. vi. He afterward found better employment in writing An Apology for Brotherly Love, against Daubeny's Guide. (Lond. 1798, 8vo), and Letter to Mr. Malan on his Defense of Polygamy. He preached as occasion demanded in dissenting chapels, and was an active and useful Christian throughout his life. He died in 1808. See Rose, Genesis Biog. Dictionary; Wesley, Works. 6:144 sq.; Stevens, History of Methodism, vol. 2, ch. 1 and 2; Sidney, Life of Sir Richard Hill (Lond. 1839, 8vo).

## Hill, Stephen P., D.D[[@Headword:Hill, Stephen P., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Salem, Massachusetts, April 17, 1806. He was converted at the age of fourteen, began to preach at seventeen, studied at Waterville College, graduated from Brown University in 1829, and from the Newton Theological Institution in 1832, became pastor at Haverhill, Massachusetts, preached one winter (1833-34) near Charleston, S.C., was pastor thereafter in Baltimore, Maryland, and Washington, D.C., until 1861, and died in the latter city, September 15, 1884. He published several sermons and addresses, likewise some works on hymnology and for the young. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. s.v.

## Hill, William Wallace, D.D[[@Headword:Hill, William Wallace, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Bath County, Ky, Jan. 26, 1815. He prepared for college at Mt. Sterling and Paris; graduated from Centre College in 1835; entered Princeton Theological Seminary the same year,  and remained two years. He was licensed by the Presbytery of New Brunswick, April 24, 1838, ordained by the Presbytery of Louisville, October 3 following, and installed pastor at Shlelbyville, where he served four years. He then took charge of The Protestant Herald, published at Bardstown, but removed it to Frankfort, as a more central place of publication. In November 1844, he again removed with his paper to Louisville, and its name was changed to The Presbyterian Herald. As a religious newspaper it had few equals in the land. Its publication ceased in 1862, on account of the war. From 1845 to 1860 he was also corresponding secretary of the Western Executive Committee of the Board of Domestic Missions. He then founded Bellewood Female Seminary, near Louisville, and was its principal from 1862 to 1874. During these years he also preached more or less regularly at Plumb Creek, Middletown, and Anchorage. In 1874 he accepted the charge of the Synodical Female College at Fulton, Missouri, and supplied the Presbyterian Church of that place. He left Fulton in 1877, and went to Sherman, Texas, where he commenced teaching in Austin College, preaching for the Church there at the same time. He died May 1, 1878. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1879, page 39.

## Hill, William, D.D[[@Headword:Hill, William, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Cumberland Co., Va., March 3, 1769. In 1785 he entered Hampden Sidney College. While there he embraced religion, and decided to study for the ministry. He graduated in 1788, and was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Hanover July 10, 1790. After acting for two years as missionary, he settled in Berkeley, Va., and in January 1800, assumed charge of the Presbyterian Church in Winchester. In February 1834, he became pastor of the Briery Presbyterian Church in Prince Edward Co., where he remained only two years, when impaired health obliged him to resign, and he returned to Winchester to pass the last days of his life. He died there Nov. 16,1852. Dr. Hill was engaged on a History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, intended to make two 8vo vols. He decided to publish it in numbers, but only a single number of it appeared. “In the great contest that issued in the division of the Church, Dr. Hill's judgment, sympathies, and acts were fully with the New School.” — Presb. Quarterly Review, 1853; Sprague, Annals, 3, 563.

## Hill, William, D.D (2)[[@Headword:Hill, William, D.D (2)]]

             an English divine, was born at Cudworth, in Warwickshire, in 1619, and educated at Merton College, Oxford. He died in 1677. He published, Dionysii Orbis Descriptio (1658, 1659, 1663, 1678, 1688): — Woman's Looking-glass (1660). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Hill-Gods[[@Headword:Hill-Gods]]

             (אֵֹלהֵי הָרַים, “gods of the hills”) are mentioned (1Ki 20:23) by the heathenish Syrians as being those of the Hebrews, because more powerful; and such deities (dii montium), i.e. those that have their dwelling or throne on hills, whence they command control of all the region within view, were generally worshipped by the ancient pagans (see Dougteei Anal. 1, 178; Deyling, Observ. 3 no. 12) sometimes in general (Gruter, Inscript. f. 21; Lactant. Mort. persec. 11), sometimes as individuals (Arnobius, Adv. gent. 4, 9; Augustine, Civ. dei, 4, 8), since heights were generally regarded as seats of the gods (Herodotus, 1, 131; Xenophon, Mem. 3, 8, 10; Strabo, 15:732; Dougtiei Anal. 1, 108; Rimptsch, De sacris gemtium in montibus, Lipsime, 1719; Creuzer, Symbolik, 1, 158 sq.; Gesenius, Jesa. 2, 282; Gramberg's Religionsid. 1, 20). SEE HIGH PLACE. Grotius (ad loc.) specially compares the δπελΠαρΤθ Pun. (See Walch, De deo Ebroeor. montano, Jen. 1746).

## Hilla or Hillel Codex of the O.T[[@Headword:Hilla or Hillel Codex of the O.T]]

             SEE MANUSCRIPTS.

## Hille, Wilhelm[[@Headword:Hille, Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born February 16, 1803. He studied at Gottingen, was from 1824 to 1833 teacher at the gymnasia in Wolfenbrittel and Helmstadt, in 1833 pastor at Marienthal, in 1834 superintendent, in 1840 general superintendent and pastor primarius at Helmstadt, and in 1845 member of consistory. In 1875 he retired from his many positions, and died October 2, 1880. As Christianity had become a reality in Hille, who had freed himself from the fetters of rationalism, he became to many a leader to Christ. He published, Oratiunuae Synodales (Helmstidt, 1844): — Das Kirchenjahr (Berlin, 1858): — Zeugnisse von Christo (1859). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:557. (B.P.)

## Hillel[[@Headword:Hillel]]

             (Heb. Hillel', הַלֵּל, praising; Sept. Ε᾿λλήλ, Josephus, ῎Ελληλος), a Pirathonite, father of the judge Abdon (Jdg 12:13; Jdg 12:15). B.C. ante 1233.

## Hillel I, Ha-Zaken[[@Headword:Hillel I, Ha-Zaken]]

             (הִזָּקֵן, or the Great), BEN-SIMON, was born at Babylon about B.C. 75. He was one of the most eminent Jewish rabbis, founder of a school which bore his name, and by his self-denying, holy life, and great wisdom and learning, exercised a very remark-able influence both upon the theology and literature of his nation. About B.C. 36 he came to Jerusalem, where, while obliged to work for his daily bread, he attended at the same time the lectures of Shemaja and Abtalion, then the presiding officers of the Sanhedrim. About B.C. 30 he was himself chosen president of the Sanhedrim. This office he held for forty years with great success. Etheridge says: “His administration, along with his coadjutor Shammai, forms an era in the history of rabbinical learning. His scholars were numbered by thousands. The Talmud commemorates eighty of them by name, among whom are the celebrated R. Jochanan ben-Zachai, and Jonathan ben-Uziel, the Chaldee Targumist on the Prophets.” Some have asserted (Ginsburg in Kitto, among others) that by his teachings he prepared his people for the coming of Christ, but we are inclined to believe that, while Hillel was a most noble leader of the Jews, teaching as he did that the cardinal doctrine and aim of life is “to be gentle, showing all meekness to all men.” and “when reviled not to revile again,” yet his views of the prophecies rather inclined him to give warning to his nation-especially prepared, by their social and political discomfort, to look more intently for the coming of that mysterious king who, according to their idea, was to free them from the oppression of Herod as well as Caesar, and establish in the land of Judah a throne that should have supremacy over all others-by asserting that “no such king will ever appear” (Sanhedrin). But it is undoubtedly true that he foresaw the dispersion of his nation, for the Talmud informs us that he drew up civil and political ordinances intended to regulate their relation to each other after their separation. While president of the Sanhedrim, his great aim was to give greater precision to the study of the law. Before his time tradition learning had been divided into six hundred, or, as some ‘have it, seven hundred sections. He simplified the subject by arranging this once complicated mass under six (Sedarim) treatises-the basis, really, of the  future Mishna labors of Akiba, Chijja, and Jehuda Hakkodesh in this department. Hillel was also the first who laid down definite hermeneutical rules for the interpretation of the O.T. They are very important for a proper understanding of the ancient versions (Midrash). His colleague, the vice-president of the Sanhedrim, Shammai, became displeased with the liberality of Hillel's mind, and this finally resulted in the establishment of “the school of Shammai” by the side of “the school of Hillel.” Their points of difference related to questions of jurisprudence and Church discipline, not to dogmas, yet their disputes caused great excitement among the Jews. Hillel's party finally prevailed, in consequence, it is said, of a bath kol (q.v.) in his favor. Jerome and some other writers have considered Hillel as the founder of the sect of Pharisees, and Shammai as the first Scribe. This, however, is an error, for the Scribes and Pharisees did not constitute two distinct sects, and, moreover, were anterior to these two teachers. Hillel died when Jesus was about ten years of age. It seems strange that Josephus makes no mention of Hillel. Arnold (in Herzog, Real Encyklop. 7, 97, thinks that Pollio (Ant. 16, 1, 1, 10) stands for Hillel. To the school of Hillel is attributed the authorship of Megillath Beth Hashmonaim, a work on the history of the Maccabees, now lost. See Bartolocci, Magna Biblioth. Rabbin. 2, 783-796; G. E. Geiger et H. Giessman, Brevis Commentatio de Hillel et Schammai, etc. (Altdorf, 1707, 4to); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 686; Engl. Cyclopaedia; Fürst, Kulturgesch. 1, 13; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebr. Literat. p. 33; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 8, 207; Jost, Gesch. d. Israel. 1, 254; Kitto, Cyclop. of Bib. Liter. 2, 303; Wolf, Biblioth. Hebr. 2, 824-8. (J. H. W.)

## Hillel II, ben-Jehudah III[[@Headword:Hillel II, ben-Jehudah III]]

             (sometimes called the younger, because a descendant of Hillel I, or the elder, q.v.), came to the presidency of the Sanhedrim about A.D. 330 (some say A.D. 258), which he held for about thirty-five years. As president of the Sanhedrim, he was, of course, the head of the Jewish school at Tiberias, and it is said that while in this position he was often consulted by Origen. Some think him the Ellel mentioned by Epiphanius (adver. Haeres. 30, 4 sq.), who embraced the Christian faith on his deathbed. But this fact is unlikely, as the Jews of Hillel's time make no mention of it whatever. Had it occurred they would undoubtedly have execrated his name. It is an interesting fact, however, connected with Biblical literature to learn from Epiphanius that a Hebrew translation of the Gospel of John, of the Acts of the Apostles, and of Christ's genealogy as  recorded by Matthew, existed at this early period of Christianity, for it is said of the Ellel above referred to, that a Hebrew translation of the parts of the N.T. just mentioned was found secreted in the cabinet of the nasi (president), subsequently to his death. Hillel is said to have convoked a rabbinical synod which adjusted the period of the sun with that of the moon in calculating time, though it was not used until the change introduced under Alphonso, king of Castile (Bartolocci, Magna Bibliotheca Rabbinicarum, 2, 415 sq.). This calendar, while it greatly facilitated the uniform observance of the Paschal festival and other great festivals, tended to promote unity among a people dispersed through so many lands. “If the acts of this synod had been handed down in a written form, we should probably have had in them some light on the present discrepancies between the chronology of the Hebrew text and that of the Septuagint.” It is generally believed that the rabbins of this synod fixed the epoch of the Creation at the vernal equinox, 3761 years before the birth of Christ. Indeed, Hillel's great reputation, nay, immortality, rests upon his introduction of the calendar (q.v.) of the Jewish year, used even at present with little variation. “According to this calendar, the difference between the solar and lunar year upon which the cycle of the Jewish festivals depends, is yearly made up; the length of the month is made to approximate to the astronomical course of the moon, and attention is also paid in it to the Halachic matters connected with the Jewish festivals. It is based upon the cycle of nineteen years (מחזר הלבנה), introduced by the Greek astronomer Meton, in which occur seven intercalary years. Each year has ten unchangeable months of alternately twenty-nine and thirty days; the two autumnal months, Cheshvan and Kislev, which follow the important month Tisri, are left changeable, SEE HAPHTARAH, because they depend upon certain astronomical phenomena and the following points of Jewish law:

1. That the month of Tisri is never to begin with the day which, to a great extent, belongs to the former month.

2. The Day of Atonement is not to fall on the day before or after the Sabbath; and,

3. That the Hosanna Day is not to be on a Sabbath. It is impossible now to say with certainty how much of this calendar is Hillel's own, and how much he took from the national traditions, since it is beyond question that some astronomical rules were handed down by the presidents. This  calendar Hillel introduced A.D. 359.” A similarity of names has caused him to be considered as the author of a MS. copy of the O.T., which was preserved until the close of the 13th century, and was used to correct later copies. He died towards the close of the 4th century. — Rossi, Dizion. storico degli Autori Ebrei, p. 170,171; Wolf, Biblioth. Hebraica; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 688; Etheridge, Introd. Hebr. Lit. p. 138; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 4, 386 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. of Bib. Lit. 2, 305. (J. H.W.)

## Hillel Manuscript[[@Headword:Hillel Manuscript]]

             Of the ancient Hebrew MSS., now no more extant, the most famous is the codex Hillel. As to this name there is a difference of opinion. From Jewish history we know that there were. two rabbis by the name of Hillel, one who lived in the first century before Christ, called Hillel I, the Great, the other who lived in the fourth century after Christ, called Hillel II. Some, as  Schickhard (Jus Regium Hebracorum, ed. Carpzov, Leipsic. 1674, p. 39) and Cuneus (De Republ. Hebr. page 159), attributed this codex to the older Hillel; others, as David Gans, in his Tzemnach David, Buxtorf, in Tractatus de Punctorum Vocalium, etc. (Basle, 1648), page 353, attributed it to the younger Hillel. A third opinion is that this codex derives its name from the fact that it was written at Hilla. a town built near the ruins of ancient Babylon, so Furst (Gesch. ces Karcierthums, page 22 sq., 138, note 14), and Ginsburg (Levita's Massoreth ha-Massoreth, page 260, note 40).

But none of these opinions seems to be correct. Against the first two we have the express testimony of Abraham ben-Samuel Sakkuto (q.v.), who, in his Book of Genealogies, entitled Sepher Yuchasin, says that when he saw the remainder of the codex (circa A.D. 1500) it was 900 years old. His words are these: "In the year 4956, on the 28th day of Ab (i.e., in 1196, better 1197), there was a great persecution of the Jews in the kingdom of Leon from the two kingdoms which came to besiege it. It was then that the twenty-four sacred books, which were written long ago, about the year 600, by rabbi Moses ben-Hillel, in an exceedingly correct manner, and after which all copies were corrected, were taken away. I saw the remaining two portions of the same, viz. the earlier prophets (i.e., Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings), and the later prophets (i.e., Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets), written in large and beautiful characters, which were brought to Portugal and sold in Africa, where they still are, having been written 900 years ago." Kimchi, in his grammar on Num 15:4, says that the Pentateuch of this codex was extant in Toletola (בטוליטולה, Yuchasin, ed. Filipowski, Lond. 1857, page 220, Colossians 2). From this statement it may be deduced that this codex was written about the 7th century.

As to the third opinion, deriving the name from Hilla, a town near Babel, ve may dismiss it as merely ingenious. A better opinion seems to be that of Strack (Prolegomena, page 16), who says, "Fortasse tamen recte cogitabis eum e numero τῶν סופריםin Hispania fuisse," This is also the opinion of the famous critic Jedidja Norzi (q.v.), who remarks, on Gen 1:5 : "He was a very good Masoretic scholar, and a scribe in the city of Toletola." Whatever uncertainty may be about the derivation of its name, certain it is that this codex is very important for the criticism of the Old Test. Hebrew text, as the many quotations which we find in Norzi's critical commentary, entitled מנחת שי, published at Mantua, 1742-44, Vienna, 1813, Warsaw, 1860-66, and in Lonzano's critical work, entitled אור תורת, indicate. In the 12th century  this codex was perused by the Jewish grammarian, Jacob ben-Eleazar, as David Kimchi testifies in his grammatical work, Mi'chlul (ed. Furth, 1793, fol. 78, Colossians 2), and rabbi Jacob ben-Eleazar writes that in the codex Hillel, which is at Toletola, he found that the daleth in תַּדַרוּwas raphe (Deu 12:1); and fol. 127, Colossians 2, in fine, he writes: "In the codex Hillel, which is at Toletola, the word תאפה(Lev 6:10) is written with a tsere, תֵאָפֵה, and not תֵאָפֶה, as our present text has." We subjoin some readings of the codex Hillel:

Gen 4:8 : In some editions of the Old Test. there is a space left between אחיוand ויַהי, and is marked in the margin by פסקא, i.e., space. The LXX., Samuel, Syr., Vul., and Jerus. Targum add, "let us go into the field." The space we have referred to is found in the editions of Buxtorf, Menasseh ben-Israel, Walton, Nissel, Hutter, Clodius, Van der Hooght. But, says Lonzano, the piska is a mistake of the printer, for in the MSS. which he consulted, and in codex Hillel, there is no space. The addition "let us go into the field," is not found by Symmachus, Theodotion, and Oukelos. Even Origen remarks δίέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέδιον ἐν τῷ ῾Εβραϊκῷ οὐ γέγραπται (tom. 2:30).

Gen 9:29 : A great many codd. and edd. read ויהיוbut codex Hillel ויהי.

Gen 19:16 : וִיַּתְמִהְַמִהּhere Lonzano remarks that the second mem is written with kanets in codd. and in cod. Hillel. In the edition of Bar and Delitzsch the word is thus written, וִיַּתְמִהְמָהּ.

Gen 19:20 : אַמָּלְטָה גָּא. Lonzano says that נאis raphe, but in cod. Hillel it is written with a dagesh. In Bar and Delitzsch's Genesis it is written raphe.

Gen 27:25 : וִיָּבֵא לוֹ. In cod. Hillel, says Lonzano, the accent darga is in the yod. In our editions it is in, or'rather under, the beth; Bar and Delitzsch follow the cod. Hillel, and write וִיָּבֵא.

Genesis 39 : מִרְאֶה. Norzi remarks that the codex Hillel writes with tsere

מִרְאֵה.  Gen 42:16 : הֵאָסְרוּ. In the margin of an old codex, belonging nlowv to Dr. S. Bar; the editor of the new edition of the Old Test., in connection with professor Delitzsch, it is written בהלל האסרו, i.e., in the codex Hillel, the reading is with segol, הֶאסרי.

Gen 46:13 : וּפֻיָּה. On this word Lonzano remarks that in Hillel and other codd. the vav is raphe, i.e., וּפֻוָה.

Exo 10:9 : וּבְזַקְנֵנוּHillel, remarks Lonzano, is written מלא יוד i.e., plene ובזקנינו-

Exo 37:8 : כְרוּב. In Hillel and in some other codd., remarks Lonzano, it is written with a makkeph.

Jos 21:35-36 : Cod. Kennic. No. 357, reads in the margin בהללי לא מצינו אלו השני פסוקים, i.e., these two verses are not found in the codex Hillel. Similar is the remark in a MSS. formerly belonging to H. Lotze, of Leipsic. Pro 8:16 : A great many codd., editions, and ancient versions, as Syrizac, Vulgate, Targum, and even the Grsecus Venetus, read here שפטי צרק, while the Complutensian text and other codd. read שפטי ארוֹ, which is also supported by codex Hillel, and is adopted in Bar's ed. of Proverbs.

These few examples will show the importance of the codex Hillel for the text of the Old Test. (B.P.)

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

             a German Protestant theologian and Orientalist, was born at Stuttgardt Feb. 15,1646. He became professor of logic and metaphysics in 1692, and of Oriental languages and theology in 1698. In 1716 he exchanged these offices for the priory of Konigsbronn, where he died, Feb. 11, 1725. He acquired great reputation by his works on philology and hermeneutics. He wrote Sciagraphia Grammaticae Hebrae: — Lexicon Latino-Hebraecum (1685): — De Arcano Keri et Kethib (Tübing. 1692, 8vo), on the accentuation and punctuation of the Bible: — Institutiones Linguae Sanctae (several times reprinted, as Tübing. 1760, 8vo): — Onomasticon Sacrum (Tübingen, 1706, 4to, transl. into German by himself): — Syntagmata hermneneutica quibus loca S. Scripturae plurima ex Hebraico textu nove explicantur (Tibingen, 1711, 4to): — Hieroqlyphicum: — De Origine Gentium Celticarum: — De Origine, diis et terra Palaestinorum: — De Plantis in S. Scriptura memoratis: — Hierophyticon (Utrecht, 1725, 4to). See Fabricius, Hist. Biblioth. 6:44; Ersch und Gruber, Allg. Encyklopadie; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 689. (J. N. P.)

## Hiller, Philip Frederick[[@Headword:Hiller, Philip Frederick]]

             one of the best and most prolific hymn writers of the Evangelical Church of Southern Germany, was born at Muhlhausen in 1699; educated under J. A. Bengel; became pastor at two or three little villages, and finally at Steinheim in 1732; lost his voice in 1751, and died in 1769. After his retirement from the pulpit he devoted himself especially to sacred poetry, and produced over 1000 hymns, many of which have great excellencies. It is said that, next to the Bible, his spiritual songs are perhaps the most widely circulated book in Würtemberg (Hurst's Hagenbach). A complete edition appeared at Reutlingen in 1844 and 1851. — Herzog. Real- Encyklop. vol. 6; Hagenbach, Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries  (translated by Hurst), 2, 393; Winkworth, Christian Singers of Germany, p. 278.

## Hillhouse, Augustus L[[@Headword:Hillhouse, Augustus L]]

             author of the beautiful hymn beginning “Trembling before thine awful throne,” was born at New Haven, Conn., about 1792, and died in Paris March 14, 1859. He was a younger brother of James A. Hillhouse, the poet. New Englander, 18, 557.

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

             a Congregational minister, was born in 1746 in Kensington N. H. He graduated at Harvard College in. 1764, and is 1768 was appointed tutor, in which position he remained until 1771, when he was ordained pastor at Barnstable. This charge he resigned April 1783, and was installed co-pastor at Cambridge Oct. 27, where he remained until his death, May 9, 1790. He published the Dudleian Lecture at Harvard College (1788), and several occasional sermons. Sprague, Annals, 1, 660.

## Hilliger, Johann Zacharias[[@Headword:Hilliger, Johann Zacharias]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born January 1, 1693, at Chemnitz. He studied at Leipsic and Wittenberg, was in 1717 adjunct to the philosophical faculty at the latter place, in 1724 professor of philosophy, in 1725 superintendent at Sayda, in Saxony, and died January 16, 1770. He wrote, De Libro7 Recti ad Jos 10:15 (Leipsic, 1714): — De ἀυλήταις ad Mat 9:23 (1717): — De Vita, Fama, et Scriptis Val. Weigelii (1721): — De Plagis Magnis Pharaonis ad Gen 12:17 (1724): — De Canonica Libri Esther Auctoritate (Wittenberg, 1729): — De Augustana Conffessione Nonna Concionum Sacrarum Secunduaria (1733). See Dietmann, Chursachsische Priester; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:775; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:394. (B.P.)

## Hillyer, Asa, D.D[[@Headword:Hillyer, Asa, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Massachusetts, April 6, 1763. He graduated at Yale College in 1786; was ordained by the Presbytery of Suffolk, L.I., in 1788; called to Bottle Hill (now Madison), N.J., in 1789; to the First Presbyterian Church of Orange in 1801; resigned his charge when he was seventy years of age, and died at Orange, August 28, 1840. During his pastorate at Orange he made a missionary tour through northern Pennsylvania and western New York, and preached the first sermon ever heard in what is now the city of Auburn. See Tuttle, Hist. of the Presb. Church in Madison, N.J. (New York, 1855), page 39; Aikman, Historical Discourse Concerning the Presbyterian Church, Madison, N.J. (1876), page 8.

## Hillyer, Asa, D.D.[[@Headword:Hillyer, Asa, D.D.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was: born in Sheffield, Mass., April 6,1763; entered Yale College in 1782, and graduated in 1786. He was licensed to preach by the old Presbytery of Suffolk, L. I., in 1788, and was appointed to the churches at Connecticut Farms and Bottle Hill (now Madison, N. J., the seat of the. Drew Theological Seminary), and shortly after (Sept, 29,1789) was ordained and installed as pastor at the latter place. In the summer of 1801 he accepted an invitation to the church in Orange, ‘one of the largest and most influential in the state.” Here he labored with great acceptance and success for more than thirty years. In 1818 he received the degree of D.D. from Alleghany College. In the disruption of the Presbyterian Church (1837), Dr. Hillyer sided with the New School. “But, though he regarded the division as an unwise measure, it never disturbed his pleasant relations with those of his brethren whose views and action in reference to it differed from his own” (G. N. Judd, in Sprague's Annals). He was a trustee of the College of New Jersey from 1811 to his death, and from 1812 until the division of the General Assembly one of the first directors of the theological seminary at Princeton. This school, too, he regarded to the last with undiminished interest. — Tuttle, (Rev. Samuel  L.), History of the Presbyterian Church, Madison, N. J. p. 39 sq.; Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 3, 533.

## Hilpert, Johann[[@Headword:Hilpert, Johann]]

             a Lutheran theologian, superintendent at Hildesheim, who died May 10, 1680, is the author of, Disquisitio de Praeadamitis: — De Judeaorum Flagellationibus: — De Gloria Templi Posterioris: — Hebraeorum Philosophia Adversus Judaeos: — De Agapis: — De Perseverantia Sanctorum. See Witte, Diajum Biographicum; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:394; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hilscher, Balthasar[[@Headword:Hilscher, Balthasar]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born April 1, 1595, at Hirschberg, Silesia. He was bachelor of theology and deacon at Leipsic, and died September 13, 1630, leaving, De Integritate Codicis Hebraei: — De Evangelio: — De Justificatione: — Disputationes de Invocatione Sanctorum, de Sanctis Angelis, de Imagine Dei: — De Hominibus in Diluvio ad 1 Petr. 3:19: — Lutherischer Buss- und Betwecker wider den Pabst und seine Jesuiter. See Gitze, Elogia Theologorum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hilscher, Paul Christian[[@Headword:Hilscher, Paul Christian]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born March 15, 1666, at Waldheim, in Saxony. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1695 deacon at Dresden (Neustadt), in 1704 pastor there, and died August 3, 1730, leaving a number of ascetical works, for which see Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:394. (B.P.)

## Hilsey (or Hildesley), John[[@Headword:Hilsey (or Hildesley), John]]

             bishop of Rochester in 1535, died in 1538, leaving, The Manual of Prayers; or, The Prymer in Englyshe (1539): — De Veri Corporis Jesu in Sacramento: — Resolutions Concerning the Sacraments. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Hilten, Johannes[[@Headword:Hilten, Johannes]]

             a Franciscan of Thuringia, who died in 1502, is the author of Comment. in Apocalypsin et Danielem. Hilton made himself famous by his socalled prophecies. See Angelus, Bericht von Joh. Hilten und seinen Weissagungen. (B.P.)

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

             an English painter, was born at Lincoln, June 3, 1786. He studied in the Royal Academy School, and afterwards made a tour in Italy. In 1825 he succeeded Fuseli as keeper of the academy, and died in London, December 30, 1839. Of his religious pieces the following are the principal: Christ Crowned with Thorns, painted in 1823, lately purchased by the academy, and regarded as his masterpiece; The Angel Releasing Peter from Prison, painted in 1831; The Murder of the Innocents, his exhibited work (1838); and Rebekah and Abraham's Servant (1829), now in the National Gallery. See Encyclop. Brit. 9th ed. s.v.

## Himerius[[@Headword:Himerius]]

             ( ῾Ιμέριος), a celebrated Greek sophist and rhetorician, was born at Prusa, in Bithynia, A.D. 315. He received his education of Proaeresius, whose rival he afterwards became. After traveling considerably in the East, he settled in Athens as teacher of rhetoric. He became very famous in his profession, having among his pupils Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, and other distinguished men. The emperor Julian, during his visit at Athens, A.D. 355, attracted by his learning and eloquence, invited him to his court at Antioch, and made him his secretary (A.D. 362). After the death of his rival, Pro-aeresius, in A.D. 368, he returned to Athens and resumed his former calling. He became blind toward the close of his life, and died in a fit of epilepsy A.D. 386. Himerius was a pagan, but exceedingly kind towards the Christians. Of his works, only a part are now extant.. — Lardner, Works; Smith, Dict. Greek and Ron. Mythol.. 2; Pierer, Universal Lex. 8, 383; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24.

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

             bishop of Tarragona, Spain, known by a; letter which was addressed to him by Siricius, bishop of Rome (385-398), and in which the latter arrogates supreme ecclesiastical authority, and seeks by flattery to gain Himerius's consent to his pretensions. See Hard, Concil. 1, 848; J. A. Cramer, additions to Bossuet, 4, 597. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 98, 99. The Roman Catholic views may be seen in Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 5, 197 sq. SEE SIRICIUS.

## Himmel, Johannes[[@Headword:Himmel, Johannes]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born December 27, 1581, at Stolpe, Pomerania. He studied at different universities, and died at Jena, March 31, 1643, doctor and professor of theology. He is the author of, Analytica Dispositio Librorum Biblicorum: — Memoriale Biblicum Generale et Speciale cum Chronologia Biblica: — Compendium Historiae Ecclesiasticae a Nato Christo. Usque ad Lutherum: — De Scriptura Sacra: — Commentar. in Prophetas Minores, Epistolam ad Galatas et Philemonem: — Postilla Academica in Epistolas et Evangelia Dominicalia et Festivalia: — De Canonicatu, Jure Canonico et Theologia Scholastica: — Syntagma Disputationum Theologicarum. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:394; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Himyarites[[@Headword:Himyarites]]

             (by the classics called Homeritetn or Homeirites), an Arabian people, claiming to be descend ants of Himyar, a grandson of Saba, one of the mythical fathers of the Arabians, who is said to have been a prince in South Arabia about 3000 before Mohammed's time. They established in that part of Arabia some very flourishing towns, including Saba and Aden (Athana), the former noted more especially from its mention in the Bible, and extended their dominion nearly over the entire coast of South Africa. At the time of Constantine the Great this people inclined to Christianity, but in 529 they were subjected by the Ethiopians, and were obliged to forsake  their Christian faith. About seventy years later the Persians took the most important cities from the Himyarites, and in A.D. 629 they were subjected to the Mohammedans, and embraced Islamism. The Himyarites had a language of their own, SEE ARABIC LANGUAGE, the so called Himyaritic, of which traces have lately been found in the ancient remains to which the Oriental scholar Gesenius, and, later, Rodiger, have given much study. Of late Osiander has undertaken this task, and apparently has been much more successful. The results of his investigations are found in Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenln'd. Gesellsch. (vol. x and 19:Lpz. 1856 and 1865). — Brockhaus, Conv. Lex. 7, 929. SEE JEWS.

## Hin[[@Headword:Hin]]

             (הַין, hin, Sept. εἴν, ἴν, or υν), a measure of liquids, containing the seventh part of a “bath” (Num 15:4 sq.; Num 28:5; Num 28:7; Num 28:14; Eze 4:11), i.e. twelve Roman sextarii, according to Josephus (εἵν Ant. 3, 8, 3; 9:4), or about five quarts. The word corresponds with the Egyptian hn, hno, which properly signifies a vessel, and then a small measure, sextarius, Greek ἵνον (see Leemans, — Lettre a Salvolini, p. 154; Bickh, Metrolog. Untersuch. p. 244, 260). But it is not certain that the Hebrew and English measures were of the same size. Gesenius. According to the Rabbins, the hin contains only the sixth part of the bath. SEE MEASURE.

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

             was born in Westminster in 1731. He was educated at Westminster School and Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1764 he was appointed head master of Westminster Seminary, in 1766 vicar of Greenwich, and in 1769 bishop of Peterborough. Hinchcliffe was a man of sound scholarship, and especially celebrated as an orator both in the pulpit and in the forum. He died in 1794. He only published three sermons delivered on public occasions. A collection of his Sermons (London, 1796, 8vo) is not without merit, but they certainly did not meet the expectations of his contemporaries. — Hook, Eccles. Biog. 6, 73; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 850.

## Hinckelmann, Abraham[[@Headword:Hinckelmann, Abraham]]

             a distinguished German theologian and Orientalist, born at Doebehl, near Hamburg, May 2,1652, was educated at the University of Wittenberg. After filling several important appointments as minister, he was, in 1687, made court preacher to the landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt, and honorary  professor at the University of Giessen. But in the year immediately following he resigned these positions and returned to Hamburg. Here he was accused by some ministers of sympathy with Millenarians and Pietists, which so wrought upon his constitution and mind that he died after a short illness, February 11, 1695. Among his works are especially worthy of note, Sylloge vocum et phrasum rabbinicrum obscuriorum (Libeck, 1675, 4to): — De Scholiis Hebreorum: — De Sacrificiis Hebr.: — Testament. et pactiones inter Muhammedem et Christiane fidei Cultores (Arab. and Lat., Hamb. 1690, 4to). He published also Acoran, really the first edition of the Koran, as that of Paganini (Ven. 1530) was almost wholly destroyed by order of the pope. He also left in MS. Lexicon arabicolatinum in Alcoranum. — Jocher, A1lgem. Gelehrt. Lex. 2, 1612; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 24, 705 sq.

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

             an English clergyman, was born in Warwickshire in 1617, and was educated at St. Alban's Hall, Oxford. He filled successively the vicarate of Coleshill, Berkshire, and the rectorships of Dray ton, Leicestershire, and Northfield, Worcestershire. He died in 1695. He published Four Sermons (Oxf. 1657, 8vo): — Epistola Veridica (1659, 4to): — Persuasive to Conformity (1670, 8vo), addressed in the form of a letter to the Dissenters: — Fasciculus literarum, or Letters on several Occasions (1680, 8vo). The first half contains letters exchanged between him and Richard Baxter on the divisions in the Church. — Hook, Eccles. Biog. 6, 74; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 24, 706; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 850. Hincks, Edward, D.D., a clergyman of the Church of England, and a distinguished Assyrian scholar, was born in August, 1792, and was prepared for college under his father's care. He entered Trinity College, Dublin, at a very early age, and obtained a fellowship before he was twenty-one, being facile prinaeps of all the candidates. After graduation he became rector of Ardtrea, one of the college livings, whence he was promoted to Killyleagh, in the diocese of Down (north of Ireland), and there he spent the last forty-one years of his life. Dr. Hincks was considered one of the best philologists in Europe. He contributed numerous valuable papers, especially on Egyptian hieroglyphics and Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions, to the Royal Irish Academy, the Royal Society of Literature, the Asiatic Society, and the British Association. “His talent for deciphering texts in unknown characters and languages was wonderful. It was applied to the study of Egyptian hieroglyphics, and to  the inscriptions in the cuneiform character found in Persepolis, Nineveh, and other parts of ancient Assyria. In this field especially he labored for years with great perseverance and success, having been the first to ascertain the numeral system, and the power and form of its signs by means of the inscriptions at Van. He was one of the chief restorers of Assyrian learning, throwing great light on the linguistic character and grammatical structure of the languages represented on the Assyrian monuments. Living in a remote country village, with very limited means at his command, he had to contend with great difficulties. In London, beside the British Museum, he would have accomplished more than he did” (London A thenaeum, December, 1866). He died December 3,1866. SEE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS; SEE HIEROGLYPHICS. (J. H. W.)

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

             a Unitarian minister, born in Cork, Ireland, in 1804, was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and the Belfast Academical Institution, and in 1827 was called to a Unitarian Church at Liverpool. He died in 1831. The only published writings of his are Sermons and occasional services, with Memoir by J. H. Thorn (Lond. 1832, 8vo). — Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 1, 1484; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 850.

## Hincmar[[@Headword:Hincmar]]

             archbishop of Rheims, one of the most learned divines of his age, was born about A.D. 809, of a noble family, related to the counts of Toulouse, and was educated in the Monastery of St. Denys, near Paris. After finishing his studies he was summoned to the court of Louis le Debonnaire, to whom he faithfully adhered, and who employed him, after his restoration, in settling the ecclesiastical affairs of the empire; after this he retired to his monastery, whence he was again summoned into public life by being chosen archbishop of Rheims, A.D. 845. On the accession of Lothaire, an attempt was made to depose him from his see, without success. He was a zealous supporter of the rights of the Gallican Church. In 847 the controversy with Gottschalk (Godeschalcus) (q.v.) about predestination arose, and when the case of Gottschalk came before him, he drove it on with too great heat, and Gotteschalk by his means was condemned and punished with much and unjust severity. One of the most important events in Hincmar's life was his controversy in 862 with pope Nicholas I, one of the most learned men of the Roman Catholic Church. Rothadius, bishop of Soissons, and suffragan of Hincmar, deposed a priest of his diocese, who appealed to Hincmar as metropolitan, and was ordered by him to be restored to office. Rothadius, who resisted this order, was, in consequence, condemned and excommunicated by the archbishop. He appealed to the pope, who at once ordered Hincmar to restore Rothadius, or to appear at Rome either in person or by his representative, to vindicate the sentence. He sent a legate to Rome, but refused to restore the deposed bishop; whereupon Nicholas annulled the sentence, and required that the cause should have another hearing, and this time in Rome. Hincmar, after some demurral, was forced to acquiesce. The cause of Rothadius was reexamined, and he was acquitted and restored to his see. But perhaps more historically interesting is Hincmar's opposition to the temporal power of the mediaeval papacy. SEE PAPACY.

Under the successor of Nicholas, Adrian II, the succession to the sovereignty of Lorraine on the death of king Lothaire was questioned; the pope favored the pretensions of the emperor Louis in opposition to those of Charles the Bold of France. Adrian addressed a mandate to the subjects of Charles and to the nobles of Lorraine, accompanied by a menace of the censure of the Church. To this Hincmar offered a firm and persistent opposition. He was equally firm, ten years  later, in resisting the undue extension of the royal prerogative in ecclesiastical affairs. Louis III, in opposition to the judgment of the Council of Vienne, wished to bestow upon his favorite, Odoacer, the see of Beauvais; but Hincmar boldly remonstrated, and fearlessly denounced the attempt as an unjustifiable usurpation. He died A.D. 882. His works consist chiefly of Letters about local ecclesiastical affairs, and his treatise De Pradestinatione Dei et libero arbitrio, and small tracts on discipline. A former treatise of his, De Praedest., is lost. In the controversy with Gottschalk he maintained that “God wills the salvation of all men; that some will be saved through the gift of divine grace; that others are lost, owing to their demerit; Christ suffered for all; whoever does not appropriate these sufferings has himself to-blame.” All his remains are to be found in the careful edition of his works edited by Sirmond, Opera, duos in tomos digesta, etc. (Paris, 1645, 2 vols. fol.). See Noorden, Hinkmar, Erzbischof v. Rheims (Bonn, 1863); Cave, Hist. Litt.; Mosheim, Ch. History, cent. 9:pt. 2, eh. 2, n. 52; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2, 50; Flodoard, Ecclesiae Remensis Hist.; Gallia Christiana, 9, 39; Hist. litter. de la France, 5, 544 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 706 sq.; Neander, History of Dogmas, 2, 454; Riddle, History of the Papacy, 2; Milman, Lat. Christianity, 3, 51 et al; 4:84; Illgen, Zeitsch. f. d. Hist. Theol. 1859, p. 478; Hefele (Romans Cath.) in Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen- Lexikon, 5, 203.

## Hincmar of Laon[[@Headword:Hincmar of Laon]]

             was nephew of Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, who at first patronized him, and had him elected bishop of Laon, about A.D. 856. , He soon showed an obstinate and refractory spirit; set at naught his uncle, who was his metropolitan; rebelled against his king, and scorned the decrees of synods, whose sentence of condemnation he for some time avoided by appealing to Rome; but at length he was summoned, heard, condemned, and deposed from his see of Laon. He was also imprisoned and his eyes cruelly put out, A.D. 871. Two years later, at the Council of Troyes, he obtained access to the pope, who reinstated him, assigned him a portion of the episcopal revenues, and permitted him even to resume his pontifical functions in part. He died about A.D. 880. He wrote many Letters, etc., which are lost; but a few may be found with his life, defense, etc., in Labbe, Concil. tom. 7 and in Sirmond's edition of the works of Hincmar of Rheims (q.v.). See Clarke, Succession of Sacred Literature, vol. 2; Cellot, Vie d'Hincmar de Laon; Biddle, Hist. of the Papacy, 2, 24-27; Neander,  Church Hist. 3, 364; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen Lex. 5, 208; Illgen, Zeitsch. f. d. Hist. Theol. 1858, p. 227.

## Hind[[@Headword:Hind]]

             (אִוָּלָה, ayalah', Gen 49:21; 2Sa 22:34; Job 34:1; Psa 18:33; Psa 29:9; Son 2:7; Son 3:5; Hab 3:19; or

אִוֶּלֶת, aye'leth, Pro 5:19; Jer 14:5; “Aijaleth,” Psalms 22 :title), the female of the hart or stag, “doe” being the female of the fallow-deer, and “roe” being sometimes used for that of the roebuck. All the females of the Cervidae, with the exception of the reindeer, are hornless. SEE DEER. The hind is frequently noticed in the poetical parts of Scripture as emblematic of activity (Gen 49:21; 2Sa 22:34; Psa 18:33; Hab 3:19), gentleness (Pro 5:19), feminine modesty (Son 2:7; Son 3:5), earnest longing (Psa 42:1), and maternal affection (Jer 14:5). Its shyness and remoteness from the haunts of men are also noticed (Job 39:1), and its timidity, causing it to cast its young at the sound of thunder (Psa 29:9). The conclusion which some have drawn from the passage last quoted, that the hind produces her young with great difficulty, is not, in reality, deducible from the words, and is expressly contradicted by Job 39:3. It may be remarked on Psa 18:33, and Hab 3:19, where the Lord is said to cause the feet to stand firm like those of a hind on high places, that this representation is in perfect harmony with the habits of mountain stags; but the version of Pro 5:19, “Let the wife of thy bosom be as the beloved hind and favorite roe,” seems to indicate that here the words are generalized so as to include under roe monogamous species of antelopes, whose affections and consortship are permanent and strong; for stags are polygamous. The Sept. reads אֵילָהin Gen 49:21, rendering it στέλεχος ἀνειμένον, “a luxuriant terebinth,” an emendation adopted by Bochart. Lowth has proposed a similar change in Psalms 29, but in neither case can the emendation be accepted. Naphtali verified the comparison of himself to a “graceful or tall hind” by the events recorded in Jdg 4:6-9; Jdg 5:18. The inscription of Psalms 22 :” the hind of the morning,” probably refers to a tune of that name. SEE AIJELETH.

## Hindostan[[@Headword:Hindostan]]

             SEE INDIA.

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

             bishop of Norwich, was born about 1798, on the isle of Barbadoes. At an early age he was sent to England, and educated at Oxford. In 1822 he took orders in the Church of England, and in 1849 he was appointed bishop of Norwich. Later, he was made vice principal of St. Alban's Hall, Oxford. He died in 1870. Bishop Hinds wrote The three Temples of the true God contrasted (1830; 3rd edit. 1857, 8vo): — Inspiration and Authority of Script. (1831, 8vo): — Script. and the Authorized Version of Script. (1853, 12mo): — Catechist's Manual (2nd ed. 1855, 12mo): — Hist. of Christianity (1829, 1846, 1850, 1853, 2 vols. 8vo), which was originally contributed to the Encyclop. Metropolitana. — A1libone, Dict. of British and American Authors, 1, 850; Vapereau, Dict. des Contemporais, p. 884.

## Hindu Literature[[@Headword:Hindu Literature]]

             SEE SANSKRIT LITERATURE.

## Hindu Philosophy[[@Headword:Hindu Philosophy]]

             is divided into six systems or (astra, namely, the Nyaya, Vaiseshika, Sankhyd, Yoga, Mimansa, and Vedanta. The Sankhya and Yoga agree in  all essentials, except that the former is atheistic and the latter theistic. The systems generally unite on certain points:

1. The Mimansa excepted, their end is to inculcate expedients for “salvation,” which is deliverance from “bondage.”

2. The soul, though distinct from the mind, the senses, and the body, yet identifies itself with them. As a consequence of this delusion, it conceives the thought of ownership in itself and others, and supposes that it receives pleasure and pain through the body. As a farther consequence, it engages in good and evil works, which have merit or demerit. As this merit or demerit must be awarded, the soul must pass to Ely-sium or Hell, and repeatedly be born and die. This is bondage caused by ignorance, from which, when the soul is delivered, it gains absorption into the deity.

3. As a consequence of the foregoing, good deeds and their reward are only a less curse than their opposites, and are to be deprecated, as they compel the soul till the award is experienced to abide in the body of a god, or a man, or other superior being.

4. Release from transmigration can only be had through “right apprehension,” which consists, of course, in the recognition by the soul of itself as distinct from the mind and all else. To gain this “right apprehension” one must study the Shastras; and, in order to clearness of intellect and heart for this “work, such good works as sacrifices, alms, pilgrimages, repetitions of sacred words, and the like, are to be performed, but without desire for reward.

5. They all maintain that the soul has existed from everlasting, and that it is exempt from liability to extinction, though it may be again and again invested with a corporeal body.

6. All the systematists teach the eternity of matter.

7. They all receive the words of the Veda as unquestionable authority. See Refutation of Hindu Systems, by N. Gore (Calcutta, 1862); Aphorisms of the Yogd, Sankhya, etc. (Allahabad, India, 1864). (J. T. G.)

## Hinduism or Hindu religion[[@Headword:Hinduism or Hindu religion]]

             the name of the variety of creeds derived from Brahmanic sources. It is the religion of the East, professed, in some form or another, by nearly half of the human race (see Max Müller, Chips from a German Workshop, 1, 23),  especially if Buddhism (q.v.) is included, or considered as a development of it. The different sects into which the Hindus (on the origin of the Hindus, and their gradual occupation of India, see Lassen, Ind. Aterth. 1, 511 sq.; Muller, Science of Language, p. 240 sq.; Donaldson, New Cratylus, p. 118,119, 2nd ed.; Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, 1, 171, 172, 2nd ed.) are divided at present are of modern origin, and the system of theology taught by them differs very much from the religion of their forefathers.

I. History. — For brevity's sake, we will divide Hinduism into three great periods, the Vedic, Epic, and Puranic. Our knowledge of the first is derived from the sacred books of the Hindus, the Veda (q.v.); that of the second from the epic poem Ramayana, and the great epos Mahabharata; and that of the third chiefly from the mythological works, the Puranas and Tantras.

1. The Vedic Period. — According to the hymns of the Veda, the Hindus of that period regarded the elements of nature as heavenly beings, and worshipped and revered them as such. Among these were first in order Agni, the fire of the sun and lightning; Indra, the bright, cloudless firmament; the Maruts, or winds; Sûrya, the sun; Ushas, the dawn; and various kindred manifestations of the luminous bodies, and nature in general. “They are supplicated to confer temporal blessings upon the worshipper, riches, life, posterity the shortsighted vanities of human desire, which constituted the sum of heathen prayer in all heathen countries” (Wilson, Lectures, p. 9, 10). The great contrast in this particular between heathen and Christian worshippers has been well commented upon by Stuhr (Religions-Systeme d. heidnischen Volker d. Orients, Einleit. p. xii). Indeed, it is a fact worthy the notice of philosophers and of scholars in comparative science of religion that only a very small fraction of heathen prayers are offered for spiritual or moral benefits (compare Creuzer, Symbolik, 4, 162; Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, 1, 181, 182). “We proclaim eagerly, Maruts, your ancient greatness, for the sake of inducing your prompt appearance, as the indication of (the approach of) the showerer of benefits;” or, “Offer your nutritious viands to the great hero (Indra), who is pleased by praise, and to Vishnu (one of the forms of the sun), the two invincible deities who ride upon the radiant summit of the clouds as upon a well-trained steed. Indra and Vishnu, the devout worshipper glorifies the radiant approach of you two who are the granters of desires, and who bestow upon the mortal who worships you an immediately receivable (reward), through the distribution of that fire which is the scatterer (of desired blessings).” Such is the strain in which the Hindu  of that period addressed his gods. Ethical considerations are foreign to these religious outbursts of the mind. Sin and evil, indeed, are often adverted to, and the gods are praised because they destroy sinners and evildoers; but one would err in associating with these words our notions of sin or wrong. A sinner, in these hymns, is a man who does not address praises to those elementary deities, or who does not gratify them with the oblations they receive at the hands of the believer. He is the foe, the robber, the daemon-in short, the borderer infesting the territory of the “pious” man, who, in his turn, injures and kills, but, in adoring Agni, Indra, and their kin, is satisfied that he can commit no evil act.

Neither did the Hindu in that early period so frequently evince his consciousness of imperfection by a display of animal sacrifices. The Veda contains not a single example of human victims for sacrifice. It informs us that by far the most common offering was the fermenting juice of the soma (q.v.) or moon plant, which, expressed and fermented, made an exhilarating and inebriating beverage, and for this reason, most probably, was offered to the gods to increase their beneficial potency. In this the Hindu afterwards beheld a vital sap whereby the universe itself is made productive; but in bringing such an oblation, it is more likely that he was actuated by the hope of gratifying the animal wants of his divinity rather than by the idea of deepening his own sense of guilt, or by a desire to compensate for his own demerit (compare Hardwick, 1, 183). Besides this, another oblation, mentioned as agreeable to the gods, and likely to belong to this early period of Veda worship, was clarified butter, poured upon the fire. There is, however, a class of hymns in the Veda in which “this distinctive utterance of feeling makes room for the language of speculation,” in which “the allegories of poetry yield to the mysticism of the reflecting mind, and the mysteries of nature becoming more keenly felt, the circle of beings which overawe the popular mind becomes enlarged” (Chambers, Encyclopedia, 1, 541). The objects by which Indra, Agni, and the other deities are propitiated now become gods. Thus, for example, one whole section of the Rig-Veda, the principal part of the Veda (q.v.), is addressed to Soma (see above). Still more prominent is the deification of Soma in the Sama-Veda (comp. Hardwick, Christ, 1, 178, 179; — Auller, Chips, 1, 176).

But in the worship of these powers of nature there is an inclination, at least, if not a real desire, to pay homage to one higher being that should prove the Creator of all perishable and changeable beings. There ensued, so  to speak, a struggle to reconcile the worship of the elementary powers with the idea of one supreme being, or to emancipate the inquiry into the principle of creation from the elementary religion as found in the oldest portion of Vedic poetry. The former of these efforts is apparent in the Brahmana of the Veda, the latter in the Upanishad (q.v.). In the Brahmanas a second and later class of Vedic hymns we see the simple and primitive worship become complex and artificial. A special feature is “the tendency to determining the rank of the gods, and, as a consequence, to giving prominence to one special god amongst the rest; whereas in the old Vedic poetry, though we may discover a predilection of the poets to bestow more praise, for instance, on Indra and Agni than on other gods, yet we find no intention on their part to raise any of them to a supreme rank. Thus, in some Brahmanas, Indra, the god of the firmament, is endowed with the dignity of a ruler of the gods; in others, the sun receives the attributes of superiority. This is no real solution of the momentous problem hinted at in some Vedic hymns, but it is a semblance of it. There the poet asks ‘whence this varied world arose here the priest answers that ‘one god is more elevated than the rest;' and he is satisfied with regulating the detail of the Soma and animal sacrifice according to the rank which he assigns to his deities. A real answer to this great question the theologians attempt who explain the ‘mysterious doctrine' held in the utmost reverence by all Hindus, and laid down in the writings known under the name of Upanishads, which relate not only to the process of creation, but to the nature of a supreme being, and its relation to the human soul. In the Upanishads, Agni, Indra, Vayu, and the other deities of the Vedic hymns, become symbols to assist the mind in its attempt to understand the true nature of one absolute being, and the manner in which it manifests itself in its worldly form. The human soul itself is of the same nature as this supreme or great soul: its ultimate destination is that of becoming reunited with the supreme soul, and the means of attaining that end is not the performance of sacrificial rites, but the comprehension of its own self and of the great soul. The doctrine which at a later period became the foundation of the creed of the educated-the doctrine that the supreme soul, or Brahm, is the only reality, and that the world has a claim to notice only in so far as it emanated from this being, is already clearly laid down in these Upanishads, though the language in which it is expressed still adapts itself to the legendary and allegorical style that characterizes the Brahmanic portion of the Vedas. The Upanishads became thus the basis of the enlightened faith of India. They are not a system of philosophy, but they  contain all the germs whence the three great systems of Hindu philosophy arose; and like the latter, while revealing the struggle of the Hindu mind to reach the comprehension of one supreme being, they advance sufficiently far to express their belief in such a being, but at the same time acknowledge the inability of the human mind to comprehend its essence” (Chambers, Encyclopedia). SEE UPANISHAD.

The Veda also teaches the two ideas so contradictory to the human understanding, and yet so easily reconciled in every human heart: God has established the eternal laws of right and wrong; he punishes sin and rewards virtue; and yet the same God is willing to forgive; just, yet merciful; a judge, and yet a father (Müller, 1, 38). But there is no trace, at least not in the Veda, of metempsychosis, which has generally been supposed to be a distinguishing feature of the Indian religion, especially of the Vedic period. “Instead of this, we find what is really the sine qua non of all real religion, a belief in immortality, and in personal immortality. passages wherein immortality of the soul personal immortality, and personal responsibility after death are clearly proclaimed” (Miller, 1, 45). Professor Roth (Journal of the German Oriental Society, 4, 427) says that we find in the Veda “beautiful conceptions of an immortality expressed in unadorned language with childlike conviction. If it were necessary, we might find here the most powerful weapons against the view which has lately been revived and proclaimed as new, that Persia was the only birthplace of the idea of immortality, and that even the nations of Europe had derived it from that quarter as if the religious spirit of every gifted race was not able to arrive at it by its own strength.” We find also in the Veda vague allusions to a place of punishment for the wicked. “In one verse it is said that the dead are rewarded for their good deeds; that they leave or cast off all evil, and, glorified, take their new bodies… A pit is mentioned into which the lawless are said to be hurled down, and into which Indra casts those who offer no sacrifices.... In one passage we read that ‘those who break the commandments of Varuna, and who speak lies, are born for that deep place”‘(Muller, 1, 47; comp. Dr. Muir, Yama, in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, p. 10).

2. “The Epic period of Hinduism is marked by a similar development of the same creeds, the general features of which we have traced in the Vedic writings. The popular creed strives to find a center round which to group its imaginary gods, whereas the philosophical creed finds its expression in the ground works of the Sânkhya, Nyâya, and Vedânta systems of  philosophy. In the former, we find two gods in particular who are rising to the highest rank, Vishnu and Siva; for as to Brahman (the masculine form of Brahm), though he was looked upon now and then as superior to both, he gradually disappears, and becomes merged into the philosophical Brahma (the neuter form of the same word), which is a further evolution of the great soul of the Upanishads. In the Râmâyana, the superiority of Vishnu is admitted without dispute; in the great epos, the Mahâbhârata, however, which, unlike the former epos, is the product of successive ages, there is an apparent rivalry between the claims of Vishnu and Siva to occupy the highest rank in the pantheon; but Sanskrit philology will first have to unravel the chronological position of the various portions of this work, to lay bare its groundwork, and to show the gradual additions it received, before it will be able to' determine the successive formation of the legends which are the basis of classical Hindu mythology. Yet so much seems to be clear even already, that there is a predilection during this Epic period for the supremacy of Vishnu, and that the policy of incorporating rather than combating antagonistic creeds led more to a quiet admission than to a warm support of Siva's claims to the highest rank.” For the character of these gods, and their relation to the Vedic and the Epic period, see below. “We will point, however, to one remarkable myth, as it will illustrate the altered position of the gods during the Epic period. In the Vedic hymns, the immortality of the gods is never matter of doubt; most of the elementary beings are invoked and described as everlastingness liable neither to decay nor death. The offerings they receive may add to their comfort and strength; they may invigorate them, but it is nowhere stated that they are indispensable for their existence. It is, on the contrary, the pious sacrificer himself who, through his offerings, secures to himself long life, and, as it is some-times hyperbolically called, immortality. The same notion also prevails throughout the oldest Brahmanas. It is only in the latest work of this class, the Satapatha Brahmana, and more especially in the Epic poems, that we find the inferior gods as mortal in the beginning, and as becoming immortal through exterior agency. In the Satapatha- Brahmana, the juice of the soma plant, offered by the worshipper, or at another time clarified butter. or even animal sacrifices, impart to them this immortality. At the Epic period, Vishnu teaches them how to obtain the Amnrita, or beverage of immortality, without which they would go to destruction; and this epic Anrita itself is merely a compound, increased by imagination, of the various substances which in the Vedic writings are called or likened to Amnrita, i.e. a ‘substance that frees from death.' It is  obvious, therefore, that gods like these could not strike root in the religious mind of the nation. We must look upon them more as the gods of poetry than of real life; nor do we find that they enjoyed any of the worship which was allotted to the two principal gods, Vishnu and Siva.”

“The philosophical creed of this period adds little to the fundamental notions contained in the Upanishads, but it frees itself from the legendary dross which still imparts to those works a deep tinge of mysticism. On the other hand, it conceives and develops the notion that the union of the individual soul with the supreme spirit may be aided by penances, such as peculiar modes of breathing, particular postures, protracted fasting, and the like; in short, by those practices which are systematized by the Yoga doctrine. The most remarkable Epic work which inculcates this doctrine is the celebrated poem Bhagavadgitâ, which has been wrongly considered by European writers as a pure Sânkhya work, whereas Saminkara, the great Hindu theologian, who commented on it, and other native commentators after him, have proved that it is founded on the Yoga belief. The doctrine of the reunion of the individual soul with the supreme soul was necessarily founded on the assumption that the former must have become free from all guilt affecting its purity before it can be remerged into the source whence it proceeded; and since one human life is apparently too short for enabling the soul to attain its accomplishment, the Hindu mind concluded that the soul, after the death of its temporary owner, had to be born again, in order to complete the work it had left undone in its previous existence, and that it must submit to the same fate until its task is fulfilled. This is the doctrine of metempsychosis, which, in the absence of a belief in grace, is a logical consequence of a system that holds the human soul to be of the same nature as that of an absolute God.” This doctrine, as we have already stated, is foreign to the Vedic period. It is found in some of the Upanishads, but its fantastical development belongs decidedly to the Epic time, where it pervades the legends, and affects the social life of the nation. SEE METEMPSYCHOSIS; SEE CABALA, III, 3.

3. “The Pâranic period of Hinduism is the period of its decline, so far as the popular creed is concerned. Its pantheon is nominally the same as that of the Epic period. The triads of principal Hindu gods, Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva, remain still at the head of its imaginary gods; but whereas the Epic time is generally characterized by a friendly harmony between the highest occupants of the divine spheres, the Pâranic period shows discord and destruction. The popular adoration has turned away from Brahma to  Vishnu and Siva who alone remain to contend with each other for the highest rank in the minds of their worshippers. The elementary principle which originally inhered in these deities is thus completely lost sight of by the followers of the Purânas. The legends of the Epic poems relating to these gods become amplified and distorted, according to the sectarian tendencies of the masses; and the divine element which still distinguishes these gods in the Ramayana and Mahabharata is now more and more mixed up with worldly concerns and intersected by historical events, disfigured in their turn to suit individual interests. Of the ideas implied by the Vedic rites, scarcely a trace is visible in the Purânas and Tantras, which are the textbooks of this creed. In short, the unbridled imagination which pervades these works is neither pleasing from a poetical, nor elevating from a philosophical point of view. Some Purânas, it is true — for instance, the Bhagavata-form in some sense an exception to this aberration of original Hinduism; but they are a compromise between the popular and the Vedanta creed, which is henceforward chiefly the creed of the educated and intelligent. They do not affect the worship of the masses as practiced by the various sects; and this worship itself, whether harmless, as with the worshippers of Vishnu, or offensive, as with the adorers of Siva and his wife Durga, is but an empty ceremonial, which, here and there, may remind one of the symbolical worship of the Vedic Hindu, but, as a whole, has no connection whatever with the Vedic scriptures, on which it affects to rest. It is this creed which, with further deteriorations, caused by the lapse of centuries, is still the main religion of the masses in India. The opinion these entertain, that it is countenanced by the ritual, as well as by the theological portion of the Veda, is the redeeming feature of their belief; for, as nothing is easier than to disabuse their mind on this score by reviving the study of their ancient and sacred language, and by enabling them to read again their oldest and most sacred books, it may be hoped that a proper education of the people in this respect, by learned and enlightened natives, will remove many of the existing errors, which,:if they continued, must inevitably lead to a further, and, ultimately, total degeneration of the Hindu race.

“The philosophical creed of this period, and the creed which is still preserved by the educated classes, is that derived from the tenets of the Vedanta philosophy. It is based on the belief of one supreme being, which imagination and speculation endeavor to invest with all the perfections conceivable by the human mind, but the true nature of which is nevertheless declared to be beyond the reach of thought, and which, on this  ground, is defined as not possessing any of the qualities by which the human mind is able to comprehend intellectual or material entity” (Chambers). SEE VEDANTA.

II. Deities. — It has been stated above that the original worship of the Hindus appears to have been addressed to the elements. The heavens, the sun, the moon, fire, the air, the earth, and spirits are the objects most frequently addressed. In fact, the deities invoked appear to be as numerous as the prayers addressed to them.

“It would be impossible to give any account of the numerous inferior deities, whose number is said to amount to 330,000,000. The most important are the Lokapalas, that is, ‘guardians of the world,' who are the eight gods next in rank to the Triad:

1. Indra, the god of the heavens;

2. Agni, the god of fire;

3. Yama, the god of hell;

4. Surya, the god of the sun:

5. Varunr., the god of water;

6. Purâna, the god of the wind;

7. Kuvera, the god of wealth;

8. Soma, or Chandra, the god of the moon.

Many other deities were afterwards intruded in the list;” among them, Ganesa, god of wisdom and science; Kamas, god of love; Ganga, goddess of the river Ganges; Naradas, messenger of the gods, etc. Each of the gods besides has his legal spouse. The most important among these goddesses are Sarasiwati, wife of Brahma, goddess of eloquence, the protect-or of arts and sciences, and particularly of music, wherefore the vina, or lute, is her attribute; Sri, Laksehni, etc., wife of Vishnu, dispenser of blessings. But the most important of all is Siva's female partner, Durga, Kali, or Calee, goddess of evil and destruction, whose worship is by far the most extensive. Aside from these, there is yet a multitude of inferior gods, demigods etc., the principal of which are the seven or ten Brahmadikas or Rishis (seers), the most important of whom is Dakshas, with Diti and Aditi for wives; from Diti come the Daityas or Asuras, the daemons (of destruction), but from Aditi the Suras or Devas (i.e. gods). The Gandharvas are the musicians and dancers of heaven; the Apsarasas, the heavenly nymphs; the Yakshas, the keepers of treasures in the mountains;  the Rakshasas, the enemies of mankind and of all good. The earth is, besides, inhabited by a multitude of evil spirits. The existence of the three worlds (of the gods, the earth, and the lower world) is not considered eternal; it is to be destroyed by Kala, the god of time, who, in regard to this act, is called Mahapralaya, or the great end. Some animals also are the objects of religious adoration or fear, particularly the bull; also the snakes, whose connection with the demigods brought forth the monkeys, which are the objects of superstitious dread. Among the birds the Ganada is the most honored, and the Banian among trees.

III. Later Sects. — The worship of these gods, as well as of numerous others, which was once very popular in Hindustan, has almost disappeared in consequence of the exclusive worship which is paid to Vishnu, Siva, Kali, or Sakti, and a few other deities, by the religious sects of the present day. Each sect maintains that the god it worships unites in his person all the attributes of the deity. Few Brahmins of learning, however, will acknowledge themselves to belong to any of the popular divisions of the Hindu faith; they acknowledge the Vedas, Purânas, and Tantras as the only orthodox ritual, and regard all practices not derived from these sources as irregular and profane. The following is a list of the principal sects:

(1.) Vaishnavas, who worship Vishnu, or, rather, Rana, Krishna, and other heroes connected with the incarnation of that deity. This sect is distinguished generally by an abstinence from animal food, and by a worship less cruel than that of the Saivas (2). They are divided into numerous sects, which often agree only in maintaining that Vishnu is Brahma, that is, Deity. One of the most important of the Vaishnava sects is the Kabir Panthis, founded by Kabir in the 15th century. Kabir assailed the whole system of idolatrous worship, and ridiculed the learning of the Pundits and the doctrines of the Shastra. His doctrines have had great influence. His followers are included among the Vaishnavas because they pay more respect to Vishnu than to any other deity; but it is no part of their faith to worship any Hindu deity, or to observe any of the rites of the Hindu religion.

(2.) Saivas, who worship Siva, and are more numerous than any other sect. The mark by which they are distinguished is three horizontal lines on the forehead, drawn in ashes, obtained from the hearth on which a sacred fire is kept; while that of the Vaishnavas consists in perpendicular lines, of which the number differs according to the sect to which the individual  belongs. “Sivaism recalls the ancient religion of nature, and the gross dualism of Phoenicia” (Pressense, Religions before Christ, p. 58).

(3.) Saktas. The Hindu mythology has personified the abstract and active powers of the divinity, and has ascribed sexes to these personages. The Sakti, or active power of God, is female, and is considered the consort of the abstract attribute. The Saktas, who may perhaps be regarded as only a subdivision of the Saivas, worship the Sakti of Siva, and are not very numerous.

(4.) Sauras, the worshippers of Surya, the sun.

(5.) Ganapatyas, the worshippers of Ganesa, the god of wisdom.

The Sauras and Ganapatvas are not very numerous. The religious sects of India are divided into two classes, which may be called clerical and lay. The priests may also be divided into two classes, the monastic and secular clergy, the majority belonging to the monastic order, since the preference is usually given by laymen to teachers who lead an ascetic life.

The sects which have already been enumerated profess to follow the authority of the Veda, but there are other sects which disavow its authority, and are therefore regarded as forming no part of the Hindu Church. The most important of these are the Buddhists, the Jainas (q.v.), and the Sikhs. The Buddhists have long since been expelled from Hindustan, but it is evident that they were once very numerous in all parts of the country. SEE BUDDHISM.

The sect of the Sikhs was founded by Nanak Shah about A.D. 1500. Their present faith is a creed of pure deism, grounded on the most sublime general truths; blended with the belief of all the absurdities of Hindu mythology and the fables of Mohammedanism (Malcolm). They despise the Hindus and hate the Mussulman, and do not recognize the distinction of caste. They also reject the authority of the Veda, the Purânas, and all other religious books of the Hindus; eat all kinds of flesh except that of cows; willingly admit proselytes from every caste; and consider the profession of arms the religious duty of every individual. An interesting account of this sect is given in Malcolm's Sketch of the Sikhs. — Asiatic Researches, 11, 197-292; Cunningham, Sikhs. For the distinctions of caste, SEE INDIA.

IV. Doctrines acid Worship. — As already intimated, a broad distinction exists between the religion of the people and that of the learned. The  popular religion is a debased polytheism, without unity of belief or worship. The people believe that the performance of certain forms is the only and sure means of salvation, and that those who observe these things will, at a fixed time after death, be admitted into the joys of paradise. The religion of the learned class, on the other hand, professes to rest upon pure contemplation; its theory of the universe is pantheistic; and religious observances, apart from absorption of mind in the universal mind, are of no value. The daily duties of the Brahmin consist of five religious occupations, considered as five sacraments: the study of the Veda (brahma-jagnas, or ahuta, i.e. not offered); offering for the progress of the honor of the gods (huta, i.e. offered); entertaining the fire of the dead (sradda) in honor of the manes (prasita); offering of the Bali in honor of the spirits (prahuta), and of hospitality, in honor of mankind (brahma-huta). Offerings and prayers for all possible objects follow each other from morning till night. Prayer is recommended by the Veda for every occasion. The number of ablutions the Hindus consider as obligatory is immense; near every temple a pond is provided for that purpose; but the most sanctifying ablutions are those performed in the Ganges, particularly at the five points where it unites with other streams. The holiest of all, according to the popular belief of the Hindus, is Allahabad, where, besides the Jumna, the Sarasvati also unites with the Ganges. The most important act of worship consists partly of bloody sacrifices. The principal among these is that of Asamedha, or sacrifice of horses. Bloody sacrifices are mostly made to Siva and Kali, whilst the offerings to Vishnu are generally of water, oil, butter, fruit, flowers, etc. All sins of commission or of omission can be effaced by penances described in the laws, and provided for every caste and every case; a thorough fast of twelve days' duration (Pavaka) cancels all sins. The prescribed penances must be observed if the sinner desires to avoid the penalty of his sin in a new form of existence. There are therefore a great number of penitents and hermits in India, who seek merit by the renunciation of all enjoyment, and the mortification of the flesh. In fact. Eastern monachism is, in many respects, the type of that of the Romish Church. SEE MONACHISM.

The gnosis of the learned Hindus consists in regarding union (Yoga) with God as the highest aim of man, this doctrine is further developed in the philosophy of the Veda. The liberation following death is twofold. Such souls as have arrived at high perfection are admitted into the Brahmic heavens (Svarga), where they enjoy much higher happiness than in the  paradise of the Indra, but after a time they are sent back again to undergo another period of probation. But when man has by contemplation identified himself with the divinity, or Nirvana, his soul enters into, and becomes part of the: immense soul (Atma), and enjoys everlasting felicity,. not having to assume any new form of existence. Those who aim at reaching this unity with the divinity are called Yogi. An essential means of arriving at this result is found in the penances or Tapas. On certain occasions (feasts) all the practices of the religion are united, sacrifices, offerings, prayers, etc. There are eighteen such feasts considered obligatory. The feast of Hali, or Holaka, is the oldest and most important. The Vais-vadera is the offering to all gods. It consists, as has already been stated in our treatment of the Vedic period, in throwing melted butter (ghee) on the flame of the sacred fire, which must be carefully kept burning. The Brahmins must offer it every morning and evening,. first to the god of fire and the moon, then to all the other gods and goddesses. Each particular feast presents some peculiarities, and they are differently observed in the various localities. Aside from these general feasts, each important pagoda has some special ones. The most important are those of Jaggemaut, Benares, Guja, Allahabad, Tripety, Dvaraka, Somnauth. Ramisseran, the sea Manasarovara, Gangotri, Omerkuntuk, Trimbuck-Nasser, Pervuttum, Parkur, Mathura, and Bindrabund.

V. Images, Temples, etc. — The Hindus have images of their gods, but they are of a grotesque or fantastic kind; some are represented with heads of animals (as Ganesa), others with superabundant limbs (as Brahma, with four arms), or disfigured, etc. Antiquity was more sparing in this life, but afterwards the arts of India were applied to the production of innumerable monstrosities. The lower orders of divinities are often represented under the form of animals (thus Hanuman is represented as an ape, Mundi as a bull, etc.), and are generally considered as the steeds of the higher deities. These images of the gods are placed in the temples, which originally were grottoes; they now are pagodas, built in the shape: of a pyramid, ornamented with columns, statues, and symbolic figures; they are divided into courts by means of colonnades, surrounded by high walls, and by the habitations of the priests. In the vestibule there is always. an image of some inferior deity confronting the worshipper as he enters. Admission into these courts is only granted to the Kshattriyas and the Vaisyas; the interior of the pagoda is reserved for the Brahmins or priests, which, in each pagoda, are under the command of a head-Brahmin, who admits as many assistants  as the income of the pagoda will permit. In some of the temples there are as many as 3000 Brahmins. Their priestly duties consist in offering sacrifices and reading the Veda. The worship is accompanied by songs and dances from the two higher classes of dancing girls, the Devadasis and the Natakas.

VI. Literature. — See Moor, Hindu Pantheon (London,. 1810); Coleman, Mythol. of Hindus (1832); Rhode, Ueberrelig. Bildung, der Hindu (Lpz. 1827, 2 vols.); Wilson, Relig. Sects of the Hindoos (As. Res. 16 and 17); Ess. and a Lect. on the Relig. of the Hind. (2 vols. 8vo); Vishnu Purâna, or Syst. of Hin. Mythol. (4 vols. 8vo); Colebrooke,. Miscell. Essays (Lond. 1837, 2 vols.); Relig. and Philos. of the Hindoos (Lond. 1858, 8vo); Small, Hdbk. of Sanskrit Lit. (Lond. 1869, 12mo); Wheeler, History of India (vol. 1, Vedic period and the Mahabharata; vol. 2, the Ramyana, the Brahm. period, Lond. 1869, 8vo); Wuttkei Gesch. d. Ieidenthums (2nd ed. Berl. 1855, 2 vols.); Weber, Akadem. Vorles. U. Ind. Literaturgesch. (Berl. 1852). Ind. Stud. (Berl. 1849-58,1-4 vols.); Ind. Skizzen (Berl. 1857); Muller, On the Li' cat. of the Verdas (Lond. 1859 2 vol.); Chips from a German Workshop (N. Y. 1870, 2 yols. 12mo); Hardwick, Christ and other Masters (2nd ed. Lond. 1863, 2 vols. 12mo); Scholten, Gesch. d. Religion u. Philos. (Elberf. 1868, 8vo); Wrightson, Introd. Treatise on Sanskrit Hagiograha, or the Sacred Literat. of the Hindus (2 parts, 12mo); Corkman's Pressense, Religions before Christ, p. 44 sq.; Barlow, Ess. on Symbolism (Lond. 12mo), ch. 4 and 8; Williams, Ind. Epic Poet. (Lond. — 8vo); Pierer, Univ. — Lex. 8; Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 540 — sq.; Revue d. deux Mondes, Jan. 1858; N. Am. Rev. April, 3858, p. 435. A clear and concise statement of the religion of India is given by Arthur, Mission to the Mysore, ch. 9 (Lond. 1847.12mo). For India as a Missionfield (by the Rev. T. J. Scott), see Methodist Quart. Rev. Jan. 1869, p. 30; Biblioth. Sacra, Apr. 1852, art. 1. SEE BUDDHISM; SEE BRAHMA; SEE INDIA. (J. H.W.)

## Hindus, Modern[[@Headword:Hindus, Modern]]

             a term recently used to designate a class of Hindu reformers, who call themselves Brahmists, and represent a school of thought which originated fifty or sixty ago with Rammohun Roy, who undertook to reform  Hinduism on the basis of the Veda alone, the religion of which he held to be a pure theism. In 1846 they became dissatisfied with the Veda, and adopted Intuitionalism. They have planted societies throughout Bengal, Madras, the North-west Provinces, the Punjab, and Bombay. They ignore idol worship, caste, metempsychosis, and all Brahminical ceremonies. The Tuttu Bodheney Press, of Calcutta, has issued a great number of their publications (see Dr. Duff, in Christian Work for 1862; Foreign Missions, by Dr. Anderson). SEE RAMMOHUN ROY. (J. T. G.)

## Hindustan[[@Headword:Hindustan]]

             SEE INDIA.

## Hindustani Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Hindustani Version Of The Scriptures]]

             Hindustani (or Urdu), the language of "Hindu-stan," or "country of Hind," is a mixed language, and owes its formation to the intercourse of the Mohammedan invaders with the conquered natives of India. At the time of the first Mohammedan invasions, which date from the 10th century, Hinduwi, or Hindi, was the prevailing dialect in Northern India. On their permanent settlement in India the Mohammedans adopted this dialect as the medium of communication with the natives, but they greatly altered it by the introduction of words and idioms from the Persian and Arabic, their own vernacular and liturgic languages. The new dialect thence arising was called Urdu (camp), or Urdu Zaban (camp language), because the language of the Mohammedan camp and court; it was also called "Hindustani," from the geographical region through which it ultimately became diffused.

The first translation of any portion of Scripture into Hindustani seems to have been made by B. Schulze, a Danish missionary. His version of the Psalms was published by Callenberg at Halle in 1746, and the New Test. in 1758. But the most important translation that has been made into this language is that of the New Test. by the Reverend Henry Martyn, which appeared, after much delay, at Serampore in 1814. This version soon obtained such a high reputation that it led to a demand for an edition in the Devanagari (or regular Sanscrit) character, for the benefit of the Hindus in the upper provinces. Au edition in this character was published in 1817 by the Calcutta Bible Society. No subsequent editions of the Hindustani Scriptures were, however, issued in this dress, for it was found by experience that the Scriptures in the Hinduwi dialect (q.v.) were far more acceptable than in the Hindustani to the numerous class of natives who employ the Devanagari characters. For their use, as we shall have occasion to mention, SEE HINDUWI VERSION, Martyn's New Test. was eventually divested of its Persian and Arabic terms, and transferred into the Hinduwi idiom by Mr. Bowley.

While these editions were issued by the Calcutta Auxiliary, the publication of an edition in London had been contemplated by the British and Foreign Bible Society since, the year 1815, and was published in 1819, under the superintendence of professor Lee. Four thousand copies of this edition were sent to Calcutta. The committee at the latter place now turned their attention to the publication of a Hindustani version of the Old Test. The  first portion of the work published was the Pentateuch, which appeared in 1823, and in 1844 the Old Test. was completed, and editions, both in Arabic and Roman characters, were distributed. The Hindustani version of the Scriptures has undergone subsequent revision at the hands of a committee appointed for the purpose, and later editions, both of the Old and New Tests., have appeared. Some of these have been printed in the Arabic, and others in the Roman character. At present there exist four different versions in Hindustani, one by Martyn, the second by Thomasen and others, the third Yates's version, and the fourth the Benares version, so called from the place where it was made. See Bible of Every Land, page 94.

Linguistic Helps. — Garcin de Tassy, Rudiments de la Langue Hindoustanie, avec Appendiae (Paris, 1829-33; 12th ed. 1863); Vinson, Elements de la Grammaire Generale Hindoustanie (ibid. 1884); Craven, The Popular Dictionary in English and Hindustani and Hindustani and English (London, 1882); Dowson, A Grammar of the Urdu or Hindustani Language; A Hindustani Exercise Book; Fallon, A New Hindustani- English Dictionary (Benares, 1879); English-Hindustani Dictionary (1880). (B.P.)

## Hinduwi Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Hinduwi Version Of The Scriptures]]

             Hinduwi (called Hindi by the Serampore translators), with its various dialects, is spoken in all the upper provinces of India. Its affinity to the Sanscrit is very remarkable, and about nine tenths of its words may be traced to that language. In idiom and construction Hinduwi resembles Hindustani; the chief difference between the two dialects consists in this, that while Persian and Arabic words and phrases predominate in Hindustani, the Hinduwi is entirely free from foreign admixture, and the proper mode of writing it is in the Devanagari or regular Sanscrit characters. Beside these, the Kythi, or Kaithi, or writer's character, an imperfect imitation, and in some respects an alteration, of the Devanagari, is also used in writing and printing Hindiuwi, particularly by the trading community, and it is said that of the lower class of natives there are ten who read and write in the Kythi for one who transacts business il the Devanagari.

A version into the Hinduwi language was commenced in 1802, and in 1807 the whole of the New and part, of the Old Test. were completed and ready for revision. It is one of the versions made by the late Dr. Carey. In 1811  the New Test. was published at Serampore, followed in 1813 by a second edition. A third was soon needed, and the Serampore missionaries determined to publish the version executed by the Reverend John Chamberlain. In 1819 the gospels in the Devanagari character were published, and in the following year another edition appeared in the Kaithi character. The further publication of this version was interrupted by the death of Mr. Chamberlain, and the Reverend J.T. Thompson, a Baptist missionary, long resident at Delhi, then undertook the revision of the New Test. and of the Psalms, and under his superintendence the gospels were printed in 1824. The Old Test., in Dr. Carey's translation, appeared in 1818. From time to time new editions were published in both characters by the Serampore missionary societies, each edition having been subjected to a careful revision.

There also exists another Hinduwi version of the entire Bible, known as the Bowley translation, so called from its author, the Reverend William Bowley, for many years missionary at Benares. His New Test. was completed in 1826, but the version is not a new or independent translation, but is throughout substantially the same as Martyn's

Hindustani version, from which it differs chiefly in the substitution of Sanscrit for Persian and Arabic terms. Martyn's Testament was thus adapted to the use of persons speaking the Hinduwi dialect, by Mr. Bowley, agent of the Church Missionary Society at Chunar. Being unacquainted with the original languages of Scripture, he consulted the English A.V. in all passages where the Hinduwi idiom required him to alter Martyn's renderings, referring at the same time to the best commentators on Scripture. In the same manner he undertook the transference of the Hindustani version of the Old Test. into the Hinduwi dialect, following in his translation of Isaiah the one made by bishop Lowth. The idiom of the version was excellent. After all, it was felt that a revision for the purpose of conforming his version to the originals, and correcting the misapprehension of Old English idiom, was exceedingly desirable. After the formation of the North India Bible Society in 1845, this matter was taken in hand, and a revision of the New Test. undertaken. The committee consisted of Messrs. Leupoldt, Kennedy, and Schneider, and the work was carried through the press at Secundra, under the superintendence of Mr. Schneider, in 1850 and 1851. These copies of the New Test. were destroyed during the mutiny in 1857. The Reverend J. Ullmann was then sent to England to bring out a new edition, which included a revision, and the whole was completed in  1860. Soon after the revision of the New Test. a committee, consisting of Messrs. Schneider, Leupoldt, Kennedy, and Owen, was appointed to revise the Old Test. This was brought out in two volumes at the Allahabad Mission Press in 1852 and 1855. These copies, too, were destroyed in the mutiny, and another revised edition was completed under the superintendence of the former editor; of this the first volume was issued in 1866, and the second in the beginning of 1869. At present the Hinduiwi version is undergoing a thorough revision. See Bible of Every Land, page 100.

Linguistic Helps. — For the study of the language, see Garcin de Tassy, Rudiments de la Langue Hindoui (Paris, 1847); Bate, A Dictionary of the Hindee Language; Browne, A Hindi Primer (London, 1822); Etherington, The Student's Grammar of the Hindi Language (Benares, 1873); Kellog, A Grammar of the Hindi Language, in which are treated the standard Hindi, Braj, and the Eastern Hindi of the Ramayan of Tulsi Das; also the Colloquial Dialects of Marwar, Kumaon, Avadh, Baghelkhand, Bhojpur, etc., with Copious Philological Notes; Mathuraprasda Misra, A Trilingual Dictionary, being a Comprehensive Lexicon in English, Urdu, and Hindi, exhibiting the Syllabication, Pronunciation, sand Etymology of. English Words, with their Explanation in English and in Urdu and Hindi, in the Roman Character (Benares, 1865). (B.P.)

## Hinduwi, Dialects Of The, And Of Central India, Versions[[@Headword:Hinduwi, Dialects Of The, And Of Central India, Versions]]

## Hines, Richard, D.D[[@Headword:Hines, Richard, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born in North Carolina, and educated at the university of that state. He became rector of St. Mary's, Memphis, Tenn. (1857-71), then of Meridian and Enterprise parishes, Mississippi, and died March 30, 1883.

## Hinge[[@Headword:Hinge]]

             (צַיר, tsir, that upon which a door revolves, Pro 26:14; also the pangs of childbirth, Isa 13:8, etc.; also a messenger, Pro 13:17, etc.; פֹּת, poth, lit. zan interstice, put. for pudenda. muliebra, Isa 3:17; fig, female hinges, i.e. the eyes or parts with sockets, 1Ki 7:50). “Doors in the East turn rather on pivots than what we term hinges. They were. sometimes of metal, but generally of the same material as the door itself, and worked in sockets above and below in the door- frame. As the weight of the door rests on the lower pivot, it opens with much less ease than one moving on hinges, particularly when the lower socket becomes worn by the weight and friction.” — Pict. Bible, note on Pro 26:14. “In Syria, and especially the Hauran, there are many ancient doors consisting of stone slabs with pivots carved out of the same piece, inserted in sockets above and below, and fixed during the building of the house. The allusion in Pro 26:14 is thus clearly explained. The hinges mentioned in 1Ki 7:50, were probably of the Egyptian kind, attached to the upper and lower sides of the door (Buckingham, Arab Tribes, p. 177; Porter, Damascus, 2, 22, 192; Maundrell, Early Travels, p. 447, 448 [Bohn]; Shaw, Travels, p. 210; Lord Lindsay, Letters, p. 292; Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. abridgm. 1, 15).” SEE DOOR.

## Hingnoh[[@Headword:Hingnoh]]

             in the mythology of the Hottentots, is the name of the first woman, not born, but created. She is worshipped as their chief protecting goddess. Hinton,

## Hinman, Clark F., D.D[[@Headword:Hinman, Clark F., D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Kortright, Delaware Co., N. Y., Aug. 3,1819. He graduated at the Wesleyan University in 1839, and  spent several years in teaching, at one time as principal of Newbury Seminary, Vt. In 1849 he was elected principal of the Wesleyan Seminary at Albion, Michigan, and early in 1853 president of the Northwestern University. In this position he devoted his whole energy to the work of putting that institution on a proper footing, and his labors in its behalf exhausted his strength and broke his constitution completely. Yet he refused to suspend his exertions until a pending list of engagements was fulfilled, and while thus employed he was prostrated at Troy, N. Y., and died on the 21st of October 1854. Dr. Hinman distinguished himself in every relation of life, from boyhood to his death, by capacity, energy, and piety. He was a good scholar, an earnest and eloquent preacher, and a very successful educator of youth. His early death was a great loss to the cause of Christian education in America. — Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 7, 817.

## Hinnom[[@Headword:Hinnom]]

             (Heb. Hinnom', הַנֹּם, for חַנֹּם, gracious, or for הַינֹם, abundant), or, rather, BEN-HINNOM (בֶּןאּהַנֹּם, son of Hinnom; Sept. υἱὸς Ε᾿ννόμ; also in the plur. “sons of Hinnom”), an unknown person (prob. one of the original Jebusites), whose name (perh. as resident) was given to the valley (“Valley of Hinnom,” otherwise called “the valley of the son” or “children of Hinnom,” הַנֹּם גֵּיאּ, or גֵּיִבֶןאּה, or גֵּיאּבְנֵיאּה, variously rendered by the Sept. φάραγξ Ε᾿ννόμ, or υἱοῦ Ε᾿ννόμ, or Γαιέννα, Jos 18:16; ἐν γῇ Βενέννομ, 2Ch 28:3; 2Ch 33:6; τὸ πολυάνδριον υἱῶν υἱῶν τῶν τέκνων αὐτῶν., Jer 19:2; Jer 19:6), a deep and narrow ravine, with steep, rocky sides, on the southerly side of Jerusalem, separating Mount Zion on the south from the “Hill of Evil Counsel,” and the sloping, rocky plateau of the “plain of Rephaim” on the north, taking its name, according to Stanley, from “some ancient hero, the son of Hinnom,” having encamped in it (S. and Pal. p. 172). The earliest mention of the valley of Hinnom in the sacred writings is in Jos 15:8, where the boundary line between the tribes of Judah and Benjamin is described with minute topographical accuracy, as passing along the-bed of the ravine from En- Rogel to the top of the mountain “that lieth before the valley westward,” at the north end of the plain of Rephaim. It is described in Jos 18:16 as on the south side of Jebusi, that is, Mount Zion, on which the ancient stronghold of the Jebusites stood. The valley obtained wide notoriety as the scene of the barbarous rites of Molech and Chemosh, first introduced  by Solomon, who built” a high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, in the hill that is before Jerusalem (Olivet); and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon” (1Ki 11:7). The inhuman rites were continued by the idolatrous kings of Judah. A monster idol of brass was erected in the opening of the valley, facing the steep side of Olivet, and there the infatuated inhabitants of Jerusalem burnt their sons and their daughters in the fire-casting them, it is said, — into the red-hot arms of the idol (Jer 7:31; 2Ch 28:3; 2Ch 33:6). No spot could have been selected near the Holy City so well fitted for the perpetration of these horrid cruelties: the deep, retired glen, shut in by rugged cliffs, and the bleak mountain sides rising over all. The worship of Molech was abolished by Josiah, and the place dedicated to him was defiled by being strewn with human bones: “He defiled Topheth, which is in the valley of the children of Hinnom, that no man might make his son or his daughter pass through the fire to Molech and he brake in pieces the images, and cut down their groves, and filled their places with the bones of men” (2Ki 23:10; 2Ki 23:14). The place thus became ceremonially unclean; no Jew could enter it (2Ch 34:4-5). From this time it appears to have become the common cesspool of the city, into which its sewage was conducted, to be carried off by the waters of the Kidron, as well as a laystall, where all its solid filth was collected. It was afterwards a public cemetery, SEE ACELDAMTA, and the traveller who now stands in the bottom of this valley and looks up at the multitude of tombs in the cliffs above and around him, thickly dotting the side of Olivet, will be able to see with what wondrous accuracy the curse of Jeremiah has been fulfilled: “Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called Tophet, nor The Valley of the Son of Hinnom, but The Valley of Slaughter; for they shall bury in Tophet till there be no more place” (Jer 7:32). We learn from Josephus that the last terrible struggle between the Jews and Romans took place here (War, 6, 8, 5); and here, too, it appears the dead bodies were thrown out of the city after the siege (5:12; 5:7). The inhuman rites anciently practiced in the valley of Hinnom caused the latter Jews to regard it with feelings of horror and detestation. The Rabbins suppose it to be the gate of hell (Lightfoot, Opera, 2, 286); and the Jews applied the name given to the valley in some passages of the Sept. Γέεννα, to the place of eternal torment. Hence we find in Mat 5:22, “Whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός — the Gehenna of fire.” The word is formed from the Hebrew גיא הנם, “Valley of Hinnom.” SEE HELL. The valley was also called TOPHETH (2  Kings 23:10; Isa 30:33; Jer 7:31), either from חפת, “spittle,” and it would hence mean “a place to spit upon,” or from תפתה, “place of burning.” SEE TOPHET.

Most commentators follow Buxtorf, Lightfoot, and others, in asserting that perpetual fires were kept up for the consumption of bodies of criminals, carcases of animals, and whatever else was combustible; but the rabbinical authorities usually brought forward in support of this idea appear insufficient, and Robinson declares (1, 274) that “there is no evidence of any other fires than those of Molech having been kept up in this valley,” referring to Rosenmuller, Biblisch. Geogr. II, 1, 156, 164. For the more ordinary view, see Hengstenberg, Christol. 2, 454; 4,41; Keil on Kings 2, 147, Clark's edit.; and: comp. Isa 30:33; Isa 66:24. SEE MOLOCH. It is called, Jer 2:23, “the valley,” κατ ἐξοχήν, and perhaps “the valley of dead bodies,” 21:40, and “the valley of vision,” Isa 22:1; Isa 22:5 (Stanley, S. and P. p. 172, 482). The name by which it is now known is (in ignorance of the meaning of the initial syllable) Wady Jehennam, or Wady er-Rubeb (Williams, Holy City, 1, 56, Supplem.), though in Mohammedan traditions the name Gehenna is applied to the Valley of Kedron (Ibn Batutah, 12, 4; Stanley, ut sup.). SEE GEHENNA.

The valley commences in a broad sloping basin to the west of the city, south of the Jaffa road (extending nearly to the brow of the great wady on the west), in the center of which, 700 yards from the Jaffa gate, is the large reservoir, supposed to be the “upper pool,” or “Gihon”, SEE GIHON (Isa 7:3; Isa 36:2; 2Ch 32:30), now known as Birket el- Mamilla. After running about; three quarters of a mile east by south, the valley takes a sudden bend to the south opposite the Jaffa gate, but in less than another three quarters of a mile it encounters; a rocky hill-side which forces it again in an easterly direction, sweeping round the precipitous south-west corner of Mount Zion almost at a right angle. In this part of its course the valley is from 50 to 100 yards broad, the bottom everywhere covered with small stones, and cultivated. At 290 yards from the Jaffa gate it is crossed by an aqueduct on nine very low arches, conveying water from the “pools of Solomon” to the Temple Mount, a short distance below which is the “lower pool” (Isa 22:9), Birket es-Sultan. From this point the ravine narrows and deepens, and descends with great rapidity between broken cliffs, rising in successive terraces, honeycombed with innumerable sepulchral recesses, forming the northern face of the “Hill of  Evil Counsel,” to the south, and the steep shelving, but not precipitous southern slopes of Mount Zion, which rise to about the height of 150 feet to the north. The bed of the valley is planted with olives and other fruit- trees, and, when practicable, is cultivated. About 400 yards from the south- west angle of Mount Zion the valley contracts still more, becomes quite narrow and stony, and descends with much greater rapidity towards the “valley of Jehoshaphat,” or “of the brook Kidron,” before joining which it opens out again, forming an oblong plot, the site of Tophet, devoted to gardens irrigated by the waters of Siloam. Towards the eastern extremity of the valley is the traditional site of “Aceldama,” authenticated by a bed of white clay still worked by potters (Williams, Holy City, 2, 495), opposite to which, where the cliff is thirty or forty feet high, the tree on which Judas hanged himself was located during the Frankish kingdom. (Barclay, City of Great King, p. 208). Not far from Aceldama is. a conspicuously situated tomb with a Doric pediment, sometimes known as the “whited sepulcher,” near which a large sepulchral recess, with a Doric portal hewn in. the native rock, is known as the “Latibulum anostolo-rum,” where the Twelve are said to have concealed themselves during the time between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. The tombs continue quite down to the corner of the mountain, where it bends off to the south along the valley of Jehoshaphat. None of the sepulchral recesses in the vicinity of Jerusalem are so well preserved; most of these are very old-small gloomy caves, with narrow, rock-hewn doorways. SEE JERUSALEM.

Robinson places “the valley gate,” Neh 2:13; Neh 2:15; 2Ch 26:9, at the north-west corner of Mount Zion, in the upper part of this valley (Researches, 1, 220, 239, 274, 320, 353; Williams, Holy City, 1, Suppl. 56; 2, 495; Barclay, City of Great Kiny, p. 205, 208); but this part was rather called the Valley of Gihon. SEE GIHON.

## Hinrichs, Hermann Friedrich Wilhelm[[@Headword:Hinrichs, Hermann Friedrich Wilhelm]]

             a German philosopher of the old Hegelian school, was born at Karlseck, in Oldenburg, August 22, 1794. In 1812 he entered the University of Strasburg as a student of theology, but changed for law in 1813 at Heidelberg. Here he studied under Creuzer and Hegel, and became a privatdocent in 1814. In 1822 he was called to the University of Breslan as a professor of philosophy. In 1824 Halle gave him a call, which he ‘accepted, and here he remained until his death, August 17, 1861. The work which gave to him particular prominence as a Hegelian was his Die  Religion im mern Verhaltniss zur Wissenschaft (Heidelb. 1822), an essay that gained him a prize sustained by Hegel himself. — Brockhauls, Cone. Lex. 7, 933; Vapareau, Dict. des Contemp. p. 885. , (J. H. W.)

## Hinton, Isaac Taylor[[@Headword:Hinton, Isaac Taylor]]

             a Baptist preacher and author of note, was born at Oxford, England, July 4, 1799. His father, who was teacher in a boy's school of considerable repute, superintended his son's education. At the age of fifteen young Hinton was apprenticed at the “Clarendon Press,” and in 1820 he set up as a printer and publisher. He edited and printed the Sunday Scholars' Magazine. In 1821 he was converted and baptized. He was soon licensed to preach, continuing, however, in business, which he removed to London. He also assisted his brother, John Howard Hinton in preparing a History of the United States, in two quarto volumes, with 100 engravings. While thus engaged, his republican feelings were so developed that he decided to emigrate to this country. He arrived at Philadelphia in 1832. His services as a preacher were much sought, but he had resolved on fixing his residence in the West. He was, however, induced to accept the pastorate of the First Baptist Church in Richmond, Va. The church had a large colored membership, a fact from which some embarrassment was experienced by him in the consistent application of his principles. This, in connection with his original predilections, led to his removal in 1835 to Chicago, then in its infancy. The Church was unable to give him a sufficient support, and he was compelled to engage in teaching. His congregations were large, and he delivered a course of lectures on the Prophecies, which attracted much attention. The financial disasters of 1837, however, depressed the material prosperity of his Church, and differences on the slavery question divided it. In 1841 he removed to St. Louis, where he labored for about three years, and enjoyed repeated seasons of revival and ingathering. In 1844 he accepted a call to New Orleans, where he had every prospect of success and usefulness, but his labors were cut short by the yellow fever. He died Aug. 28,1847. His Lectures on Prophecy, above referred to, were repeated in St. Louis, and were published afterwards under the title The Prophecies of Daniel and John illustrated by the Events of History. He also published a History of Baptism, from Inspired and Uninspired Sources. He was diligent, enthusiastic, yet cautious and investigating in his habit of mind, genial in his private intercourse, and an impressive public speaker. His ardor and energy fitted him for the work of which he did so much, that of a pioneer, founding and building up churches. (L. E. S.)

## Hiouen-tsang[[@Headword:Hiouen-tsang]]

             a celebrated Buddhist traveler of China, was born A.D. 603. At the age of twenty he took priest's orders. Even at this early age he had become famous for his vast information, especially in the Buddhist faith; and in the doctrines of Confucius and Laotse. A desire to study the origin of Buddhism made him overcome all the obstacles in his way, and he set out on a journey to India in the first half of the 7th century (629). He traveled sixteen years in that country, and on his return wrote a work describing his travels, which were published under the auspices of the Chinese emperor of his time. In this work he gave a very de, tailed and interesting account of the condition of Buddhism as it prevailed at that period in India. His inquiries having been chiefly devoted to Buddhism, he did not enter much into details concerning the social and political condition of the country; but many curious notices which he gives on other matters, besides those of Buddhist interest that came under his observation, and the high degree of trustworthiness which his narrative possesses, makes it one of the most important works on the history of India in general, and of Buddhism in particular, during this period. He traveled alone, or with a few occasional companions, wearing the garb of a religious mendicant, from China to India. He brought with him on his return to his native country, besides images of Buddha and various sacred relics, an immense collection of works, the extent of which may be estimated from the statement of Muller, “It is said that the number of works translated by Hiouen-tsang, with the assistance of a large staff of monks, amounted to 740, in 1335 volumes” (Chips, 1, 272). He died A.D. 664. Two of his friends and pupils have left an account of their instructor, and M. Stanislas Julien, who has lately translated the travels of Hiouen-tsang from Chinese into French (Voyages des Pelerins Bouddhistes, 2 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1853-1857), prefixes a translation of this biography to the translation of the travels of Hiouen- tsang. An abstract of this work, by the late Professor H. H. Wilson, appeared in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 17, 106-137. A very full account of the life and works of Hiouen-tsang is given by Max Miller (Chips), with a review of the translation of M. Julien. — Müller, Chips from a German Workshop, 1, 232275; Julien, Histoire de la Vie de Hiouen-tsang; Memoires sur les Contrees Occidentales, par Hiouen- tsang; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 24, 715 sq.; Chambers, Encyclop. 5, 372. (J.H.W.)

## Hip[[@Headword:Hip]]

             (שׁוֹק, shok, usually “shoulder”) occurs in the A.V. only in the phrase “hip and thigh” (lit. leg upon thigh), in the account of Samson's slaughter of the Philistines (Jdg 15:8); evidently a proverbial phrase, i.e. “he cut them in pieces so that their limbs, their legs and their thighs, were scattered one upon another, q. d. he totally destroyed them” (Gesenius). SEE SAMSON.

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

             in architecture, is the external angle formed by the meeting of the sloping sides of a roof which have their wall-plates running in different directions: thus, when a roof has the end sloped back, instead of finishing with a gable, the pieces of timber in these angles are called hip-rafters, and the tiles with which they are covered are called hip-tiles. The internal angles formed by the meeting of the sides are termed valleys, whether the latter be horizontal or sloping, and the piece of timber that supports a sloping valley is termed the valley rafter. Such a roof is called a hip roof.

## Hip-knob[[@Headword:Hip-knob]]

             SEE FINIAL.

## Hipparchus[[@Headword:Hipparchus]]

             a martyr at Samosata, with several others, A.D. 297, under Galerius, variously commemorated March 15 and December 9.

## Hipplcus[[@Headword:Hipplcus]]

             ( ῾Ιππικός, equestrian), the name given by Herod (in honor of one of his generals) to that one of the three towers (Josephus, War, 2, 17, 9) along the first wall of Jerusalem, inclosing Mount Zion on the north, which lay westernmost, and at its junction with the third wall (War, 5, 4, 2), being built up with immense strength (ib. 3). Its remains are still a very prominent object in the city (Robinson, Researches, 1, 453 sq.; Bartlett, Walks about Jerusalem, p. 85 sq.). Schwarz absurdly identifies it (Palest. p. 251) with the tower of Hananeel (q.v.) of Jer 31:38, on the authority of Jonathan's Targum, which there has “the tower of Pikus (פיקוס).” SEE JERUSALEM.

## Hippo[[@Headword:Hippo]]

             in Africa, now called Bona, a maritime colony. (See Schaff, Ch. Hist. 3, 993, note 1.) A general council was held at this place in 393. Aurelius,  bishop of Carthage, presided. Augustine made a discourse before the council on the subject of faith, the Creed, and against the Manichaeans. Forty-one canons were agreed to, which were taken as the model for after councils.” The first express definition of the N.T. Canon, in the form in which it has since been universally retained, was fixed at the council of A.D. 393, at Hippo.” Another council was held in 426, in which Augustine appointed Eradius his successor, requiring Eradius, however, in accordance with the canon of Nicoea, to remain in his priestly office until Augustine's death. — Smith, Tables of Church History; Landon, Manual of Councils; Schaff, Church History, 1, § 75; 3. 609.

## Hippocratia[[@Headword:Hippocratia]]

             a festival held by the Arcadians in honor of Poseidon (q.v.), in course of which it was customary to lead horses and mules in procession gayly caparisoned.

## Hippogriff[[@Headword:Hippogriff]]

             in the mythology of the Middle Ages, was a fabulous animal, half horse, half griffin, which cleaves the air with preternatural swiftness. The Italian  poet, Bojardo, seems to have invented it. Modern German poets use the name frequently for the muses' steed, Pegasus (q.v.).

## Hippoltus, St[[@Headword:Hippoltus, St]]

             ( ῾Ιππόλυτος), the name of several saints and martyrs of the early Church, especially that celebrated one of the fathers of the Church who probably lived in the early part of the 3rd century. Every particular of his life has been made a point of controversy. Thus the oldest ecclesiastical writers who make any mention of him, Eusebius and Jerome, give him the title of bishop, but without stating of what see, the latter even saying that he was unable to ascertain this point. “The Chronicon Paschale, our earliest authority, makes him ‘bishop of the so-called Portus, near Rome;' and as this statement is supported by the authority of Cyril, Zonaras, Anastasius, Nicephorus, and Syncellus (see Bunsen's Hippolytus, 1, 205), and as Prudentius (lib. περὶ στεφάνων, Hymn 9) describes his martyrdom as having taken place at Ostia, close by Portus, most critics will probably regard this point as finally settled. His mastery of the Greek language would render him peculiarly fit to be a ‘bishop of the nations,' who frequented the harbor of Rome in multitudes. In spite of Jacobi's assertion (see below) to the contrary, there seems to be no reason why he should not at the same time have been (what the ῎Ελεγχος shows him to have been) a presbyter and head of a party at Rome. We know, further, that he was a disciple of Irenaeus (Phot. Cod. 121), and was engaged in some warm disputes with Callistus on points of doctrine and discipline, which are graphically described in his recovered book, κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος” (Kitto, Cyclop. s.v.). On the other hand, the treatise De duabus Naturis, attributed to pope Gelasius I, gives Hippolytus the title of metropolitan of Arabia.

Le Movne even indicated a town of the district of Aden, called Portus Romanus, on account of its being the great mart of Roman trade in the East, as the seat of his bishopric. The same uncertainty exists with regard to the time in which he lived. Eusebius places him in the  first half of the 3rd century. Photius states that he was a disciple of Ireneus; Baronius says, of Clement of Alexandria; two assertions which appear equally well grounded. Portius adds that Hippolytus was the intimate friend and zealous admirer of Orngen, and that he invited him to comment on the Scriptures, furnishing him for that purpose seven amanuenses to write under his dictation, and seven copyists. Hippolytus himself testifies to his acquaintance with Origen. As for the other details given by Photius, they are based on a misinterpretation of a passage in Jerome. According to this father, Ambrosius of Alexandria, struck with the reputation Hippolytus had acquired by his commentaries on the Scriptures, invited Origen to attempt the same task, and furnished him with a number of secretaries for that purpose. The martyrdom of St. Hippolytus is not mentioned by Eusebius. Jerome, Photius, and other writers, however, call him a martyr, and his name appears with that title in the Roman, Greek, Coptic, and Abyssinian calendars.

Yet these martyrolegies differ so much from each other that they appear rather to refer to different parties of the same name than to one individual only. Prudentius, a Christian poet of the 4th century, wrote a long poem on the martyrdom of St. Hippolytus, but it is evident that he also confounded several parties of that name, and his pious legend is devoid of all historical authority. The date of St. Hippolytus's death is very doubtful. It is generally believed to have occurred under Alexander Severus, yet it is well known that this prince did not persecute Christians. If we admit that the Exhortatorius ad Severinam, mentioned among Hippolytus's works, is the same which Theodoret states was addressed to a certain queen or empress (πρὸς βασιλίδα τινά), and, further, that this Severina, according to Döllinger (see below), was the wife of the emperor Philip the Arabian, this would bring the martyrdom of the saint to the time of Decius's persecution (about 250), and perhaps later. In that case, Hippolytus, having been a disciple of Irenneus, who died about 190, must have been quite advanced in age at the time of his death. It is generally supposed that he suffered martyrdom near Rome, probably at the mouth of the Tiber. According to general opinion, it is thought he was thrown into the sea with a stone tied around his neck. In 1551 a statue was discovered at Rome, near the church of St. Lorenzo, which appeared to date back to the 6th century, and represented a man in monastic garb, in a sitting posture. The inscription bore the name of Hippolytus, bishop of Portus, and on the back of his seat was found inscribed the canon or paschal cycle which he introduced into Rome, and also a list of his principal-works. Some of these works, mentioned by Eusebius, Jerome, Photius, and other  ecclesiastical writers, or named on the statue, are yet extant, and we have extensive fragments of several others. A number of them have been published separately. Fabricius gave a complete collection of them under the title S. Hippolyti, episcopi et martyris, Opera non antea collecta et partem nunc primum e MSS. in lucen edita, Greece et Latine (Hamb. 1716-1718, fol.). This was reprinted, with additions by Galland, and inserted in his Bibliotheca Patrum (Venice, 1766, fol.), vol. 2. A collection of fragments of Syriac translations of Hippolytus is given in the Analecta of Lagarde. The same scholar, in an appendix to his Analecta (Lagardii ad Analecta sua Syriaca Appendix [Lips. 1858]), gives Arabic fragments of a commentary of Hippolytus on Revelation.

A recent discovery has directed general attention to this old ecclesiastical writer. In 1842 M. Mynoide Minas, on his return from a mission on which he had been sent by M. Villemain, minister of public instruction in France, brought back from Mount Athos, among other unpublished works, a mutilated Greek MS. of the 14th century, written on cotton paper, without name of author, and containing a Refutation of all Heresies (κατὰπασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος). This MS. was deposited in the Imperial Library at Paris, where it remained undisturbed until M. Emmanuel Miller found it to contain the last part of a treatise, the beginning of which was printed in the works of Origen. At Miller's request, the University of Oxford consented to publish it, under his direction, at their own press, with the title, ᾿Ωριγένους φιλοσόφούμενα ἣ κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος (Origenis Philosophumena sive omnium Haeresium Refutatiae Codiae Parisino nunc primum edidit Emmanuel Miller [Oxford, 1851, 8vol.). This work attracted great attention among the theologians and philologists of Germany and France, as well as of England. The first argument published to show that Hippolytus was the author of the MS. may be found in the Methodist Quarterly Review for October, 1851, in an article by professor J. L. Jacobi, of the University of Berlin. After proving that Origen was not the author, Jacobi shows that the writer was certainly contemporary with Origen. “He places himself in that age, and all his statements harmonize with this view. Taking him, then, to have lived in the first quarter of the 3rd century at the time of Zephyriuus, bishop of Rome, and of Cailistus, we should be led by Eusebius to identify him with the learned presbyter Caius, or with Hippolytus. It is easily shown, however, that Caius could not have been the author of the book, for he was specially distinguished for his writings against Cerinthus, and for his peculiar views with regard to that  Gnostic leader; while our author has nothing of his own to offer about Cerinthus, and borrows all that he does say (and that is not much), word for word, from Irenaeus. Caius ascribed the Apocalypse to Cerinthus our author assigns it to the apostle John. The former was a strenuous opponent of the sensual Chiliasm; the latter, while he blames much in Montanism, does not include Chiliasm under it, and indeed it is more than probable that he was a friend of that doctrine.” On the other hand, there are the following, among other reasons, for ascribing the work to Hippolytus.

(1.) A work bearing the same or a similar title was ascribed by Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, and Nicephorus to Hippolytus.

(2.) The monument dug up at Rome (see above) has on it the names of writings which the author of the treatise on heresies claims as his own.

(3.) The internal evidence is all in favor of Hippolytus. Professor Jacobi developed the argument at greater length in the Deutsche Zeitschrift fir Christl. Wissenschaft (1852), and Dr. Duncker followed in the Göttingen Gelehrt Aneigen (1851). But the most earnest work on the subject was done by the Chevalier Bunsen, who canvassed the whole question with great, learning in his copious and somewhat clumsy book, Hippolytus and his Age, or the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome under Commodus and Alexander Severus, and ancient and modern Christianity and Divinity compared (Lond. 1852, 4 vols. 8vo). In this work it is, we think, established beyond a doubt that the Refutation of all Heresies was written by Hippolytus, bishop of Portus, near Rome, in the first quarter of the 3rd century. Several writers, however, objected to some of Bunsen's conclusions, and he replied to them by republishing his work, greatly enlarged, under the title Christianity and Mankind (London, 1854, 7 vols. 8vo). This work is full of erudition, but often advances hasty statements and unauthorized conclusions.

The importance of this newly-discovered work of Hippolytus in the sphere of Church History and archaeology can hardly be overstated. It throws great light upon the Gnostic and other heretical sects of the early Church. Names and even facts are given of which we knew absolutely nothing before; while others that were held to be as unimportant as they were obscure are brought out into light and prominence, illuminating many dark nooks of Church History. The book tells us, for instance, of a Gnostic, by name Justin, of whom we had not before heard: and describes at length Monoiamos and the Peraticians, of whom we knew only the names. The  Simonians, and the strange, fragmentary, and enigmatical ideas generally attributed to Simon Magus, are here treated with something approaching to orderly and clear connection. That part of the work which treats of the morals of the Roman Church and of its clergy is full of interest. Hippolytus censures them for unchastity, and casts it up to them as a great reproach that many, even of the higher orders of clergy, were married-some of them more than once. His account of Callistus throws much light upon the state of society and of religion in Rome at the time. The work shows us also that the received doctrine of the Church at that time-a century before the Council of Nice-was the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity and the person of Christ. Its revelations are fatal, too, to many of the claims of the papacy. Romanist writers, therefore, have sought to invalidate the conclusions drawn by Jacobi, Bunsen, and the Protestants generally. Professor Döllinger seeks to refute the “calumnies” of the book against Callistus in his Hippolytus und Kallistus (Ratisb. 1853, 8vo), and to settle the question of the authorship of the Philosophoumena. He undertakes to show also from the character of the work itself that the author was not a Catholic, but a heretic, in the judgment of the Church of the age when he wrote it. The abbd Cruice, of Paris, published Etudes sur les... Philosophoumena (Paris, 1853, 8vo), to show that the book is neither genuine nor authentic; and he has since followed it up by his Histoire de l'Eglise de Rome sous les Pontificats de St. Victor, St. Zephyrin, et St. Calliste (Paris, 1856). He has also published an elegant edition of the Philosophoumena, with Latin version, notes, and indexes (Par. 1861, 8vo). The best edition of the work, however, is that of Duncker and Scheidewin (Göttingen, 1859, 8vo). Another edition, which embraces all the Greek works of Hippolytus, was published by Lagarde (Hippolyti Romani quae feruntur omnia Grae, Leips. 1858). The subject is very ably treated in its theological aspects, especially in their bearing on the Romish controversy, by Wordsworth, Hippolytus and the Church of Rome (London, 1852, 8vo). A very good account of the history and contents of the book, with an English translation of the most important parts, is given by Tayler, Hippolytus and the Christian Church of the Third Century (Lond. 1853, 12mo), and by Volkmar, Hippolytus u. d. rom. Zeitgenossen (Zurich, 1855). The leading reviews have generally given articles on the subject: see especially Methodist Quarterly Review, Oct. 1851; Jan. 1863, p. 160; Quarterly Rev. (Lond.) 89, 87; Journ, of Sacred Literature, Jan. 1853, and Jan. 1854; N. Brit. Review, Nov. 1854; Edinburgh Review, Jan. 1853; Ulgen, Zeitschriftf. hist. Theolog. 1842, 3:48-77; 1862, 2, 218; Journal des  Debats, Dec. 1852; Baur, Theolog. Jahrbücher (Tübingen, 1853); Studien u. Kritiken, by Gieseler (1853). Another important work ascribed to Hippolytus, a collection of canons, has lately been published for the first time, in an Arabic translation, by Dr. Hamberg (Canones S. Hippolyti Arabiae e codicibus Romanis cum versione Latina, annotationibus et prolegomenis, Munich, 1870). The collection contains thirty-eight canons, which are known to have been in use in the 12th century in the Coptic Church. Before this time no mention is made of this work by any ecclesiastical writer; but the editor regards this as no argument against its authenticity (which he defends), as all the works of Hippolytus had fallen into oblivion. In case it is genuine, its contents are of considerable importance for the history of Christian doctrines and on the constitution of the Christian Church.

## Hippolytus, Brothers (or Hospital Monks) of the Christian[[@Headword:Hippolytus, Brothers (or Hospital Monks) of the Christian]]

## Hippopotamus[[@Headword:Hippopotamus]]

             an animal regarded by Bochart (Hieroz. 3, 705), Ludolf (Hist. Aethiop. 1, 11), Shaw (Trav. 2, 299, Lond. 8vo), Scheuzer (Phys. Sac. on Job 40), Rosenmuller (Not. ad Bochart. Hieroz. 3, 705, and Schol. ad Vet. Test. in Job 40), Taylor (Appendix to Calmet's Dict. Bibl. No. 65), Harmer (Observations, 2, 319), Gesenius (Thes. s.v.בְּהֵמוֹת), Fürst (Concord. Heb. s.v.), and English commentators generally, as being designated by the Heb. word בְּהֵמוֹת(behemoth' in Job 40:15), by which, however, some writers, as Vatablus, Drusius, Grotils (Crit. Sac. Annotationis ad Job 40), Pfeiffer (Dubia vexata S. S., p. 594, Dresden, 1679), Castell (Lex. Hept. p. 292), A. Schultens (Comment. in Job 40), Michaelis (Suppl. ad Lex. Heb. No. 208), have understood the elephant; while others, again, amongst whom is Lee (Comment. on Job 40 :and Lex. Heb. s.v.בְּהֵמוֹת), consider the Hebrew term as a plural noun for “cattle” in general; it being left to the reader to apply to the scriptural allusions the particular animal, which may be, according to Lee, “either the horse, or wild ass, or wild bull”(!). Compare also Reiske, Conjecture in Job. p. 167. Dr. Mason Good (Book of Job literally translated, p. 473, Lond. 1712) has hazarded a conjecture that the behemoth denotes some extinct pachyderm like the mammoth, with a view to combine the characteristics of the hippopotamus and elephant, and so to fulfill all the scriptural demands. Compare with this Michaelis (Sup. ad Lex. Heb. No. 208), and Hasaeus (in Dissertat. Syllog.  No. 7, § 37, and § 38, p. 506), who rejects with some scorn the notion of the identity of behemoth and mammoth. Dr. Kitto (Pict. Bib. Job 40) and Colonel Hamilton Smith (Kitto's Cycl. Bib. Lit. art. Behemoth). from being unable to make all the scriptural details correspond with any one particular animal, are of opinion that behemoth is a plural term, and is to be taken as a poetical personification of the great pachydermata generally, wherein the idea of hippopotamus is predominant.

The term behemoth would thus be the counterpart of leviathan, the animal mentioned next in the book of Job; which word, although its signification in that passage is restricted to the crocodile, does yet stand in Scripture for a python, or a whale, or some other huge monster of the deep. SEE LEVIATHAN. According to the Talmud, behemoth is some huge land-animal which daily consumes the grass off a thousand hills; he is to have, at some future period, a battle with leviathan. On account of his grazing on the mountains, he is called “the bull of the high mountains.” (See Lewysohn, Zool. des Talmuds, p. 355). “The ‘fathers,' for the most part,” says Cary (Job, p. 402), “surrounded the subject with an awe equally dreadful, and in the behemoth here, and in the leviathan of the next chapter, saw nothing but mystical representations of the devil: others, again, have here pictured to themselves some hieroglyphic monster that has no real existence; but these wild imaginations are surpassed by that of Bolducius, who in the behemoth actually beholds Christ!”

The following reasons seem clearly to identify it with the hippopotamus. 1. The meaning of the original word itself. Gesenius (Thesaurus, p. 183), with whom also Furst agrees (Heb. Lex. s.v.), holds it not to be a Heb. plural, but the Coptic behemoth, “the water-ox” (see Jablonsky, Opusc. 1, 52), equivalent to the ἵππος ὁ ποτάμοις,tocor river-horse of the ancients (Herod. 2, 71; Aristot. Anim. 2, 12 [4]; Diod. Sic. 1, 35; Pliny, 8:39; Ammian. Marcell. 22:15; Abdollatif, Denker. p. 146 sq.; Prosper Alpinus, Res AEg. 4, 12; Ludolph, Hist. Eth. 1, 11, and Comment. p. 155 sq.; Hasselquist, Tray. p. 280 sq.; Sparrmann, Reise druch siidl. Africa, p. 562 sq.; Ruppell, Arab. Petr. p. 55 sq.; comp. Schneider,.Hist. hippo. vett. crit. in his edit. of Artedi Synon pisc. p. 247 sq., 316 sq.; Bochart, Hieroz. 3, 705 sq.; Oken, Zool. 2, 718 sq.). Rosenmüller's objection to the Coptic origin of the word is worthy of observation-that, if this were the case, the Sept. interpreters would not have given θηρία as its representative. Michaelis translates בְּהֵמוֹתby jumenta, and thinks the name of the elephant has dropped out (“Mihi videtur nomen elephantis forte פיל  excidisse”). Many critics, Rosenmüller amongst the number, believe the word is the plural majestatis of בְּהֵמָה. But in that case it would hardly be employed with a verb or adj. in the singular, and that masc., as it is.

2. A careful examination of the text shows that all the details descriptive of the behemoth accord entirely with the ascertained habits of that animal. Gesenius and Rosenmüller have remarked that, since in the first part of Jehovah's discourse (Job 38, 39) land animals and birds are mentioned, it suits the general purpose of that discourse better to suppose that aquatic or amphibious creatures are spoken of in the last half of it; and that since the leviathan, by almost universal consent, denotes the crocodile, the behemoth seems clearly to point to the hippopotamus, his associate in the Nile. Harmer (Observations, 2, 319) says, “There is a great deal of beauty in arranging the descriptions of the behemoth and the leviathan, for in the Mosaic pavement the people of an Egyptian bark are represented as darting spears or some such weapons at one of the river-horses, as another of them is pictured with two sticking near his shoulders… It was then a customary thing with the old Egyptians thus to attack these animals (see also Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 3. 71); if so, how beautiful is the arrangement: there is a most happy gradation; after a grand but just representation of the terribleness of the river-horse, the All mighty is represented as going on with his expostulations something after this manner: “But dreadful as this animal is, barbed irons and spears have sometimes prevailed against him; but what wilt thou do with the crocodile?

Canst thou fill his skin with barbed irons?” — etc. In the Lithostrotun Praenestinum, to which Mr. Harmer refers, there are two crocodiles, associates of three river-horses, which are represented without spears sticking in them. though they seem to be within shot. Behemoth “eateth grass as an ox” (Job 40:15) — a circumstance which is noticed as peculiar in an animal of aquatic habits; this is strictly true of the hippopotamus, which leaves the water by night, and feeds on vegetables and green crops. Its strength is enormous, Job 40:16; Job 40:18, and the notice of the power of the muscles of the belly, “his force is in the navel of his belly,” appears to be strictly correct. The tail, however, is short, and it must be conceded that the first part of Job 40:17, “he moveth his tail like a cedar,” seems not altogether applicable. His mode of attack is with his mouth, which is armed with a formidable array of teeth, projecting incisors, and enormous curved canines; thus “his Creator offers him a  sword,” for so the words in Job 40:19 may be rendered. But the use of his sword is mainly for pacific purposes, “the beasts of the field playing” about him as he feeds; the hippopotamus being a remarkably inoffensive animal. “With these apparently combined teeth the hippopotamus can cut the grass as neatly as if it were mown with the scythe, and is able to sever, as if with shears, a tolerably thick and stout stem” (Wood's Nat. Hist. 1, 762). חֶרֶב. is perhaps the Greek ἃρπη. See Bochart (3, 722), who cites Nicander (Theriac. 566) as comparing the tooth of this animal to a scythe.

The next verse explains the purpose and use of the “scythe” with which God has provided his creature, viz., in order that he may eat the grass of the hills. His retreat is among the lotuses (tzelin; A.V. “shady trees”), which abounded about the Nile, and amid the reeds of the river. Thoroughly at home in the water, “if the river riseth, he doth not take to flight; and he cares not if a Jordan (here an appellative for a ‘stream') press on his mouth.” Ordinary means of capture were ineffectual against the great strength of this animal. “Will any take him before his eyes?” (i.e. openly, and without cunning); “will any bore his nose with a gin?” as was usual with large animals. Though now no longer found in the lower Nile, it was formerly common there (Wilkinson, 1, 239). The method of killing it in Egypt was with a spear, the animal being in the first instance secured by a lasso, and repeatedly struck until it became exhausted (Wilkinson, 1, 240); the very same method is pursued by the natives of South Africa at the present day (Livingstone, p. 73; instances of its great strength are noticed by the same writer, p. 231, 232, 497). The skin of the hippopotamus is cut into whips by the Dutch colonists of South Africa, and the monuments of Egypt testify that a similar use was made of the skin by the ancient Egyptians (Anc. Egypt. 3, 73). The inhabitants of South Africa hold the flesh of the hippopotamus in high esteem; it is said to be not unlike pork.

It has been said that some parts of the description in — Job cannot apply to the hippopotamus:

(1.) The 20th verse, for instance, where it is said “the mountains bring him forth food.” This passage, many writers say, suits the elephant well, but cannot be applied to the hippopotamus, which is never seen on mountains. In answer to this objection, it has been stated, with great reason, that the word hàrim (הָרַים) is not necessarily to be restricted to what we understand commonly by the expression “mountains.” In the Palestine  pavement alluded to above there are to be seen here and there, as Mr. Harmer has observed, “hillocks rising above the water.” In Eze 43:15 (margin), the altar of God, only ten cubits high and fourteen square, is called “the mountain of God.” “The eminences of Egypt, which appear as the inundation of the Nile decreases, may undoubtedly be called mountains in the poetical language of Job.” But we think there is no occasion for so restricted an explanation. The hippopotamus, as is well known, frequently leaves the water and the river's bank as night approaches, and makes inland excursions for the sake of the pasturage, when he commits sad work among the growing crops (Hasselquist, Trav. p. 188). No doubt he might often be observed on the hillsides near the spots frequented by him. Again, it must be remembered that the “mountains” are mentioned by way of contrast with the natural habits of aquatic animals generally, which never go far from the water and the banks of the river; but the behemoth, though passing much of his time in the water and in “the covert of the reed and fens,” eateth grass like cattle, and feedeth on the hill-sides in company with the beasts of the field. According to a recent traveler in Egypt, the Rev. J. L. Errington, “the valley of the Nile in Upper Egypt and Nubia is in parts so very narrow, that the mountains approach within a few hundred yards, and even less, to the river's bank; the hippopotamus, therefore, might well be said to get its food from the mountains, on the sides of which it would grow.” There is much beauty in the passages which contrast the habits of the hippopotamus, an amphibious animal, with those of herbivorous land- quadrupeds; but if the elephant is to be understood, the whole description is, comparatively speaking, tame.

(2.) Again, the 24th verse — “his nose pierceth through snares” — seems to be spoken of the trunk of the elephant, “with its extraordinary delicacy of scent and touch, rather than to the obtuse perceptions of the river- horse.” With respect to this objection, there is little doubt that the marginal reading is nearer the Hebrew than that of the text. “Will any take him in his sight, or bore his nose with a gin?” Perhaps this: refers to leading him about alive with a ring in his nose, as, says Rosenmüller, “the Arabs are accustomed to lead camels,” and we may add the English to lead bulls, “with a ring passed through the nostrils.”

(3.) The expression in Eze 43:17, “he bendeth his tail like a cedar,” has given occasion to much discussion; some of the advocates for the elephant maintaining that the word zânâb (זָנָב) may denote either extremity, and  that here the elephant's trunk is intended. The parallelism, however, clearly requires the posterior appendage to be signified by the term. The expression seems to allude to the stiff, unbending nature of the animal's tail, which in this respect is compared to the trunk — of a strong cedar, which the wind scarcely moves.

(4.) The description of the animal's lying under “the shady trees,” amongst the “reeds” and willows, is peculiarly applicable to the hippopotamus. It has been argued that such a description is equally applicable to the elephant; but this is hardly the case; for, though the elephant is fond of frequent ablutions, and is frequently seen near water, yet the constant habit of the hippopotamus, as implied in Eze 43:21-22, seems to be especially made the subject to which the attention is directed. “At every turn there occurred deep, still pools, and occasional sandy islands densely clad with lofty reeds. Above and beyond these reeds stood trees of immense age, beneath which grew a rank kind of grass on which the sea-cow delights to pasture” (G. Cumming, p. 297). SEE BEHEMOTH.

## Hippos[[@Headword:Hippos]]

             (῎Ιππος, a horse; but Reland suggests, Palest. p. 830, that it may be one of the towns called היפאin the Talmud), a city of Palestine, 30 stadia from Tiberias (Josephus, Life, 65), one of the Decapolis (Reland, Palcest. p. 215), frequently mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 15:7, 3; 17:11, 4; War. 2, 18, 1; 18, 5; 3:3, 1; Life, 31); later, an episcopal city (Reland, p. 440, 821), identified by Burckhardt with the ruin es-Sunuah, at the south-east end of Lake Tiberias. — Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 322.

## Hirah[[@Headword:Hirah]]

             (Heb. Chirach', חַירָה, mobility; Sept. εἰράς), an Adullamite and friend of Judah (Gen 28:1; Gen 28:12; comp. Gen 28:20). B.C. cir. 1896-1876.

## Hiram[[@Headword:Hiram]]

             (Heb. Chiram', חַירָם, high-born; generally written “Huram,” חוּרָם, Chramz', in Chronicles, and “Hirom,” חַירוֹם, Chirom,' in 1Ki 5:10; 1Ki 5:18; 1Ki 7:40; Sept. Χειράμ or Χιράμ; Joseph. Εἵραμος and Εἵρωμος), the name of three men.

1. HURAM (Sept. makes two names, Α᾿χιρὰν καὶ Ι᾿ωίμ), the last named of the sons of Bela, son of Benjamin (1Ch 8:5). B.C. post 1856.

2. HIRAM, HURAM, or HIROM, king of Tyre at the commencement of David's reign. He sent an embassy to felicitate David on his accession, which led to an alliance, or strengthened a previous friendship between them. It seems that the dominion of this prince extended over the western slopes of Lebanon; and when David built himself a palace, Hiram materially assisted the work by sending cedar-wood from Lebanon, and able workmen to Jerusalem (2Sa 5:11; 1Ch 14:1). B.C. cir. 1044. It was probably the same prince who sent to Jerusalem an embassy of condolence and congratulation when David died and Solomon succeeded, and who contracted with the new king a more intimate alliance than ever before or after existed between a Hebrew king and a foreign prince. The alliance seems to have been very substantially beneficial to both parties, and without it Solomon would scarcely have been able to realize all the great designs he had in view. In consideration of large quantities of corn, wine, and oil furnished by Solomon, the king of Tyre agreed to supply from Lebanon the timber required for the Temple, to float it along the coast, and deliver it at Joppa, which was the port of Jerusalem (1Ki 5:1 sq.; 1Ki 9:10 sq.; 1Ch 2:3 sq.). The vast commerce of Tyre made gold very plentiful there; and Hiram supplied no less than 500 talents to Solomon for the ornamental works of the Temple, and received in return twenty towns in Galilee, which, when he came to inspect them, pleased him so little that he applied to them a name of contempt, and restored them to the Jewish king (2Ch 8:2). SEE CABUL.

It does not, however, appear that the good understanding between the two kings was broken by this unpleasant circumstance, for it was after this that Hiram suggested, or at least took part in, Solomon's traffic to the Eastern Seas, which certainly could not have been undertaken by the Hebrew king without his assistance in providing ships and experienced mariners' (1Ki 9:27; 1Ki 10:11, etc.; 2Ch 8:18; 2Ch 9:10, etc.). B.C. cir. 1010. SEE OPHIR; SEE SOLOMON.

Josephus has preserved a valuable fragment of the history of Mercander, a native of Ephesus, relating to the intercourse of Hiram and Solomon. professedly taken from the Syrian archives (Apion, 1, 18). “After the death of Abibalus, Hiromus, his son, succeeded him in his kingdom, and reigned thirty-four years, having lived fifty-three. He laid out that part of the city  which is called Eurychoron, and consecrated the golden column which is in the temple of Jupiter. And he went up into the forest on the mountain called Libanus, to fell cedars for the roofs of the temples; and having demolished the ancient temples he rebuilt them, and consecrated the fanes of Hercules and Astarte: he constructed that of Hercules first, in the month Peritius; then that of Astarte, when he had overcome the Tityians who had refused to pay their tribute; and when, he had subjected them he returned. In his time was a certain young: man named Abdemonus, who used to solve the problems which were propounded to him by Solomon, king of Jerusalem.” According to the same authority (ib. 1, 17), the historian Dius, likewise from the Tyrian annals, says, “Upon the death of Abibalus, his son Hiromus succeeded to the kingdom. He raised the eastern parts of the city, and enlarged the citadel, and joined it to the temple of Jupiter Olympius, which stood before upon am island, by filling up the intermediate space; and he adorned that temple with donations of gold, and he went up into Libanus to cut timber for the construction of the temples. And it is said that Solomon, who at that time reigned in Jerusalem, sent enigmas to Hiromus, and desired others in return, with a proposal that whichsoever of the two was unable to solve them, should forfeit money to the other. Hiromus agreed to the proposal, but was unable to solve the enigmas, and paid treasures to a large amount as a forfeit to Solomon. And it is said that one Abdemonus, a Tyrian, solved the enigmas, and proposed others which Solomon was not able to unriddle, for which he repaid the fine to Hiromus” (Cory's Ancient Fragments, p. 193.) Some of these riddles, the: Jewish historian states (ib. 1, 17), were extant in his day;; and in Ant. 8, 2, 6, 7, he gives what he declares to be authentic copies of the epistles that passed between the two kings respecting the materials for the Temple. SEE LEBANON. With the letters in 1 Kings 5, , 2 : Chronicles 2, may be compared not only his copies of thee letters, but also the still less authentic letters between: Solomon and Hiram, and between Solomon and Vaphies. (Apries?), which are preserved by Eupolemon (ap. Eusebius, Praep. Evang. 9, 30), and mentioned by Alexander Polvhistor (Clem. Alex. Strom. 1, 24, p. 332). Some Phoenician historians (ap. Tatian. cont. Graec. § 37) relate that Hiram, besides supplying timber for the Temple, gave his daughter in marriage to Solomon. Jewish writers in less ancient times cannot overlook Hiram's uncircumcision in his services towards the building of the Temple. Their legends relate (Eisenm. Ent. Jud. 1, 868) that because he was a God-fearing man, and built the Temple, he was received alive into Paradise; but. that, after he had been there a thousand years, he  sinned by pride, and was thrust down into hell. Eupolemon (Euseb. Praep. Evang. 9, 30) states that David, after a war with Hiram, reduced him to the condition of a tributary prince. SEE DAVID.

Some have regarded this Hiram as a different person from the friend of David, since Josephus states that the Temple was built in the twelfth year of the reign of the Tyrian king who aided Solomon in the work (Apion, 1, 17 sq.; the eleventh, according to Ant. 8, 3, 1); but this is probably only by a computation of the historian, whose numerical calculations in these points are far from trustworthy. (See Nessel, Diss. de amicitia Salom. et Hirami, Upsal, 1734.) Hiram is also spoken of by Herodotus (2, 44) as the builder of new temples to Heracles, Melcart, and Astarte, and the adorner of that of Zeus-Baalsamin.

Ewald (Gesch. Israel, III, 1, 28, 83) and Movers (II, 1, 326 sq., 446 sq.) give a Hiram II, who reigned from 551532 B.C., toward the close of the Chald. — Babylonian empire, and who is not mentioned in the Bible.

Dr. Robinson describes a remarkable monument of Solomon's ally, still extant, which he passed a little beyond the village of Hunaneh, on his way from Safed to Tyre (Bib. Res. 3:385). “It is an immense sarcophagus of limestone, resting upon a pedestal of large hewn stones; a conspicuous ancient tomb, bearing among the common people the name of Kaibr Hairan, ‘Sepulcher of Hiram.' The sarcophagus measures twelve feet long by six feet in height and breadth; the lid is three feet thick, and remains in its original position; but a nose has been broken through the sarcophagus at one end. The pedestal consists of three layers of the like species of stone, each of three feet thick, the upper layer projecting over the others; the stones are large, and one of them measures nine feet in length. This gray, weather-beaten monument stands here alone and solitary, bearing the marks of high antiquity; but the name and the record of him by whom or for whom it was erected have perished, like his ashes, forever. It is indeed possible that the present name may have come down by tradition, and that this sepulcher once held the dust of the friend and ally of Solomon; more probably, however, it is merely of Mohammedan application, like so many other names of Hebrew renown, attached to their welys and monuments in every part of Palestine. I know of no historical trace having reference to this tomb; and it had first been mentioned by a Frank traveler (Monro,  1833) only five years before.” (See also Thomson, Lond and Book, 1, 290 sq.)

3. The son of a widow of the tribe of Dan, and of a Tyrian father. He was sent by the king of the same name to execute the principal works of the interior of the Temple, and the various utensils required for the sacred services (1Ki 7:13-14; 1Ki 7:40). We recognize in the enumeration of this man's talents by the king of Tyre a character common in the industrial history of the ancients (comp. those of Bezaleel, Exo 31:3-5), namely, a skilful artificer, knowing all the arts, or at least many of those arts which we practice, in their different branches. SEE HANDICRAFT. It is probable that he was selected for this purpose by the king from among others equally gifted, in the notion that his half Hebrew blood would render him the more acceptable at Jerusalem. B.C. cir. 1010. He is called “Huram” in 2Ch 2:13; 2Ch 4:11; 2Ch 4:16; and “Hirom” in the margin of 1Ki 7:40. In 2Ch 2:13, חוּרָם אָבַי is rendered “Huram my father's;” so in, 2Ch 4:16, חוּרָם אָבַיו is rendered “Huram his father;” where, however, the words אָבַיand אבַיוcan hardly belong to the name, but are appellations; so that “Huram my (oa, his) father” seems to mean Huramo my counselor, i.e., foreman, or master-workman.

## Hircanus[[@Headword:Hircanus]]

             ( ῾Υρκανός, i.e. Hyrcanus), “a son of Tobias,” who had a large treasure placed for security in the treasury of the Temple at the time of the visit of Heliodorus (2Ma 3:11), B.C. cir. 187. Josephus. also mentions “children of Tobias” (παίδες Τωβίου. Ant. 12:5, 1), who, however, belonged to the faction of Menelaus, and notices especially a. son of one of them (Joseph) who. was named Hyrcanus (Ant. 12:4, 2 sq.). But there is no sufficient reason for identifying the Hyrcanus of 2 Macc. with this grandson of Tobias either by supposing that the ellipsis (τοῦ Τωβίου) is to be so filled up(Grotius, Calmet), or that the. sons of Joseph were popularly named after their grandfather(Ewald, Gesch. 4:309), which. could scarcely have been the case in consequence of the great. eminence of their father. — Smith. SEE MACCABEES.

The name of Hyrcanus occurs at a later period under the: Maccabees. It has been thought. that it was adopted on account: of a victory gained by John, the son and successor of Simon Maccabaeus, over the Hyrcanians (Euseb. Chronicles lib. 2; Sulp. Severus, Hist. Sacr. lib. 2, c. 26). Josephus  informs us that Hyrcanus accompanied Antiochus VII Sidetes into Parthia, and Nicolaus of Damascus says that a trophy was erected at the river Lycus to commemorate thee victory over the Parthian general (At. 13, 8,4). The Hyrcanians were a nation whose territory was bounded on the north by the Caspian. Sea, and would thus be at no great distance from Parthia, where John Hyrcanus had gained the victory... It is remarkable that the different statements agree in the position of the countries, Hyrcania, Parthia, and the river Lycus (of Assyria) being contiguous. As Josephus, however, does not give any explanation of the name (Ant. 13, 7, 4; War, 1, 2, 3), and the son of Simon is nowhere called Hyrcanus in 1 Macc., the reason. for its assumption is uncertain. SEE HYRCANUS.

## Hireling[[@Headword:Hireling]]

             (שָׂכַיר, sakir'; μισθωτός), a laborer who, is employed on hire for a limited time (Job 12:1; Job 14:6; Mar 1:20). By the Mosaic law such a one was to be paid his wages as soon as his work was over (Lev 19:13). The little interest which would be felt by such a temporary laborer, compared with that of the shepherd or permanent keeper of the flock, furnish a striking illustration in one of our Lord's discourses (Joh 10:12-13). The working day in the East begins with the rising of the sun, and ends when it sets. The parable in Mat 20:1-14, is interesting, not only as showing what were the day's wages of a laborer at this period in Judaea, “a penny,” i.e. the Roman denarius, about fifteen cents of our money, but also as showing that the salvation of the Gentiles can in itself become no impediment to the Jews; and as eternal life is the free gift of God, he has a right to give it in whatever proportions, at whatever times, and on whatever conditions he pleases. SEE SERVANT; SEE WAGES, etc.

## Hirmologion[[@Headword:Hirmologion]]

             (εἱρμολόγιον), a collection of hirmoi;. also the exaltation of the Panaghia (q.v.) in the Greek Church (Neale, Hist. of the Eastern Church, p. 890). SEE HIRMOS.

## Hirmologium[[@Headword:Hirmologium]]

             (εἱρμολόγιον), an office-book in the Greek Church, consisting mainly of a collection of the Hirmoi, but containing also a few other forms. Hirmus (εἱρμός). The Canons, which form so important a part of the Greek offices, are divided into nine odes, or practically into eight, as the second is always omitted. Each ode consists of a varying number (three, four, or five are the numbers most frequently found) of troparia, or short rhythmical strophes, each formed on the model of one which precedes the ode, and which is called the Hirmus. The Hirmus is usually independent of the ode, though containing a reference to the subject matter of it; sometimes, however, the first tiroparion of an ode is called the Hirmus. It is distinguished by inverted commas (' ") in the office-books. Sometimes the first words alone-of a Hirmus are given, and it is not unfrequently placed at the end of the ode to which it belongs.

## Hirmos[[@Headword:Hirmos]]

             or rather IRMOS (εἰρμός, a series) is the name of a strophe in a Greek hymn. “The model of succeeding stanzas, so called as drawing others after it.” — Walcott, Sac. Archaeology (8vo, London, 1868).

## Hirnheim or Hirnhaym, Hieronymus[[@Headword:Hirnheim or Hirnhaym, Hieronymus]]

             a distinguished Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Troppau, province of Silesia, in 1635. He took orders in 1659, and pursued his theological studies at Prague until appointed instructor in philosophy at the Norbertin College. A short time after he was made abbé of Mount Sion, and later general vicar of Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, and Austria. Hirnheim is generally ranked among modern skeptics, and most of his works have been placed in the Roman Index. He was a great hater of the Protestant Church, and employed, in common with a number of other theologians of his Church, to combat. Protestantism, skeptical weapons, as he saw no prospect of vanquishing them in the dogmatic field. He died August 27,1769. His most important work is De typho generis humani, sive scientiarum humanarum: — inani ac ventoso tumore, dificultate, labilitate, falsitate, jactantia, praesumptione, incommodis et periculis, tractatus brevis, etc. (Prague, 1676, 4to), put into the Index April 14, 1682. — Jochers, Gelehrt. Lex. Addenda 2, 2018; Krug, Philosophisches Handwörterb. 2, 438; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 24, 791.

## Hirom[[@Headword:Hirom]]

             SEE HIRAM.

## Hirsch[[@Headword:Hirsch]]

             (or Hirz), a name common to many Jewish writers, of whom we mention the following:

1. BEN-JONATHAN ha-Levi. who flourished in the 18th century, is the author of נתיב הישר, a commentary on the Pentateuch, allegorical and homiletical (Dyhernfurt, 1712): — שביל הישרglosseson Talmudic treatises (1718).

2. BEN-NISSAN, who flourished in the 18th century, wrote תפארת צבי, novellas on the Pentateuch (Amsterdam, 1755).

3. SAMUEL bein-Samuel, wrote a cabalistical commentary on the Pentateuch, entitled, מרגליות התורה. (1788). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:395 sq. (B.P.)

## Hirsch, Andreas[[@Headword:Hirsch, Andreas]]

             a Lutheran minister of the latter half of the last century. He studied theology at Strasburg, and filled several positions as preacher, but gave dissatisfaction to the people, and was driven from each of them in succession. Notwithstanding all persecution, he found sufficient time to write several works, among which are, Kircherus Jesuita Germaniae redonatus, etc. (Halle, 1662, 8vo): — Religionsgesprach zwischen zweierlei Religionsverwandten (Rottenburg, 1672, 4to): Predigten und Gelegenhmeitsschriften (ibid. 1673, 8vo). — Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex. Addenda 2, 2018.

## Hirsch, Carl Christian[[@Headword:Hirsch, Carl Christian]]

             a German theologian, was born at Hersbruck October 20,1704. He studied at Altorf, Leipzig, and other universities, and went to the theological seminary at Nuremberg in 1729. He entered the ministry in 1734, and in 1740 was appointed deacon of Lorenz Church at Nuremberg. He died Feb.  27, 1754. His works are: Hadriani Pontii Historiae Libri rariomres: — Venerab. Agnetis Blamabeck in Vita et Revelationes (Frankf. and Leip. 1735): — Catechismus Histo:rice (Nurnb. 1752, 8vo): — Lebensbeschreib. aller Geistlichen Niirnbergs (continued by Wüffel and Waldau, published ‘in 1756-1785, 4to): to this work he devoted his time mainly. He also wrote a number of monographs inserted in the Acta Histor. eccles. and in the Acta Scholast. of Nuremberg. Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex. Append. 2, 2021; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 24, 793; Döring, Gelehrt. Theol. Deutschl. 1, 738.

## Hirsch, Paul Wilhelm[[@Headword:Hirsch, Paul Wilhelm]]

             a Jewish convert of Germany in the 18th century, who joined the Church in 1717, is the author of, מגלת תקופות, or Entdeckung der Tekufot oder das schadliche Blut (Berlin, 1717): — מתנת יובל, or, Das vom Gott den  Christen aufs neue gewordene Jubel-Geschenk (1718): — Beschreibung des judischen Weihnachts-Festes (1725): — Der Juden lacherliche Zuriistung zum Sabbat (1722): — Beschreibung des betrubten Endes Rabban Jochanan's (1728): — Nachricht von der Bedeutung der beiden Redensarten. Kapore werden und Krie' reissen (1730). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:398; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 3:907 sq.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

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

             a Protestant theologian and historian of Germany, was born December 17, 1806, at Dantzic. He studied at Berlin, was for some time professor at the Friedrich-Wilhelms gymnasium there, and in 1833 at Dantzic. In 1865 he was called as professor of history and librarian to Greifswalde, and died February 17, 1881. He published, Beitrag zur Reformationsgeschichte Danzigs (Dantzic, 1842): — Die Ober-Pfarrkirche von St. Marien in Danzig (1843): — Danzigs Handels- und Gewerbegeschichte unfer der Ferrschaft des Deutsche Ordens (Leipsic, 1858). He also edited, with Strehlke and Toppen, Scriptores Rerum Prussicarum (1868 sq.). (B.P.)

## Hirsch-Chotsch, Zebi, ben-Jerachmiel[[@Headword:Hirsch-Chotsch, Zebi, ben-Jerachmiel]]

             a Polish Rabbi, and one of the most eloquent preachers of the 17th century, was born at Cracow, but spent his later days in Germany. He gained renown as an author by נִחִלִת צְבַיor Hereditas decoris ex Jeremiah 3, 19 (Frankf. 1721, fol.); an allegorical commentary on the Pentateuch, written in German, with Hebrew characters, and in the main drawn from “Zohar.” one of the works of the Cabalists: — שִׁבִּתָּה דנְרַגְלָא, Sabbathum festi (Furth, 1603, 4to): — חֶמְדִּת צְבַי, or Desiderium decoris, a commentary on “Tilne Zohar” (Amsterd. 1706, fol.), etc. Furst, Bib. Judaica, 1, 177; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 24, 792; Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex. 2, 1626.

## Hirschau or Hirsau[[@Headword:Hirschau or Hirsau]]

             a very celebrated old German monastery, of the Benedictine order, in the diocese of Speier, having much in common with the congregation of Clugny (q.v.). It is asserted by the Roman Catholics to have been opened A.D. 645; but it was probably founded about 830 by count Erlafried von Calw and bishop Notting of Vercelli. The monks and the different abbots who inhabited it were distinguished for their scholarship. Some were authors, others rose to high distinction in the Church. Among these, the abbot Wilhelm der Selige (q.v.) did perhaps more than any other to establish the noble reputation of this monastery. After the Reformation it became a Protestant seminary until 1692, when the French, on their invasion of the country, destroyed it. A history of this monastery was written by Johann Trittenhemius, one of its abbots, under the title Chronicon Hirsaugiense (Basil, 1559, fol., and 1690,2 vols. fol.). — Herzog, Real-Encyklop 6, 143; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 5, 213; Real-Encyklopadie für d. Kathol. Deutschl. 5, 375. SEE BENEDICTINES. (J. H. W.).

## Hirschel, Solomon[[@Headword:Hirschel, Solomon]]

             a Jewish rabbi, was born in England in 1762. He was educated in Germany and Poland, and was for some time preacher at Prenzlau, in Prussia. In 1802 he was called to London as rabbi of the synagogue in Duke's Place, but gradually his jurisdiction was extended over all the Jews of the Ashkenazi Minhag (i.e., German rite) in London, and indeed in England. It was during his time that the scattered elements formed by the English Jews were gathered into one compact mass, and the Spanish and Portuguese Jews, and the German Jews, who were formerly spoken of as two distinct "nations," became closely connected together as members of the same creed. He died October 31, 1842. (B.P.)

## Hirscher, Johann Baptist von[[@Headword:Hirscher, Johann Baptist von]]

             a celebrated German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Alt- Ergarten, Würtemberg, Jan. 20, 1788. He was educated at the Lyceum of Constance and at the University of Freiburg, and was made a priest in 1810. He held the position of instructor in philosophy and theology in different institutions until 1817, when he was called as professor of ethical and pastoral theology to the University of Tübingen. In 1837 he was called to the University of Freiburg, and in 1839 he became a member of the cathedral chapter of the archdiocese of Freiburg. He was also appointed an “ecclesiastical counselor,” and, somewhat later, a privy counselor (Geheim-Rath). In 1849 he was delegate of the University of Freiburg in the First Chamber of the grand duchy of Baden, into which he was subsequently several times called by the confidence of the grand duke. In 1850 he became dean of the cathedral chapter. In 1863 he resigned his position at the university on account of ill health. He died Sept. 4,1865. Hirscher was one of the representative men of Roman Catholic theology in the 19th century. At the beginning of his literary career he was a zealous advocate of liberal reforms within his Church; subsequently he gradually became, with Mihler (q.v.), Drey (q.v.), and other professors of Tübingen, a more outspoken champion of the tenets of his Church in opposition to Protestantism, and joined his colleagues as founder and co-editor of the Theologische Quartalschrift (established 1819), one of the ablest theological organs of the Church of Rome. But, though a prolific and prominent writer in behalf of his Church, he continued, even in later life, to favor the introduction of some reforms, as the admission of the laity to diocesan synods, and laid, in general, greater stress on those points which the Roman Catholic Church has in common with orthodox Protestantism than on those which separate the two churches. He remained an opponent of Ultramontane theories, and was therefore, up to his death, the object of many attacks on the part of Ultramontane writers. Several of his earlier works, in particular the one entitled De Missa (Tübingen, 1821; German. transl. Baden, 1838), in which he advocated the use of the Latin language at divine service, were put in the Roman Index. The chief aim of most of his works is to represent the doctrines of his Church, especially those most offensive to Protestants and liberal Roman Catholics, in as favorable a light as possible. The most important among his works are Ansichten von dem Jubilsum (Tüb. 1826), the second edition of which appeared under the title Die Lehre vom kathol. Ablass (6th edit. Tüb. 1855): — Gesch. Jesu  Christi (Tüb. 1840; 2nd edit. 1845): — Katechetik (4th edit. Tüb. 1840): — Betrachtungen fiber saimmliche Evangelien der Fasten (Tüb. 1848): — Die kirchl. Zustlnde d. Gegenwart (Tüb. 1848): — Die christl. Moral (Tüb. 1835, 3 vols.; 5th ed. 1850-1851): — Beiträge zur Homiletik u. Katechetik (Tüb. 1852): — Betrachtunan über die sonntiag lichen Evangelien des Kirchenjahres (5th edit. Tüb. 1853, 2 vols.): — Erörterungen fiber die grossen religiosen Fragen der Gegenwart (3 Numbers 3 rd ed. Freib. 1846-1857): — Hauptstiicke des christkath. Glaubens (Tüb. 1857): Katechismus (Freib. 1842, and many edit. since): — Betrachtungen uoer sämmiliche sonntigl. Episteln (Freiburg, 1860- 1862, 2 vols.): — Das Leben farice (5th edit. Freib. 1865). He took a special interest in the education of poor and abandoned children, himself establishing three houses of refuge. He wrote on this subject the work — Die Sorge fur die sittlich verwahrlosten Kinder (Freib. 1856). A volume of minor posthumous works (Nachgyelassene kleinere Schriften, Freib. 1868) has been published by Rollfuss. This work contains also a biography of Hirscher. — Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, transl. by Smith, 2, 457; Hase, Church History, transl. by Blumenthal and Wing, p. 654; Allgeem. Real- Encyklop. 7, 128. (A. J. S.)

## Hirschfeld, Hermann T[[@Headword:Hirschfeld, Hermann T]]

             a Jewish rabbi and writer, who died at Charlottenburg, Prussia, June 10, 1884, at the age of seventy, is the author of, De Literatura Deperdita Hebraeorum; Molochsglaube und Religionsschindung (1842): — Tractatus Maccoth cum Scholiis Hermeneiticis et Glossario nee nom Indicibus (Berlin, 1842): — Wunsche eines Juden (Posen, 1846): — Der Geist der talmudischen Auslegung der Bibel (Berlin, 1847): —  Untersuchungen uber die Religion (Breslau, 1856): — Ueber die Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit der Seele bei den verschiedenen Volkern (1868). See Fust, Bibl. Jud. 1:400; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:561. (B.P.)

## Hirt, Aloysius Ludwig[[@Headword:Hirt, Aloysius Ludwig]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, professor of archaeology at Berlin, was born June 27, 1759, at Donaueschingen, Baden, and died June 29, 1836. He is the author of Der Tempel Salomonis (Berlin, 1809). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:139; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:400. (B.P.)

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

             a distinguished German theologian, was born at Apolda, in Thuringia, August 14, 1719. He studied at the University of Jena, and in 1758 was made extraordinary professor of philosophy. In 1769 he changed to the chair of theology, and in 1775 was appointed regular professor of theology at the University of Wittenberg. He died July 29,1784. Hirt was regarded as one of the first theologians at the Wittenberg University, and inferior to no other person as a scholar of the Oriental languages. He is especially known in this department by the development which ‘he gave to the systems of Alting and Danz on the Hebrew language (Systema trium morarum); but the advance of late years in the field of exegetical theology decreases the value of all his efforts in this direction. His most important works are. besides a host of dissertations in the field of exegesis, Biblia Hebraea analytica (Jena, 1753, 4to): — Philologisch-exegetische Abhandlung ub. Psalms 15, 14, 45 (ibid. 1753, 4to) — Divinitas Christi, ex ejus resurrectione demonstrata (ibid. 1757, 4to): — Bibliorum analyticorum pars Chaldaica (ibid. 1757, 8vo): — Vollstand. Erklarung d. Sprüche Salomos (ibid. 1768, 4to): — Instit. abicae linguae (ibid. 1770, 8vo): — Orientalische und exeget. Biblioth. (ibid. 1772-1776, 8 vols. 8vo;  continued, under the title Wittenb. Oriental. und-exeget. Biblioth., Jena, 1776-1779,4 vols. 8vo). — Jocher ,Gelehrt Lex. Addend. 2, 2022; Döring, Gelehrt. Theol. Deutsch. 1, 740 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biograph. Géneralé, 24, 795. — (J. H. W.)

## Hirz, Naphthall, ben-Jacob-Elchanan[[@Headword:Hirz, Naphthall, ben-Jacob-Elchanan]]

             one of the most celebrated Jewish Cabalists, was born at Frankfort-on-the- Main in the latter half of the 16th century. The only work of Hirz which was printed, עֵמֶק הִמֶּלֶךְ, or Valley of the King (Amst. 1848, fol.), is a complete expose of the Cabala. The vast research which he made for the preparation of this work makes it indispensable for inquirers into the Cabalistic system. He died, Furst says, in Palestine, but the date is not certainly known. — Furst, Biblioth. Judaica, 1, 401; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 800.

## Hirzel, Bernhard[[@Headword:Hirzel, Bernhard]]

             a Swiss theologian and Orientalist, was born at Zurich in 1807. He was for many years pastor of a small parish at Pfaiffikon. Most of his life he devoted to the study of the Oriental and Sanskrit languages. In the ecclesiastical revolt of Sept. 6, 1839, he led the peasants to the city of Zurich, on which incident he wrote a book entitled Mein Antheil a. d. Bewegung d. oten Sept. (Ziir. 1839). He died in Paris June, 1847. Among his works, his translation of the dramas of Kalisada, Sakuntala (Zurich, 1838), and of Solomon's Song: Das Lied d. Lieder (ibid. 1840), and the Hebrew poem Gesicht d. Todesboten u. d. Erdkreis (ibid. 1844), are best known. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 24, 801; Brockhaus, Conv. Lex. 7, 946.

## Hirzel, Heinrich[[@Headword:Hirzel, Heinrich]]

             a Swiss theologian, was born at Zurich, April 17, 1818. He studied at his native place and at Tubingen, and died at Zurich, April 17, 1871, where he had been laboring since 1857. Hirzel belonged to the so-called Protestanten-Verein. See Lang, Protestantische Kirchenzeitung (May 20 and 27, 1871); Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hirzel, Johann Heinrich[[@Headword:Hirzel, Johann Heinrich]]

             a German theologian, was born at Zurich (Switzerland) Dec. 18, 1710. In 1737 he was appointed professor of oratory and Church history at the university of his place; in 1745, of logic and rhetoric; and in 1759 was called to the chair of theology. He died Nov. 20,1764. Of his writings, most remained in MS. He published Disp. de verbo Dei unico — reformatae Relig. fundamento (Zür. 1760, 4to): — Disp. de vi et amplitudine nominis Div. Jehovah Zebaoth (ibid 1762, 4to). — Jocher, Gelehrt Lexikon, Add. 2, 2025. (J. H.W.)

## Hirzel, Ludwig[[@Headword:Hirzel, Ludwig]]

             son of Bernhard (q.v.), was born at Zurich, August 27, 1801, and died April 13, 1841, professor of theology. He is the author of, De Pentateuchi Versionis Syriacae quam Peschito Vocant Indole (Leipsic, 1825): — De Chaldaismi Biblici Origine et Auctoritate Critica (1830): — Das Buch Hiob erklart (1839; 3d. ed. by Dillmann, 1869). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:56, 124; Fiirst, Bibl. Jud. 1:402; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:562. (B.P.)

## His Brother, Philip Sirach Bridel[[@Headword:His Brother, Philip Sirach Bridel]]

             pastor of Montreux, wrote sermons, poetry, an Essai Statistique sur le Canton de Vaud, and a Course de Bale a Brienne par les Vallees dui Jura (Basle, 1802). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Hiss[[@Headword:Hiss]]

             (שָׁרִק, sharak', to whistle), a term usually expressing insult and contempt (Job 27:23); so in the denunciation of the destruction of the Temple (1Ki 9:8; comp. Jer 19:8; Jer 49:17, etc.). To call any one with hissing is a mark of power and authority (Isa 5:26), and the prophet Zechariah (Zec 10:8), speaking of the return from Babylon, says that the Lord will gather the house of Judah, as it were with a hiss, and bring them back into their own country: an image familiar to his readers, as Theodoret and Cyril of Alexandria remark that, in Syria and Palestine, those who looked after bees drew them out of their hives, carried them into the fields, and brought them back again, with the sound of a flute and the noise of hissing (Isa 7:18). SEE BEE.

## Histopedes[[@Headword:Histopedes]]

             (ἱστός, a mast of a ship, and πούς, a foot), a term applied to certain heretics, chiefly Eunomians, who baptized only the upper parts of the body as far as the breast, and this with the heels upward and the head downward (τοὺς πόδας ἄνω, καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν κάτω). Hence the name Histopedes, orPederecti. See Epiphanius, Haeres. c. 79; Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. 40, chap. 11:§ 4.

## Histories[[@Headword:Histories]]

             a name applied to anthems composed either out of Scripture or from lives of the saints. — Walcott, Sacred Archceöl. p. 312.

## History[[@Headword:History]]

             in its modern sense, is hardly a term that expresses the conception of the sacred writers, who nevertheless have given us invaluable materials for its construction. The earliest records of the O.T. are rather family pedigrees (תֹּלְדוֹת, generations), and the Gospels and Acts are properly memoirs and personal memoranda. SEE CHRONOLOGY.

1. It is evident, however, that the Hebrew people were a commemorative race; in other words, they were given to creating and presenting memorials of important events. Even in the patriarchal times we find monuments set up in order to commemorate events. Jacob (Gen 28:18) “set up a pillar” to perpetuate the memory of the divine promise; and that these  monuments had a religious import and sanction appears from the statement that “he poured oil upon the top of the pillar” (see Gen 31:45; Jos 4:9; 1Sa 7:12; Jdg 9:6). Long-lived trees, such as oaks and terebinths, were made use of as remembrancers (Gen 35:4; Jos 24:26). Commemorative names, also, were given to persons, places, and things; and from the earliest periods it was usual to substitute a new and descriptive name for an old one, which may in its origin have been descriptive too (Exodus 2, 10; Genesis 2, 23; Gen 4:1). Genealogical tables appear, moreover, to have had a very early existence among the people of whom the Bible speaks, being carefully preserved first memoriter, afterwards by writing, among family treasures, and thus transmitted from age to age. These, indeed, as might be expected, appear to have been the first beginnings of history-a fact which is illustrated and confirmed by the way in which what we should term a narrative or historical sketch is spoken of in the Bible, that is, as “the book of the generation” (“of Adam,” Genesis 5, 1): a mode of speaking which is applied even to the account of the creation (Gen 2:4), “These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created.” The genealogical tables in the Bible (speaking generally) are not only of a very early date, but are free from the mixtures of a theogonical and cosmogonical kind which are found in the early literature of other primitive nations, wearing the appearance of being, as far at least as they go, true and complete lists of individual and family descent (Gen 5:1). But perhaps the most remarkable fact connected with this subject is the employment of poetry at a very early period to perpetuate a knowledge of historical events. Even in Gen 4:23, in the case of Lamech, we find poetry thus employed, that is, by the great-grandson of the primitive father. Other instances may be found in Exodus 15; Judges 5; Jos 10:13; 2Sa 1:18.

2. The sources of Biblical history are chiefly the Biblical books themselves. Any attempt to fix the precise value of these sources in a critical point of view would require a volume instead of an article. Whatever hypothesis, however, may eventually be held touching the exact time when these books, or any of them, were put into their actual shape, as also touching the materials out of which they were formed, one thing appears very certain, that (to take an instance) Genesis, the earliest book (probably), contains most indubitable, as well as most interesting historical facts; for though the age, the mode of life, and the state of culture differ so widely  from our own, we cannot do otherwise than feel that it is among men and women, parents and children-beings of like passions with ourselves-and not with mere creations of fancy or fraud, that we converse when we peruse the narratives which this composition has so long preserved. The conviction is much strengthened in the minds of those who, by personal acquaintance with the early profane writers, are able to compare their productions with those of the Hebrews, which were long anterior, and must, had they been of an equally earthly origin, have been at least equally deformed by fable. The simple comparison of the account given in Genesis of the creation of the world with the Cosmogonies of heathen writers, whether Hindu, Greek, or Latin, is enough to assure the impartial reader that a purer, if not a higher influence, presided over the composition of Genesis than that whence proceeded the legends or the philosophies of heathenism; nor is the conclusion in the slightest degree weakened on a closer scrutiny by any discrepancy which modern science may seem to show between its own discoveries and the statements in Genesis. The Biblical history, as found in its Biblical sources, has a decided peculiarity and a great recommendation hi the fact that we can trace in the Bible more clearly and fully than in connection with any other history, the first crude elements and the early materials out of which all history must be constructed.

How far the literature supplied in the Bible may be only a relic of a literary cyclus called into being by the felicitous circumstances and favorable constitution of the great Shemitic family, but which has perished in the lapse of ages, it is now impossible to determine; but had the other portions of this imagined literature been of equal religious value with what the Bible offers, there is little risk in affirming that mankind would scarcely have allowed it to be lost. The Bible, however, bears traces that its were not the only books current in the time and country to which it relates; for writing, writers, and books are mentioned without the emphasis and distinction which always accompany new discoveries or peculiar local possessions, and as ordinary, well-known, and matter-of-course things. It is certain that we do not possess all the works which were known in the early periods of Israelitish history, since in Num 21:14 we read of “the book of the wars of the Lord,” and in Jos 10:13, of “the book of Jasher.”

Without writing, history, properly so called, can have no existence. Under the head WRITING we shall trace the early rudiments and progress of that important art: here we merely remark that an acquaintance with it was  possessed by the Hebrews at least as early as their Exodus from Egypt-a fact which shows at least the possibility that the age of the Biblical records stands some thousand years or more prior to the earliest Greek historian, Herodotus.

Other sources for at least the early Biblical history are comparatively of small value. Josephus has gone over the same periods as those the Bible treats of, but obviously had no sources of consequence relating to primitive times which are not open to us, and in regard to those times does little more than add here and there a patch of a legendary or traditional hue which could well have been spared. His Greek and Roman predilections and his apologetical aims detract from the value of his work, while in relation to the early history of his country he can be regarded in no other light than a sort of philosophical interpreter; nor is it till he comes to his own age that he has the value of an independent (not even then an impartial) eye-witness or well-informed reporter. In historical criticism and linguistic knowledge he was very insufficiently furnished. The use of both Josephus and Philo is far more safe for the student of the New Testament than for the expounder of the old. SEE JOSEPHUS.

The Talmud and the Rabbins afford very little assistance for the early periods, but might probably be made to render more service in behalf of the times of the Savior than has generally been allowed. The illustrations; which Lightfoot and Wetstein have drawn from these sources are of great value; and Gfrorer, in his Jahrhundert des Heils (Stuttgart, 1838), has made ample use of the materials they supply in order to draw a picture of the first century, a use which the learned author is at: no small pains to justify. The compilations of the Jewish doctors, however, require to be employed with the greatest caution, since the Rabbins were the depositories, the expounders, and the apologists of that corrupt form of the primitive faith and of the Mosaic institutions which has been called by the distinctive name of Judaism, comprising a heterogeneous mass of false and true things, the colluvies of the East as well as light from the Bible, and which, to a great extent, lies under the express condemnation of Christ himself. How easy it is to propagate fables on their authority, and to do a disservice to the Gospel records, may be learnt from the fact that older writers, in their undue trust of Rabbinical authority, went so far as to maintain that no cock was allowed to be kept in Jerusalem, because fowls. scratched unclean things out of the earth, though the authority of Scripture (which in this case they refused to admit) is most express and decided  (Mat 26:34; Mar 14:30; Mar 14:60; Mar 14:72). On the credibility. of the Rabbins, see Ravii Diss. Phil. Theol. de eo quod Fidei merentur, etc., in Oelrich's Collect. Opusc. Hist. Phil. Theol.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 2, 1095; Fabricius, Bibliog. Anti. 1, 3, 4; Brunsmann, Diss. de Judaica (Hafnie, 1705).

The classical authors betray the grossest ignorance almost in all cases where they treat of the origin and history of the Hebrew people; and even the most serious and generally philosophic writers fall into vulgar errors and unaccountable mistakes as soon as they speak. on the subject. What, for instance, can be worse than: the blunder or prejudice of Tacitus, under the influence of which he declared that the Jews derived their origin from Mount Ida, in Crete; that by the advice of an oracle they had been driven out of Egypt; and that they set up in their temple at Jerusalem as an object of worship the figure of an ass, since an animal of that species had directed them in the wilderness and discovered to them a fountain (Tacitus, Hist. 5, 1, 2). Dion Cassius (37, 17) relates similar fables. Plutarch (Quaest. Sympos. 4, 5) makes the Hebrews pay divine honors to swine, as being their instructors in agriculture, and affirms that they kept the Sabbath and the Feast of Tabemacles in honor of Bacchuse. A collection of these. gross misrepresentations, together with a profound and successful inquiry into their origin, and a full exposure of their falsehood, has been given by Dr. J. G. Muller, in. the Theologische Studien und Kritiken (1843, 4:893).

3. The children of the faithful Abraham seem to have had one great work of Providence entrusted to them, namely, the development, transmission, and infusion into the world of the religious element of civilization. Their history, accordingly, is the history of the rise, progress, and diffusion of true religion, considered in its source and its developments. Such a history must possess large and peculiar interest for every student of human nature, and pre-eminently for those who love to study the unfoldings of Providence, and desire to learn that greatest of all arts-the art of living at once for time and for eternity.

The subject matter contained in the Biblical history is of a wide and most extensive nature. In its greatest length and fullest meaning it comes down from the creation of the world till near the close of the 1st century of the Christian sera, thus covering a space of some 4000 years. The books presenting this long train of historical details are most diverse in age, in kind, in execution, and in worth; nor seldom is it the fact that the modern  historian has to construct his narrative as much out of the implications of an epistle, the highly-colored materials of poetry, the far-reaching visions of prophecy, and the indirect and illusive information of didactic and moral precepts, as from the immediate and express statements of history strictly so denominated.

The historical materials furnished relating to the Hebrew nation may be classed under three great divisions:

1. The books which are consecrated to the antiquity of the Hebrew nation-the period that elapsed before the era of the judges. These works are the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, which, according to Ewald (Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 1, 72), properly constitute only one work, and which may be termed the great book of original documents.

2. The books which describe the times of the judges and the kings up to the first destruction of Jerusalem; that is, Judges, Kings, and Samuel, to which belongs the book of Ruth: “all these,” says Ewald, “constitute also, according to their last formation, but one work, which may be called the Great Book of Kings.”

3. The third class comprises the books included under the head of Hagiographa, which are of a much later origin, Chronicles, with Ezra and Nehemiah, forming the great book of general history reaching to the Grecian period. After these books come those which are classed together under the name of Apocrypha, whose use, we think, has been unduly neglected. Then the circle of evangelical records begins, which closed within the century that saw it open. Other books found in the Old and New Testaments, which are not properly of a historical character, connect themselves with one or other of these periods, and give important aid to students of sacred history.

4. Biblical history was often treated by the older writers as a part of Church History in general, since they considered the history given in the Bible as presenting different and successive phases of the Church of God (Buddei Hist. Ecclesiastes 2 vols. 1726-29; Stolberg, Gesch. der Religio Jesu, 1, 111). Other writers have viewed this subject in a more practical light, presenting the characters found in the Bible for imitation or avoidance; among whom may be enumerated Hess (Geschichte der Israeliten vor dlen Zeiten Jesu, Zurich, 1775) and Niemeyer (Characteristik der Bibel, Halle,  1830). Among the more strictly learned writers several have had it in view to supply the gaps left in the succession of events by the Bible, out of sources found in profane writers. Here the chief authors are of English birth, namely, Prideaux, Shuckford, Russell; and for the New Testament, the learned, cautious, and fair-dealing Lardner. There is a valuable work by G. Langen: Versuch eizner Harmonie der heiligen und profan. scrib. in der Geschichte der Welt (Bayreuth, 1775-80). Other writers have pursued a strictly chronological method, such as Usher (Annales Vet. N.T. Lond. 1650) and Des Vignoles (Chronologie de l'Histoire Sainte, Berlin, 1738). Heeren (Handb. der Geschichte, p. 50) recommends, as containing many valuable inquiries on the monarchical period, the following work: J. Bernhardi Commentatio de causis quibus egfectum sit ut regnum Judae diutius persisteret quam regnum Israel (Lovanni, 1825). Heeren also declares that Bauer's Handbuch der Gesch. des Hebr. Volks (1800) is the best introduction both to the history and the antiquities of the Hebrew nation; though Gesenius ,complains that he is too much given to the construction of hypotheses. The English reader will find a useful but not sufficiently critical compendium in The History of the Hebrew Commonwealth, translated from the German of John Jahn, D.D., by C. E. Stowe (N. Y. 1829, and later). A far more valuable, as well as more interesting, yet by no means faultless work is Milman's History of the Jews (London, 1829, 3 vols. 12mo; revised, Lond. and N. Y. 1870-1, 3 vols. sm. 8vo). A more recent and very valuable work, Kitto's Pictorial History of Palestine (Lond. 1841), combines with the Bible history of the Jews the results of travel and antiquarian research, and is preceded by an elaborate Introduction, which forms the only Natural History of Palestine in our language. A valuable compendium is Smith's ‘series of “Student's Histories” (Old-Testament History and New Testament History, Lond. and N. Y. 1869, 2 vols. 12mo). Stanley's Lectures on Jewish History (London and N. Y. 1863 sq. 2 vols. 8vo) are more brilliantly written.

German theologians are strongly imbued with the feeling that the history of the Hebrews has yet to be written. Niebuhr's manner of treating Roman history has had a great influence on them, and has aroused the theological world to new efforts, which have by no means yet come to an end; nor can we add that they have hitherto led to very definite and generally approved results. The works of the learned Jews, Jost (Gesch. der Israeliten seit der Maccabaer, 9 vols; Gesch. des Judenthums und Seiner Sekten, 1857-59,3 vols.), Herzfeld (Gesch. d. Volkes Israel v. d. Vollendung des Zweiten  Tempels bis zur Einsetzung des Mckabaers Schimen 1854-57, 2 vols. 8vo), Gratz (Geschichte d. Juden, 11 vols. 8vo, not yet completed), as well as that of Nork (Das Leben Mosis vom A stron. Stand. betrachtet, 1838), Raphall (Post-bibl. History of the Jews, N.Y. 1855, of which vols. 1 and 2 only ever appeared), and others, must not be overlooked by the professional student; nor will he fail, to study with care the valuable introductions to the knowledge of the Old Testament put forth in Germany, with which we have nothing comparable in our language. SEE INTRODUCTION. Of the more recent works we may mention Stahelin's Kritisch Untersuchungyee über den Pentateuch, etc. (1843), and Io Ewald's Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus (Götting. 1843 sq., 1851-3, 6 vols. 8vo), the first part of which has been translated into English (London. 1869, 2 vols. 8vo). The latter especially is learned, acute, and profound, but thoroughly pervaded by a rationalistic spirit. Kurtz's Manual of Sacred History (Philadel. 1858,12mo; from the German, Kinigsberg, 1850, 8vo), and History of the Old Covenant (Edinburgh, 1859, 3 vols. 8vo; from the German, Berlin, 1848-55, 3 vols. 8vo), are more evangelical, but less searching and original. Weber und Holtzmann's Gesc. d. Volkes Israel (Leipz. 1866, 2 vols. 8vo) is rationalistic. The latest is Hitzig's Gesch. Isr. (Lpz. 1870). For other works, see Darling, Cyclopedia, col. 1830 sq.

## History of Doctrines[[@Headword:History of Doctrines]]

             SEE DOCTRINES, HISTORY OF.

## History, Church[[@Headword:History, Church]]

             SEE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

## Histriomastix[[@Headword:Histriomastix]]

             is the name of a book written in 1663 by William Prynne, a Puritan barrister, against plays, masks, dancing, etc. It is a thick quarto of 1006 pages, and abounds with learning and curious quotations. The author of this work was arraigned before the Star Chamber Feb. 7, 1663, on account of passages which, it was alleged, reflected on the religious conduct of the royal house. But the fact was that the author condemned, and that justly, the levity and voluptuousness of the court, and the encouragement which even some of the prelates gave to its licentiousness. Prynne was sentenced” to have his book burned by the hands of the common hangman, to be put  from the bar, and to be forever incapable of his profession, to be turned out of the society of Lincoln's Inn, to be degraded at Oxford, to stand in the pillory at Westminster and Cheapside, to lose both his ears, one in each place, to pay a fine of £5000, and to suffer perpetual imprisonment.” But more remarkable than this, if possible, was the violent speech of an English earl (Dorset) on this occasion. “I declare you (Prynne) to be a schism maker in the Church, a. sedition sower in the commonwealth, a wolf in sheep's clothing; in a word, omnium malorum nequissimus,” continuing in this strain, and closing thus: “I would have him branded in the forehead, slit in the nose, and have his ears chopped off.” Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, 1, 316, 317; Wood, Athenae Oxon. 2, 315; Granger, Biog. Hist. 2, 230; Carwithen, History of the Church of England, 2, 78-80. (J. H.W.)

## Hita, Ruiz[[@Headword:Hita, Ruiz]]

             SEE RUIZ.

## Hitchcock, Calvin, D.D[[@Headword:Hitchcock, Calvin, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Westminster, Vermont, October 25, 1787, graduated from Middlebury College in 1811, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1814. His first settlement was at Newport, R.I., where he was ordained August 15, 1815. This pastorate was finished October 1, 1820, and he was installed at Randolph, Massachusetts, February 28 following, and remained there for more than thirty years, the  date of his dismissal being June 1851. His residence thereafter was at Wrentham, where he died, December 3, 1867. He made frequent contributions to the Boston Recorder, and published some Sermons. See Cong. Quarterly, 1868, page 286.

## Hitchcock, Edward, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Hitchcock, Edward, D.D., LL.D]]

             was born in Old Deerfield, Mass., May 24, 1793. Poverty, general ill health, and, worse than all, an affection of his eyes, prevented him from the completion of a collegiate course: but, despite this, he succeeded in obtaining in 1816 the principalship of the academy in his native place, and his success as a teacher received the recognition of Yale College in the degree of M.A., which that institution of learning conferred on him only two years later. — In 1819 he went to Yale, and studied theology under Dr. Taylor for about three years. His first and only settlement in the ministry was at Conway, where he remained from 1821 to 1825, when again failing health induced him to accept the professorship of natural history and chemistry in Amherst College, which gave him the prospect of more exercise and less exhaustive labors. He entered this new position after some preparatory study under Prof. Silliman, senior, of Yale College. In 1845 he was elected president of Amherst College, and professor of natural theology and geology. In 1854 he resigned the presidency, but still continued in the chair of geology. He died Feb. 27, 1864. Dr. Hitchcock is especially deserving of our recognition in this place on account of his Religion of Geology and its connected Sciences (Boston, 1851, 12mo), the result of thirty years' study and reflection, which had a very extended circulation both in this country and in Europe. Among Dr. Hitchcock's peculiar literary traits (see the Biblioth. Sacra, July, 1851, p. 662, 663) may be mentioned “his mode of answering the objection to the resurrection of the body; his proofs from geology of the benevolence of God, of special providence, and of special divine interposition in nature” (comp. his articles in Bib. Sacra, 10:166-194, “Relations and Duties of the Philosopherarid  Theologian;” and 11:776-800, “Special Divine Interpositions in Nature”). Dr. William S. Tyler, professor in Amherst College, who preached a discourse at Dr. Hitchcock's funeral, which has been printed, gave “an admirable estimate and summary of his life, character, attainments, and influence.” — Appleton's Cyclop. 9, 210, and Annual, 1868, p. 1428; Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 379; Amer. Presb. Rev. July 1864, p. 528.

## Hitchcock, Enos, D.D[[@Headword:Hitchcock, Enos, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Springfield, Mass., graduated at Harvard in 1767, and was ordained colleague of Mr. Chipman, pastor of the Second Congregational Church of. Beverley, in 1771. In 1780 he became a chaplain in the army, and at the close of the war in 1783 he took a pastoral charge in Providence, R. I. He bequeathed at his death, which occurred in 1803, $2500 as a fund for the support of the ministry. He published a Treatise on Education (1790, 2 vols.): — Sermons, with an Essay on the Lord's Supper (1793-1800). — Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 852.

## Hitchcock, Gad, D.D[[@Headword:Hitchcock, Gad, D.D]]

             a Unitarian minister, was born at Springfield, Mass., Feb. 12, 1718 or 1719. He was educated at Harvard University, where he graduated in 1743, and was ordained and installed in Pembroke (now Hanson, Mass.), in October 1748. During the Revolutionary War he served as chaplain. In 1787 his alma mater conferred on him the degree of doctor of divinity. In 1797 he was attacked with paralysis while preaching to his people, from which he never recovered so as to engage any further in active service. He died Aug. 8, 1803. His writings were mainly sermons and a (Dudleian) lecture, delivered at Harvard College in 1779. — Sprague, Ann. of the Amer. Pulpit, 8, 29.

## Hitchcock, Henry L., D.D[[@Headword:Hitchcock, Henry L., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Benton, Ohio, October 31, 1813. He studied at the Benton Academy, graduated from Yale College in 1832, and spent some time as a student in the Lane Theological Seminary. He was licensed to preach in 1837, and installed at Morgan, Ohio, the same year. In 1840 he began to preach at Columbus, and the next year was installed pastor there. In 1855 he was elected president of Western Reserve College, after leaving which position he lived in retirement until his death at Hudson, Ohio, July 6, 1873. See Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v.

## Hitchcock, Samuel Austin[[@Headword:Hitchcock, Samuel Austin]]

             a philanthropic layman of the Congregational Church, was born at Brimfield, Massachusetts, January 9, 1794. On March 23, 1812, he left home in search of employment, which he found with a merchant of Dudley. In 1820 he went to Boston and entered a dry-goods firm, established for the sale of goods manufactured by the different cotton-mills the first in New England. In 1831 he went to Southbridge as agent of the Hamilton Woollen Company. He united with the Old South Church, in Boston, June 23, 1827, and was afterwards connected with the Church in Brimfield. In 1840 he gave $10,000 to Amherst College, and this was followed by other amounts until the aggregate reached $175,000. To Andover Theological Seminary his donations amounted to $120,000. To the town of Brimfield he gave $10,000, in 1855, to establish a free school, and subsequent donations increased this to $80,000, and it was called the Hitchcock Free High School. In 1871 he gave $50,000 to Illinois College. These are only samples of his munificence. His donations aggregated about $650,000. Mr. Hitchcock was withal a humble Christian, seeking no notoriety in the bestowal of his wealth. He died in Boston, November 23, 1873. See Cong. Quarterly, 1874, page 517.

## Hitopadesa[[@Headword:Hitopadesa]]

             (good advice), in Hindu literature, is a famous collection of ethical tales and fables, compiled from the larger and older work called Pancha-tantra.  It has often been printed in the original, and translated into various languages.

## Hitt, Daniel[[@Headword:Hitt, Daniel]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister of considerable eminence, was born in Fauquier County, Va., entered the itinerancy in 1790, became the traveling companion of bishop Asbury in 1807, and in 1808 was elected by the General Conference one of the agents of the Methodist Book Concern, the duties of which office he discharged for eight years. He next, with great fidelity, served as presiding elder until 1822, when he became the traveling companion of bishop M'Kendreee In 1823 he took charge of the Potomac  District; after two years' labors he passed to the Carlisle District, and there closed his earthly work. Mr. Hitt was a man of marked “simplicity and integrity,” and “the affability of his manners and the sweetness of his disposition, in his private intercourse in society, gained him the affection of all.” He died of typhus fever, in great peace and sure hope, in September 1825. — Minutes of Conf. 1, 507.

## Hittite, or rather Chethite[[@Headword:Hittite, or rather Chethite]]

             (Heb. Chitti', חַתַּי, usually in the plur. חַתַּים, Sept. Χεττῖοι; also בְּנֵי חֵת,. “children of Heth;” fem. חַתַּית, Eze 16:3; plur. חַתַּיּוֹת, 1Ki 11:1; also בְּנוֹת חֵת, “daughters of Heth,” Gen 27:46), the designation of the descendants of Heth, and one of the nations of Canaan (q.v.).

I. Biblical Notices. —

(1.) With five exceptions, noticed below, the word is הִחַתַּי=“the Chittite;” in the singular number, according to the common Hebrew idiom.. It is occasionally rendered in the A.V. in the singular number,” the Hittite” (Exo 23:28; Exo 33:2; Exo 34:11; Jos 9:1; Jos 11:3), but elsewhere as a plur. (Gen 15:20; Exo 3:8; Exo 3:17; Exo 13:5; Exo 23:23; Num 13:29; Deu 7:1; Deu 20:17; Jos 3:10; Jos 12:8; Jos 24:11; Jdg 3:5; 1Ki 9:20; 2Ch 8:7; Ezr 9:1; Neh 9:8; 1Es 8:69, Χετταίοι).

(2.) The plural form of the word is הִחַתַּים = the Chittim, or Hittites (Jos 1:4; Jdg 1:26; 1Ki 10:29; 2Ki 7:6; 2Ch 1:17).

(3.) “A Hittite [woman]” is חַתַּית (Eze 16:3; Eze 16:45). In 1Ki 11:1, the same word is rendered “Hittites.”

In the list of the descendants of Noah, Heth occupies the second place among the children of Canaan. It is to be observed that the first and second names, Sidoli and Heth, are not gentile nouns, and that all the names following are gentile nouns in the sing. Sidon is called the first-born of Canaan, though the name of the town is probably put for that of its founder, or eponym, “the fisherman,” Α῾λιεύς, of Philo of Byblus. It is therefore probable, as we find no city Heth, that this is the name of the ancestor of the nation, and the gentile noun, children of Heth, makes this  almost certain. After the enumeration of the nations sprung from Canaan, it is addled, “And afterwards were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad” (Gen 10:18). This passage will be illustrated by the evidence that there were Hittites and Amorites beyond Canaan, and also beyond the wider territory that must be allowed for the placing of the Hamathites, who, it may be added, perhaps had not migrated from Canaan at the date to which the list of Noah's descendants mainly refers (see Gen 10:19). SEE CANAANITE.

1. Our first introduction to the Hittites is in the time of Abraham, when they are mentioned among the inhabitants of the Promised Land (Gen 15:20). Abraham bought from the Bene-Chethe” Children of Heth” such was then their title — the field and the cave of Machpelah, belonging to Ephron the Hittite (Gen 23:3-18). They were then settled at the town which was afterwards, under its new name of Hebron, to become one of the most famous cities of Palestine, then bearing the name of Kirjath-arba, and perhaps also of Mamre (Gen 23:19; Gen 25:9). The propensities of the tribe appear at that time to have been rather commercial than military. The “money current with the merchant,” and the process of weighing it, were familiar to them; the peaceful assembly “in the gate of the city” was their manner of receiving the stranger who was desirous of having a “possession” “secured” to him among them. The dignity and courtesy of their demeanor also come out strongly in this narrative. As Ewald well says, Abraham chose his allies in warfare from the Amorites, but he goes to the Hittites for his grave. But the tribe was evidently as yet but small, not important enough to be noticed beside “the Canaanite and the Perizzite,” who shared the bulk of the land between them (Gen 12:6; Gen 13:7). In the southern part of the country they remained for a considerable period after this, possibly extending as far as Gerar and Beersheba, a good way below Hebron (Gen 26:17; Gen 28:10). From their families Esau married his first two wives (Gen 26:34; Gen 36:2 sq.), and the fear lest Jacob should take the same course is the motive given by Rebekah for sending Jacob away to Haran. It was the same feeling that had urged Abram to send to Mesopotamia for a wife for Isaac. The descendant of Shem could not wed with Hamites, with the daughters of the Canaanites among whom I dwell… wherein I am a stranger,” but “go to my country and thy kindred” is his father's command, “to the house of thy mother's father, and take thee a wife from thence” (Gen 28:2; Gen 24:4). SEE HIVITE.

From several of the above notices we learn that the original seat of the Hittites, the city of Hebron, was founded by one Arba of the Anakim, whence its earlier name, and had inhabitants of that giant race as late as Joshua's time. It is also connected with Zoan in Egypt, and is said to have been built seven years before that city (Num 13:22). Zoan or Avaris was built or rebuilt, and no doubt received its Hebrew or Shemitic name, Zoan, the translation of its Egyptian name HA-AWVAR, in the time of the first Shepherd-king of Egypt, who was of Phoenician or kindred race. It is also to be noted that, in Abraham's time, the Amorites, connected with the giant race in the case of the Rephaim whom Chedorlaomer smote in Ashteroth Karnaim (Gen 14:5), where the Rephaite Og afterwards ruled, dwelt close to Hebron (Gen 14:13). The Hittites and Amorites, we shall see, were later settled together in the Orontes valley. Thus at this period there was a settlement of the two nations in the south of Palestine, and the Hittites were mixed with the Rephaite Anakim. SEE HEBRON.

2. Throughout the period of the settlement in Palestine, the name of the Hittites occurs only in the usual formula for the occupants of the Promised Land. Changes occur in the mode of stating this formula, but the Hittites are never omitted (see Exo 23:28). In the enumeration of the six or seven nations of Canaan, the first names, in four phrases, are the Canaanites, Hittites, and Amorites; in two, which make no mention of the Canaanites, the Hittites and Amorites; and in three, the former three names, with the addition of another nation. In but two phrases are these three nations further separated. It is also to be remarked that the Hittites and Amorites are mentioned together in a bare majority of the forms of the enumeration, but in a great majority of passages. The importance thus given to the Hittites is perhaps equally evident in the place of Heth in the list of the descendants of Noah, in the place of the tribe in the list in the promise to Abraham, where it is first of the known descendants of Canaan (Exo 15:20), and certainly in the term “all the land of the Hittites,” as a (designation of the Promised Land in its full extent, from Euphrates to the Mediterranean, and from Lebanon to the desert (Jos 1:4). The close relation of the Hittites and Amnorites seems to be indicated by the prophet Ezekiel, where he speaks of Jerusalem as daughter of an Amnorite father and a Hittite mother (Eze 16:3; Eze 16:45). Indeed the Hittites and Amorites seem, in these last-cited passages, to be named for the Canaanites in general.  When the spies examined Canaan they found “the Hittites, and the Jebusites, and the Amorites” dwelling “in the mountains” (Num 13:29), that is, in the high tracts that afterwards formed the refuges and rallying points of the Israelites during the troubled period of the judges. There is, however, no distinct statement as to the exact position of the Hittites in Palestine. We may draw an inference from their connection with Jerusalem and the Amorites, and their inhabiting the mountains, and suppose that they were probably seated chiefly in the high region of the tribe of Judah.' Of their territory beyond Palestine there are some indications in Scripture. The most important of these is the designation of the Promised Land in its full extent as “all the land of the Hittites” already mentioned, with which the notices of Hittite kings out of Canaan must be compared. Whatever temporary circumstances may have originally attracted them so far to the south as Beersheba, a people having the quiet commercial tastes of Ephron the Hittite and his companions can have had no call for the roving, skirmishing life of the country bordering on the desert; and thus, during the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, they had withdrawn themselves from in those districts, retiring before Amalek (Num 13:29) to the more secure mountain country in the center of the land. Perhaps the words of Ezekiel (Eze 16:3; Eze 16:45) may simply that they helped to found the city of Jebus.

From this time, however, their quiet habits vanish, and they take their part against the invader, in equal alliance with the other Canaanitish tribes (Joshua 9, Jos 11:3, etc.).

3. Henceforward the notices of the Hittites are very few and faint. We meet with two individuals, both attached to the person of David.

(1.) “Ahimelech the Hittite,” who was with him in the hill of Hachilah, and with Abishai accompanied him by night to the tent of Saul (1Sa 26:6). He is nowhere else mentioned, and was possibly killed in one of David's expeditions, before the list in 2 Samuel 23 was drawn up.

(2.) “Uriah the Hittite,” one of “the thirty” of David's body-guard (2Sa 23:39; 1Ch 11:41), the deep tragedy of whose wrongs forms the one blot in the life of his master. In both these persons, though warriors; by profession, we can perhaps detect traces of those qualities which we have noticed as characteristics of the tribe. In the case of the first, it was Abishai, the practical, unscrupulous “son of Zeruiah,” who pressed David. to allow him to kill the sleeping king: Ahimelech is clear  from that stain. In the case of Uriah, the absence from suspicion and the generous self-denial, which he displayed, are too well known to need more than a reference (2Sa 11:11-12). He was doubtless a proselyte, and probably descended from several generations of proselytes; but the fact shows that Canaanitish blood was in itself no bar to advancement in the court and army of David.

Solomon subjected the remaining Hittites to the same tribute of bond- service as the other remnants of the Canaanitish nations (1Ki 9:20). Of all these the Hittites appear to have been the most important, and to have been under a king of their own; for “the kings of the Hittites” are, in 1Ki 10:29, coupled with the kings of Syria as purchasers of the chariots which Solomon imported from Egypt. It appears that this was some different division of the Hittite family living far away somewhere in the north; although, from their connection in 2Ki 7:6, with the Egyptians, others have inferred that the noise came from the south, from which quarter it seems they and the Egyptians were the only people who could be expected to make an attack with chariots. This would identify them with the southern Hivites, who were subject to-the scepter of Judah, and show also that it was they who purchased Egyptian chariots from the factors of Solomon. It is evident in any case, however, that they were a distinct and independent body, apparently outside the bounds of Palestine. The Hittites were still present in Palestine as a distinct people after the Exile, and are named among the alien tribes with whom the returned Israelites contracted those marriages which Ezra urged and Nehemiah compelled them to dissolve (Ezr 9:1, etc.; comp. Neh 13:23-28). ‘After this we hear no more of the Hittites, who probably lost their national identity by intermixture with the neighboring tribes or nations. (See Hamelseld, 3:51 sq.; Journ. of Sac. Lit. Oct. 1851, p. 166.) SEE HEATHEN.

4. Nothing is said of the religion or worship of the Hittites. Even in the enumeration of Solomon's idolatrous worship of the gods of his wives- among whom were Hittite women (1Ki 11:1) no Hittite deity is alluded to (see 1Ki 11:5; 1Ki 11:7; 2Ki 23:1). — See below.

5. The names of the individual Hittites mentioned in the Bible are as follow. They are all susceptible of interpretation as Hebrew words, which would lead to the “belief either that the Hittites spoke a dialect of the  Aramaic or Hebrew language, or that the words were Hebraized in their transference to the Bible records.

ADAH (a woman), Gen 36:2.

AHIMELECH, 1Sa 26:6.

BASHEMATH, accurately BAS'MATH (a woman); possibly a second name of Adah, Gen 26:34.

BEERI (lather of Judith, below), Gen 26:34.

ELON (father of Basmath), Gen 26:34.

EUHURON, Gen 23:10; Gen 23:13-14, etc.

JUDITH (a woman), Gen 26:34.

URIAH, 2Sa 11:3, etc; 23:39, etc.

ZOHAR (father of Ephron), Gen 23:8.

In addition to the above, SIBBECHAT, who in the Hebrew text is always denominated a Hushathite, is by Josephus (Ant. 7, 12, 2) styled a Hittite.

II. Notices in Ancient Inscriptions. —

1. The Egyptian monuments give us much information as to a Hittite nation that can only be that indicated in the two passages in the books of Kings above noticed. The kings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties made extensive conquests in Syria and Mesopotamia. They were opposed by many small states, which probably always formed one or more confederacies. In the time of Thothmes III (B.C. cir. 1450), the leading nation was that of the RUTEN (or LUTEN), which appears to have once headed a confederacy defeated by that king before Megiddo (De Rouge, Revue Archeology n.s., 4, 346 sq.). The KHETA were conquered by or tributary to Thothmes III (Birch, Annals of Thothmes III, p. 21); but it is not until the time of Rameses II (B.C. cir. 1306), second king (according to Manetho) of the nineteenth dynasty, that we find them occupying the most important place among the eastern enemies of the Egyptians, the place before held by the RUTEN. The name is generally written KHET, and sometimes KHETA, and was probably in both cases pronounced KHAT. It is not easy to determine whether it properly denotes the people or the country; perhaps it denotes the latter, as it rarely has a plural  termination; but it is often used for the former. This name is identical in radicals with that of the Hittites, and that it designates them is clear from its being connected with a name equally representing that of the Amorites, and from the correspondence of this warlike people) strong in chariots, with the non-Palestinian Hittites mentioned in the Bible. The chief or strongest city of the KCETA, or at least of the territory subject to or confederate with the king of the KHETA, was KETESH, on the river ARNUT, ANURTA, or ARUNATA. KETESH was evidently a Kadesh, “a sacred city,” קדשׁ, but no city of that name, which could correspond to this, is known to us in Biblical geography. It is represented in the Egyptian sculptures as on or near a lake, which Dr. Brugsch has traced in the modern lake of Kedes, fed by the Orontes, southward of Hems (Emesa). The Orontes, it must be observed, well corresponds to the ARUNATA. The town is also stated to have been in the land of AMAR (or AMARA), that is, of the Amorites. The position of this Amoritish territory is further defined by Carchemish being placed in it, as we shall show in a later part of this article. The territory of these Hittites, therefore, lay in the valley of the Orontes. It probably extended towards the Euphrates, for the KHETA are also connected with NEHARENA, or Mesopotamia, not the NAHIRI of the cuneiform inscriptions, but it is not clear that they ruled that country. Probably they drew confederates thence, as was done by the Syrians in David's time.

The greatest achievement of Rameses II was the defeat of the KHETA and their allies near KETESH, in the fifth year of his reign. This event is commemorated in a papyrus and by several inscriptions and sculptures. The nations confederate with the KHETA were the ARATU (Aradus?), MAXAUSU (Mash?), PAXTSA or PATASA, KESHKESH, ARUTNU, KATAWATANA, KHERABU (Helbon?), AKATERA, KETESH, RETA, Arkites, TENTENE (or TRATENUEE), and KARAKAMASHA (Carchemish). These names are difficult to identify save the seventh and the last, but it is evident that they do not belong to Palestine. The Hittites are represented as having a regular army, which was strong in chariots, a particular which we should expect from the Biblical notices of them and of the Canaanites, where the latter name seems applied to the tribe so called. Each chariot was drawn by two horses, and held three- men, a charioteer and two warriors. They had also cavalry and disciplined infantry. In the  great battle with Rameses they had 2500 horses, that is, chariots. The representations of the KHETA in the sculptures relating to this campaign probably show that their forces were composed of men of two different races. Sir Gardner Wilkinson thinks that both belonged to the KHETA nation, and it seems hardly possible to form any other conclusion. “The nation of Sheta [the initial character is thus sometimes read sh] seems to have been composed of two distinct tribes, both comprehended under the same name, uniting in one common cause, and probably subject to the same government.” These supposed tribes differed in dress and arms, and one was sometimes bearded, the other was beardless (Ancient Egyptians, 1, p. 400 sq.). They are rather fair than yellow, and the beardless warriors are probably of a different race from the people of Palestine generally. In some cases they remind us of the Tatars, and it is impossible to forget that the Egyptians of the Greek period evidently took the KHETA for Scythians or Bactrians. The name Scythian is not remote, nor is that of the Kittas, or warrior — Tatars in the Chinese garrisons; but mere word resemblances are dangerous; and the circumstance that the Scythians appear in history when the Hittites have just disappeared is not of much value. But it is worthy of remark that in the time of Moses there was a Rephaite ruling the Amorites in Palestine, as the sons of Anak had apparently long ruled the Hittites in Hebron, so that we need not be surprised to find two races under the same government in the case of the Hittites of Syria.

In the twenty-first year of Rameses II, the great king of the Hittites, KHETSERA, came to Egypt to make a treaty of peace. A copy of the treaty is preserved in a hieroglyphic inscription. From this it appears that KHETSERA had been preceded by his grandfather SAPRARA, his father MAURASARA, and his brother MAUTNURA, and that in the reigns of SAPRARA and MAUTNURA peace had been made upon the same conditions. In a tablet of the thirty-fourth year of the same king, one of his wives, a Hittite princess with the Egyptian name RA-MIA-UR-NE-FRU, is represented as well as her father, the king (or a king) of the KHETA. Solomon also, as Dr. Brugsch remarks, took Hittite women into his harem (1Ki 11:1). Rameses III (B.C. cir. 1200) had a war with the KHETA, mentioned in one of his inscriptions with KETE (KETESH) KARA[K]AMSA (Carchemish), ARATU (Aradus?), and ARASA, all described as in the land AMABA.  The religion of the Hittites is only known from the above treaty with Rameses II, though it is probable that additional information may be derived from an examination of proper names. In this inscription the divinities both of the land of KHETA and of Egypt are mentioned, probably because they were invoked to see that the compact was duly kept. They are described from a Hittite point of view, a circumstance which is curious as showing how carefully the Egyptian scribe had kept to the document before him. They are the gods of war, and the gods of women of the land of KHETA and of Egypt, the SUTEKH of the land of KHETA, the SUTEKH of several forts, the ASHTERAT (written ANTERAT) of the land of KHETA, several unnamed gods and goddesses of places or countries, and of a fortress, the mountains and rivers of the land of KHETA, and of Egypt, Amen, SUTEKH, and the winds. SUTEKI — , or SET, was the chief god of the Shepherd-kings of Egypt (one of whom appears to have abolished all other worship in his dominions), and is also called BAR; or Baal. SUTEKH is perhaps a foreign form, SET seems certainly of foreign origin. ASHTERAT is, of course, Ashtoreth, the consort of Baal in Palestine. They were the principal divinities of the KHETA, for they are mentioned by name, and as worshipped in the whole land. The worship of the mountains and rivers is remarkably indicative of the character of the religion, and the mention of the gods of special cities points in the same direction. The former is low nature-worship, the latter is entirely consistent with it, and, indeed, is never found but in connection with it.

The Egyptiani monuments furnish us with the following additional Hittite names: TARAKANUNASA, KAMAET, TARKATATASA (an ally?), KHERAPSARA, scribe of books of the KHETA, PESA, TETARA, KRABETUSA, AAKMA (an ally?), SANARPUS, TATARA, MATREMA, brother of [the king of] the KHETA, RABSUNUNA (an ally?), TUATASA (an ally?).

These names are evidently Shemitic, but not Hebrew, a circumstance that need not surprise us when we know that Aramaic was distinct from Hebrew in Jacob's time. The syllables SERA in KHET-SERA, and RAB in RAB-SUNUNA, seem to correspond to the SAR and RAB of Assyrian and Babylonian names. TETARA may be the same name as the Tidal of Scripture. But the most remarkable of all these names is MATREMA, which corresponds as closely as possible to Mizraim. The third letter is a. hard T, and the final syllable is constantly used for the Hebrew dual. In the  Egyptian name of Mesopotamia, NEHARENA, we find the Chaldee and Arabic dual It would therefore appear that the language of the KHETA was nearer to the Hebrew than to the Chaldee. TARKATATASA probably commences with the name of the goddess Derceto or Atargatis.

The principal source of information on the Egyptian bearings of this subject is Brugsch's Geographische Inschriften, 2, 20 sq. The documents to which he mainly refers are the inscriptions of Rameses II, — the poem of PENTAUR, and the treaty. The first are given by Lepsius (Denkmäler, A bh. 3, bl. 153-161, 164-166, 187, 196; see also 130, 209), and translated by M. Chabas (Rev.. Arch., 1859); see also Brugsch, Histoire d'Egypte, 1, 137 sq.: the second is translated by M. de Rouge (Revue Contemporaine, No. 106, p. 389 sq.), Dr. Brugsch (11. cc.), Mr. Goodwin, Cambridge Essays, 1858, and in Bunsen's. Egypt's Place, 4, 675 sq.; and the third is translated by Dr. Brugsch (11. cc.) and Mr. Goodwin (Parthenon, 1862).

2. In the Assyrian inscriptions, as lately deciphered, there are frequent references to a nation of Khatti, who” formed a great confederacy ruled by a number of petty chiefs,” whose territory also lay in the valley of the Orontes, and who were sometimes assisted by the people of the sea-coast, probably the Phoenicians (Rawlinson's Herodotus, 1, 463). “Twelve kings of the southern. Khatti are mentioned in several places.” If the identification of these people with the Hittites should prove to be correct, it agrees with the name Chat, as noticed under HETH, and affords a clew to the meaning of some passages which are otherwise puzzling. These are

(a) Jos 1:4, where the expression “all the land of the Hittites” appears to mean all the land of Canaan, or at least the northern part thereof.

(b) Jdg 1:26. Here nearly the same expression recurs. See Luz.

(c) 1Ki 10:29; 2Ch 1:17, “All the kings of the Hittites and kings of Aram” (probably identical with the “kings on this side Euphrates,” 1Ki 4:24) are mentioned as purchasing chariots and horses from Egypt, for the possession of which they were so notorious, that

(d) it would seem to have become at a later date almost proverbial in allusion to a alarm of an attack by chariots (2Ki 7:6).

## Hittites[[@Headword:Hittites]]

             All that is known concerning this important Canaanitish people, whose history is often referred to on' the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments under the name Kheta, has been collected by Wright, Empire of the Hittites (Lond. 1884, 8vo).

## Hittorff, Jacques Inace[[@Headword:Hittorff, Jacques Inace]]

             a French architect, was born at Cologne, August 20, 1793. He entered the School of Fine Arts in Paris in 1810, and became architect to the government in 1818. He made a study of the remains of Greek architecture in Sicily, and followed the Greek artists in applying colors to most of his architectural designs. From 1824 he was engaged in the construction of important public buildings, of which the Church of St. Vincent de Paul is regarded as his masterpiece. He was elected to the Academy of Fine Arts in 1853, and died in Paris, March 25, 1867. His principal productions are, Architecture Antique de la Sicile (Paris, 1826-30, 3 volumes): — Architecture Polychrome chez les Grecs (1831): — Memoire sur Pompei et Petra (1866).

## Hitzig, Ferdinand[[@Headword:Hitzig, Ferdinand]]

             a German exegetical scholar, was born at Hauingen, in Baden, June 23, 1807. He studied at Heidelberg and Halle, commenced his academical career at the former place in 1830, accepted a call to Zurich in 1832, went again in 1861 to Heidelberg as Umbreit's successor, and died January 22, 1875. At Zurich Hitzig publicly announced himself in favor of calling Strauss. Though on the one hand a man without fear or hypocrisy, and on the other of a polemic temperament and caustic wit, which seemed to exclude personal piety and gentleness, yet Hitzig was of a pious nature, and not only loved the Old Test., but sought to serve the kingdom of God by his investigations. He enjoyed the esteem of his colleagues and friends, and even of his opponents. We can adopt the words of Keim, in the. dedication of his History of Jesus (2d ed. January 1875): "To the memory of F. Hitzig, the honest man without fear, the faithful friend without deceit, the pride of Zurich and Heidelberg, the bohl, restless architect of Biblical science." Hitzig's earliest and by far the best work is his Uebersetzung und  Auslegung des Propheten Jesaia (Heidelberg, 1833); his other works are, Die Psalmen, historischer und kritischer Commentar (1835-36, 2 volumes; new ed. 1863-65): — Ueber Johannes Markus und seine Schriften (Zurich, 1843): — Urgeschichte und Mythologie der Philistder (Leipsic, 1845): — Die Spruche Salomo's (Zurich, 1858): — Die wolf kleinen Propheten (3d ed. 1863): — Jeremiah (1841; 2d ed. 1866): — Ezechiel (1847): — Ecclesiastes (eod.): — Daniel (1850): — Das. Hohelied (1855): — Hiob (1874): — Geschichte des Volkes Israel (Leipsic, 1869). As to the value of Hitzig's commentaries and history, says Kamphausen, "If I am not mistaken, it was a want of common-sense which prevented this gifted and truthloving investigator to such a remarkable degree from becoming an exemplary exegete and a trustworthy historian. Ewald was fully justified when he complained that Hitzig made that which was beautiful and tender in Solomon's song disagreeable and repulsive; that he, in an almost incredible manner, declared the first nine chapters of the Proverbs to have been the last composed, etc. But, in spite of this, Hitzig will always have a place of prominence among his contemporaries, and his works will for a long time remain a fountain of instruction and quickening to many." Hitzig also contributed to Schenkel's Bibel-Lexikon, to the Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenldndischen Gesellschaft, and other periodicals. See Kneuker, in Protestantische Kirchenzeitung (1875, col. 181-188); Weech, in Badische Biographien, 1:377-380 (Heidelberg, 1875); Diestel, Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christl. Kirche (Jena, 1869); Kamphausen, in Plitt-Herzog's Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hiubbard, Bela, D.D[[@Headword:Hiubbard, Bela, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born in Guilford, Connecticut, August 27, 1739. In 1758 he graduated from Yale College, and afterwards studied theology at King's College, New York city. On February 5, 1764, he was ordained deacon in the King's Chapel, London, and presbyter in St. James's Church on the 19th of the same month. Returning to America, he officiated at Guilford and Killingworth until 1767, when the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts appointed him missionary to New Haven and West Haven, Connecticut. Between these places he divided his labors equally until the Revolution; after that, until 1791, he gave only one fourth  of his time to West Haven, and from that time onward his services were confined almost entirely to New Haven. Although a royalist during the Revolution, he exercised so much discretion that he was not seriously embarrassed in performing his duties. Until peace was declared, in 1783, he continued to receive a salary of £60 yearly from the society which employed him, but after that time he became entirely dependent upon his parishes. Rev. Henry Whitlock became his assistant minister in 1811 Trinity Church being the name of his parish. Dr. Hubbard died in New Haven, December 6, 1812. He was not considered a brilliant man, but was distinguished for sound judgment. His style of preaching, though not animated, was earnest. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 5:234.

## Hivite[[@Headword:Hivite]]

             (Heb. Chivvi', חַוַּי, usu. with the art., often collectively for the plur., “the Hivite,” i.e. Hivites; Sept.. o Ebaiog), a designation of one of the nations inhabiting Palestine before the Israelites. SEE CANAAN. The name is, in the original, uniformly found in the singular number. It never has, like that of the Hittites, a plural, nor does it appear in any other form. Perhaps we may assume from this that it originated in some peculiarity of locality or circumstance, as in the case of the Amorites. — “mountaineers,” and not in a progenitor, as did that of the Ammonites, who are also styled Bene- Ammon-children of Ammon, or the Hittites, Bene-Cheth children of Heth. The name is explained by Ewald (Geschl.. 1, 318) as Binnenlander, that is, “Midlanders;” by Gesenius (Thes. p. 451) aspagani, “villagers.” In the following passages the name is given in the A.V. in the singular, “the Hivite:” Gen 10:17; Exo 23:28; Exo 33:2; Exo 34:11; Jos 9:1; Jos 11:3; 1Ch 1:15; also Gen 34:2; Gen 36:2. In all the rest it is rendered by the plural.

1. In the genealogical tables of Genesis “the Hivite” is named as one of the descendants-the sixth in order of Canaan, the son of Ham (Gen 10:17; 1Ch 1:15).. In the first enumeration of the nations who, at the time of the call of Abraham, occupied the Promised Land (Gen 15:19-21), the Hivites are omitted from the Hebrew text (though in the Samaritan and Sept. their name is inserted). This has led to the conjecture, amongst others, that they are identical with the Kadmonites, whose: name is found there and there only (Reland, Palaest. p. 140; Bochart, Phal. 4, 36; Can. 1. 19). But are not the Kadmonites rather, as their name implies, the representatives of the Bene-kedem, or “children of the East?” Moreover, in this passage, the position of the Hivites, if represented by the Kadmonites, would be at the head of the nations usually assigned to the Land of Promise, and this is most unlikely, unless the order be geographical. A more ingenious conjecture is that which suggests the identity of the Hivites and the Avites, or Avim, on the grounds

(a) that at a later time the Galilaeans confounded the gutturals;

(b) that the Sept. and Jerome do not distinguish the two names;

(c) that the town of ha-Avvim (A.V. “Avvim”) was in the same district as the Hivites of Gibeon;

(d) and that, according to the notice in Deuteronomy 2, the Avim disappear before the Hivites appear;

(e) to which we may add that, if Gesenius's etyemology be sound, it is remarkable that the Avim are described as dwelling “in villages.” See Aviar.

On the other hand,

(a) it is unlikely that a dialectic difference ‘would be recorded, and it seems too slight to be anything else;

(b) the Sept. and Jerome are not very careful as to exact transcriptions of proper names;

(c) the presence of Avim in a district does not prove them to be the same as other inhabitants of that district;

(d) and the narrative in Deuteronomy 2 speaks only of the overthrow, before the coming of the Israelites, by later settlers, of certain tribes or peoples, not mentioned in the list of Genesis 10 which were, as far as stated, Rephaim, or of Rephaite stock.

The probability that the Avim were of this stock is strengthened by the circumstance that there was a remnant of the Rephaim among the Philistines in David's time, as there was among other nations when the Israelites conquered the country. Therefore it seems to us very unlikely that the Avim were the same as the Hivites, although they may have been related to each other. The name constantly occurs in the formula by which the country is designated in the earlier books (Exo 3:8; Exo 3:17; Exo 13:5; Exo 23:23; Exo 23:28; Exo 33:2; Exo 34:11; Deu 8:1; Deu 20:17; Jos 3:10; Jos 9:1; Jos 12:8; Jos 24:11), and also in the later ones (1Ki 9:20; 2Ch 8:7; but comp. Ezr 9:1; and Neh 9:8). It is, however, absent in the report of the spies (Num 13:29), a document which fixes the localities occupied by the Canaanitish nations at that time. Perhaps this is owing to the insignificance of the Hivites at that time, or perhaps to the fact that the spies were indifferent to the special locality of their settlements.

2. We first encounter the actual people of the Hivites at the time of Jacob's return to Canaan. Shechem was then (according to the current Hebrew text) in their possession, Hamor the Hivite being the “prince (נָשַׂיא) of the  land” (Gen 24:2). The narrative of the transaction of Jacob, when he bought the “parcel of a field,” closely resembles that of Abraham's purchase of the field of Machpelah. They were at this time, to judge of them by their riders, a warm and impetuous people, credulous, and easily deceived by the crafty and cruel sons of Jacob. The narrative further exhibits them as peaceful and commercial, given to “trade” (Gen 10:21), and to the acquiring of “possessions” of cattle and other “wealth” (Gen 10:23; Gen 10:28-29). Like the Hittites, they held their assemblies or conferences in the gate of their city (20). We may also see a testimony to their peaceful habits in the absence of any attempt at revenge on Jacob for the massacre of the Shechemites. Perhaps similar indications are furnished by the name of the god of the Shechemites some generations after this, Baal-berith-Baal of the league, or the alliance (Jdg 8:33; Jdg 9:4; Jdg 9:46); by the way in which the Shechemites were beaten by Abimelech (40) and by the unmilitary character both of the weapon which caused Abimelech's death and of the person who discharged it (Jdg 9:53). In the matter that led to the overthrow of this Hivite city we see an indication of the corruption that afterwards became characteristic of the Canaanitish tribes (Gen 33:18-20; Genesis 34). Jacob's Teproof of his sons seems to imply that the more powerful inhabitants of at least this part of the Promised Land were Canaanites and Perizzites, these only being mentioned as likely to attack him in revenge (Gen 34:30). It is possible, but not certain, that there is a reference to this matter where Jacob speaks of a portion he gave to Joseph as having been taken by him in war from the Amorite (Gen 48:22), for his land at Shechem was given to Joseph, but it had been bought, and what Simeon and Levi seized was probably never claimed by Jacob, unless, indeed, the Hivites, who might possibly be spoken of as Amorites (but comp. Gen 34:30), attempted to recover it by force. Perhaps the reference is to some other occurrence. It seems clear, however, from the first of the passages just noticed (Gen 34:30), that the Hivites ruled by Hamor were a small settlement. SEE JACOB.

The Alex. MS., and several other MSS. of the Sept., in the above narrative (Gen 34:2) substitute “Horite” for “Hivite.” The change is remarkable from the usually close adherence of the Alex. Codex to the Hebrew text, but it is not corroborated by any other of the ancient versions, nor is it recommended by other considerations. No instances occur of Horites in this part of Palestine, while we know, from a later narrative, that there was an important colony of Hivites on the high land of  Benjamin at Gibeon, etc., no very great distance from Shechem. On the other hand, in Gen 36:2, where Aholibamah, one of Esau's wives, is said to have been the daughter of the daughter of Zibeon the Hivite, all considerations are in favor of reading “Horite” for “Hivite.” In this case we fortunately possess a detailed genealogy of the family, by comparison of which little doubt is left of the propriety of the change (comp. Gen 36:20; Gen 36:24-25; Gen 36:30, with 2), although no ancient version has suggested it here. SEE HORITE.

3. We next meet with the Hivites during the conquest of Canaan (Jos 9:7; Jos 11:19), when they are not mentioned in any important position. Their character was then in some respects materially altered. They were still evidently averse to fighting, but they had acquired possibly by long experience in traffic-an amount of craft which they did not before possess, and which enabled them to turn the tables on the Israelites in a highly successful manner (Jos 9:3-27). The colony of Hivites who made Joshua and the heads of the tribes their dupes on this occasion, had four cities-Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth. and Kirjath-jearim-situated, if our present knowledge is accurate, at considerable distances apart. It is not certain whether the last three were destroyed by Joshua or not (Gen 11:19), Gibeon certainly was spared. In Gen 11:11 the Gibeomltes speak of the m- elders” of their city, a word which, in the absence of any allusion to a Hivite king, has been thought to point to a liberal form-of government (Ewald, Gesch. 1, 318, 9). This southern branch of the nation embraced the Jewish religion (2Sa 21:1; 2Sa 21:4; Jos 9:21-27), and seem thus to have been absorbed.

4. The main body of the Hivites, however, were at this time living on the northern confines of western Palestine — ” under Hermon in the land of Mizpeh” (Jos 11:3) — “in Mount Lebanon, from Mount Baal- Hermon to the entering in of Hamath” (Jdg 3:3). Somewhere in this neighborhood they were settled when Joab and the captains of the host, in their tour of numbering, came to “all the cities of the Hivites” near Tyre (2Sa 24:7). A remnant of the nation still existed in the time of Solomon, who subjected them to a tribute of personal labor, with the remnants of other Canaanitish nations which the Israelites had been unable to expel (1Ki 9:20). In the Jerusalem Targum on Gen 10:17, they are called Tripolitans (טְרַיפוֹלָאֵי), a name which points to the same general northern locality. The HERMONITES may perhaps be a later name for the Hivites; we recognize in the Egyptian REMENEN alone any trace  of the Hivites in the conquests of the Pharaohs who passed through this tract. Chaseaud (Dmases, p. 361 sq.) refers the modern DRUSES SEE DRUSES (q.v.) to them.

5. There are few Hivite names recorded in Scripture. Hamor, “the he-ass,” was probably an honorable name. Shechem, “shoulder,” “back,” may also be indicative of strength. Such names are suitable to a primitive people, but they are not sufficiently numerous or characteristic for us to be able to draw any sure inference. It is, indeed, possible that they may be connected, as the similar Hittite names seem to be, with low nature worship. SEE HITTITE. The names of the Hivite towns do not help us. Gibeon merely indicates lofty position; Kirjath-jearim, “the city of the woods,” is interesting from the use of the word Kirjah, which we take to be probably a Canaanitish form: the other names present no special indications.

6. In the worship of Baal-berith, or “Baal of the covenant,” at Shechem, in the time of the Judges, we more probably see a trace of the head-city of a Hivite confederacy than of an alliance between the Israelites and the Hivites. (See Hamelsyeld, 3, 62 sq.; Jour. of Sac. Lit. Oct. 1851: p. 166.)

## Hizkiah[[@Headword:Hizkiah]]

             (Heb. Chizkiyah', חַזְקַיָּה: Sept. Ε᾿ζεκίας; Vulg. Ezechia), an ancestor of Zephaniah the prophet (Zep 1:1). SEE HEZEKIAH.

## Hizkijah[[@Headword:Hizkijah]]

             (Heb. Chizkiyah', חזַקיָּה‘Sept. Ε᾿ζεκία; Vulg. Ezechia), according to the punctuation of the A.V., a mal who sealed the covenant of reformation with Ezra and Nehemiah (Neh 10:17). But there is no doubt that the name should be taken with that preceding it, as “Ater-Hizkijah,” a name given in the lists of those who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel. It appears also extremely likely that the two names following these in 10:17,18 (Azzur, Hodijah) are only corrupt repetitions of them SEE HEZEKIAH.

## Hizr[[@Headword:Hizr]]

             founder of the Hizrevites, a monastic order of the Mohammedans, lived at the time of Orchan II. He founded poor-houses at Cairo and Babylon, and many visits are made by the Mohammedans to his grave at Brusa. — Pierer, Univ. — Lexikon, 8, 416.

## Hjort, Victor Christian[[@Headword:Hjort, Victor Christian]]

             a celebrated hymnologist of the Protestant Church, born at Gunderslevholm, in: Denmark, in 1735 was bishop of Ribe. His collection of sacred songs were almost entirely inserted in the public hymn-book of the Danish Church. He published also collections of songs for the Sunday schools of workmen, soldiers, etc. He died in 1818, on the island of Amagar, near Copenhagen — Pierer, Univ. — Lex. 8, 417. (J.H.W.)

## Ho-Chang[[@Headword:Ho-Chang]]

             a name given in China to the priests of Fo or Buddha. They strongly inculcated on their followers the worship of the three gems. SEE GEMS THE THREE SACRED.

## Hoadley (or Hoadly), Benjamin[[@Headword:Hoadley (or Hoadly), Benjamin]]

             an English prelate, theologian, and politician, was born at Westerham Kent, Nov. 14, 1678. He studied at Catharine Hall, ‘Cambridge, and passed A.M. in 1699. In 1700 he was appointed lecturer at St. Mildred's, London, and in 1702 rector of St. Peter-le-Poor. “His ability as a controversialist and his love of civil and religious liberty, became conspicuous in the strife of parties at the beginning of the century, when he entered the field against bishop Atterbury and the High-Church party. His share in this debate, and his intimate connection with the settlement of the new dynasty and the liberties of the country, were recognized by the House of Commons, who addressed the queen in his favor, and thus paved the way for his rapid promotion.” In 1710 he was made rector of Streatham, and on the accession of George I, 1714, he became chaplain to the king. In 1715 he was made bishop of Bangor. In 1717 he preached the sermon before the king, on the text, My kingdom is not of this world, which gave rise to the famous Bangorian controversy (q.v.), in which Hoadley was assailed by the chiefs of the nonjurors, and with most effect by William Law, the champion of authority both in Church and State. This controversy was brought to a close about 1720, without conciliating either the High-Church party on the one hand, or the Dissenters on the other, but with great credit to Hoadley's ability and tolerant spirit. In 1721 he was translated to Hereford, and thence in 1723 to Salisbury. In 1734 he was made bishop of Winchester. He died April 17, 1761. In the political history of the Church of England, Hoadley is to “be regarded as the great advocate of what are called Low Church principles, a species of Whiggism in ecclesiastics in opposition to the high pretensions sometimes advanced by the Church or particular churchmen.

It was in this character that he wrote his treatise on the ‘Measure of Obedience to the Civil Magistrate,' which was animadverted upon by Atterbury, and defended by Hoadley, whose conduct on this occasion so pleased the House of Commons (as stated above) that they  represented in an address to queen Anne what signal service he had done to the cause of civil and religious liberty.” He maintained the same principles in the Bangorian controversy. The war of pamphlets on the subject was wonderful; the number issued on all sides was nearly fifty. His doctrines excited so violent discussion in the lower House of Convocation that the government, in order to prevent further dissensions, suddenly prorogued the Houses of Convocation, and they have never since been permitted to meet for the dispatch of business. The burden of Hoadley's offence, in the eyes of High-churchmen, lies in his doctrine, as stated in the sermon above mentioned: that the “Church is Christ's kingdom; that he alone is lawgiver; and that he has left behind him no visible human authority: no vicegerents who can properly be said to supply his place; no interpreters upon whom his subjects are absolutely to depend; no judges over the consciences and religion of his people.” Against the Dissenters, and especially in answer to Calamy's abridgment of the Life and Times of Baxter, he wrote his Reasonableness of Conformity to the Church of England (1703, 8vo), and his Defense of Episcopal Ordination (1707, 8vo). Besides the writings named, he wrote a number of theological treatises, in which he shows great freedom of thought. His theology is Latitudinarian (q.v.). These writings include Letters on Miracles, to Dr. Fleetwood (1702, 4to): — A Preservation against the Principles of the Nonjurors (1716, 8vo): — Sermons (1718 et al.): — Plain Account of the Nature and Kind of the Lord's Supper (1735, 8vo). All these, with his Life of Dr. Samuel Clarke, his controversial pamphlets, sermons, etc., may be found in the Works of Bishop Hoadley, edited by his son, John Hoadley, LL.D. (London, 1773, 3 vols. fol., of which the first volume contains a life of bishop Hoadley). See English Cyclopaedia; Biographia Britannica; Hook, Eccles. Biography, vol. 6; Bogue and Bennett, History of Dissentc. ers, 2, 154; Buchanan, Justif. p. 200-201; Skeats, Hist. of the Free Churches of England, p. 227 sq.; Gass, Gesch. der Dogmatik, 3, 327; Wesley, Works. 2, 445; 6:510; Hagenbach, History of Doctrines (Smith's), 2, 417. 516; Mosheim, Church Hist. 3; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 852.

## Hoadley, John, LL.D[[@Headword:Hoadley, John, LL.D]]

             youngest son of bishop Hoadley (q.v.), was born Oct. 8, 1711, and educated at Cambridge. He edited the works of his father, and wrote himself a number of poems, among which are Love's Revenge, a pastoral (1737, 4to): — Jephtha, an oratorio (1748, 8vo): — Force of Truth,  oratorio (1764), and others. He died March 16, 1776. — Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 852.

## Hoadly (or Hoadley), John, D.D[[@Headword:Hoadly (or Hoadley), John, D.D]]

             an Irish prelate, was born at Tottenham, September 27, 1678, and was brother to the celebrated Benjamin Hoadly, bishop of Winchester. John Hoadly was' chaplain to bishop Burnet, and by him installed chancellor and canon residentiary of the Church of Salisbury, archdeacon of Sarum, and rector of St. Edmund's, and was afterwards made canon of Hereford by his brother, when bishop of that see. He was advanced, June 3, 1727, to the sees of Leighlin and Ferns. He was translated to the see of Dublin, January 13, 1729. In November 1739, Dr. Hoadly was of the privy council, when the proclamation was issued requiring all justices, magistrates, etc., to search and seize arms in possession of any papist, and to prosecute any papist who should presume to carry arms contrary to the intent of the proclamation. Dr. Hoadly adopted the system of his predecessor, and what  was then styled the English interest in the country. He died at Rathfarnham, July 19, 1746. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 330.

## Hoag, Ephraim[[@Headword:Hoag, Ephraim]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Peru, N. Y., Sept. 15, 1815. He was converted in 1835, and, after a course of study at Cazenovia Seminary, entered, in 1841, the Oneida Conference (now merged in the Central New York Conference). His superior talents soon procured for him the favor of the people to whom he was sent, and the good wishes of his brethren in the ministry. Although comparatively a self-made man, he was looked upon as one of the first Methodist ministers in Central New York. He filled the chief appointments of this Conference, e.g. Ithaca (1852-3), Utica (1854-5), Norwich (1856-7), Cazenovia (1860-1), and in 1864 was made presiding elder of Cortlaitd District. Here he labored with great success for four years, when he was sent to Canastota. In 1869 while at the session of the newly formed New York Central Conference, he was suddenly struck with paralysis, and was obliged to ask for a superannuate relation. He died Oct. 3,1869. “As a preacher he was earnest and uncompromising, seeking to please God and save men; as a pastor he was diligent, caring for and seeking the good of all the people under his charge. Of him it was true, the poor welcomed his coming, and blessed him when he went away.” — Rev. L. C. Queal, in the North. Christ. Advocate, Dec. 16, 1869.

## Hoag, Wilbur[[@Headword:Hoag, Wilbur]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Oswegatchie, N. York, May 12, 1806; was converted in 1821, joined the Genesee Conference in 1826, was stationed at Buffalo in 1831, was agent for the Genesee Wesleyan Seminary in 1832, and died April 12, 1839. Mr. Hoag was a man of “quick perception, ready utterance, and clear discrimination.” He was an able business man, and highly esteemed as a winning and successful minister. — Min. of Conferences, 2, 677.

## Hoar, Leonard[[@Headword:Hoar, Leonard]]

             one of the early presidents of Harvard College, was born about 1630. He graduated at Harvard hi 1650, and in 1653 went to England and continued his studies at Cambridge University. He entered the ministry at Wensted, in Sussex County, in 1656, but his nonconformity to the English Church  caused his deposition in 1662. A few years afterward he decided to return to America. His first appointment was as assistant to Dr. Thacher, in Boston. In 1672 he was elected president of Harvard, but the college, which had suffered from mismanagement, was then slenderly supported, and he retired from this office in less than three years. See Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 853; Dictionnaire Universal, 19, 309.

## Hoard, Samuel, B.D[[@Headword:Hoard, Samuel, B.D]]

             was born in London in 1599, and educated at Oxford. He was rector of Moreton, Essex. In the latter years of his life he forsook the Calvinistic path, and became a zealous advocate of the Arminian doctrine. He is said to have been a fine scholar, especially at home in the works of the fathers of the Church, and was considered a superior preacher and good disputant. He died in 1657. Hoard wrote God's Love to Mankind (1633, 4to; anonymous, and answered by Bp. Davenant [Cambridge, 1641,8vo] and Dr. Twiss [Oxford, 1653, fol.], and by Amyraut of Saumur in his Doctrinae Jo. Calvini de absoluto Reprobationis Decreto Defensio adv. Script. anonymum [Saum. 1641, 4to]): — The Church's Authority asserted (1637, 4to; and in Hickes's Tracts, 1709, 8vo, p. 190). He also published some sermons of less value, however. — Smith's Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2, 187; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 1, 1498; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 853.

## Hoare, Charles James[[@Headword:Hoare, Charles James]]

             an eminent clergyman of the Church of England, the date of whose birth is uncertain, was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1803. In 1806 he was elected fellow of his alma mater; in 1807 he was appointed vicar at Blanford Forum, Dorsetshire; in 1821, at Godstone; in 1829, archdeacon; and in 1831, canon of Winchester. In 1847 he was translated to the archdeaconate of Surrey, which position he resigned in 1860 on account of his age. He died January 15,1864. He was an extensive writer, and many of his works have been published. A complete list of them is given in Darling's Cyclop. Bibl. 1, 1498-99. Among them are, Course of Divine Judgments; eight Lect. principally in reference to the present Times and the impending Pestilence (1831, 8vo; 1832):Baptism, or the ministration of public Baptism of Infants, to be read in the Church, scripturally illustrated and explained (1848, sm. 8vo): — Principles of the Tracts for the Times (1841, 8vo); and a number of  theological essays and sermons, of which Sermons on the Christian Character, with occasional sermons (3rd edit. Lond. 1822, 8vo), deserve special notice. — Appleton's Amer. Annual Cyclop. 1865, p. 664; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 853.

## Hobab[[@Headword:Hobab]]

             (Heb. Chobab', חֹבָב, beloved; Sept. Ο᾿βάβ, in Judges Ι᾿ωβάβ), the son of Raguel the Midianite, a kinsman of Moses (Num 10:29; Jdg 4:11). B.C. 1657. He has usually been identified with Jethro (see Exo 18:5; Exo 18:27, compared with Num 10:29-30); but it is rather his father Reuel to whom the title “Moses's father-in-law” is intended to apply in Num 10:29; for that these two latter were' names of the same person, and that the father of Moses's wife, seems clear from Exo 2:6; Exo 2:21; Exo 3:1. Hence Hobab was Moses's brother-in-law (and so we must render חֹתֵןin Jdg 4:11, where the Auth.Vers. has “father-in-law,” being, it is true, the same applied elsewhere to Jethro, but merely signifying any male relative by marriage, and rendered even “son- in-law” in Gen 19:14); so that while Jethro (as was natural for a person of his advanced age) returned to his home (Exo 18:27), Moses prevailed upon Hobab (whose comparative youth rendered his services the greater object to secure) to remain (as. seems implied by the absence of any refusal to his second importunity in Num 10:32), so that we find his descendants among the Israelites (Jdg 4:11). SEE JETHRO.

## Hobah[[@Headword:Hobah]]

             (Heb. Chobah', חוֹבָה, hiding-place; Sept.. Χοβά), a place to the northward of Damascus (לְדִמֶּשֶׂק מַשְּׂמאֹל, lit. on the left), whither Abraham pursued the kings who had taken Lot captive (Gen 14:15); perhaps the Chobai or Choba mentioned in the Apocrypha. (Χωβαϊv, Jdt 15:4; Χωβά, 4:4). Eusebius (Onomast. s.v. Choba) confounds this place with Cocaba, the seat of the Ebionites in the 4th century; and Burckhardt- (Syria, p. 312) found a village called Kokab, probably the same, which, however, lies south of Damascus. This is apparently also the village Hoba, visited in the year 1666 by Ferd. von Troilo, who says, “It lies a quarter of a (German) mile north from the town, on the left hand. Near the city of Damascus is seen a large hill, where the patriarch Abraham overtook and defeated the army of the four kings. There formerly dwelt  here a sect of Jews, converted to the (Christian) faith, who were called Ebionites; but at present the place is inhabited by a great number of Moors (Arabs) who have a mosque. In the neighborhood is a cave, in which the patriarch offered to the Divine Majesty his thanksgivings for the victory” (Travels, p. 584). On the other hand, Reland thinks of a castle called Caucab, mentioned by Edrisi as being on the lake of Tiberias (Palaest. p. 727). “Josephus mentions a tradition concerning Abraham which he takes from Nicolaus of Damascus: ‘Abraham reigned at Damascus, being a foreigner… and his name is still famous in the country; and there is shown a village called from him The Habitation of Abraham (Ant. 1, 7, 2).' It is remarkable that in the village of Burzeh, three miles north of Damascus, there is a oely held in high veneration by the Mohammedans, and called after the name of the patriarch, Masjad Abraham, ‘the prayer-place of Abraham.' The tradition attached to it is that here Abraham offered thanks to God after the total discomfiture of the Eastern kings. Behind the wely is a cleft in the rock, in which another tradition represents the patriarch as taking refuge on one occasion from the giant Nimrod. It is remarkable: that the word Hobah signifies ‘a hiding-place.' (See: Ritter, Syria, 4:312; Wilson, Lands of Bible, 2, 331.) The Jews of Damascus affirm that the village of Jobar, not far from Burzeh, is the Hobah of Scripture. They have a synagogue there dedicated to Elijah, to which they make frequent pilgrimages (see Porter, Handbook for Syria and Palestine, p. 491, 492; Stanley, Jewish. Church, 1, 481).”

## Hobal[[@Headword:Hobal]]

             an idol of the ancient Arabians, was demolished by Mohammed after he had taken possession of Mecca. It was surrounded by three hundred and sixty smaller idols, each of which presided over one day of the lunar year.

## Hobart, John Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Hobart, John Henry, D.D]]

             Protestant Episcopal bishop of New York, was born Sept. 14, 1775. In 1788 he entered the College of Philadelphia, but soon after went to Princeton, where he passed A.B. in 1793 with high honor. In 1798 he took charge of two suburban churches near Philadelphia. The two following years he was called to New Brunswick, next to Hempstead, Long Island, and later became assistant minister of Trinity, New York. In 1799 he was chosen secretary to the House of Bishops, and subsequently to the Convention, and one of the deputies to the General Convention in 1801. In 1806 he was made D.D. by Union College, and in 1811 he was elected assistant bishop of New York. Afterwards he became diocesan of New York, and rector of Trinity Church. He was especially instrumental in the establishment of the General Theological Seminary, in which he held the chair of pastoral theology and pulpit eloquence. In 1823, his health becoming enfeebled, a voyage to Europe was deemed desirable, and he  remained there above two years. He preached in Rome when Protestant worship was barely tolerated, and made an effective appeal in behalf of the Waldenses. In his journey through the Italian States he encountered much annoyance, and when at Milan was examined before the civil magistrates as to the object of his tour. He defended himself with a freedom and frankness that left little doubt of his honesty. When in London he published two volumes of Discourses preached in America, which drew forth warm expressions of approbation from the leading periodicals. On his return, he resumed his various duties with zeal and energy, devoting himself to the promotion of every good work, and feeling a special interest in the cause of the Indians. He died at Auburn- Sept. 10, 1830. His publications include A Companion to the Altar (N. York, 1804, 8vo; many editions since) — Festivals and Fasts (N. York, 1804, 12mo; over twenty editions): — Apology for Apostolic Order (N. Y. 1807, 8vo; 1844, 8vo): — The State of departed Spirits ((new ed. N. York, 1846, 12mo): — Clergyman's Companion (new ed. 1855, 12mo): — Christian's Manual (12mo; several editions); besides numerous charges and occasional discourses (reprinted, New York, 2 vols. 8vo). His Posthumous Works, with a Memoir by the Rev. Dr. Berrian, were issued in 1833 (N.Y. 3 vols. 8vo). See Schroeder,

Memoir of Bp. Hobart (N. Y. 1833, 12mo); M'Vickar, Early and professional Years of Hobart (N. York, 1836, 12mo); Christian Spectator, 9, 79; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 854; Sprague, Annals, 5, 440; Christian Journal, vol. xiv; Episcopal Church Reg. A fine tribute is paid to bishop Hobart as an author by Lowndes in his British Literature, p. 656, 833.

## Hobart, Noah[[@Headword:Hobart, Noah]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Hingham Jan. 12, 1706. He graduated at Harvard College in 1724, and was ordained pastor of the First Congregational Church at Fairfield, Connecticut, Feb. 7, 1733. About this time a controversy arose in the Eastern States respecting the Episcopalians, in which Hobart enlisted, and wrote in behalf of the validity of Presbyterian ordination a pamphlet entitled Serious Address to the Episcopal Separation (1748; 2nd address, 1751; 3rd address, 1761). His opponents were Dr. Johnson and other ministers who had swerved from Congregationalism. Of Mr. Hobart's ability and learning, Dr. Dwight, who was one of the men of his time, says: “He possessed high intellectual and moral distinction. He had a mind of great acuteness and discernment; was a  laborious student; was extensively learned, especially in history and theology; adorned the doctrine which he professed by an exemplary life, and was holden in high veneration for his wisdom and virtue. Among the American writers of the last century, not one has, I believe, handled the subject of Presbyterian ordination with more ability or success.” He died Dec. 6, 1773. Besides several sermons, he published Principles of the Congreg. Church, etc. (1754). — Contrib. to Eccl. History of Connecticut, p. 385; Smith's Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2. 448; Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 1, 375.

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

             a Congregational minister, was born in England in 1604, and was educated at Cambridge. After teaching and preaching for a time, he emigrated to this country in 1635, and settled, with his friends who had preceded him, in Hingham, Mass. After a residence of some years, the people of his former charge at Haverhill, England, urged him to return to them as pastor, but he declined, and remained with his friends, preaching only at times. He died in 1678. Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 68. (J. H.W.)

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

             an English philosopher and deist, was born April 5,1588, at Malmesbury, in Wiltshire, and was educated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford. In 1608 he became tutor to lord Hardwick, subsequently earl of Devonshire; and, after their return from traveling, he resided in the family for many years, during which period he translated Thucydides, and made a Latin version of some of lord Bacon's works. In 1628 he went abroad with the son of Sir Gervase Clifton, with whom he remained some time in France. He returned in 1631 to undertake the education of the young earl of Devonshire. In 1634 he went with his new pupil to Paris, where he applied himself much to natural philosophy, and afterwards to Italy, where he formed an acquaintance with Galileo. He returned to England in 1637, and soon after wrote his Elementa Philosophica de Cive (Par. 1642). A second edition was printed in Holland in 1647, under the superintendence of M. Sorbire. In 1640, after the meeting of the Long Parliament, Hobbes withdrew to Paris. Here he became acquainted with Des Cartes and Gassendi. In 1647 Hobbes was appointed mathematical tutor to the Prince of Wales, afterwards Charles II. His treatises entitled Human Nature and Me Corpore Politico were published in London in 1650, and in the following year the Leviathan. Of  the last work he caused a copy to be fairly written out on vellum, and presented to Charles II; but the king, having been informed by some divines that it contained principles subversive both of religion and civil government, withdrew his favor from Hobbes, and forbade him his presence. After the publication of the Leviathan Hobbes returned again to England, and published his Letter upon Liberty and Necessity (1654), which led to a long controversy with bishop Bramhall. SEE BRAMHALL. It was about this time, too, that he began a controversy with Dr. Wallis, the mathematical professor at Oxford, which lasted until Hobbes's death. By this last controversy he got no honor. In 1666 his Leviathan and De Cive were censured by Parliament. Shortly after Hobbes was still further alarmed by the introduction of a bill into the House of Commons for the punishment of atheism and profaneness; but this storm blew over. In 1672 Hobbes wrote his own life in Latin verse, being then in his eighty-fifth year, and in 1675 published his translation of the Iliad and Odyssey. This translation is wholly wanting in Homeric fire, bald and vulgar in style and diction; and it must be allowed that the fame of the philosopher is anything but heightened by his efforts as a poet. Hobbes's Dispute with Laney, bishop of Ely, concerning Liberty and Necessity, appeared in 1676; and in 1679 he sent his Behemoth, or a History of the Civil Wars from 1640 to 1660, to a bookseller, with a letter in which he requested him not to publish it until a fitting occasion offered. It appears from this letter that Hobbes, being anxious to publish the book some time before, had with that view shown it to the king, who refused his permission, and for this reason Hobbes would not now allow the bookseller to publish it. It appeared, however, almost immediately after Hobbes's death, which took place by paralysis Dec. 4, 1679.

In philosophy Hobbes was the precursor of the modern materialistic schools of Sensationalism and Positivism. Professing to reject “everything hypothetical (of all qualitatum occultarum), he affected to confine himself to the comprehensible, or, in other words, to the phenomena of motion and sensation. He defines philosophy to be the knowledge, through correct reasoning, of phenomena or appearances from the causes presented by them, or, vice versa, the ascertaining of possible causes by means of known effects. Philosophy embraces as an object every body that admits the representation of production and presents the phenomena of composition and decomposition. Taking the term Body in its widest extent, he divides its meaning into natural and political, and devotes to the consideration of  the first his Philosophia Naturalis, comprehending the departments of logic, ontology, metaphysics, physics, etc.; and to that of the second his Philosophia Civilis, or Polity, comprehending morals. All knowledge is derived from the senses; but our sensational representations are nothing more than appearances within us, the effect of external objects operating on the brain, or setting in motion the vital spirits. Thought is calculation (computatio), and implies addition and subtraction. Truth and falsehood consist in the relations of the terms employed. We can become cognizant only of the finite; the infinite cannot be imagined, much less known: the term does not convey any accurate knowledge, but belongs to a Being whom we can know only by means of faith. Consequently, religious doctrines do not come within the compass of philosophical discussion, but are determinable by the laws of religion itself. All, therefore, that Hobbes has left free to the contemplation of philosophy is the knowledge of our natural bodies (somatology), of the mind (psychology), and polity. His whole theory has reference to the external and objective, inasmuch as he derives all our emotions from the movements of the body, and describes the soul itself as something corporeal, though of extreme tenuity.” From these principles no moral or religious theory can flow, except that of infidelity. Though none of Hobbes's writings are expressly leveled against Christianity, few authors have really done more to subvert the principles of morality and religion. He makes self-love the fundamental law of nature, and utility its end; morality is nothing but utility, and the soul is not immortal. His writings gave rise to a very voluminous controversy. “The Philosopher of Malmesbury,” says Dr. Warburton, “was the terror of the last age, as Tindall and Collins are of this. The press sweat with controversy, and every young churchman militant would try his arms in thundering on Hobbes's steel cap” (Divine Legation, 2, 9, Preface). His principal antagonists were Clarendon, in A brief View of the dangerous and pernicious Errors to Church and State in Mr. Hobbes's Book entitled Leviathan; Cudworth, in his Eternal and immutable Morality; and bishop Cumberland, in his Latin work on the Laws of Nature. Bishop Bramhall's controversy with Hobbes has been noticed above. We may also mention archbishop Tenison's Creed of Mr. Hobbes examined, and Dr. Eachard's Dialogues on Hobbes. Hobbes's whole works have been carefully re-edited by Sir William Molesworth, the Latin under the title Opera Philosophica quae Latine Scripsit W. Hobbes (Lond. 1839-45, 5 vols. 8vo); English Works now first collected (London, 1839, 4 vols. 8vo). See English Cyclopedia; Tennemann, Man. Hist. Philos. § 324; Mackintosh, Ethical  Philosophy, § 4; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. 17 § 22; Hallam, Lit. of Europe, 3, 271; Leland, Deistical Writers, ch. 2; Morell, Modern Philosophy, pt. 1, ch. 1, § 1; Bayle, Genesis Dict. s.v.; Shedd, History of Doctrines, vol. 2; British Quarterly Review, 6:155; Lewis, Hist. of Phil. 2. 226-235; Krug, Handworterbuch d. philos. Wissensch. 2, 441-443; Leckey, Hist. of Rationalism (see Index); Hurst, Hist. of Rationalism, p. 114 sq.; Christian Examiner, 29, 320; Leidner, Philos. p. 270; Cudworth, Intell. Syst. 2; Farrar, Hist. of Free Thought, p. 121 sq.; Dorner, Gesch. d. prot. Theol.; Gass, Gesch. d. protest. Dogmat. 3:39, 322; Waterland, Works (see Index, vol. vi); Watson, Works; Tennemann, Gesch. d. Philos. 10; Sigwart, Gesch. d. Philos. 2 (see Index); Schröckh, Kirchen-Gesch. s. d. Reform. 3; Doderlein, Lit. (see Index); Westm. Review, April, 1867, p..162; Contemp. Review, Feb. 1868, vol. 3; Bibliotheca Sacra, 8, 127.

## Hobbhahn, Johann Wilhelm[[@Headword:Hobbhahn, Johann Wilhelm]]

             a German theologian, was born at Ochsenberg March 8,1665; studied at the universities of Ulm, Strasburg, and Tübingen, and entered the ministry in 1690. In 1716 he was appointed superintendent over a number of churches, and pastor at Knittlingen, where he died in 1727. Hobbhahn wrote, mainly under fictitious names, a number of excellent polemics against the Romish Church and the Syncretists. Of these, his Obsiegende Wahrheit, and Apologet. Schauplatz d. triumphirenden Wahrheit, against Eust. Eisenhut; Histor. theolog. Prüfung d. rom. Priester Weihe, against Mandle; and especially Angetastete Juzngfer-Ehe d. lutherischen Kirche, which gave him much trouble, and endangered his life, are considered the best. — Jicher, Gelehrt. Lex. 2, 1631.

## Hobbs, Lewis[[@Headword:Hobbs, Lewis]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, born in Burke County, Ga., Feb. 1783; was converted in 1804, and entered the itinerancy in 1808. He was stationed in New Orleans in 1813, and died in Georgia in 1814. Mr. Hobbs was a young man of deep and uniform piety, great simplicity and zeal as a minister, and nobly endured the perils and hardships of missionary life in the Southern wildernesses and the poisonous climate of the Mississippi. — — Minutes of Conferences, 1, 254. (G. L. T.)

## Hobhouse, Sir Benjamin[[@Headword:Hobhouse, Sir Benjamin]]

             was born in 1757, and educated at Oxford for the bar. From 1797-1818 he was a distinguished member of the House of Commons, and filled other important stations. He died in 1831. His name is mentioned here on account of his Treatise on Heresy (Lond. 1792, 8vo), and his Reply to the Rev. F. Randolph's Letter to the Rev. Dr. Priestly, or an Examination of the Rev. F. Randolph's Scriptural Revision of Socinian Arguments (Lond. 1792, 8vo; and again, Bath, 1793, 8vo). — Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 856.

## Hobnim[[@Headword:Hobnim]]

             SEE EBONY.

## Hoburg, Christian[[@Headword:Hoburg, Christian]]

             a mystic, born at Luneburg in 1607, was for a time assistant minister at Lauenburg, and, later, subconrector at Uelzen. Here he was deposed from his position on account of his mystical tendencies, and he retired to private life at Hamburg. Later, he was appointed minister to congregations in the duchy of Brunswick, and finally became a Mennonite preacher at Hamburg. He died in 1675. Hoburg wrote much under the pseudonym Bachmann and Pratorius, as Der unbekannte Christus (Hamb. 1858; Frankf. 1695): — Theol. syst. (2nd edit. 1656; Nimeg. 1672; 3rd edit. 1684, and often). See Lebenbeschreibung (by his son Philip, 1676) Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8, 420; Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex. 2, 1668. (J. H.W.)

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

             an English Baptist minister, was born in 1788. In his youth he enjoyed the friendship and counsel of the Reverend Joseph Iviney, and in 1813 became co-pastor at Maze Pond, Southwark. In 1824 he resigned his pastoral work, and devoted his long life to the advocacy of the several Baptist funds which go to the support of the aged ministers and poorly paid pastors. He paid special attention to the claims of churches in debt, and resided successively in Birmingham, Weymouth, and Twickenham, in order to assist poor churches around each of those places. He took great interest in young ministers, and in the Foreign Missionary Society, and visited America in its behalf. He was widely esteemed and greatly beloved. He died at Caterham, Surrey, November 20,1871. See (Lond.) Baptist Hand- book, 1872.

## Hoc age[[@Headword:Hoc age]]

             (do this), a form of words solemnly pronounced by a herald when the ancient Romans were about to engage in a public sacrifice. It implied that the whole attention of the people was to be fixed on the service in hand.

## Hocein[[@Headword:Hocein]]

             SEE HOSSEIN.

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

             SEE JEPINUS.

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

             a German theologian, born at Ulm in 1677, was educated at the University of his native place and at Tübingen and Wittenberg. At the last school he at first devoted his time mainly to the study of philosophy, but afterwards changed to the study of theology. He next went to Hamburg, where his acquaintance with the great Fabricius led him to a more thorough study of  Greek and Hebrew. In 1705 he was made M.A. at Wittenberg, and immediately began there a course of lectures which procured for him an adjunct professorship in the philosophical department, he entering at the same time as a candidate of theology. In 1709 he was called as professor of Hebrew to the gymnasium at Breslau, where he died in 1712. Hocheisen contributed largely to the learned periodicals of his day. Of his published works the most important are De Hebraeo-rum vocalium. officio et valore in constituenda syllaba (Viteb. 1705, 4to): — De Deismo in Cartesianismo deprehenso (ibid. 1708, 4to): — De Deismo in Theosophia deprehenso, contra Westphalun novatorem (ibid. 1709, 4to). Some take him to be the author (though this is unlikely) of the first letter in Vertrauter Brieefiechsel zweierguten Freunde 5. Wesen d. Seele (1713 and 1734, 8vo), in which the soul is regarded only as a mere mechanism of the bodv. — Doiring, Gelehrt. Theolog. Deutschlands, 1, 744; Adelulg's Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex. Add. 2, 2029. (J. H. W.)

## Hochmann (Of Hochenau), Ernst Christoph[[@Headword:Hochmann (Of Hochenau), Ernst Christoph]]

             a German mystic, and principal representative of the Wittgenstem separatists, born at Hochenau (Lauenburg) in 1661 (according to Hagenbach, 1670) and educated at Halle University. During his residence there (1699) he began to attract attention by his addresses to the Jews, whom he endeavored to convert to Christianity. In 1702 he made a journey through nearly all Germany, and attacked the lukewarmness of the clergy with great boldness, oftentimes entering the pulpit either during the discourse or immediately after it. He also conducted devotional exercises in private houses, which were largely attended by the people. “He was a man of rare gifts, and was inspired by a sincere and resigned type of piety, which brought many sides to his heart.” He suffered great persecution, and was even imprisoned frequently, but it “was all borne by him with patience, and even with a certain degree of humor.” His adherents, in spite of all these difficulties, were numerous, and his influence over them without bounds. Stilling says that an old pietist related to him “that Hochman once preached on the great meadow below Elberfeld, called the Ox Comb, with so much power and eloquence that his many hundreds of hearers fully believed themselves raised to the clouds, and that they had no other thought than that the morning of eternity had really dawned.” The theological views of Hochmann were in the main the same as those of the great mystics, Jacob Baehme (q.v.), Weigel, Gichtel, etc. He opposed infant baptism, and held that the Lord's Supper should be administered  only to the chosen and faithful disciples of Christ. He also insisted on a complete separation of Church and State, and had most peculiar views of the matrimonial state. The charge has been laid against him that he disbelieved the doctrine of the Trinity, but we think without just cause. He was, however, a fervent believer in the doctrine of perfection, and held that only those men should preach the Gospel who felt that the Lord called them to this sacred work. He died in 1721. Hochmann's writings were published in pamphlet form, and were few in number. They are of value mainly as an index to his life and works as a Christian man. A complete list of them may be found in Gobel, Gesch. d. christl. Lebens in d. rheinisch- westphal. evangel. Kirche (Coblenz, 1852), 2, 809 sq. Among these we consider as particularly valuable his Glaubensbekenntniss sammt seiner an die Juden gehaltenen Rede (1703, 12mo): — Necessaria supplicatio et dehortatio ad Germaniae Rectores s. Magistratus de dura persec. sic dictor. Pietistarum (without year or date). — Hurst's Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries, 1, 167-8; Adelung's Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex. Add. 2, 2029-2030; Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch. 2, 318; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 163-164. (J. H. W.)

## Hochstetter, Andreas Adam[[@Headword:Hochstetter, Andreas Adam]]

             a distinguished German theologian of the Lutheran confession, was born July 13, 1668, at Tübingen, and educated at the university of his native place. In 1688 the reigning prince of his country sent him abroad to visit the different universities of Germany, Holland, and England, where he formed an acquaintance with a number of distinguished scholars. He paid particular attention to the study of the Hebrew and English languages. In the latter he made great proficiency, and translated into Latin, among others, Stillingfleet's Epistolam ad deistam, etc. On his return he was appointed a professor extraordinary at his alma mater. In 1707 he was advanced regular professor of theology and city preacher of Tübingen, and in 1711 court preacher and Consistorial Rath at Stuttgart. Four years later, however, he returned again as professor to the university. He died April 27, 1718. His own works were mainly dissertations, of which the few published are in pamphlet form. A list of them is given by Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex. 2, 1633. (J.H.W.)

## Hochstraten[[@Headword:Hochstraten]]

             SEE HOOGSTRATEN.

## Hochwart, Laurentius (Tursenrutanus)[[@Headword:Hochwart, Laurentius (Tursenrutanus)]]

             a distinguished German preacher and historian of the 16th century, born at Tirschenreut in 1493, and educated at Leipzig. His first years after graduation were spent in teaching, first at Freysing, and later at Ingolstadt. In 1528 he became pastor at Waldsassen, and later at Regensburg. In 1531 he had a call as preacher to the court at Dresden, but he gave the preference to an offer from Eichstadt which came at the same time. In 1533 he returned again to Regensburg, and later went to Passau, He died toward the close of 1569 or in the beginning of 1570. His valuable works were left unpublished, with the exception of his Catalog. Ratisponensium episcoporum libriis 3 (printed in A. F. Oefel's Rerum Boicarum script. 1, 148-242). Among those unpublished the following are of especial, value: Sermones Varii: — Monotessaron in quatuor Evangelia: — Chrom. ingens mun-di.Wetzer ü.Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 1, 253; Herzog, Real Encyklop. 6, 164.

## Hock Tide[[@Headword:Hock Tide]]

             (from Anglo-Sax. hocken, to seize), or Hoke Days an English holiday, usually observed on Monday and Tuesday two weeks after Easter, in memory of the slaughter of the Danes by Ethelred, Nov. 13, 1002, according to Henry of Huntingdon, and mentioned in the Confessor's Laws. It was the custom formerly to collect money of the parishioners. A trace of this practice is found as late as 1667. Collections were also taken up at town gates, as at Chichester in the last century. Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, p. 312.

## Hock, Heinrich[[@Headword:Hock, Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Hamburg, October 18, 1700. He studied at Giessen and Wittenberg, and died at his native place, April 26, 1779, pastor of Trinity Church. He wrote, Das Evangeliumn aus  den Evangeliis (Hamburg, 1734-40, 4 parts): — Das Siegel der Propheten in den Leiden Jesu (1739, 1743, 2 parts): — Beitrage zum richtigen und erbaulichen Verstande einiger Schriftstellen (1749-52, 3 parts). See Neubauer, Jetztlebende Theologen; Thiess, Hamburg. Gelelhten- Geschichte; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

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

             SEE JEPINUS.

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

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1581. He studied at different universities, was in 1609 deacon at Tubingen, in 1614 superintendent, and died June 7, 1617. He wrote, Sylloge Utilissimorum Articulorum inter Augustanae Conjfssionis Theologos et Pontificios ut oet Calvinianos Controversorum: — Clavis Theologico-Philosophica: — Quaestiones Aliguot de Dignitate S. Scripturae, de. Trans-substantictione. See Fischlin, Memoria Theologorum Wiirtenbergensium; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hod[[@Headword:Hod]]

             (Heb. id. הוֹד, majesty, as often; Sept. ῞Ωδ), one of the sons of Zophah. of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:37). B.C. ante 1017.

## Hodaiah[[@Headword:Hodaiah]]

             (Hebrew Hodayeva'hu, הוֹדִיְוָהוּ, marg more correctly, Hodavya'hu, הוֹדִוְיָהוּ, a prolonged form of Hodaviah; Sept. ᾿Ωδουϊvα, Vulgate Oduja),  the first named of the seven sons of Elioenai, of the descendants. of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:24); probably a brother of the Nahum of Luk 3:25 (see Strong's Harm. and Exposition of the Gospels, p. 17). B.C. cir. 406. SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

## Hodamo[[@Headword:Hodamo]]

             the priest of the inhabitants of the island of Socotra, in the Indian Ocean, off the eastern coast of Africa, who worshipped the moon, for which purpose they had temples called Moquamos. The hodamo was chosen annually, and presented with a staff and a cross as the emblems of his office.

## Hodaviah[[@Headword:Hodaviah]]

             (Heb. Hodavyah', הוֹדִוְיָה, praise of Jehovah, or perh. i.q. הוֹדוּיָה, praise ye Jehovah; Sept. ᾿Ωδουία or ᾿Ωδουϊvα), the name of three or four men.

1. A chieftain and warrior of the tribe of Manasseh East at the time of the Assyrian captivity (1 Chronicles 5, 24). B.C. cir. 720.

2. Son of Has-senuah and father of Meshullam, of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 9:7). B.C. ante 588.

3. A Levite whose posterity (to the number of 74) returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:40). In the parallel passage, Neh 7:43, his name is written Hodevah' (הוֹדנְוָה, by contraction for Hodaviah, marg. הוֹדנְיָה, by contraction for Hodijah; Sept. Οὐδουία, Vulgate Oduja). B.C. ante 536. Apparently the same is elsewhere called JUDAH (Ezr 3:9).

4. See HODAIAH. Hodegetics, a word properly signifying the art of induction, or, better, the art of introduction (τέχνη being understood with ὁδηγητική), but generally taken to signify introduction (ὁδηγία) itself, especially when reference is made to scientific Hodegetics. The Hodegete (ὁδηγητής), of course, is expected to be thoroughly conversant with the science of which he treats, and which he is to introduce, else he might easily lead ill the wrong direction, or into another department. Other names for this science are Methodology (from μεθοδος), or Propaedeutics (from πρό and παιδεύω, παῖς), or Isagogics (from εἰς and ἄγω). The difference between Hodegetics and Encyclopsedia (q.v.) of Theology is, that “the former has regard to the personal qualifications of the student, his method of study, his preparatory helps, etc., whereas the latter has regard to the various departments and systems of the science itself.” The literature of Hodegetics is quite extensive. See Schlegel, Summe 5. Esfahrungen und Beobb. z. Beford. d. Studien in gel. Schulen und auf. Univ. (Riga, 1790); Kiesevetter, Lehrb. d. Hod. o. kurze Aszweis. z. studieren (Berl. 1811); Schelling, Vorles. ib. d. Methode d. akadem. Studiums (3rd edit. Tübingen, 1832); Scheidler, Grundr. d. H. o. Methodik d. akadem. Stud. (3rd ed.  Jena, 1847). — Krug, Phil. Lex. 5, 1, 531; Danz, Univ. Wort. d. theol. Lit. p. 404; Bib. Sac. 1, 179. SEE INTRODUCTION.

## Hodegetria[[@Headword:Hodegetria]]

             ( ῾Οδηγητρία, the guide) is the name which the Greeks give to a painting, said to have been the work of St. Luke, because Michael Palaeologus, upon his entry at Constantinople, after the defeat of the Latins, had this portrait borne in advance, he and his army following on foot. The Virgin Mary is also worshipped under this name by the Sicilians, especially at Messina. At Rome they erected and dedicated a church to her, generally called the Constantinopolitan Church. — Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch. 2, 320; Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sac. 1, 495.

## Hodesh[[@Headword:Hodesh]]

             (Heb. Cho'desh, חֹדֶשׁ, a month, as often; Sept. Α᾿δά,Vulg. Hodes), one of the wives of Shaharaim, of the tribe of Judah, several of whose children are enumerated (1Ch 8:9); called in 1Ch 8:8 more correctly BAARA SEE BAARA (q.v.).

## Hodevah[[@Headword:Hodevah]]

             (Neh 7:43). SEE HODAVIAH 3. Hodges, Cyrus Whitman, a Baptist clergyman, was born in Leicester, Vt., July 9, 1802. At the age of twenty he was licensed to preach in Brandon, Vt., and in the autumn of that year accepted an invitation to preach at Minerva for a year. In connection with this work he pursued his ministerial studies under the Rev. Daniel 0. Morton, at Shoreham, but so anxious was he to be fully engaged in the work of his calling that he abandoned the idea of a full course of study. He, however, diligently improved such opportunities as he had, and his literary and theological acquisitions became quite respectable. He was ordained in Chester, Warren Co., N. Y., in 1824, and remained there three years. He preached two years in Arlington, Vt.; four years in Shaftesbury; four years in Springfield; six years in Westport, N. Y.; and five years in Bennington, Vt. Thence he went to Bristol, where he finished his career. He died April 4,1851. He was a true Christian pastor; he believed heartily, entirely. His sincerity, his thorough consecration to his work, was the true secret of his effective and useful ministry. In 1850 Mr. Hodges published a small volume of sermons. — Sprague, Annals, 6, 724.

## Hodge, Caspar Wistar, D.D[[@Headword:Hodge, Caspar Wistar, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister and educator, was born at Princeton, N.J., February 21, 1830, being a son of the late Charles Hodge. Graduating from Princeton College in 1848, and from the Seminary in 1853, he entered the pastorate and served until 1860, when he became professor of New Testament literature and Biblical Greek in Princeton Theological Seminary, serving until his death, September 28, 1891. He was the author of Apostolic History and Literature (1887): — and A Gospel History (1889).

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

             an eminent Presbyterian divine, was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, December 27, 1797, his father, Dr. Hugh Hodge, being an eminent physician of that city. Charles was fitted for college first at Somerville Academy, N.J., and at the age of fourteen entered Princeton, one year in advance, graduating with the highest honors in 1815. After another year of classical study, he entered the Theological Seminary at Princeton, and graduated in 1819. He was licensed by the Presbytery of Philadelphia, October 21, 1819, and during the following winter preached at the Falls of Schuylkill, the Philadelphia Arsenal, and Woodbury, N.J. Being received as a licentiate from the Presbytery of Philadelphia by that of New Brunswick, July 5, 1820 he was appointed the same year to supply the: churches of Georgetown and Lambertville for a number of Sabbaths during the following winter, and the next year "for Georgetown, as stated supply for one half his time during the ensuing six months;" also to supply  Lambertville and Trenton First Church during parts of the years from 1820 to 1823.

In May 1820, he became assistant instructor in the original languages of Scripture in the seminary, which position he held until 1822, and was then elected by the General Assembly to the professorship of Oriental and Biblical literature. At this time he founded the Biblical Repertory, to which was added the title of Princeton Review, in 1829. In 1825 he went to Europe, and spent three years in the universities of Paris, Halle, and Berlin, returning in 1829. Dr. Hodge, after this, devoted all his hours not required in seminary duties to the conduct of his magazine, which was already beginning to take rank among American periodicals, and also to studies and researches for A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, which was published in 1835. This work was abridged in 1836, and then rewritten and enlarged in 1866. In 1840 he published A Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, in two volumes.

In the same year he was transferred from the chair which he had filled for eighteen years, to that of exegetic and didactic theology, to which was united that of polemic theology, in 1851, when the incumbent, Dr. Alexander, died. In April 1872, his friends and pupils commemorated his semi-centennial as professor in Princeton, Seminary. Dr. Hodge was chosen moderator of the General Assembly-Old School in 1846. He died in Princeton, N.J., June 19, 1878. His works, published in addition to the above, were, Questions to the Epistle to the Romans (1842, 18mo): — The May of Life (18mo, published by the American Sunday-school Union; republished by the London Religious Tract Society, 1842): — What is Presbyterianism? (1856): — Commentary on Ephesians (N.Y. 1856, 8vo): — Commentary on First Corinthians (1857): — Commentary on Second Corinthians (1859): — Reviews and Essays Selected from the Princeton Review (ibid. 1857, 8vo): — Selections from the Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review (ibid. 8vo): — What is Darwinism? (1874).

During this time he was busily engaged in collecting materials for his Systematic Theology, and also in conducting the Review. It is said he contributed one fifth of all the articles published in that periodical. In 1872 the Review was united with the Presbyterian Quarterly and American Theological Review. The Systematic Theology, in three volumes, large octavo, is the work of his life, and by this his power is best demonstrated, and will be transmitted to posterity. It is published in Scotland and Germany, and in all the world where Christian theology is a subject of study this work is held in the highest esteem, as the best exhibition of that system of Calvinistic doctrine known as Princeton theology. As a writer on  theological, ethical, and ecclesiastical subjects, Dr. Hodge was easily at the head of all his contemporaries, and the distinguishing grace of his writings was their exquisite clearness. No one was at a loss to know what he believed and. what he intended to teach, and the authority on which he relied. His theology was Biblical. In the profoundest discussions, a text of Holy Scripture is a rock on which his structure of argument. rests. Therefore the rationalism of modern schools, infusing itself into his own. Church and the literature of the day, was to him a shame as well as a sin, and he resented and resisted it with tremendous energy and effect; his blows were those of a giant. No man has been more persistently abused than Dr. Hodge. He has been represented as the incarnation of bigotry. Those who could not answer his arguments or detect a flaw in his logic had to fall back on the. only weapon left in their artillery. No man was farther removed from intolerance, bigotry, and persecution, as all who knew him while living, and now revere and venerate him dead, know. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1879, page 9; Memorial Discourses, by Drs. Paxton and Boardman; Life, by Dr. A.A. Hodge (1880).

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

             a learned and respected English Presbyterian clergyman, was. educated at Taunton for the ministry, and had his first pastoral charge at Deal, Kent. He removed to Gloucester, where he preached for some years. In 1749 he accepted a call to the church at Crosby Square, London. His energies became enfeebled with age, church members died, and he resigned in 1762 and lived in retirement, preaching occasionally till he died, August 18, 1767. He bequeathed his valuable library to the Taunton Academy, where he was educated. He published a volume on The Evidences of Christianity, and several single Sermons. See Wilson, Dissenting Churches, 1:354.

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

             a Baptist minister, was born at Norton, Mass., May 19, 1806, and was a graduate of Waterville College in the class of 1830. He took the full course of study at the Newton Theological Institution (1830-33), and was licensed to preach by the Church at Canton, Mass. in April 1831. He was ordained at Weston, Nov. 18, 1835, and was pastor of the Church in that place four years (1835-39). He had pastorates of a shorter or longer duration at Amherst, Coleraine, Three Rivers, Palmer, East Brookfield, and North Oxford, all in Massachusetts, for fifteen years (1840-55). For six years (1855-61) he was an agent of the American and Foreign Bible Society. He died at Cambridge, Mass., Aug. 23,1863.

## Hodges, Richmond E[[@Headword:Hodges, Richmond E]]

             a minister of the Church of England, was born in 1836; "'When an apprentice in London, Mr. Hodges found an old Hebrew grammar, which fascinated his mind, and made him determine to become a Shemitic scholar. The result was that, after acting as scripture-reader for a short time, he was sent, by the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, first to Palestine, then to Algeria, where he stayed until 1865. A few years afterwards he resigned his connection with the society, in order to devote himself more fully to linguistic studies. For some time he was a minister of  the Reformed Episcopal Church, but a few years before his death he was ordained a clergyman of the Established Church of England. He died May 9, 1881. Mr. Hodges published Ancient Egypt (1861); in 1863 he brought out a new and revised edition of Craik's Principia Hebraica; in 1876 he published a new edition of Cory's Ancient Fragments, and at the time of his death he was engaged upon An English Version of the Armenian History of Moses of Khorene. He also assisted in the Old-Test. portion of the work known as The Holy Bible in Paragraphs and Sections, with Emendations of the Text, and contributed largely to the Encyclopedia Britannica, and to the supplement to the English Encyclopedia. (B.P.)

## Hodges, Walter, D.D[[@Headword:Hodges, Walter, D.D]]

             a clergyman of the Hutchinsonian school and provost of Oriel College, Oxford, flourished about the middle of the last century. He provoked a great deal of attention by his Elihu, or an Inquiry into the principal Scope and Design of the Book of Job (London, 1750, 4to; 1751, 8vo; 3rd ed. 1756; 12mo and others), in which he endeavored to show that Elihu is the Son of God, a discovery which he supposed would throw great light on the book of Job, and solve the controversies respecting the doctrines which have been agitated thereupon. He wrote also The Christian Plan (2nd edit., with additions, and with other theological pieces, London, 1775, 8vo), a no less curious work than the one above mentioned, though it failed to produce so much sensation. “The whole meaning and extent of the Christian plan he represents as embodied, according to his interpretation, in the Hebrew Elohim.” The other theological pieces in the addenda of this work are on the historical account of David's life; and on Sheol, or concerning the Place of departed Souls between the Time of their Dissolution and the general Resurrection; also, Oratio habita in domo convocationis. — Kitto, Cyclop. 2, 317; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 1, 1504; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 857.

## Hodgson, Bernard, LL.D[[@Headword:Hodgson, Bernard, LL.D]]

             principal of Hertford College, is the author of Solomon's Song, translated from the Hebrew (Oxford, 1785, 4to), in which his chief design has been to give as literal a rendering of the original as possible. Also, The Proverbs o ‘Solomon, translated from the Hebrew, with Notes (Oxford, 1788, 4to) Ecclesiastes, a new translation from the original Hebrew (Oxford, 1791,  4to). The notes are few in number, and are principally devoted to verbal criticism. — Kitto, Cyclopaedia, 2, 317.

## Hodgson, Francis, D.D[[@Headword:Hodgson, Francis, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born of Wesleyan parents, in Driffield, England, February 13, 1805. He sailed to the United States in his youth, and with his parents settled in West Chester, Pennsylvania, where he developed a noble manhood. He entered the Philadelphia Conference in 1828, and served consecutively, Dauphin Circuit; Elkton, Maryland; St. George's, Philadelphia; Harrisburg Circuit; and Columbia. In 1836 he was transferred to the New York Conference, and stationed at Vestry Street charge: afterwards at Mulberry Street, Middletown; Hartford; and New Haven. In 1845 he received a retransfer to the Philadelphia Conference, and was sent to Trinity charge, Philadelphia; afterwards at Salem, Pennsylvania; Harrisburg; St. Paul's, Wilmington, Delaware; St. George's, Philadelphia; Union; Lancaster, Pennsylvania; South Philadelphia District; Fifth Street, Philadelphia; and Salem, Pennsylvania. He was transferred to the Central Pennsylvania Conference in 1868, and stationed successively at Danville, Lewisburg, and Chambersburg. A superannuated relation was granted him in 1876 with the Philadelphia Conference, and he retired to that city, where he died, April 16, 1877. Dr. Hodgson was a persuasive orator, a successful preacher, a profound theologian, and a skilful polemic, as well as a man of deep piety and unwavering devotedness to the Church. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1878, page 75; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

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

             was dean of Carlisle in 1820, but the date of his birth is not known. He published mainly his sermons (London, 1803-42), and edited the works of his uncle, bishop Porteus, of London, with his life (Lond. 1816, 6 vols. 8vo), of whom he also published a biography (Lond. 1811, 8vo). He died in 1844. — Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 858.

## Hodheilids[[@Headword:Hodheilids]]

             an heretical sect of the Mohammedans, who believe that the saints live' in Paradise in an undisturbed quiet. SEE MOHAMMEDANISM.

## Hodiah[[@Headword:Hodiah]]

             (הוֹדַיָּה, the same as Hodijah [q.v.]), the wife of Mered (Sept. ἣ Ι᾿δουία; Alex. MS. Ι᾿ουδαία), and the mother of Jered, and Heber, and Jekuthiel (1Ch 4:19), the same who is called JEHUDIJAH (הִיְּהֻדַיָּה, the Jewess, i.e. his Jewish wife, as distinguished from Bithiah, who was an Egyptian) in the former part of the verse.

## Hodijah[[@Headword:Hodijah]]

             (Heb. Hodiyah', הוֹדַיָּה, majesty of Jehovah; Sept. ᾿Ωδουία, ᾿Ωδουίας, ᾿Ωδούα, ᾿Ωδουϊvα), the name of at least two men.

1. One of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the law to the people (Neh 8:7; Neh 9:5),.and subscribed Nehemiah's covenant (10:18; his name is apparently repeated in Neh 9:13). B.C. cir. 410.

2. One of the chief Israelites who subscribed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:18). B.C. cir. 410.

3. SEE JEHUDIJAH.

## Hodshi[[@Headword:Hodshi]]

             SEE TAHTIM-HODSHI.

## Hodur (or Hoeder)[[@Headword:Hodur (or Hoeder)]]

             in Norse mythology, was a very powerful god of the Asas, but blind; the son of Odin and Frigga, therefore Baldur's brother. The latter having been made invulnerable by his mother. Loke showed the blind Hodur the small  plant mistletoe, which the latter threw at Baldur, who died. and was taken to Hel in the infernal regions. A third son of Odin avenged Baldur's death, by slaying Hodur and sending him to Hel. Hodur and Baldur remain good friends, because the former committed the injury involuntarily.

## Hody, Humphry, D.D[[@Headword:Hody, Humphry, D.D]]

             an English divine, was born Jan. 1, 1659, at Oldcombe, Somersetshire, and was educated at the University of Oxford. In 1684 he was elected a fellow of Wadham College, and in the same year he published a Dissertatio contra Historiam- Aristeae de LXX Interpretibus. Hody became principally known by his publications respecting the bishops who had been deprived of their bishoprics during the reign of William and Mary for refusing the oath of allegiance. The first work which he published on this subject was a translation of a Greek treatise, supposed to have been written by Nicephorus in the latter end of the 13th or the beginning of the 14th century, in which the writer maintains that “although a bishop was unjustly deprived, neither he nor the Church ever made a separation, if the successor was not a heretic.” The original Greek work, as well as the English translation, were both published in 1691. Dodwell replied to it in A Vindication of the Deprived Bishops (Lond. 1692). In the following year Hody published The Case of Sees Vacant by an Uncanonical Deprivation (Lond. 1693, 4to), in which he replies to the arguments of his opponents. These exertions of Hody in favor of the ruling party in the Church did not pass unrewarded. He was appointed domestic chaplain to Tillotson, archbishop of Canterbury, which office he also held under Tillotson's successor. He was presented with a living in London, and was appointed regius professor of Greek at Oxford in 1698, and archdeacon of Oxford in 1704. He died Jan. 20,1706. He founded ten scholarships at Wadham College in order to promote the study of the Greek and Hebrew languages. Of the other works of Hody, the most important are: 1. De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus, versionibus Graecis et Latina Vulgata, libri 4 (Oxford, 1704, folio), which is said by Bishop Marsh to be “the classical work on the Septuagint.” The first book contains the dissertation against the history of Aristeas, which has been mentioned above. The second — gives an account of the real translators of the Septuagint, and of the time when the translation was made. The third book gives a history of the Hebrew text and of the Latin Vulgate; and the fourth, of the other ancient Greek versions: —

2. The Resurrection of the (same) Body Asserted (Lond. 1694,8vo): —

3. Animadversions on two Pamphlets lately published by Mr. Collier (Lond. 1696, 8vo). Sir W. Perkins and Sir J. Friend had been executed in  1695 for treason against the government; but previous to their execution they had been absolved of their crime by some nonjuring clergymen. This act was condemned by the ecclesiastical authorities, but was justified by Collier in two pamphlets which he published on the subject: —

4. De Graecis Illustribus linguae Graecae litteraruque humaniorum instauratoribus (Lond. 1742). This work was published several years after the author's death by Dr. Jebb, who has prefixed to it an account of Hody's life and writings. See English Cyclopaedia; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 858; Hook, Eccles. Biography, 6:104; Kitto, Cyclop. 2, 317.

## Hoefel[[@Headword:Hoefel]]

             SEE HOFEI.

## Hoefling[[@Headword:Hoefling]]

             SEE HOFLING.

## Hoek, Jan Van[[@Headword:Hoek, Jan Van]]

             an eminent Flemish painter, born at Antwerp in 1597, was instructed in the school of Rubens, and became one of his most distinguished scholars. On returning to Flanders he was invited to Vienna by Ferdinand II, and painted the portraits of the imperial family, and some historical works for the churches and public edifices. Among his historical works is a picture of the Deposition from the Cross, in the Church of Our Lady, at Mechlin, highly commended. He died at Antwerp in 1650. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Hoeke, Peter Van[[@Headword:Hoeke, Peter Van]]

             a Protestant preacher at Leyden, who lived at the beginning of the 18th century, is the author of, Uytlegging vatn het Breef ande Hebreyen (Leyvden, 1693): — Uytlegging von het Boeck Jobs (1697): — Uytlegging over de Prophetam Nahum, Habakuk, Zephania, Haggai, Zacharia en Malctlchia (1709): —Lucubrationes in Catechismun Palatinum (1711): — Straets der goddelike Waerheden (1718). See Winrer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:266; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.).

## Hoel[[@Headword:Hoel]]

             bishop of Mans in the 13th century, made himself quite conspicuous by the part which he took for the English in the revolt of the nobility of Mans against them after the death of William the Conqueror. He suffered imprisonment, and after the accession of Hugo was even obliged to seek a refuge in England. But we find him again at Mans in 1092, and an attendant at the councils of Saumur (1094) and Brives. Later he traveled for a time with pone Urban II. He died July 28, 1096. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 859. (J. H. W.)

## Hoes, Cantine Farrell, D.D[[@Headword:Hoes, Cantine Farrell, D.D]]

             a Reformed (Dutch) minister, was born at Middleburgh, N.Y., July 13, 1811. He graduated from Amherst College in 1832, studied two years in Princeton Theological Seminary, was licensed to preach in 1834, became pastor at Chittenango, N.Y., in 1836, at Ithaca in 1837, at Kingston in 1845, resigned in 1867, and died at the last named place, February 9, 1883. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1883, page 29.

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

             an eminent Greek scholar, born at Augsburg in 1556, was professor at St. Anne's College, and, later, the librarian of his native city. He died Oct. 30, 1617. He deserves a notice here on account of his valuable editions of some of the Greek fathers, and of a number of Greek authors who have written in the department of Christian antiquity and ecclesiastical history. — Bayle, Hist. Dict. 3, 478.

## Hoeven[[@Headword:Hoeven]]

             [pronounced Hoovn], Abraham (Des Amorie) van der a celebrated Dutch preacher, born at Rotterdam in 1798, was for a time professor at the seminary of the Remonstrants at Amsterdam, and later professor at Utrecht. He died July 1855. Hoeven wrote De Joanne Clerico et Philippo a Limborch (Amst. 1843). — Pierer, Universal-Lex. 8, 435.

## Hofacker, Ludwig[[@Headword:Hofacker, Ludwig]]

             a German divine and celebrated preacher, born at Wildbad April 15,1798, and educated at the University of Tübingen. While here he became very zealous for the cause of religion; and especially endeavored to encourage the study of the Bible among his fellow students. He formed Bible-classes which were largely attended; and his intimate acquaintance with the works  of the orthodox commentators Bengel, Oetinger, and Steinhofer rendered him especial service in his sermons, which he frequently delivered at this time, always extemporaneously. After filling the vicariates of Stettin and Plieningen, he was appointed assistant to his father, preacher at St. Leonard's, in Stuttgardt. He was now only 28 years old, but his sermons attracted general attention, especially on account of his earnestness and piety. In 1826, after the death of his father, he was sent to Rielingshausen, near Marbach. It is said that his audience was composed not only of his own congregation, but that strangers came from afar to hear the young preacher. In the fall of 1827, urged by his admirers and many friends, he began the publication of some of his sermons: Predigten (1827; 27th ed. 1866). The rapid sale of these was really surprising. An edition of 1500 was exhausted almost immediately after publication. His sudden death, November 18, 1828, incited his friends to a publication of all his sermons., They have now been spread abroad in more than 100,000 copies, not only in Germany, but also in translations in France, England, Denmark, Sweden, Russia, and our own country. Speaking of his ability, Knapp (Leben v. L. Hofacker, Heidelb. 1852) says that he was the greatest and most powerful preacher of the Würtemberg Church in this century. This opinion was confirmed by the celebrated F. W. Krummacher “The Suabian Land lost in him its most powerful preacher” (in his Autobiography, transl. by Easton, p. 207). A prayer book, compiled from posthumous works of Hofacker and from his sermons (Erbauungs und Gebetbltch fjr alle Tage, Stuttgard), appeared in 1869. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 19, 646 sq.

## Hofacker, Wilhelm[[@Headword:Hofacker, Wilhelm]]

             a younger brother of Ludwig (q.v.), and, like him. a celebrated preacher of the Würtemberg Church, was born February 16, 1805. In 1828 he became assistant to his brother, who was then in failing health. After his decease he traveled through Northern Germany on a literary tour. From 1830-1833 he delivered lectures at the University of Tübingen on Dogmatics, based on the work of Nitzsch, pursuing himself at the same time a course of study. In 1833 he was appointed at Waiblingen, and in January 1836, at St. Leonard's, in Stuttgardt, a church which his father and elder brother had served before him. Here he died, August 10, 1848. Like his brother, he was an earnest servant of the Church of Christ, and a regular attendant at the Bible and Missionary meetings of the University students while at Tübingen, where he also was educated. He was a zealous defender of the orthodox doctrine of the divinity of Christ, asserting that modem science is  more in harmony with the Christian doctrine of the orthodox Church than with the speculative theology of the Hegel-Strauss school. He published, besides a number of polemical articles in different theological periodicals, Tropfiein aus der Lebensquelle (Stuttg. 1863 and 1864), and Predigten für alle Sonn und Festtage (ib. 1853). Of his sermons nine editions have already been published. They contain a short biography written by Kapff, a German preacher, one of Hofacker's associates at Tübingen University. See Knapp, Leben von L. Hofacker; Hartmann, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 19, 649 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Hofel, Johann[[@Headword:Hofel, Johann]]

             a German lawyer, born at Uffenheim in 1600, and educated at the universities of Strasburg, Giessen, and Jena, deserves mention here on account of his Musica Christiana (1634), and Historisches Gesangbuch (Schleusingen, 1681). He died in 1683.Pierer, Univers. Lex. 8, 440.

## Hofer, Joseph Anton[[@Headword:Hofer, Joseph Anton]]

             a German Roman Catholic priest, born at Kastelruth May 19, 1742, was educated at the University of Innspruck. In 1765 he was made priest, in 1722 professor of rhetoric and prefect of the Gymnasium at Brix, and in 1776 professor of ecclesiastical law; here he remained, with an interruption of four years only, which he spent at Innspruck, until the discontinuance of the school in 1807, when he was pensioned, retaining, however, the title of an ecclesiastical councilor (Rath) of the government. He died in 1820. Hofer contributed several articles to periodical literature. Of his published works, Conspectus Juris eccles. publici (Brixen, 1781, 4to) entitles him to a position in theological literature. Hofer published several sermons which are of superior merit. Of these the following are perhaps the best: Ermahnungsrede am Titularfeste Mariä (ib. 1793, 8vo): — Kunstgriffe frommer Eltern z. Erziehung wohlgesitt. Kinder (ib. 1794, 8vo): — Untrügliches Kennzeichen d. sittlich. Aufersteh. (ibid. 1798, 8vo). — Döring, Gelehrten Theolog. Deutschl. 1, 746.

## Hoff, John Francis, D.D[[@Headword:Hoff, John Francis, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, January 10, 1814. He graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 1833, and from the General Theological Seminary, N.Y., in 1836; was ordained deacon in 1837, became rector of Trinity Church, Georgetown,  D.C., in 1838, of Christ Church, Millwood, Virginia, in 1847, of Trinity Church, Towsonton, Maryland, in 1858, and died in Baltimore, December 18, 1881. He served twelve years on the standing committee of his diocese.

## Hoff, Ludwig Johannes[[@Headword:Hoff, Ludwig Johannes]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born December 29, 1795, at Laage, Mecklenburg-Schwerin. In 1819 he entered the missionary college of Rev. J. Jatnicke, at Berlin, and in 1821 connected himself with the London Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Jews. In 1822 he was sent as missionary to Poland, and was ordained in 1824. In, 1841 Hoff was stationed at Cracow, and died April 28, 1851, a faithful servant, who for, nearly thirty-two years had been active and most laborious missionary among the Jews. (B.P.) Hoffmanists. SEE HOFFMANN, DANIEL.

## Hoffbauer, Clemens Maria[[@Headword:Hoffbauer, Clemens Maria]]

             a Roman Catholic, and the first Redemptorist (q.v.) in Germany, was born at Tasswitz, in Moravia, Sept. 26, 1751. His parents had intended him for the ministry, but the sudden death of his father left his mother in destitute circumstances, and at the age of fifteen Hoffbauer was apprenticed to a  baker. While engaged in his trade he studied Latin, and passed an examination in the lower class of a monastery school, determined to become a priest at some future time, if possible. The bishop of Tivoli (later Pius VII) finally took him under his protection, and Hoffbauer succeeded in making his way to Vienna, where he studied at the university. In 1783 he went to Rome, whither he had journeyed already twelve times, and joined the congregation of the Redemptorists. Two years later, after consecration to the priesthood, he returned to Vienna, and then to Warsaw, where a house and a church of St. Benno were placed at his disposal.. From this he and his associates afterwards bore the name of Bennonites. The success of the Redemptorists in the establishment of a monastery at-this place was so great that Pius VI, in 1791, decided to give them an annual support of 100 scudi. The Roman Catholics assert that many Protestants became converts of Hoffbauer, and that their confidence in him and his brothers of the monastery was unbounded. While the latter may be possible, the former is surely improbable. The effect of the French Revolution may have led some disturbing minds to join the ranks of the Roman Catholics, because many of that Church had taken such a peculiar attitude in France against true Christianity. Later Hoffbauer also established a monastery in Switzerland. Here he and his followers suffered great persecution, which, while it is possible that the disturbed state of the people gave rise to it, is more likely to have been provoked by Hoffbauer and his followers. This last supposition receives additional strength from the dealings of Napoleon while in Prussia. He imprisoned them one entire month in the fortress of Küstrin, and, after a search of their papers, demolished the monastery and discontinued the order. Some time later Hoffbauer succeeded in establishing an educational institution at Vienna, which had been presented to the Redemptorists by a converted (?) Protestant. In 1815 he went to Bulgaria, and returned to Vienna in 1818, where the government (Roman Catholic) ordered him from the country. The intercession of the clergy influenced the emperor not only to annul the order of the government, but to establish even a monastery at Vienna under his own protection. Hoffbauer died suddenly March 25, 1820. In his labors he was assisted by J. T. Hibel, who died in 1807. Initial steps have been taken for his beatification (q.v.). See Posl, Derste deutsche Redemptorist, in s. Leben und Wirken (Reg. 1844); S. Brunner, H. und seine Zeit (Vienna, 1850); Real-Encyklop. f. d. Kathol. Deutschl. 5, 413 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Hoffeditz, Theodore L., D.D[[@Headword:Hoffeditz, Theodore L., D.D]]

             a German Reformed minister, was born near Carhshaven, on the Weser, Germany, December 16,1783. He emigrated to America in 1807. He first followed the calling of a schoolteacher. Subsequently he studied theology with Rev. Samuel Helfenstein, D.D., in Philadelphia. He was licensed and ordained in 1813, and became pastor of German Reformed congregations in Northampton County, Pa., and served this charge during the remainder of his life, with the exception of brief intervals, during which he served numerous congregations which he organized in neighboring counties. In 1843 he, with Rev. Dr. Schneck, visited Germany, bearing a call from the Synod of the German Reformed Church to Dr. Krummacher to become professor of theology in the seminary at Mercersburg. He died July 10, 1858. Mild, warm-hearted, and zealous, Dr. Hoffeditz exerted a wide and blessed influence in the Church. One of his sons entered the ministry.

## Hoffmann (or Hofmann), Melchior[[@Headword:Hoffmann (or Hofmann), Melchior]]

             one of the most celebrated Anabaptist (q.v.) prophets, born at Hall, in Suabia, originally a furrier, went to Livonia about the time of the Reformation, and became a Protestant. His enthusiasm for the cause of the  Protestants led him to preach at Wolmar. On account of the great opposition which he there encountered, he went to Dorpat, where the opposition against him was no less great, and he became so embittered against the Roman Catholic priests that he sought to influence the people in favor of destroying all paintings in churches, and all monasteries. This course estranged from him even his own friends, and he left in 1525 for Wittenberg to consult with Luther and Bugenhagen, who encouraged him to return to Dorpat, admonishing his friends, at the same time, to harmonious action. But his success was no better than before, and he soon after left for Reval. Later we find him at Stockholm. In 1527 the king of Denmark appointed him preacher at Kiel, but his determination to explain the Bible apocalyptically, and his deviation from the Lutheran doctrine of the sacraments, made Luther and his followers opponents of Hoffmann, and, after a stay of only two years, a conference to examine his doctrines was appointed. He was condemned for heresy, deposed from his position, and ordered to leave the country. He now went to Strasburg, and next to Emden, where he allied himself with the Anabaptists, and soon became one of their principal leaders. At the latter place he so infatuated his followers that they took him for the prophet Elias, and announced the Day of Judgment as coming in 1536. From Emden he returned to Strasburg, but the disturbances which he provoked occasioned the calling of a synod (June, 1533), which condemned him and caused his imprisonment. He died in prison in 1542.

On the person of Christ. Hoffmann, with many other Anabaptists, and like the Valentinians of the early ages, held that our Lord's birth was a mere phantom, laying great stress upon ἐγένετο (Joh 1:14); that the Logos did not merely assume our nature, but he became flesh — hence his blasphemous expression, “Maledicta sit caro Mariae” (Smith's Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, 2, 349; comp. also Tuchsel, p. 34, 35). On the Eucharist he differed, as we have already stated, from Luther in his doctrine of the real (spiritual) presence, holding that the bodily bread is a seal, sign, and token in memory of the body; the body, however, is received in the word by an unwavering faith in our heart; the word is spirit and life; the word is Christ, and is partaken of by faith. Thus he thought it possible, while considering the bread only as a symbol, to adhere to the symbol of the real spiritual presence of Christ. The followers of Hoffmann, who took the name of their leader, flourished for a short time after his death near Strasburg and Lower Germany, but finally joined the other Anabaptist sects, from which Hoffmann, while alive, had kept distinct. Fuhrmann (Handwörterb d. christl. Religions ü.  Kirchengesch. 2, 325) says that a number of this sect went to England in 1535, and that there also they suffered greatly from persecutions; twenty- two of them were even imprisoned. Under Edward VI. (1548) they fared somewhat better, but after Mary's accession to the throne they were obliged to flee the country. Under the reign of Elizabeth they again ventured to reside in England, but in 1560 they were finally banished the country. A full account of Hoffimann and his sects is given by Krohn, Gesch. d. fanat. u. enthus. Wiedert'ufer in Niederdeutschland (Lpz. 1758, 8vo, containing, also, a complete list of the writings of Hoffmann, which were mainly apocalyptical); Herrmann, Sur la vie et les ecrits de M. H. (Strasburg, 1858). See also Schröckh, Kirchengesch. s. d. Reformat. 4, 442 sq.; Cunitz, in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. 6, 191 sq.; Bayle, Histor. Dict. 2, 480; Niedner, Lehrb. d. Kirchengesch. p. 64; Möller, Cimbria litterata, 2, 347 sq.; Rihrich, in Zeitschr. f. histor. Theol. (1860, p. 3 sq.); Gass, Gesch. d. Dogmat. 2, 73; Baumgarten-Crusius, Dogmengesch. p. 628. (J. H.W.)

## Hoffmann, Andreas Gottlieb[[@Headword:Hoffmann, Andreas Gottlieb]]

             a very distinguished theologian and Orientalist, born April 13, 1796, at Welbsleben, near Magdeburg, was educated at the University of Halle where the influence of Gesenius led him to a thorough study of the Shemitic languages, especially the Syriac. After graduation he lectured at his alma mater for a short time on the Arabic language and in 1822 was called as extraordinary professor to Jena. Here he was advanced to the regular professorship in 1826, with the degree of S.T.D. and membership in the theological faculty. At the time of his death, March 16, 1864, he was senior of the theological faculty and of the senate of the university. As a professor at Jena he devoted himself mainly to the philological department of theology. His most popular lectures were on Hebrew Antiquities; but, like Gesenius, he lectured also on Church History, Isagogics, both of the Old and New Testament, Exegesis of the Old Testament, and on all the Shemitic and Eastern languages generally studied at a German university. In philology, his Grammatica Syriaca (Hal. 1827; translated into English by Day and Cowper) is by some of the best authorities considered superior to any other yet published, that of Ullmann included. Among his other works are Entwurfd. hebr. Alterthümer (Weim. 1832), which is based on the work of Warnekros (Weim. 1782 and 1794): — Commentarius phil. crit. in Mosis benedictionem (in pamphlet form, Halle; later, Jena, 1822, etc.): — Apokalyptiker d. alt. Zeit unter Juden und Christen (Jena, 1833- 38, vol. 1, part 1 and 2, containing the book of Enoch). Hoffmann was also  editor of the second section of the great Encyclopaedia of Ersch und Gruber. In addition to these literary labors; he contributed largely to the German theological and philological periodicals. — Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 19, 651; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 899; Brockhaus, Conversat. — Lex. 5, 20. (J. H.W.)

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

             (better known as Hoffmann von Fallersleben), a German theologian, was born at Fallersleben, Luneburg, April 2, 1798. After studying at Gottingen  and Bonn, he devoted himself at first to theology, but afterwards betook himself entirely to the history of literature. He died January 20, 1874. Hoffmann edited, in connection with Endlicher, Fragmenta Theotisca Versionis Antiquissimae Ev. S. Matthaei et Aliquot Homiliarum (Vienna, 1834): — Williram's Uebersetzung und Auslegung des Hohenliedes (Breslau, 1827): — Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes bis auf Luther's Zeit (1832; 3d ed. 1861): — Ringwaldt und Benj. Schmolcke (1833). See Winer, Handbuch der deutschen, Lit. 1:67; 2:287, 288; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:569. (B.P.)

## Hoffmann, Daniel[[@Headword:Hoffmann, Daniel]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born at Halle 1540, and educated at the University of Jena. In 1576 he was made professor of theology at the University of Helmstadt. In the theological controversies of his day he took an active part, contending against the Calvinistic theory of the sacraments, predestination, and also against the doctrine of Ubiquity (q.v.) as held by his own Church. He decried philosophy as hurtful both to religion and to the community, attempting to sustain his position by extracts from the Pauline epistles and the writings of Luther himself, who, as is well known, did in his earlier years hold that there is a contradiction between the truths of theology and those of philosophy. In his later years Luther radically changed his views. Hoffmann was attacked by the two great Aristotelian philosophers, Caselius and Martini, who also complained of him at the university. The duke of Brunswick, after consulting the University of Rostock, obliged Hoffmann to retract, and vacate his chair at the university. He died at Wolfenbüttel in 1611. His followers, on account of their adherence to a twofold doctrine, were called duplicists, and their opponents simplicists. His controversial writings are numerous, as De duplici veritate Lutheri a philosophis impugynata (Magdeb. 1600): — Super quaestione, num syllogismus rationis locum habeat in regno fidez (ibid. 1606). An account of his disputes may be, found in Thomasius, De Controversia Hoffmanniana (Erlangen, 1844, 8vo) Halleus Impietatis Hoffmannianae (Frankf. 1604). See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 185 sq.; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. 17 pt. 2, chap. 1, § 10; Enfield, Hist. of Philos. 2, 506; Gass, Gesch. d. Dogmat. 2, 73 sq.; Bayle, Hist. Dict. 3, 478 sq.; Krug, Philos. Lex. 5, 531 sq.; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. s. d. Reform. 4, 159-61. See HUNNIUS.

## Hoffmann, Gottfried[[@Headword:Hoffmann, Gottfried]]

             born at Plagwitz, in Silesia, in 1678, studied at Leipzig, and was rector of the gymnasia at Lauban and Zittau. He died in 1712. His name is mentioned here on account of his contributions to hymnology, as  Leichengesange (Laub. 1704): — uszlieder (ib. 1705). — Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8, 442.

## Hoffmann, Heinrich[[@Headword:Hoffmann, Heinrich]]

             a German preacher of the 17th century at Masko, in Finland, was associated with other divines in translating the Bible into the Finnish language, published at Stockholm (1642, fol. and 1658). — Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8, 447.

## Hoffmann, Immanuel[[@Headword:Hoffmann, Immanuel]]

             born at Tübingen April 16,1710, was appointed archdeacon of Tübingen in 1741, and in 1756 professor of Greek in the university of the same place. He died in 1772. Hoffmann published a number of dissertations; of these, the following are considered the best: Diss. in Oraculum Rom 10:5-8 (Tüb. 1752,4to): — Diss. de stilo Apostoli Pauli (1757): — Diss. in loca parallela, 2 Pet. 2, 4-17; Jud 1:5-13 (1762, 4to): — Commentatio in 1Co 1:19-21 (1766, 4to). He wrote also, but left unpublished, Demonstratio Evangelica per ipsum scripturarum consensum in oraculis ex Vetere Testamento in Novo allegatis declarata, partes 3 (Tübingen, 1773-82, 4to). T. G. Hegelmaier, who edited this work after the decease of the author, prefixed to it a life of Hoffmann, an ana excursus on the right method of interpreting the quotations made from the O.T. in the New. Orme speaks of this work as “full of learning, and in general very judicious.” — Kitto, Bib. Cyclop. 2, 318.

## Hoffmann, Johann[[@Headword:Hoffmann, Johann]]

             a distinguished German theologian, was born at Schweidnitz. The date of his birth is not known. He was for a time professor of theology at the University of Prague. In 1409 he and Otto of Münsterberg went to Leipzig, and induced many students to accompany them. They thus contributed to the founding of the Leipzig University. At first he was one of its professors, but in 1414 he was made bishop of Meissen. He died there in 1451. — Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8, 441.

## Hoffmann, Ludwig Friedrich Wilhelm[[@Headword:Hoffmann, Ludwig Friedrich Wilhelm]]

             general superintendent of Brandenburg, was born October 30, 1806, in Leonberg, Wurtemberg. His father was the founder of the religious colony at Kornthal (1819), and his brother, Christoph, was the originator of a movement for the colonization of Palestine. Hoffmann studied at Tubingen, where David Strauss was his fellow-student; was in 1829 vicar at Heumaden, near Stuttgart, in 1834 at Stuttgart, and accepted, in 1839, a call to Basle as inspector of the Mission Institute. He remained there for twelve years, giving himself up with great enthusiasm to his duties and to the study of the history of missions. During this period he published, Missionsstunden und Vortrage (Stuttgart, 1847, 1851, 1853): — Missionsfragen (Heidelberg, 1847): — Die Epochen der Kirchengeschichte Indien's (1853): — Die christl. Literatur als Werkzeug der Mission (eod.). From Basle he passed to Tubingen as professor; and, in  1852, he accepted the call of Frederick William, IV as courtpreacher to Berlin. He exerted a greater influence over the king of Prussia than any other man, in favor of ecclesiastical union. Hoffmann was an indefatigable worker, and was very influential as an evangelical preacher, sympathizing with the theology of Bengel. He died August 28, 1873. He published a number of volumes of sermons under the title, Ruf zum Herrn (Berlin, 1854-58, 8 volumes), and Ein Jahr der Gnade in Christo (1864): — Die Posaune Deutschlands (1861-63): — Die gottliche Stufenordsung im Alten Testamsent (1854). He also contributed largely to the first edition of Herzog, etc. See Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:572 sq.; Leben und Wirken des Dr. L. Fr. W. Hoffmann (Berlin, 1878, written by his son Karl). (B.P.)

## Hoffmann, Pranz[[@Headword:Hoffmann, Pranz]]

             a Roman Catholic philosopher of Germany, was born at Aschaffenburg, January 19, 1804. He studied at Munich, was in 1834 professor of philosophy at Amberg, in 1835 at Wurzburg, and died October 22, 1881. He published, Vorhalle zur spekulativen Lehre Buaader's (Aschaffenburg, 1836): — Spekulative Entwickelung der ewigen Selbsterzeugung Gottes, aus Franz von Baader's samimtlichen Schriftens zusammengestellt (Amberg, 1835): — Baader's sammtliche Werke (Leipsic, 1851-60, 16 volumes): — Grundriss der allgeneinen reinen Logik (2d ed. Wurzburg, 1855): — Baader's Blitzstrahl wider Rom (2d ed. 1871): — Kirche und Staat (1872): — Philosophische Schriften (Erlangen, 1867-81, 8 volumes). Hoffmann, as a former pupil of Baader, contributed greatly towards propagating his master's philosophy. (B.P.)

## Hoffmannites[[@Headword:Hoffmannites]]

             SEE HOFFMANN, MELCHIOR.

## Hoffmeier, John Henry[[@Headword:Hoffmeier, John Henry]]

             a minister of the German Reformed Church, born at Anhalt-Cöhten, Germany, March 17, 1760, was educated at the University of Halle. He spent some time as private tutor in Hamburg; then went to Bremen, where he preached a short time, and finally emigrated to America in 179a Here he became pastor of several German Reformed congregations in Northampton County, Pa. In 1806 he was called to Lancaster, Pa., where he continued to labor till 1331. He was able to preach only in German; and, the English language being needed in his charge, he retired from the active duties of the ministry. He died March 18, 1838. Well educated and diligent in his. work, he was a successful minister. Two of his sons and three of his grandsons also devoted themselves to the ministry.

## Hofmann, Johann Christian Konrad[[@Headword:Hofmann, Johann Christian Konrad]]

             (afterwards honored by Bavaria with the title von Hofmann), a German theologian, was born December 21, 1810, at Nuremberg. He studied at Erlangen, where the Reformed theologian, Krafft, exercised a lasting influence on Hofmann. From Erlangen he went to Berlin in 1829, at a time when Hegel, Schleiermacher, Neander, and Heng stenberg were lecturing. After teaching several years at the gymnasium in Erlangen, he became repetent at the university, and now devoted himself exclusively to theology. Thus he writes in 1835, "The more I occupy myself with Scripture exegesis, the more powerfully am I convinced of the certainty that the divine Word is one single work, and the more am I stimulated with the glad hope that our generation will witness the victory of the truth of inspiration. It is especially the wonderful unity of history and doctrine, which becomes clearer and clearer to me.

The whole Old-Test. prophecy is but a seeing of the deepest signification of historical events and conditions.... It is a sheer impossibility that the prophecies of the prophets and apostles are false, while their doctrines are true; for here form and contents, fact and doctrine, are one, which is the distinguishing characteristic of revealed truth.... I pray God to permit me to see the Christ, now crucified by his enemies, lifted up by himself, that I may place my hands in the print of the nails, and may know him in the glory of his victory, whom I have heretofore loved in the humility of his conflict and suffering." In 1838 he commenced his academical career, and presented as his dissertation, De Argumento Psalmi Centesimi Decimi, in which he makes David the author of that psalm, but denies the common Messianic  interpretation, by referring the psalm to the angel of Jehovah. In the year 1841 he was made professor, and published the first part of his famous work, Weissagung und Erfullung. In 1842 he accepted a call to Rostock, but returned to Erlangen in 1845. His return to the latter place marked a new period of prosperity for the university, to which he devoted all his energies. He died December 20, 1877. Hofmann took not only a deep interest in ecclesiastical matters, but also in political affairs, and was for several sessions a member of the Bavarian Parliament. Among Hofmann's first publications were some historical works, Geschichte des Ausfsuhrs in den Sevennen unter Ludwig XIV (1837): — Lehrbuch der Weltgeschichte fur Gymnasien (1839; 2d ed. 1843): — De Bellis ab Antiocho Epiphane Adversus Ptolemaeos Gestis (1835).

His first effort in theology was Die siebenzig Jahre des Jeremias und die siebenzig Jahrwochen des Daniel (Nuremberg, 1836). Concerning this latter work he wrote to a friend: "If I am correct, I cause a great revolution in the Assyrian, Chaldaean, Egyptian, and Israelitish chronology. Jerusalem was destroyed in 605 B.C.; the seventy years of the Captivity go from 605 to 535, the sixty-two weeks of Daniel (7 X 62 = 434) from 605 to 171, the sixty-third from 171 to 164. Thus the results of both investigations which I made independently from each other, agree most harmoniously with each other." Weissagung und Erfullung im alten und neuen Testament (1841-44) appeared at a time when two views of prophecy prevailed; criticism explained it away as presentiment, Hengstenberg petrified it into simple prediction. Hofmann brought prophecy into closest connection with history, and treated it as an organic whole. History itself is prophecy; each period contains the germ of the future, and prefigures it. Thus the entire sacred history, in all its essential developments, is a prophecy of the final and eternal relation between God and man.

The incarnation of Christ marks the beginning of the essential fulfillment; for the head is only the realization of the intended perfect communion with God, when it is joined with the body of believers. The word of prophecy connects itself with prophetical history, both corresponding with each other. Each event in the course of history is followed by a progress of prophecy. When God gives divers forms to the history of the Old Test., he thus exhibits the different sides which are comprehended and united in the person of Christ. Prophecy in the course of history becomes ever richer and richer in its forms, but points only to one goal — the God-man. He is then again the starting-point for new prophecy and new hope, for his appearance is the prefigurement of the final glorification of the congregation of believers. The permanent value of this  work consists in thy proof that the Old and New Tests. are parts of a single history of salvation; displaying the gradual realization, by divine interpositions, of redemption for the race. Between 1852 and 1856 Hofmann published his second great work, Schriftbeweis (2 volumes; 2d ed. 1857-60).

In this work he attempted to prove the authenticity and divine origin of. Christianity from its records. He lamented the usual method of doing this from single passages of Scripture, and himself sought to use the Biblical record in its entirety as one organic whole. He started from the idea that, to understand Christianity, it was not necessary to describe religious experiences, nor rehearse the doctrines of the Scriptures and the Church, but to develop the simple fact that makes us Christians, or the communion of God with man, mediated by Christ. Herein he differs fundamentally from Schleiermacher, who starts out from the sense of absolute dependence in the Christian's experience. Hofmann starts with the new birth. The results at which they arrive in their systems are therefore so entirely different. With Hofmann all is historical, with Schleiermacher, nothing. This work aroused opposition. The author had combated the doctrine of vicarious atonement, and the charge was made against him of denying the atonement altogether. Hofmann had expected opposition. For a time he kept quiet, but finally he replied in Schutzschriften fur eine neue Weise, alle Wahr heit zu lehren (1856-59). Without continuing the controversy, Hofmann wrote his last great work, Die heilige. Schsrif des neuen Testaments zusammenhangenduntessucht (1862 sq.), in which he endeavored to prove scientifically the inspiration of the Scripture and the integrity of the canon. After Hofmann's death there were published, Theologische Ethik (1878): — Encyclopadie der Theologie (edited by Bestmann, 1879): — Biblische Hermeneutik (edited by Volck, 1880). See Stahlin, J. Chr. K. v. Hofmann, in Luthardt's Allgemeine Lutherische Kirchenzeitung (1878); Grau, Erinnerungen an J. Chr. K. v. Hofmann (Gutersloh, 1879); Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v. (B.P.)

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

             a German theologian, born at Windsheim October, 1724, was educated at Erlangen and Leipzig. In 1757 he began philosophical lectures at Leipzig, and in 1762 was honored with a professorship. In 1764 he went to Giessen as professor of Oriental languages, and in 1765 was made D.D. In 1769 he was called to Altorf as professor of theology, and here he became also archdeacon. He died May 10, 1772. His principal works are Die Erbauung n. ihrem wahren Begriffe ihrem Mitteln und Hinderniszen (Frankf. 1756, 8vo): — Grammatica Hebraea Danziana methodo (Gieszen, 1765, 8vo): — Lock's paraphrast. Erklarung der Briefe and. Galater, Korinther, Romer, und Epheser, aus d. Engl. übers. (Frankf. 1768-69, 2 vols. 4to), besides several essays. — Adelung's Jocher, Gelehrt. — Lexik. Add. 2, 2079.

## Hofmann, Karl Gottlob, D.D[[@Headword:Hofmann, Karl Gottlob, D.D]]

             a distinguished German theologian, born at Schneeberg Oct. 1,1703, was educated at the University of Leipzig, and lectured there for several years on philosophy and philology. Later he became a preacher at St. Paul's and St. Thomas's churches, and later still he was called to the St. Nicolas Church. In 1739 he was called to the University of Wittenberg as professor of theology. Here he became the senior of the theological faculty, and one of the brightest lights of the day. He died Sept. 19,1774. lie published many valuable works, of which Adelung's Jocher gives a complete list. We have space only to mention his Introductio Theolog. — Crit. in Lectionem epist. Pauli ad Galat. et Coloss. (Lips. 1750, 4to), and a series of minor works, under the title Varia Sacra (Wittenb. et Lips. 1751). He also edited and enlarged the Introductio in Lectionent N.T. of J. G. Pritius (Leipsic, 1737).Jocher. Gelehrt. Lexik. (Addenda by Adelung, 2, 2049); Kitto, Biblical Cyclop. 2, 318.

## Hofmann, Leonhard[[@Headword:Hofmann, Leonhard]]

             professor of Oriental languages at Jena, who died December 14, 1737, is the author of, De Ancilla Ebraea ad Eze 21:7 (Jena, 1712): — Disp. ad Psa 2:7 (1726): — De Singulari Hebraeorum cum Sepeliendi Mortuos, ad Mat 8:22 (eod.): — De Summo Hebraeorum Sacerdote ante diem Expiationis Adjurato (1730). See Gotte, Gelehrtes Europa, 2:484;  Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:404. (B.P.)

## Hofmeister, Sebastian[[@Headword:Hofmeister, Sebastian]]

             SEE WAGNER.

## Hofstatter, Heinrich Von[[@Headword:Hofstatter, Heinrich Von]]

             a German prelate, was born in 1805 at Aindling, in Upper Bavaria. He studied at first jurisprudence, and was already promoted in 1829 as "doctor utriusque juris," when he betook himself to the study of theology, received holy orders in 1833, and was in 1836 appointed cathedral-dean at Munich. In 1839 he was made bishop of Passau, and died May 12, 1875. (B.P.)

## Hofstede de Groot, Peter[[@Headword:Hofstede de Groot, Peter]]

             a distinguished Dutch theologian, was born at Rotterdam in 1720, and educated at Groningen. Soon after the completion of his university course he was called to Rotterdam as professor of theology. Here he became a leader of a theological school of “mediation,” known as the Groningen School, founded by the Platonist Van Heusde (17781839), who was also a professor in the Rotterdam University at that time. Hofstede, assisted by Pareau, published a dogmatic theology, containing a complete exposition of the doctrines of this school, which are nothing more or less than a spiritual Arianism. They held that there is in human nature a divine element which needs development in order to enable humanity to reach its destination. This destination is conformity to God. All religions have aimed and worked at the same problem, but Christianity has solved it in the highest and purest manner. Still there is only a difference in degree between that and other religions. God has fulfilled the desire of man, whom he had prepared for salvation by sending perfection embodied in Christ. To know Christ we need the exegetical study of that preparation of man for Christ which is furnished by the Old Testament. The New Testament is the fulfillment. The latter contains the sayings of Jesus and the conclusions of  the apostles. The writers of the Scriptures were not infallible, though they did not often err. Sin is regarded as a mere inconvenience, since all sinners will eventually be holy and happy. In stating the influences of the Groningen school in Dutch theology, Hurst (Rationalism, p. 366,367) says that it is similar to the position occupied by Channing with regard to the orthodoxy of the American Church. Hofstede was a violent opponent of the Lutheran Church; and when, in 1779, a Lutheran church was about to be established at the Cape of Good Hope, he protested loudly, and wrote Oost-indiansche Kerkzaaken., or Ecclesiastical Affairs of India (Hague, 1779-1780, 2 vols. 8vo). Against Marmontel's celebrated novel Belisaire he also wrote a work exposing the vices of distinguished heathens, and showing their utter unfitness for a claim to salvation, to which Marmontel believed those entitled who had lived before Christ's coming. He died Nov. 27, 1803. See Schröckh, Kirchen q. 8, 735; Hurst, Hist. of Rationalism, p. 364-367; Farrar, Hist. of Free Thought, p. 445 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genesis 24,903 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Hofstede de Groot, Peter (2)[[@Headword:Hofstede de Groot, Peter (2)]]

             a distinguished Dutch theologian, was born October 8, 1802, at Leer, in East Frisia. In 1826 he was preacher in the Reformed Church, in 1829 professor at the university in Groningen, but resigned his professorship in 1872. He died August 27, 1884. Hofstede was the head of the so-called "Groningen school," the adherents of which called themselves the "Evangelicals." They represent the theologico-ecclesiastical middle-party, between the "Liberals" and the "Orthodox," and their organ, Waarheid in Liefde, edited by Hofstede de Groot, Pareau, and Van Oordt (1837-72), is the best exponent of this school. With Pareau, de Groot published, Encyclopaedia Theologi Christiani (1840; 3d ed. 1851), and Dogmatica et. Apologetica Christiana (1845). His own works are, Theologia Naturalis (1834; 4th ed. 1861): — Institutiones Historiae Ecclesiae Christi (1835): — Opvoeding der Menschheid (1847): — Kort Overzigt van de Leer der Zonde (1856): — Over de evangelisch-catholicke Godgeleerdheid asde Godgeleerdheid der Toekomst (eod.): — Het Evangelie der Apostelen tegenover de Twifelingengen de Wijsheid der Wereld (1861): — Basilides, als erster Zeuge fiur alter und Autoritdt neutestamentlicher, Schriften (1868): — Oud-catholicke Bevmejung in het Licht der Kerkgeschzedenis (1877). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:577; Brockhaus, Conversations-Lexikon, 13th ed. s.v. (B.P.)

## Hog[[@Headword:Hog]]

             SEE BOAR; SEE SWINE.

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

             of some notoriety in Catholic controversies, a young priest of inferior education but good natural parts, who had been dismissed from Maynooth for a breach of discipline, left the diocese of Limerick in 1818 or 1819 for New York. He was first employed in the ministry in Albany, but left that city, against the wish of Dr. Connolly, then bishop of New York, and was  temporarily installed by Reverend Dr. De Barth, administrator of the see of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as pastor of St. Mary's Church in that city. In December, 1820, bishop Conwell took possession of the see, and having reason to suspect Hogan's conduct in. Ireland and elsewhere, withdrew his faculties. Hogan continued to officiate at St. Mary's in spite of the censure of his bishop .and the refusal of the archbishop of Baltimore to entertain his appeal, the trustees of the church supporting Hogan. On February 11, 1821, Conwell excommunicated Hogan, appointed other pastors, occupied the church for some months, but in the summer of that year Hogan and his party took possession of the church. Bishop England of Charleston, visiting Philadelphia, and having promised Hogan a mission in-his diocese, induced Conwell to grant him power to absolve the troublesome ecclesiastic on proper submission.

On October 18, 1821, England absolved him; but the next day Hogain, hearkening to the advice of his trustees, retracted, said mass at St. Mary's, and resumed his functions as pastor. England then re- excommunicated him. Many of the members now deserted the interdicted church and went to St. Joseph's, where the bishop had installed William V. Harold, former pastor at St. Mary's. The two parties became more and more exasperated; the orthodox (as De Courcy and Shea term the party who went with the bishop) hoped to defeat the schismatics by electing a new board of trustees. Every male occupant of a seat was an elector. The election took place in the church on Easter Tuesday 1822, and led to sad results. The disorder was frightful; blood was shed; and the schismatics triumphed, preserving Hogan as pastor.

At the close of the year the archbishop of Baltimore (Mardchal) returned from Rome, bringing a papal brief (August 2, 1822), which solemnly condemned the schismatics of St. Mary's. On December 10, 1822, Hogan submitted, and received from Conwell his exeat and removal of censures. On the 14th of the same month the unhappy priest, circumvented by the trustees (it is said), objected that the authenticity of the brief had not been shown, and continued to officiate and preach at Sto Mary's. He published violent pamphlets against his diocesan and bishop England, whom he sought to compromise. Hogan at length grew tired of his rebellion, left Philadelphia for the South, married, became a custom-house officer in Boston, went into the pay of the enemies of Romanism, published some books to stimulate the Know Nothing movement (Popery as it Was and Is, Boston and New York, 1845: — Nunneries and Auricular Confession, recently reprinted at Hartford), and died in 1851 or 1852. The above account is from the standpoint of the opponents of Hogan. The historians of the Roman Catholic Church think  the troubles of which Hogan was the victim were due largely to the trustee system, whose influence in the Catholic Church they deem pernicious, and it has caused many local schisms, of which this of St. Mary's was the most celebrated and scandalous, and was not healed for many years. For an account of this schism, and voluminous documents, see bishop England's Works, 5:109-232; De Courcy and Shea, Hist. of Cath. Church in U.S. page 217.

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

             a celebrated painter, was born at London in 1697 or 1698, apprenticed to an engraver at an early age, and at the expiration of his apprenticeship entered the Academy of St. Martin's Lane. His first painting was a representation of Wanstead Assembly. In 1725 he engraved some prints for Beaver's Military Punishments of the Ancients. As a painter, he had a great facility in catching a likeness, and adopted a novel method of grouping families. He therefore devoted himself to the delineation of the calamities and crimes of private life, and the vices and follies of the age. His series of, The Hatlot's Progress; The Rake's Progress, gained him great reputation. He was an eccentric genius, and his talents were eminently in burlesque and satire. He did not excel in historical painting, but among his principal plates there are some good works by him, representing The Good Samaritan; The Pool of Bethesda; Paul Before Felix; Moses Brought to Phara'oh's Daughter. He died October 26, 1764.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Moorfield. Virginia, in 1784. He was educated chiefly by his father, though he spent one year at an academy in Baltimore. He was licensed to preach April 17, J805, was ordained in 1809, and was appointed missionary to the State of Ohio by the General Assembly. Within a year he organized a church at Franklinton, and in 1807 became minister of the First Church at Columbus, Ohio. Here he remained until 1858, when his age and infirmities induced him to resign. Dr. Hoge was the “father of the Presbytery of Columbus, and even of the Synod of Ohio.” Not merely in his own parish, but in the Church courts and in the General Assembly, he was a man of great power and influence. The institutions for the deaf; dumb, and blind in Ohio were largely due to his exertions. Though born in a slave state, he was opposed to slavery, and was thoroughly loyal to the nation. He died at Columbus Sept. 22,1863. A memorial sermon, preached by the Rev. William C. Roberts Oct. 4,1863 (Columbus, Ohio, 1863), was reviewed in the Amer. Presb. Rev. Jan. 1864, p. 89 sq. — Wilson, Presb. Historical Almanac, 1863, p. 232; 1864, p. 168.

## Hoge, Moses, D.D[[@Headword:Hoge, Moses, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born Feb. 15,1752, in Frederick County, Va. For a time he attended a classical school in Culpepper County. In 1778 he went to Liberty Hall Academy, and there completed his studies in 1780. In November, 1781, he was licensed to preach, and was ordained pastor of a church at Hardy Dec. 13. 1782. In 1787, the Southern climate proving injurious to his health, he removed to Shepherdstown, where he gathered a large congregation and acquired great popularity. In 1805 he opened a classical school, mainly for the education of his own sons. He maintained this, however, only a short time, when he was called to the presidency of Hampden Sianey College, as successor of Dr. Alexander. Five years later, while at the head of the college, the degree of D.D. was conferred on him by Princeton College. In 1812 the Synod of Virginia established a theological seminary, and Dr. Hoge was called to it as a professor. He accepted this position, retaining, however, the presidency of Hampden Sidney College. He died July 5,1820. He enjoyed the reputation of being a superior preacher. “John Randolph pronounced him the most eloquent man he had ever heard…Yet Dr. Hoge had some great disadvantages. His voice had considerable unpleasantness, arising from a nasal twang; so that he must be regarded as a very remarkable man to win such commendation from his gifted countryman.” He wrote, in 1793, in defense of the Calvinistic doctrine, a reply to the Rev. Jeremiah Walker, a Baptist minister who had suddenly passed from ultra Calvinism to the entire rejection of the Calvinistic doctrines. He also published The Christian Panoply (1799), designed as an antidote to Paine's Age of Reason. It consists of two parts, the first containing the substance of Watson's reply to Paine's first part, and the second Hoge's answer to the second part of Paine's work. It had a wide circulation, and exerted a very important influence. A volume of his sermons was published shortly after his death, but their circulation has been very limited, and they hardly do justice to his character as a preacher. A memoir of Dr. Hoge was partly prepared by his sons, but seems to have been lost, as it has never gone into print. — Amer. Presb. Rev. Jan. 1864, p. 93 sq.; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3, 426 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Hoge, Samuel Davies, D.D[[@Headword:Hoge, Samuel Davies, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, son of Dr. Moses, was born in Shepherdstown, Va., in 1791. His early instruction he received from his father, after whose assumption of the presidency of Hampden Sidney College-he became a  student in that college, and graduated in 1810. He also pursued his theological course under his father, filling at the same time, the appointment of tutor at his alma mater. Later he became professor, and at one time he acted even as vice-president. In 1816 he entered the active work of the ministry, serving the two churches of Culpepper and Madison, Virginia, at the same time. In 1821 he removed to Hillsborough, Ohio, serving also a church at Rocky Spring at the same time. Three years later he was elected professor of mathematics and natural philosophy in the Ohio University at Athens. The college being at this time without a president, Dr. Hoge performed the duties of that office, and greatly increased the prosperity of the institution. At the same time, he preached in the college chapel and in the church of the town whenever his time and health would permit. He died in December 1826. — Sprague, Ann. of Am. Pulpit, 4, 483.

## Hoglah[[@Headword:Hoglah]]

             (Heb. Choglah', חָגְלָה, from Arab. for partridge; Sept. Ε᾿γλά v.r. Αἰγλά, etc.), the third of the five daughters of Zelophehad the Gileadite, to whom, in the absence of male heirs, portions were assigned by Moses (Num 26:33; Num 27:1; Num 36:11; Jos 17:3). B.C. 1619. SEE BETH- HOGLAH.

## Hogstraaten[[@Headword:Hogstraaten]]

             SEE HOOGSTRAATEN.

## Hoham[[@Headword:Hoham]]

             (Heb. Hoham', הוֹהָם, prob. for יְהוֹהָם, whom Jehovah impels or confounds; Sept. Αἰλάμ, Vulgate Oham), the king of Hebron, who joined the league against Gibeon, but was overthrown in battle by Joshua and slain after being captured in the cave at Makkedah (Jos 10:3). B.C. 1618.

## Hohburg[[@Headword:Hohburg]]

             SEE HOBURG.

## Hoheisel, Carl Ludwig[[@Headword:Hoheisel, Carl Ludwig]]

             a German professor of Greek. and Oriental languages, was born at Dantzic, September 18, 1692. He studied at different universities; and died at his native place, April 7, 1732. He wrote Observationes Philolog.-Exegeticae, Quibus Nonnulla δυσνόητα Esaice Loca Illustrantur (Dantzic, 1729):Diss. I, I de Vasculo Mannae (Jena, 1715). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:217; Furst, Bibl.Jud. 1:404; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hohenburg or Odilienberg[[@Headword:Hohenburg or Odilienberg]]

             an old, celebrated monastery on the Rhine, is said to have been founded by duke Ethicot, whose daughter Odilia was the first abbess. She is supposed to have died in 720. This monastery was celebrated for many years for the great learning of its inmates and the encouragement which it gave to all who devoted themselves to literary labors. About 1429, this, as well as the monastery at the foot of the hill, said to have been founded by Odilia, in order to save weary travelers the task of ascending the mount, was closed. One of the works published by an abbess of this monastery (Herrad, 1167), Hortus deliciarum, in Latin, contains contributions to Biblical history and to the entire field of theology. See Albricht, History von Hohenb. (Schletstadt, 1751, 4to); Silbermann, Beschreib. v. Hohenb. (Strasb. 1781 and 1835); Rettberg, Kirchen-Gesch. Deutschl. 2, 75-79; Mabillon, Ann. 1, 488 sq., 599; 2, 58; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 5, 277. (J. H. W.)

## Hohenlohe, Alexander Leopold Franz Emmerich[[@Headword:Hohenlohe, Alexander Leopold Franz Emmerich]]

             prince of a Hungarian Roman Catholic bishop, was born near Waldenburg Aug. 17,1794. His mother, baroness Judith de Reviczky, destined him for the clerical life, and after studying at the Academy of Berne, and the seminaries of Vienna, Tyrnau, and Elwangen, he was ordained priest in 1816. In the same year he made a journey to Rome, where he associated much with Jesuits, and finally joined their Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. In 1819 he returned to Germany, and settled in Bavaria, where his birth and fortune soon procured for him a high position. His reputation is chiefly due to his pretended power to cure diseases in a miraculous way. He is said to have made cures in the hospitals of Würzburg and Bamberg. But the authorities at last interfered, and even the pope himself advised Hohenlohe to abstain from these pretensions, and the prince finally left Bavaria for Vienna. He next went to Hungary, and was made bishop in partibus of Sardica in 1844, and abbot of the convent of St. Michael of Gabojan. During the Revolution of 1848 he was driven from Hungary. and he went to Innspruck, where the emperor of Austria then resided. In Oct. 1849, he went to Vienna to visit his nephew, count Fries, who had just decided to become a priest. He died at his house Nov. 17,1849. The renown which Hohenlohe gained by his cures was not confined to his own country, but extended to England, Ireland, and even to our country, where the case of Mrs. Ann Mattingly, of Washington, D. C., who was said to have miraculously recovered of a tumor. March 10, 1824, in consequence  of his prayers, caused considerable excitement. The prince ceased these practices many years before his death, at least publicly. Various theories have been propounded to account for the cures attributed to him: the most rational is that which assigns them to the power of the imagination over so called nervous disorders. His principal works are Der im Geiste der kathol. Kirche betende Christ (Bamberg, 1819; 3rd edit. Lpz. 1824): — Des katholischen Priesters Beruf Würde u. Pficht (Bamb. 1821): — Was ist d. Zeitgeist (Bamberg, 1821), an attempt to show that none but a good Roman Catholic can be a good and loyal citizen, addressed to Francis of Austria and Alexander of Russia: — Die Wanderschift einer Gött suchenzden Seele, etc. (Vienna, 1830): — Lictblicke und Ergebnisse aus d. Welt ut. dem Priesterleben (Ratisbon, 1836); a number of sermons, etc. His posthumous works were published by Brunner (Ratisbon, 1851). See Paulus, Wundercuren z. Würtzb. u. Bamb. unternommen durch. M. Michel u. d. Proverbs 5. Hohenlohe (Lpz. 1822); Gieseler, Kirchengeschichte d. neuest. Zeit, p. 321; Real-Encyklop. f. d. Kathol. Deutschl. 5, 434 5 (gives a full account of his works); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 19, 653 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 24, 914.

## Hohenstaufen[[@Headword:Hohenstaufen]]

             SEE GUELPHS AND GHIBEL LINES.

## Hohnbaum, Johann Christian[[@Headword:Hohnbaum, Johann Christian]]

             a distinguished German preacher, born at Rodach, near Hildburghausen, was educated at the University of Göttingen, under Michaelis, Walch, Hevne, and others. For a time he was private tutor and preacher. In 1777 he was appointed court preacher at Coburg, and, nine years later, minister and superintendent of his native city. He died Nov. 13,1825. Hohnbaum was an assistant in the preparation of the Hildburger Gesangbuch (hymn- book), and contributed also largely to different theological periodicals. His theological works are Ueber d. heilige Abendmahl (Cobl. 1781, 8vo): — Predigten fiber Gesch. d. A. T. (ibid. 1788-89, 2 vols. 8vo): — Gesinge und Predigten (ib. 1800, 8vo). — Döring, Deutschl. Kanzelredner, p. 143 sq. (J. H. W.)

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

             of Hohenegg, famous in history as the confessor of John George I, elector of Saxony. He was born of a noble family at Vienna in 1580, and educated at Wittenberg. In 1600 he commenced at this university a course of lectures, and published a program on the position which he was to take, Oratio detestans Papam et Calvinistas, in which he manifests that great hatred for Romanists and Calvinists which characterized all the acts of his life. Hoe distinguished himself greatly both as a student and a lecturer. In 1612 he was called to Dresden by the elector, and became court preacher and confessor. His talents and adroitness gave him, in time, complete possession of the judgment and conscience of the elector, whom he hindered from entering into a league with Frederick V, the unfortunate king of Bohemia, by representing to him that the Reformed religion, which Frederick professed, was fatally wrong, and could not exist without injury to Lutheranism. Hoe seems, indeed, to have hated the Reformed even more than he did the Romanists, and there appears not the shadow of a reason to assert that he was bribed by the emperor. To the declaration of his principles while a lecturer at Wittenberg, and above alluded to, he adhered until the end of his life, though it is said he greatly abated in his hatred against the Calvinists in his last days. His private character has been highly commented upon by all who knew him. He wrote a Commenatarius in Apocalypsin (Lpz. 1610-40, 2 parts), and a number of controversial works against the Reformed Church and the Romanists. He died in 1645. See Bayle, Genesis Dictionary, s.v.; Herzog, Real Encyklop. vol. 6:165; Mosheim, Ch. History, cent. 17:sec. 2, pt. 1, ch. 1, n. 12; Gass, Gesch. d. Dognatik, 2, 19, 78; Kurtz, Ch. History, 2, 183; Dorner, Gesch. d. protest. Theol. (see Index); Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch. 2, 320-322. (J. H.W.)

## Holbach, Paul Henry Thiry[[@Headword:Holbach, Paul Henry Thiry]]

             baron of, an infidel of the 18th century, was born at Heidelsheim, in the palatinate (now grand-duchy) of Baden, in 1723. He went to Paris at an  early age with his father, who at his death left him heir to a large fortune. Holbach's house became then the headquarters of all the freethinkers and writers of his day. At the dinners which he gave twice a week, either in Paris or at his castle of Grandval, and which gained him the title of first maitre d'hotel of philosophy, met the abbot Galiani, Helvetius, D'Alembert, Diderot, Raynal, Grimm, Buffon, Rousseau, Marmontel, Duclos, Laharpe, Condorcet, etc. It was in these reunions that they exchanged their ideas, and prepared, at least in their minds, many of the articles which appeared in the first Encyklopèdie (Diderot's), besides many anonymous publications which were also sent forth, consisting either of original articles or of translations from the German or English. They carried their speculation, it is said, to such daring lengths that Buffon, D'Alembert, and Rousseau felt compelled to withdraw from the circle. Holbach himself was one of the most zealous of these champions of naturalism and contended not only against Christianity, but against every positive religion. He is said, according to Barbier, to have published no less than forty-seven anonymous writings of his own composition. His first philosophical work he published in 1767 under the name of Boulanger: it is entitled Le Christianisme dévoilé, ou examen des principes et des effets de la religion révéléé (Amst.). In this work he says explicitly that religion is in no way necessary for the welfare of empires; that the dogmas of Christianity are but a heap of absurdities, the propagation of which has exercised the most fatal influence on mankind; that its morality is nowise superior to the morality of other systems, and is only fit for enthusiasts incapable of fulfilling the duties imposed by society; finally, that through the eighteen centuries of its existence Christianity had led to the most deplorable results in politics. Soon after this work, which his infidel associates themselves declared the most terrible that had ever appeared in any part of the world, he published L'Esprit du Clerge, ou le Christianisme primitif vengé des entreprises et des exces de nospretres modernes (Lond. 1767), and De l'Imposture sacerdotale, ou recueil de pieces sur le clerge (Amst. 1767).

In the same year Holbach published his most important work, Systme de la Nature (Lond. 1770), under the signature of “Mirabaud, secretaire perpetuel de l'Academie Française.” It is not definitely known whether he wrote the book alone, or was assisted by La Grange, Grimm, and others, but it is generally conceded to have been sent forth by Holbach, and that he defrayed the expenses of publication. So radical was this work that even Voltaire attacked it in the article “God” of his “Philosophical Dictionary.” Yet in 1772 Holbach published a popular  edition of that work under the title Le bon Sens, ou idees naturm elles opposees aux idees surnaturelles (Amst.; often reprinted under the name of the abbot Meslier). The wretched book was largely read by the common- people, and-contributed perhaps more than all the other philosophical works of the 18th century, taken together, to the subversion of morals and the spread of infidelity. It teaches the most naked and atheistical materialism, and even Voltaire abused it as immoral. In it Holbach discusser s the maxims of religious morality, takes a hurried glance t at social and savage life, touches the so-called “social compact,” and in the course of his observations endeavors to teach, among other things, that self-interest is the ruling motive of man, and that God is only an ideal being, created by kings and priests. His Systeme Social, ou les principes naturels de la morale et de la politique (Amsterd. 1773), aims, as its title indicates, to establish the basis and rules of a moral and political system altogether independent of any religious system. This work was as ill received by the philosophers as by the religious party, and the Paris Parliament (in 1773) condemned this and all other preceding works, of Holbach to be publicly burned by the hangman. They were all secretly sent to Holland in MS., and printed there by Michael Rey, who circulated them in France, so that even the friends and guests of Holbach did not know him as their author, and often criticized his works severely while partaking of his hospitality. He was also one of the contributors to the celebrated Encyclopedia (q.v.) of Diderot. Holbach's biographers claim that he was a man of good heart, and that, notwithstanding the pernicious theories of materialism which he sought to inculcate, especially among the French people, his life was better than his books. They claim especially that he was a man of most unselfish benevolence, and that he made his house even an asylum for his foes. Thus he protected and gave a refuge to the Jesuits in the days of their adversity under Louis XV, though he hated their system, and had written against them. He died at Paris January 21, 1789. See Voltaire, Dictionnaire Philosoph.; Diderot, Meimoires; Damiron, Etudes sur la philosophie d'Holbach (in Mim. de l' academie d. Sciences morales et politiques); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 925 sq.; Biog. Univ. 20, 460 sq.; Schlosser, Gesch. d. 18 und 19 Jahrhund. 1, 580 sq.; 2, 534; Buhle, Gesch. der neueren Philos. 6, Abtheil 1, p. 94 sq.; Hurst's Hagenbach, Church History of the 18th and 19th Cent. 1, 211 sq.; Farrar, Hist. of Free Though, p. 181 sq.; Vinet, French Lit. p. 352 sq.; Hagenbach, Hist. of Rationalism, p. 50; Morell, History of Philos. p. 111 sq.; Herzog, Real Encyklop. 6, 220 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Holbein, Hans[[@Headword:Holbein, Hans]]

             an eminent Swiss painter, designer, and wood-engraver, was born at Basle in 1498, although some think he was a native of Augsburg. He was the son and scholar of John Holbein, who settled at Basle, and resided there during the rest of his life. At the age of fifteen Hans manifested great abilities, and  painted portraits of himself and his father, which were engraved in 1512. He was invited by an English nobleman to visit England, but declined the invitation. Several years afterwards he formed an intimacy with Erasmus, and painted his portrait. The latter persuaded him to go to England, and gave him a letter to Sir Thomas More. On arriving in London. he sought out that nobleman, who received him with kindness, giving him apartments in his house. One day Holbein, happening to mention the nobleman who some years before had invited him to England, Sir Thomas was desirous of knowing who it was. Holbein replied that he had forgotten the title, but thought he could draw his likeness from memory; and this he did so strongly that it was immediately recognised. This peer was either the earl of Arundel or the earl of Surrey. Holbein was introduced by Sir Thomas to Henry VIII, who immediately took him into his service, assigning him apartments in the palace, with a liberal pension.

On the death of Jane Seymour, Holbein was sent to Flanders to draw the portrait of Christiana, duchess dowager of Milan. He painted in oil, distemper, and water-colors. He had never practiced the last until he went to England, where he acquired the art from Lucas Corneli. There are but a few historical works by Holbein in England. The most important is that in the Surgeons' Hall, of Henry VIII Granting the Charter to the Company of Surgeons. At Basle.are eight pictures of the Passion of Christ; and in the library of the. University a Dead Christ, painted on a panel, in 1521. "It has been doubted whether the celebrated Dance of Death was originally designed by Holbein; but this has been occasioned by confounding the sets of prints of the Dance of Death engraved by Matthew Merian with the wooden cuts by Holbein, after his own designs, the originals of which are preserved in the public library at Basle." As a wood-engraver, Holbein is said to have executed some works as early as 1511, and he engraved a great many wood-cuts for the publishers of Basle, Zurich, Lvons, and Leyden. The most important of these are a set of wood-cuts, entitled, The Dance of Death, which, complete, consists of fifty-three small upright plates, but is seldom found above forty-six. There are also, by Holbein, a set of ninety small cuts of subjects from the Old Test., which were published at-Lyons in 1539. He made a number of designs from the Bible, which were engraved and published at Leyden in 1547. Holbein died at London in 1554. For a list of his works, see Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Holberg, Ludwig von[[@Headword:Holberg, Ludwig von]]

             a Danish divine, was born Nov. 6,1684, at Bergen, in Norway. He studied theology at Copenhagen University, and became a professor in that school. In 1735 he was elected rector of the University, and in 1737 treasurer. In 1747 the king created Holberg a baron on account of his literary services. He died Jail. 27, 1754. He is known as the creator of modern Danish literature, and deserves our notice on account of his Kirchengeschichte (1738-40, 2 vols.), and Judische Gesch. (1742, 2 vols.). Both these works are considered quite valuable even at the present time. — Brockhans, Conv. Lex. 8, 48 sq.; Gorton, Biograph. Dict. 2. (J. H. W.)

## Holcomb, Frederick, D.D[[@Headword:Holcomb, Frederick, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, officiated for many years in Trinity Church, Northfield, Connecticut, until 1861, when he became the minister of Christ Church, Bethlein. In 1865 he was residing in Watertown without regular pastoral work. In 1868 he officiated in Christ Church, Harwinton, in the neighborhood of Watertown, and continued in this work until his death, May 26, 1872, at the age of eighty-five years. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1873, page 133.

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

             a Baptist minister, was born in Prince Edward Count, Va., Sept. 22,1762. His early education was limited. While yet a boy, he entered the Revolutionary army. In his twenty-second year he was licensed to preach by the Baptists; and in Sept. 1785, was ordained pastor of the church at Pike Creek, S. C. Some time after, he was appointed delegate to the Convention of South Carolina, held at Charleston, to ratify the Constitution of the United States. In 1791 he became pastor of the Baptist Church at Euhaw, preaching also at May River and St. Helena; but, the climate not agreeing with him, he removed to Beaufort. In 1799 he accepted a call to Savannah. Here he labored with great success, and was chiefly instrumental in organizing the Savannah Female Asylum (in 1801), at the same time conducting a Magazine, The Georgia Analytical Repository. He also took part in establishing Mount Euon Academy in 1804, and a Missionary Society in 1806. In 1810 he was made D.D. by Brown University, and in 1812 became pastor of the First Baptist Church in Philadelphia, where he labored with great acceptance until his death, May 22,1824. He published a number of occasional sermons, addresses, etc. — Sprague, Annals, 6, 215.

## Holcombe, Hosea[[@Headword:Holcombe, Hosea]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Union District, S. C., July 20, 1780. He was engaged in agricultural pursuits until 1800, when he turned his attention to theology, and was licensed the following year. He labored in his native region until 1812, when he went to North Carolina, and finally settled in Jefferson Co., Ala., in the fall of 1818. His ministrations in all these places were eminently successful, and he continued his labors until his death, July  31, 1841. Mr. Holcombe published a Collection of Sacred Hymns (1815): a work on Baptism, entitled A Reply to the Rev. Finis Ewing, of the Cumberland Presbyterian Society (1832): — A Refutation of the Rev. Joshua Lawrence's Patriotic Discourse, or Anti-Mission Principles exposed (1836): — The History of the Alabama Baptists (1840). — Sprague, Annals, 6, 442.

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

             an English scholastic of the 14th century, doctor of Oxford University, and a member of the Dominican order, was one of the most liberal interpreters of sacred Scripture in his day, yet an obedient son of the Roman Catholic Church, and a zealous advocate of Nominalism (q.v.). He died a victim of the plague in 1349. Holcot wrote mainly on the sacred Scriptures, but not many of his works have ever gone into print. This may account for the fact that many books whose authorship is doubtful are attributed to him by the Dominicans. Mazonius (in Univ. Platonzis et Aristot. Philosoph. p. 201) has severely criticised the philosophical views of Holcot. His most important published theological works are De Studio Scripturae (Venice, 1586, and often): — In Proverb. Salom. (Paris, 1515, 4to): — In Cantica Canticorum et in septea Prioras Capita Ecclesiasticis (Ven. 1509). Among the works attributed to him by the Dominicans we find Moralisationes Histomriarum (Paris, 1510, 8vo). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 941; Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex. 2, 1671. (J. H. W.)

## Hold[[@Headword:Hold]]

             [verb] is often used figuratively, but in obvious meanings, in the Bible. To take hold of God and his covenant is to embrace him as given in the Gospel, and by faith to plead his promises and relations (Isa 64:7; Isa 56:4). Christians hold forth the word of life; they, by practicing it in their lives, give light and instruction to others (Php 2:16). Not holding of Christ the head is neglecting to draw gracious influence from him, and to yield due subjection to him; as, for instance (Col 2:18-19), worshipping angels, etc. instead of Christ; insisting on penances, etc. instead of on the merit of Christ's work.

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

             [noun] (מְצוּדָה, metsudah', a fortress, as often rendered), the term especially applied to the lurking places of David (1Sa 22:4-5; 1Sa 24:22, etc.). SEE STRONGHOLD.

## Holda[[@Headword:Holda]]

             SEE HULDA.

## Holda (or Holla)[[@Headword:Holda (or Holla)]]

             in German mythology, was originally a friendly goddess of the ancient heathen Germans, probably the one mentioned by. Tacitus, and compared with Isis. The name is derived from the German hold, or huld, “mild." After the introduction of Christianity the goddess became a spectre, but still with friendly rather than threatening attributes. The myths about her are nowhere so spread as in Hesse and Thuringia. The popular belief in Holda (Freau Holle) is spread over the Rhone into Northern France and Lower Saxony. She is represented as a heavenly being, encircling the earth; when it snows she makes her bed so that the feathers fly. She enjoys seas and wells; at noon she is seen bathing and disappearing in the stream. Mortals reach her dwelling through a well. Her yearly procession on Christmnas is supposed to bring fruitfulness to the country, but she also rides with the furious army, or leads it. She loves music, but her song has a sorrowful tone.

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

             a distinguished English Roman Catholic controversialist, was born in Lancashire in 1596. He studied at the Seminary of Douai, and afterwards went to Paris, where he took the degree of D.D. He became a priest in the parish of St. Nicholas du Chardonnet. Much of his time was devoted to literary labors, which placed him among the most renowned theologians of that period. He died in 1665. His principal work is Analysis Fidei (Paris, 1652, 8vo; 2nd ed. by Barbon, 1767, 12mo; translated into English by W. G., 1658 4to). Dupiln commends this book very highly. In 1660 he published Novum Testamenetum, with marginal notes, and a Letter to Arnauld on predestination and grace. See Dupin, Eccles. Writers, cent. 17; Allibone. Dictionary of Authors, 1, 863; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24, 935

## Holder, Wilhelm[[@Headword:Holder, Wilhelm]]

             (also known as Frater Wilhelmus de Stutgardia Ordinis Minorum), a Würtemberg philosopher and theologian, was born at Marbach in 1542, and educated at Tübingen. He distinguished himself especially by his great opposition to scholastic philosophy and theology, against which he wrote Mus exenteratus contra Joannern Pistorium (Tüb. 1593, 4to): — a very rare and curious work on the Mass and baptism, of which extracts have been given in the N. Götting. Hist. Mag. vol. 2, pt. 4:p. 716 sq.: — also Petitorium exhortatorium pro resolutorio super grossis quibusdam dubietatibus et quaestionibus, e.c. (Tübing. 1594, 4to). He died July 24, 1609. — Adelung's Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex. 2, 1672; Krug, Encyklop. — philos. Lex. 2, 450.

## Holder, William, D.D[[@Headword:Holder, William, D.D]]

             a learned English divine, was born in Nottinghamshire, and educated in Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. In 1642 he became rector of Blechingdon, Oxfordshire. He was canon of Ely, and of St. Paul's. He died at Amen Corner, London, January 24, 1696, leaving, Elements of Speech (1669): — Discourse on Time (1691): — Principles of Harmony (1694). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

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

             a distinguished Jewish divine of the Liberalistic or so-called reform school, was born at Kempen, province of Posen, Prussia, in 1806. His early education was, like that of every other Jewish Rabbi of his time, confined to a thorough study of the Scriptures and the Talmud. In the latter his proficiency was very great, and was pretty generally known throughout his native province, even while he was yet a young man. With great perseverance, he paved his way for a broader culture than the study of the Talmud and the instructions of the Rabbins could afford him, and he went to the universities of Prague and Berln. His limited preparation made it, however, impossible for him to graduate at those high schools. In 1836 he was called as Rabbi to the city of Frankfort on the Oder. Here he distinguished himself greatly by his endeavors to advance the interests of his Jewish brethren in Prussia, and to obtain liberal concessions from the government. He there published, besides a number of sermons delivered in behalf of the cause just alluded to, Gottesdienstliche Vortrage (Frmkf. 1839, 8vo), in which he treats of the Jewish holy days, usages, etc. These sermons were the subject of consideration by the leading Jewish periodicals for successive months. Thus the distinguished Jewish scholar J. A. Frankel aimed to establish on these sermons the laws of Jewish Homiletics (comp. Literaturblatt des Orients, 1840, No. 35, 39, 47, 49, 50). His scholarly attainments were such at this time (1840) that the University of Leipzig honored him with the degree of “doctor of philosophy.” In the same year Holdheim accepted a call as chief Rabbi of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, and was installed Sept. 19 (1840). The prominence which this position gave  him greatly increased his influence both at home and abroad. and his movements for reform in the Jewish Ritual (q.v.) contributed perhaps more than the efforts of any other person to the reform movements at Berlin with which he was afterwards so intimately associated. In 1843 he published Ueber d. Autonomie d. Rabbinen v2. d. Princip. derjuid. Ehe (Schwerin and Berlin, 1843, 8vo). In this work he labored for a submission of the Jews in matrimonial questions to the law of the land in which they now sojourned, instead of adhering to their Talmudic laws, so conflicting with the duties of their citizenship, and so antagonistic to the principles of this liberal age. He held, first, that the autonomy of the Rabbins must cease; secondly, that the religious obligations should be distinct from the political and civil, and should yield to the latter as of higher authority; and, thirdly. that marriage is, according to the Jewish law, a civil act, and consequently an act independent of Jewish authorities. (On the controversy of this question, SEE JEWS, REFORMED.)

In 1844 he published Ueber d. Beschneidung zunächst. in religios-dogmat. Beziehung (Schwrerin and Berlin, 1844, 8vo), in which he treats of the question whet-her circumcision is essential to Jewish membership, and in which his position is even more liberal than in the treatment of the questions previously alluded to. Holdheim was also a prominent member of the Jewish councils held from 1843 to 1846. In 1847 he was called to Berlin by the Jewish Reform Society of that city, consisting of members who, on account of their liberal views, had separated from the orthodox portion; and he entered upon the duties of this position on September 5. Here he labored with great distinction, and from this, the real center of Germany, he scattered the seeds of his extremely liberal views among his Jewish brethren throughout the entire length and breadth not only of his own country, but of the world. He died Aug. 22, 1860. Perhaps we call give no better evidence of Holdheim's influence in his later years than by citing the words of Rabbi Einhorn, now of New York city (in Sinai: Organfiur Erkenntniss u. Veredlung d. Judenth. Baltimore, 1860, p. 288, the November number of which gives a pretty full biography of Holdheim): “The great master in Israel, the high-priest of Jewish theological science, the lion in the contest for light and truth, no longer dwells among 11s.” Besides a number of short treatises in pamphlet form, to which the controversy between the Reformed and Orthodox Jews gave rise, he published Gesch. der jüd. Refornmgemeinde, (Berlin, 1857, 8vo): — Religions-u. Sittenlehren d. Mischnah z. Gebrauch b.Religionsunterr. 1. jüd. Religions-schulen (Berlin, 1854, 12mo), and a larger work on the same subject under the title וְהִדֵּעָה הָאמֵוּנָה, Jid. Glaubens-u. Sittenlehre (ib. 1857, 8vo): Gebete und Gesänge für das Neujahrs-u. Vershungsfest (Berlin, 1859, 8vo); and Predigten (vol. 1, 1852; vol. 2, 1853; vol. 3, 1855), besides a number of sermons separately published since his death. A complete list of his works up to 1846 is given by Furst (Biblioth. Judenth. p. 404, 405). See Ritter (Dr. J. H.), Gesch. derjüd. Reformation, vol. 3 (Samuel Holdheim, Berl. 1865); Jost, N. Gesch. d. Israel, 1, 99 sq.; 3 (Culturgesch.), 205 sq.; Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten, p. 374 sq. (J. H.W.)

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

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Thorney, near Peterborough, England, April 20,1804. At the age of fourteen he came to the United States; in 1822 joined the Philadelphia Conference, but was transferred to the New York Conference in 1834; in 1836 was elected professor of moral science and belles-lettres at Wesleyan University, which position he held until 1849, when he became corresponding secretary of the American Bible Society, serving until 1878, when the state of his health forced him to retire. He died April 10, 1893. He was the author of a Life of Wilbur Fisk: — a Treatise on Political Economy: — and a Bible History. See Minutes of the Annual Conferences (Spring), 1893.

## Holdsworth (Holsworth, Oldsworth, or Oldisworth), Richard[[@Headword:Holdsworth (Holsworth, Oldsworth, or Oldisworth), Richard]]

             an English divine, was born in 1590, and educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. Later he became a fellow of that university. In 1620 he was appointed one of the twelve preachers at Cambridge, was then called to St. Peter-le-Poor, London, and in 1629 was appointed professor of divinity at Gresham College. In 1631 he was made prebendary of Lincoln, in 1633 was further promoted to the archdeaconry of Huntingdon, and in 1637 was recalled to Cambridge as master of Emanuel College. He was a zealous adherent to the cause of Charles I, and suffered on this account by imprisonment at the outbreak of the Rebellion. He died in 1649. Holdsworth wrote, besides a large collection of sermons, of which a list is given by Darling (Cyclopedia Bibliogr. 1, 1509) and by Allibone (Dict. of Authors, 1, 863), Praelectiones Theologicae (London, 1661, fol.), published by his nephew, Dr. Wm. Pearson, with the life of the author: — Valley of Vision, in twenty-one sermons (London, 1651, 4to), of which Fuller speaks in very commendatory terms, paying the following tribute to Holdsworth (also cited by Allibone): “The author was composed of a learned head, a gracious heart, a bountiful hand, and a patient back, comfortably and cheerfully to endure such heavy afflictions as were laid upon him.” — Hook, Eccles. Biog. 6, 106 sq.

## Holdsworth, Winch, D.D[[@Headword:Holdsworth, Winch, D.D]]

             fellow of St. John Baptist's College, was born in the first half of the 18th century, and educated at Oxford University. He is especially celebrated on account of his controversy with Locke, which arose from his views on the Resurrection of the Body (Oxford, 1720, 8vo; and the same defended, Lond. 1727, 8vo). — Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 863.

## Hole, Matthew, D.D[[@Headword:Hole, Matthew, D.D]]

             a learned English divine, was born about 1640. He entered the University of Oxford as servitor at Exeter College in 1657, was elected fellow in 1663, and became M.A. in 1664, prebendary of Wells in 1667, and rector of his college in 1715. He died in 1730. His sermons were of high repute-in their day. Among his writings are An Antidote against Infidelity (Lond. 1702, 8vo): — Practical Discourses on the Liturgy of the Church of England (new ed. by the Rev. J.A. Giles, Lond. 1837, 4 vols. 8vo): — A practical Exposition of the Church Catechism (3rd ed. Lond. 1732, 2 vols. 8vo): — Practical Discourses on the Nature, Properties, and Excellencies of Charity (Oxf. 1725, 8vo). — Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, 1, 1515.

## Holebeck, Laurence[[@Headword:Holebeck, Laurence]]

             an English scholar, probably a native of Lincolnshire, was bred a monk in the abbey of Ramsey, and was one of the first 'Hebrew' scholars of his age,  a language then so unknown, even to the priests, that in the reign of Henry VIII, Erasmus, with his keen wit, says, "they counted all things Hebrew which they did not understand" (Dial. per Relig. Er.). Holebeck made a Hebrew dictionary, counted exact in those days. Pits complains that Robert Wakefield, the first Hebrew professor at Cambridge, purloined this dictionary to his private use. Holebeck died in, 1410. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 2:290.

## Holgate[[@Headword:Holgate]]

             archbishop of York under king Edward VI, was one of the prelates of the Reformers who were silenced under queen Mary shortly after her accession to the throne of England, under the pretense that their marriage relations were non-ecclesiastical. Later (Oct. 4,1553) he was imprisoned in the Tower, and kept there until January 18 of the following year, when he was pardoned. The dates of the birth and death of Holgate are not known. — Strype's Memorials of the Reformation, 4, 57 sq.; Hardwick, Hist. of the Christian Church during the Reformation, p. 234.

## Holidays[[@Headword:Holidays]]

             SEE HOLY-DAY; SEE FESTIVALS.

## Holiness[[@Headword:Holiness]]

             (קֹדֶשׁ, ἁγιοσύνη), prop. the state of sanctity, but often used of external or ceremonial relations (the more prop. ὁσιότης).

I. Intrinsic Idea. — “Holiness suggests the idea, not of perfect virtue, but of that peculiar affection wherewith a being of perfect virtue regards moral evil; and so much, indeed, is this the precise and characteristic import of the term, that, had there been no evil either actual or conceivable in the universe, there would have been no holiness. There would have been perfect truth and perfect righteousness, yet not holiness; for this is a word which denotes neither any one of the virtues in particular, nor the  assemblage of them all put together, but the recoil or the repulsion of these towards the opposite vices-a recoil that never would have been felt if vice had been so far a nonentity as to be neither an object of real existence nor an object of thought” (Chalmers, Nat. Theol. 2, 380). — Krauth, Fleming's Vocab. of Philos. p. 217.

II. Applications of the Term. —

1. In the highest sense, holiness belongs to God alone (Isa 6:3; Rev 15:4), because he only is absolutely good (Luk 18:19), and thus demands the supreme veneration of those who would themselves become good (Luk 1:49; Joh 17:11; Act 3:14 [Act 4:27; Act 4:30]; 1Jn 2:20; Heb 7:26; Rev 4:8). SEE HOLINESS OF GOD.

2. Men are called holy

(a) in as far as they are vessels of the Holy Spirit and of divine power, e.g. the prophets; and also in as far as they belong to an organization which is dedicated to God. In the N.T. Christians are especially holy, as being wholly consecrated to God's service. (Comp. Rom 8:27; Rom 12:13; 1Co 6:2; Eph 2:19; Eph 5:3; Eph 6:18; Col 1:11; Col 3:12; 2Pe 1:21; Rev 13:10; Jud 1:14.) — Men are also called holy

(b) in so far as they are or become habitually good, denying sin, thinking and acting in a godlike manner, and, in short, conforming, in their innermost being, as well as in their outward conduct, to the highest and absolute law or the will of God (Rom 6:19; Rom 6:22; Eph 1:4; Tit 1:8; 1Pe 1:15; Rev 20:6).

The grounds of this sanctification, according to outward appearance, are twofold, viz.:

(a) Holiness is given of God by the mediation of Christ, conditioned upon faith and an inward surrender, which are themselves likewise the gift of God.

(b) Man from within, by a proper purification of the heart, may attain this sanctity. Although the last cannot occur without the assistance of God, yet the personal activity of man is necessary and almost preponderant. Still, even interior holiness is, as above implied, the direct work of God.

3. As everything dedicated to God partakes in a certain manner of his holiness, so even things (e.g. the Temple), forms, and ceremonies (e.g. sacrifice): hence “to hallow” means also to dedicate to God, to offer up, to bring as an offering, to present one's self as dedicated to God through Christ (1Co 6:11; Eph 5:26; Heb 2:11; Heb 10:10; Heb 10:14; Joh 17:17). In the N.T., where the merciful assistance of God in customary purity or objective holiness appears prominent, the expression to “sanctify one's self' is used only concerning Christ, and means here the same as to offer up himself as a sacrifice for human sin (Joh 17:19). But as man may make himself holy, i.e. under the assistance of the Holy Spirit, he may work for his own purity; similar phraseology is used of Christians (Mat 23:17; Joh 17:19; 1Ti 4:5).

4. That by which God reveals his holiness, e.g. the Law, is also holy (Rom 7:12).

III. Progression. — Complete holiness, as applied to men, designates the state of perfect love, which exhibits itself in this, that every thought of man, every emotion and volition, hence also every deed, is determined by the will of God, and thus the old man, who has been fainting under the burdens of worldly lust, and has been carrying the chains of the flesh, is cast off, and the new man is fully put on. This sanctification is both a work of God and of man. This divine grace comes through Christ, first at conversion, and by successive steps thereafter under the influence of the Holy Spirit. Man must seize the proffered hand of God, use the means of grace afforded him, and by the assistance of God perfect holiness. Thus, on the one hand, everything comes from God, and, on the other, the personal work of man is necessary. Whatever the good man is, he is through God and his own will; the evil man, however, is so only through his own will, for evil is falling away from God. Goodness consists ultimately in susceptibility for the divine work of grace, while wickedness has its final ground in the free hardening of the heart against the divine influences.

Personal holiness is a work of development in time, frequently under a variety of hinderances and backslidings, and even with the possibility of entire ruin. Hence the admonitions to watchfulness, to continual prayer, to perseverance in faith, in love, and in hope, are abundant (1Co 1:30; 2Co 7:1; Eph 4:23-24; comp. Rom 12:2); hence also the apostle's prayer that the love of the Philippians might  abound yet more and more (Php 1:9). But while the laying aside of the old, and the putting on of the new, are thus referred to man, of course it is not the meaning of the sacred writer that sanctification is accomplished by our own power. Christ is our sanctification, as he is our righteousness (1Co 1:30); yet all that Christ through the Holy Spirit works in man may become in vain, because man by his unfaithfulness can hinder the operation of the Spirit.

IV. Metaphorical Representations of a State of Holiness. — In the Scriptures this sanctification is described in manifold as well as strong and explicit figures as a “putting off” of the old man, and a putting on of the new man (Col 3:9), the subject becoming dead to the old, and having recovered the lost image of God. It is represented as self-denial (1Co 9:26-27); as a cleansing (1Jn 1:9; comp. Heb 1:3; Heb 9:14; Eph 5:26; 2Pe 1:9); as a washing (1Co 6:11); as a taking away of sin (Joh 1:29); as being filled with the fruits of righteousness (Php 1:11); with the water of life (Joh 7:38; compare 4:14); as a shedding abroad of the love of God in the heart (Rom 5:5); as baptism into Christ (Rom 6:3; Eph 1:10; Eph 2:5; Rev 15:1); fellowship with God (1Jn 1:3); as being in the Father, and in the Son, and in the light (1Jn 2:5-6; 1Jn 2:10; 1Jn 2:24; compare Ephesians 15; Joh 14:20); as the having God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit dwelling in us (Joh 14:17; Joh 14:20; Gal 2:20; 1 Corinthians 5:15; 1Jn 2:24; 1Jn 4:4; 1Jn 4:12-15; Eph 4:6); as a birth unto God and Christ (1Jn 2:29; 1Jn 3:9-10; 1Jn 4:4-7; 1Jn 5:18-19); as being partaker of the divine nature (2Pe 1:4); children of God (Rom 8:14; Joh 1:12; 1Jn 3:1-2); born again (Joh 3:5; Joh 3:7; Tit 3:5-6); as being one with Christ and one another (Joh 17:22; Joh 17:26). — Krehl, Neutestam. Wörterbuch p. 356. SEE SANCTIFICATION.

HOLINESS, as a note of the Church. SEE SANCTITY. SEE HOLINESS OF GOD, his essential and absolute moral perfection. Primarily, the word holy (Sax. hali; Germ. heilig, whole, sound) denotes perfection in a moral sense. As applied to man, it denotes entire conformity to the will of God. SEE SANCTIFICATION. “But when we speak of God, we speak of a Being who is a law unto himself, and whose conduct cannot be referred to a higher authority than his own.” SEE HOLINESS, above.

1. “As to the use of the words קָדוֹשׁand ἃγιος, some critics assert that they are only used in Scripture, with reference to God, to describe him as the object of awe ‘and veneration; and it is true that this is their prevailing meaning-e.g. Isa 6:9; Joh 17:11 (ἃγιε πάτερ) and that accordingly ἁγιάζεσθαι signifies to be esteemed venerable, to be reverenced. Still it is undeniable that these words in many passages are applied to God in a moral sense; e.g. Lev 19:2, ‘Be ye holy, for I am holy;' comp. 1Pe 1:14-16. Thus also ὁσιότης, Eph 4:24; and ἁγιωσύνη, ἁγιασμός, by which all moral perfection is so frequently designated, more especially in the New Testament. The different synonymical significations of the words קָדוֹשׁand ἃγιος are clearly connected in the following manner: (a) The being externally pure; e.g. 2Sa 11:4; Lev 11:43-44; Lev 20:7; Lev 20:25-26 sq. (b) The being separate, since we are accustomed to divide what is pure from what is impure, and to cast away the latter; and therefore (c) The possessing of any kind of external advantage, distinction, or worth. So the Jews were said to be holy to God, in opposition to others, who were κοινοί, profane, common, unconsecrated. Then everything which was without imperfection, disgrace, or blemish was called holy; and קָדוֹשׁ, ἃγιος, sacrosanctus, came thus to signify what was inviolable (Isa 4:3; 1Co 3:17); hence מַקְדָּשׁ, asylum. They were then used in the more limited sense of chaste (like the Latin sanctitas), a sense in which they are also sometimes used in the New Testament; e.g. 1Th 4:3; 1Th 4:7 (comp. Wolf, ad loc.). They then came to denote any internal moral perfection; and, finally, perfection, in the general notion of it, as exclusive of all imperfection.”

2. “The holiness of God, in the general notion of it, is his moral perfection- that attribute by which all moral imperfection is removed from his nature. The holiness of the will of God is that, therefore, by which he chooses, necessarily and invariably, what is morally good, and' refuses what is morally evil. The holiness and justice of God are, in reality, one and the same thing; the distinction consists in this only, that holiness denotes the internal inclination of the divine will-the disposition of God, and justice the expression of the same by actions. This attribute implies, 1. That no sinful or wicked inclination can be found in God. Hence he is said (Jam 1:13; Jam 1:17) to be ἀπείραστος κακῶν, incapable of being tempted to evil (not in the active sense, as it is rendered by the Vulgate and Luther); and in 1Jn 1:5, to be light; and without darkness; i.e. holy, anti without sin.  In this sense he is called טָהוֹר, καθαρός, ἁγνός (1Jn 3:3); also תָּמַים; ἁπλόος, integer (Psa 18:31). The older writers described this by the word ἀναμάρτητος, impeccabilis. [The sinlessness of God is also designated in the New Testament by the words τέλειος (Mat 5:48) and ὅσιος (Rev 16:5).] 2. That he never chooses what is false and deceitful, but only what is truly good-what his perfect intelligence recognizes as such; and that he is therefore the most perfect teacher and the highest exemplar of moral goodness. Hence the Bible declares that he looks with displeasure upon wicked, deceitful courses (Psa 1:5 sq.; Psa 5:5 : Thou hatest all workers of iniquity'); but on the contrary, he regards the pious with favor (Psa 5:7-8; Psa 15:1 sq.; Psa 18:26 sq.; Psa 33:18)” (Knapp, Theology, § 29). Howe speaks of the holiness of God as “the actual, perpetual rectitude of all his volitions, and all the works and actions which are consequent thereupon; and an eternal propension thereto and love thereof, by which it is altogether impossible to that sin that it should ever vary.”

3. Holiness is an essential attribute of God, and adds glory, luster, and harmony to all his other perfections (Psa 27:4; Exo 15:11). He could not be God without it (Deu 32:4). It is infinite and unbounded; it cannot be increased or diminished. It is also immutable and invariable (Mal 3:6). God is originally holy; he is so of and in himself, and the author and promoter of all holiness among his creatures. The holiness of God is visible by his works; he made all things holy (Gen 1:31): by his providences, all which are to promote holiness in the end (Heb 11:10): by his grace, which influences the subjects of it to be holy (Tit 2:10; Tit 2:12): by his word, which commands it (1Pe 1:15): by his ordinances, which he hath appointed for that end (Jer 44:4-5): by the punishment of sin in the death of Christ (Isaiah 53); and by the eternal punishment of it in wicked men (Matthew 20:46) (Buck). SEE ATTRIBUTES.

The holiness of God, like his other attributes, constitutes the divine essence itself, and consequently exists in him in the state of absolute perfection. It were therefore impossible to consider it as a conformity of God to the laws of right, since God himself, on the contrary, is the idea and principle of holiness. But, on the other hand, we may not say that the will of God simply constitutes the essence of divine holiness. To mankind, indeed, the simple will of God is at once law in all things; but with regard to God himself, his will is holy because he wills only according to his immanent holiness, i.e. his own  nature. As the absolute Being, (God is necessarily in no wise dependent on any outward law; but as a morally perfect spirit God cannot but be true to himself, and thus manifest in all his agency his inherent moral perfection as his immanent law.

The earlier dogmatists of the Reformed Church largely discussed the question whether right is right because God wills it, or whether God wills right because it is right. Some (e.g. Polanus) maintained the former view as the only one consistent with the absolute nature of God. The later writers maintain the opposite view, e.g. Voetius: “God is subject to no moral duty from without, because he is no man's debtor, and there is no cause outside of God that can bind or determine him. But from within he may be bound (so to speak), not, indeed, in the sense of subjection, because he is his own debtor, and cannot deny himself. Thus, in divine things, the Father is bound to love the Son, for he cannot but love him; while the Son, by the very necessity of his divine nature, is bound to work by the Father; nor can he do otherwise whenever a work outside of God is to be performed. So, also, in external acts, the creature having been once produced, God is bound to maintain it by his perpetual power and continual influence (as long as he wishes it to exist), to move directly upon it as its first mover, and guide it to his glory (Pro 16:4; Rom 11:34-36). That is immutably good and just whose opposite he cannot wish.” So also Heidegger (Corp. Theol. 3, 89, 90): “Whatever is the holiness, justice, and goodness of the creature, nevertheless its rule and first norm in the sight of God is not his free will and command, but his own essential justice, holiness, and goodness.”

On this subject Watson remarks as follows: “Without conducting the reader into the profitless question whether there is a fixed and unalterable nature and fitness of things, independent of the divine will on the one hand; or, on the other, whether good and evil have their foundation, not in the nature of things, but only in the divine will, which makes them such, there is a method, less direct it may be, but more satisfactory, of assisting our thoughts on this subject. It is certain that various affections and actions have been enjoined upon all rational creatures under the general name of righteousness, and that their contraries have been prohibited. It is a matter also of constant experience and observation that the good of society is promoted only by the one, and injured by the other; and also that every individual derives, by the very constitution of his nature, benefit and happiness from rectitude, injury and misery from vice. This constitution of human nature is therefore an  indication that the Maker and Ruler of men formed them with the intent that they should avoid vice and practice virtue; and that the former is the object of his aversion, the latter of his regard. On this principle, all the laws, which in his legislative character almighty. God has enacted for the government of mankind, have been constructed.

The law is holy, and the commandment holy, just, and good.' In the administration of the world, where God is so often seen in his judicial capacity, the punishments which are inflicted, indirectly or immediately upon man, clearly tend to discourage and prevent the practice of evil. ‘Above all, the Gospel, that last and most perfect revelation of the divine will, instead of giving the professors of it any allowance to sin, because grace has abounded (which is an injurious imputation cast upon it by ignorant and impious minds), its chief design is to establish that great principle, God's moral purity, and to manifest his abhorrence of sin, and inviolable regard to purity and virtue in his reasonable creatures. It was for this he sent his Son into the world to turn men from their iniquities, and bring them back to the paths of righteousness. For this the blessed Jesus submitted to the deepest humiliations and most grievous sufferings. He gave himself (as St. Paul speaks) for his Church, that he might sanctify and cleanse it; that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, but that it should be holy and without blemish; or, as it is elsewhere expressed, he gave himself for us, to redeem us from our iniquities, and to purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works' (Abernethy, Sermons). Since, then, it is so manifest that ‘the Lord loveth righteousness and hateth iniquity,' it must be necessarily concluded that this preference of the one, and hatred of the other, flow from some principle in his very nature-' that he is the righteous Lord; of purer eyes than to behold evil; one who cannot look upon iniquity.'

This principle is holiness, an attribute which, in the most emphatic manner, is assumed by himself, and attributed to him, both by adoring angels in their choirs, and by inspired saints in their worship. He is, by his own designation, ‘the HOLY ONE of Israel;' the seraphs in the vision of the prophet cry continually ‘HOLY, HOLY, HOLY is the Lord God of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory;' thus summing up all his glories in this sole moral perfection. The language of the sanctuary on earth is borrowed from that of heaven: ‘Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name, for thou only art HOLY.' If, then, there is this principle in the divine mind which leads him to prescribe, love, and reward truth, justice, benevolence, and every other virtuous affection and habit in his creatures which we sum up in the term holiness, and to forbid, restrain, and  punish their opposites-that principle, being essential in him, a part of his very nature and Godhead, must be the spring and guide of his own conduct; and thus we conceive without difficulty of the essential rectitude or holiness of the divine nature, and the absolutely pure and righteous character of his administration. This attribute of holiness exhibits itself in two great branches, justice and truth, which are sometimes also treated of as separate attributes.” See Watson, Theolog. Institutes, 1, 436; Knapp, Theology, § 29; Leland, Sermons, 1, 199; Abernethy, Sermons, 2, 180; Heppe, Dogmatik der evangeform. Kirche, p. 73 sq.; Pye Smith, Theol. p. 173 sq.; Pearson, Exposition of the Creed, 1, 10, 531, 541; Smith's Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, 1, 110 sq.; Domeer, in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol. 1, 2; 2, 3; 3:3; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 19, 618; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. , 133; 3:321; 19:618-624; Biblioth. Sac. 12, 377; 13, 840; Meth. Quart. Rev. 11, 505; Thomasius, Dogmatik, 1, 141; Staudenmeier, Dogmatik, 2, 590-610; Dwight, Theol. 1 (see Index); Martensen, Dogmatik, p. 99; Clark, Otl. of Theol. 2, 9 sq.; Calvin, Institutes, 1, 377; Wesley, Works 2, 430. SEE GOD.

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

             a title of the Pope. SEE POPE.

## Holiness, Beauty Of[[@Headword:Holiness, Beauty Of]]

             is a phrase occurring several times in the English Bible (always as a translation of the Heb. hadrath' ko'desh, הִדְרִת קֹדְַשׁ, ornament of sanctity, 1Ch 15:29; 2Ch 20:21; Psa 29:2; Psa 116:9; in the plur. of the cognate term הָדָר, hadda, Psa 110:3), which simply denotes splendid garments, such as are worn on festive occasions, i.q. "holiday suit," not necessarily the sacred priestly vestments, since it is usually, if not exclusively, applied to nonsacerdotal persons.

## Holkot [[@Headword:Holkot ]]

             SEE HOLCOT.

## Holl, Francis Xavier[[@Headword:Holl, Francis Xavier]]

             a German Jesuit, was born at Schwandorf, November 22, 1720, and died March 6, 1784, professor at Heidelberg. He published. Statistica Ecclesiae Germanicae (Heidelberg, 1779): — Diss. Harmonia Juris Naturae, Canonici, Civilis et Publici Germaniae (1782). See Weidlich, Biogrsaphische Notizen, 3; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:779. (B.P.)

## Holland[[@Headword:Holland]]

             also called THE NETHERLANDS, a kingdom in Europe, has an area of 13,890 English square miles. Holland still owns extensive colonies in the East and West Indies, and in South America, which together make an area of about 685,700 English square miles.

I. Church History. — At the beginning of the Christian were, the country which is now called Holland or the Netherlands was inhabited by Germanic tribes, of whom the Batavians and Frisians (q.v.) are best known. Their subjection, begun by Caesar, was completed by Germanicus. At the beginning of the 4th century the Franks conquered a large portion of the country; only the Frisians maintained their independence until the 7th century. Charlemagne appointed counts in Batavia and in Zealand, and compelled the people to embrace the Christian religion. After the division  of the empire of Charlemagne, the Netherlands were united with Lorraine, and they both were made a dependency of Germany. But gradually a number of princes became semi-independent; among them the bishops of Utrecht, who ruled over Upper-Yssel and Groningen. The most powerful among the princes were the counts of Flanders, and after the extinction of these last their land fell by marriage to the dukes of Burgundy, who gradually came into possession of the whole of the Netherlands, remaining, however, feudal to the German emperor. The marriage of the daughter of the last duke of Burgundy with Maximilian, archduke of Austria (later, emperor Maximilian I of Germany), made the Netherlands a part of the extensive dominions of the house of Hapsburg.

The Christianization of the country has been referred to in the arts. BELGIUM and FRIESLAND. Holland, like Belgium, early became distinguished for its excellent cathedral schools, especially that of Utrecht. A great-influence upon the religious life not only of Holland, but of many other countries, was exercised by the Brothers of Common Life, who were founded by Gerhard Groote (q.v.) (1340-1384). This order soon established a number of schools, especially in the Netherlands and the adjacent parts of Germany, which imparted not only elementary instruction, but also a higher education. Thus Holland became celebrated for its learning and scholarship, which in the 15th century was further promoted by the establishment of the University of Deventer. Many of the prominent men of Holland tool an active part in the efforts to reform the Church of Rome; the best known of these reformers is John de Wessel. The Mennonites (q.v.) fully separated from the Church of Rome, and, living in a country which was favorable to religious toleration, suffered less from persecution than most of the mediaeval sects.

The Reformation of the 16th century found in few countries so congenial a soil as in Holland. Favored by the liberal traditions of the country, the national spirit of independence, and the extensive commerce with foreign countries, it spread rapidly. In vain did Charles V issue a number of cruel edicts (the first in March, 1520, the last in 1550) to put it down; it grew in spite of all persecution. Among the different reformed systems which then began to establish themselves, it was especially that of Calvin, first introduced by young Dutch students of Geneva, which struck deep root. The Lutheran doctrines, and, still more, Anabaptist movements, also found numerous adherents, but Calvinism soon obtained the ascendency, owing to a large extent to the influence of the Reformed churches of England and  France. Thus arose the Dutch Reformed Church, embracing at its origin the reformed churches of Belgium, as well as those of Holland, as these countries were at this time politically united. [The inner history of this Church is given in the article REFORMED CHURCH.] Philip II was determined to destroy the new doctrine, and introduced into the Netherlands. all the horrors of the Spanish Inquisition. This called forth a general opposition. The lower nobility united in presenting to the regent Margaret of Parma a protest against religious persecutions; the citizens assembled in the open field for divine service. In 1566, general attacks began against the Roman Catholic churches. In 1567, Philip sent duke Alba to ‘the Netherlands with an army, consisting of Spaniards and Italians, to subdue the religious movement; but the cruel tyranny of the duke led to very different results. William of Orange, the stadtholder,' who had escaped death by flight, unsuccessfully at, tempted, at the head of an army of exiles, to expel the Spaniards, but in 1572 nearly the whole of the northern provinces fell into the hands of the patriots. The efforts of Alba to suppress the revolution by force of arms having entirely failed, he was recalled, and departed in Jan. 1574, boasting that during his administration 18,600 men had been executed, chiefly on account of religion. The efforts of his successors likewise failed to reestablish the rule of Spain. In 1579, the provinces of Holland, Zealand, Utrecht, Friesland, Groningen, Overyssel, and Guelderland formed the Union of Utrecht, and thus laid the foundation of the republic of the Seven United Provinces. From this time the history of the Netherlands divides itself into that of Holland, in which the ascendency of Protestantism was henceforth established, and that of Flanders (subsequently Belgium, q.v.), or the ten provinces, which remained under the Spanish dominion, and adhered to the Roman Catholic Church. William of Orange was assassinated in 1584 by a partisan of Spain, but his son Maurice successfully defended the independence of Holland, and in 1609 compelled Spain to agree to a truce for twelve years. During the peace an unfortunate quarrel broke out between the Calvinists and the Arminians (q.v.). Maurice, who aspired to become hereditary sovereign of Holland, placed himself, from political reasons, at the head of the strict Calvinists, and when he prevailed, the venerable head of the Arminian party, Barneveldt, one of the most illustrious of the Dutch statesmen, was (May 13,1619) executed, while Hugo Grotius, another distinguished leader of the Arminians, or, as they were generally called, from their remonstrances in favor of religious toleration, Remonstrants, escaped by an  artifice. The war with Spain was renewed in 1621, but at the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, Spain had to recognize the independence of Holland.

Under various political vicissitudes, Holland remained henceforth a Protestant country. On the establishment of the Batavian republic in 1795, in consequence of the conquest of the country by France, Church and State were separated; the constitution of the national Church remained however, substantially as before. Simultaneously with the erection of the kingdom of Holland under Napoleon, an attempt was made to reorganize the Church, at the head of which the national Synod was to be placed; but this plan, also, was not executed, as in 1810 Holland was incorporated with the French empire. An introduction of the Organic Articles (1812) was then meditated, but never carried through. The re-establishment of the Netherlands as an independent state, with which also Belgium was united, restored to the national Church most of the rights formerly possessed by her, and gave her for the first time a national Synod. In the new state a majority of the population belonged to the Roman Catholic Church, but the government knew how to maintain in its legislation the ascendency of Protestantism, to the great dissatisfaction of the southern provinces, which revolted in 1830, and constituted the independent kingdom of Belgium (q.v.). From that time Holland again became a predominantly Protestant state, in which, however, the Roman Catholic Church comprises about two fifths of the entire population. Of late, an almost complete separation between Church and State has been effected.

II. Church Statistics. — The total population of the kingdom of Holland amounted in December 1888, according to an official calculation, to 4,505.932. This is exclusive of the grand duchy of Luxemburg (q.v.), which is governed by the king of Holland as grand duke, but is entirely independent from Holland in point of administration. A little over a majority of the entire population, according to the official census taken in 1879, 2,469,814, belong to the National Reformed Church. The present constitution of this Church, which almost makes it autonomous, was regulated by a law- of March 23, 1852. The Church embraces 43 classes in 10 provincial districts. A classis consists of the pastors and a number of the elders, but the number of the latter must not exceed the number of the pastors. Each classis meets annually, and elects a standing committee, which exercises ecclesiastical discipline. The General Synod, which meets every year in June at The Hague, consists of ten pastors, one being elected by each of the provincial synods, three elders, and the representatives of  the three theological faculties of Leyden. Utrecht, and Groningen. To these are added delegates appointed by the Commission of the Reformed Walloon Churches (those which use the French language), and by the East and West Indian churches. A Synodal Commission, consisting of the president, the vice-president, and the secretary of the Synod, of three preachers and elders, and one professor of theology, is chosen for a period of three years. The number of parishes in 1884 was 1345, which were administered by 1611 pastors. The Walloon churches were seventeen in number, with twenty-five pastors, and a population of 9678. They are placed under a special commission for the affairs of the Walloon churches, but form an integral part of the National Reformed Church. Theological faculties representing this Church are connected with the state universities of Leyden, Utrecht, Groningen, and the Athenaea of Deventer and Amsterdam. The famous theological schools of Harderwyk and Franeker (q.v.) have been abolished.

As the National Reformed Church in Holland, in the second half of the 18th and in the present century, fell more and more under the predominant influence of rationalism [for the doctrinal history of the Church, SEE REFORMED CHURCH, a number of the leading defenders of the ancient creed of the Church deemed it best to secede from the National Church, and to organize an independent Church (De afgescheid. reform. kerk). In 1884 this Church comprised forty classes in ten provinces, with about 200 ministers and 379 congregations. It has a theological school at Kampen, with fifty to sixty students. Its membership belongs chiefly to the poorer classes of the population, and numbers 139,903 souls. The Remonstrants and followers of Arminius (q.v.) have considerably decreased since the beginning of the present century. While in 1809 they still numbered thirty- four congregations and forty pastors, they had in 1884 only twenty-four congregations and twenty-four preachers left. They regard themselves as members of the Reformed Church, and call themselves the Remonstrant Reformed Brotherhood. They have been supported since 17.95 by the state, and their pastors are educated at the Athenaeum of Amsterdam. Their Synod meets annually, alternating between Amsterdam and Rotterdam. The Lutherans of Holland adopted as early as 1596 a constitution similar to that of the Reformed Church. Like them, they have elective pastors, elders, and deacons; and by the new regulations of 1858, a Church Council, Synodal.Commission, and Synod, as the three stages of ecclesiastical representation. Their Synod likewise meets annually at the  Hague. The population connected with the Church amounted in 1884 to 61,825; the number of parishes and pastors is about fifty; the number of classes six. They have a theological seminary at Amsterdam. The professors of this seminary, as well as the pastors, receive salaries from the state. The Mennonites, whose origin falls into the time before the Reformation, have likewise decreased since the beginning of the present century. In 1809 they numbered 133 congregations and 185 ministers; in 1884, 126 congregations and 129 ministers. They, too, have a seminary at Amsterdam, with fifteen students in 1884. Rationalism largely prevails among them. The population connected with their congregations numbered in 1884, 50,705. The churches are self-supporting, and independent of each other. The Moravians have two churches and four ministers. The Jews in 1888 numbered about 100,000 souls.

Among the religious societies of Holland the following are the most important:

(1.) The Netherlands Bible Society, which had in 1867 a circulation of 32,251 copies, and an income of $-30,000.

(2.) The Sunday-school Union had in 1867 established 271 Sunday-schools in ninety-five different places; they had together 1301 teachers and 24,400 children. It publishes a weekly paper, The Christian Family Circle.

(3.) The Society for Christian National-school Instruction (established in 1860), whose design is the establishment throughout the country of schools in which a sound Christian education shall be given, as opposed to that given in the national schools. Eighty schools had in 1867 been established in different parts of the country on this principle. The income of the society was about $9000.

(4.) The Netherlands Evangelical Protestant Union, established in 1853, endeavors to “counteract the terrible power of Rome, and unbelief prevailing throughout the country, by means of colporteurs and evangelists.” The income of the society is about $1500. (5.) The missionary societies of Holland labor exclusively in the Dutch colonies, and in the neighboring islands of the Indian Archipelago. Great open-air missionary gatherings are now held every year in Holland.

Until the Reformation, the whole of modern Holland belonged to the diocese of Utrecht (q.v.). In: 1559 this see was made an archbishopric, and five suffragan sees were erected-Haarlem, Middleburg, Deventer,  Leeuwarden, and Groningen. The success of the Reformed Church, after the establishment of the independence of Holland, put an end to all the dioceses. In 1583 an apostolical vicariate was established for those who continued to adhere to the Church of Rome. It was at first administered by the apostolical nuncio in Brussels. At the beginning of the 17th century the Dutch mission again received a resident vicar apostolic at Utrecht (who was to supply the place of the former archbishops), and five provicars at the former episcopal sees. In 1723 the Jansenist (q.v.) canons of Utrecht elected an archbishop; in 1742 a Jansenist bishop was elected for Haarlem, and in 1755 another for Deventer. Al these sees are still extant, but the number of parishes and the membership have decreased. These have at present (1870) a population of about 4000 souls in twenty-five parishes. After the establishment of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Roman Catholic Church in the seven old provinces was divided into seven arch-presbyterates, who were placed under the papal nuncio at the Hague as “vice superior of the Dutch mission,” while the: apostolic vicariates of Herzogenbusch, Breda, and Limburg (1840) were erected into districts which had formerly belonged to other states. On March 7. 1853, Pius IX re-established the regular hierarchy by erecting the archbishopric of Utrecht, and the four bishoprics of Haarlem) Breda, Herzogenbusch, and Roeremonde. The Catholic population in 1879 Numbered 1,439,137 souls), with 39 convents of monks (containing 815 members) and 137 female monasteries (containing 2188 members). Among the monks are Jesuits, Redemptorists, Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites, and Norbertines. Several congregations of Sisters of Charity have arisen in Holland.

A complete Church History of Holland has been published by Glasius, Geschiedeniss der christelike kerk en godsdienst in de Nederlanden (Leyden, 1833 sq., 6 vols.). The introduction of Christianity into the Netherlands is specially treated of by Diest Lorgion (Gesch. van de invoering des christend. in Nederlanden (Leuw. 1841), and by Prof. Royaards (Gesch. der invoering en vestiqing van et christend. in Nederl. Utr. 1841; 3rd ed. 1844). The latter began a Church History of Holland during the Middle Ages (Gesch. van et gerestigde Christendom en de christ. kerk in Neederlande gedurende. de middeleeuwen Utr. 1849-53, 2 vols.), but the death of this eminent historian (1854) prevented the completion of the work. A biographical Church History, from a Roman Catholic stand-point, was begun by Alberding Thijm (Gesch. der kerk in de  Nederl.; vol. 1. H. Willibrodus, A postel der Nederlanden, Amsterd. 1861; Germ. translated Munster, 1863). A work of great ability is the Church History of Holland before the Reformation, by Moll (Kerkegeschiedeniss van Nederland voor de hervorming, Arnheim, 1864 sq., 3 vols.). SEE BELGIUM. (A. J. S.)

## Holland, Guido[[@Headword:Holland, Guido]]

             An English Jesuit, was born in Lincoln about 1587. He was educated at the University of Cambridge, devoting his time mainly to metaphysics. After graduation he went to Spain, and here pursued a course in theology. In 1615 he entered the order of the Jesuits, and was sent to England as a Roman Catholic missionary. He died Nov. 26, 1660. He wrote a work of some importance on the immortality of the soul, under the title Praerogativa naturae humanae. Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex. 2, 1674.

## Holland, John M[[@Headword:Holland, John M]]

             A Methodist Episcopal minister, born in Williamson County, Tenn., about 1803 or 1804, was converted in early life, and entered the ministry in 1822. After holding several important charges, he was appointed presiding elder of the Cumberland District in 1829. Two years later he was sent to Nashville, and in 1832 was reappointed presiding elder over the Forked Deer District, transferred in 1833 to the Memphis, and in 1836 to the Florence District. In 1837 he was selected as the agent of La Grange College, but in 1838 he returned to the active work of the ministry as presiding elder of Holly Springs District, in Mississippi. In 1839 he was once more chosen agent for a college-this time for Holly Springs University; but in 1840 he again returned to the presiding eldership, that of the Memphis District. On this district he died in 1841. Holland was one of the most able and useful servants of the Methodist Episcopal Church in his day, and is generally acknowledged to rank foremost among the preachers of Tennessee. — Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 7, 662.

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

             A celebrated English divine, born at Ludlow, in Shropshire, in 1539, was educated at Exeter College, Oxford. His broad and thorough scholarship secured him the regius professorship at Oxford, and in this station “he distinguished himself so much by every kind of desirable attainment, divine or human, that he was esteemed and admired not only in our seminaries of  learning at home, but also in the universities abroad” (Middleton, Ev. Biog. 2, 373 sq.; compare also Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex. 2, 1674). He died March 17, 1612. Holland was a zealous Protestant, and labored earnestly to drive from Oxford all Papists and their sympathizers, of whom it had not a few at this early date of Protestantism in England, It is to be regretted that most of the works he left, and these were few indeed, were never printed. Allibone mentions Oratio Oxon. (Oxford, 1599, 4to) and Sermons (ibid. 1601, 4to).

## Hollar, Wentzel[[@Headword:Hollar, Wentzel]]

             an eminent Bohemian engraver, was born at Prague in 1607, studied at Frankfort under Matthew Merian, and at the age of eighteen published his first plates, an Ecce Homo, and the Virgin and Infant. He made the tour of Germany. At Cologne he formed an acquaintance with the earl of Arundel, who took him into his employment. About this time the civil war broke out, in which Hollar became involved on the side of the royalists, and was made a prisoner by the opposite party in 1645. On obtaining his liberty he went to Flannders, and settled at Antwerp. In 1652 he returned to England, but gained little encouragement. He died March 28, 1677. There are about two thousand four hundred prints by this artist, and some of them possess considerable merit. The following are only a few of his sacred subjects: The Virgin Suckling the Infant Jesus and Caressing St. John; The Holy  Family; The Ecce Homo, .with many figures; The Queen of Sheba Visiting Solomon; The Magdalen in the Desert Kneeling before a Crucifix. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

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

             A German Lutheran divine, was born at Wulkow, near Stargard, in 1648. He studied at Wittenberg, and became successively pastor of Putzerkin, near Stargard, in 1670, co-rector of Stargard in 1680, rector and preacher of Colberg, and, finally, provost and pastor of Jakobshagen. He died in 1713. Aside from minor productions on different subjects, as sermons, etc., he wrote a work on dogmatics, which was long in great favor. It is entitled Examen theologicum acroamaticum universam theologiam thetico- polemicam complectens (1707, 4to; reprinted in 1717, 1722, 1725, 1735, and 1741; and, with additions and corrections, by R. Teller in 1750 and 1763). The popularity enjoyed by this work was not so much due to its scientific originality, for it was mainly based on the works of Gerhard, Calov, Scherzer, etc., as to its convenient arrangement, the clearness and precision of its definitions, and the careful and thorough classification of its contents. Another, and perhaps still more powerful cause of- its success is to be found in its liberal spirit, coupled with unimpeachable orthodoxy. Hollaz occupies the first place among the Lutheran theologians of the close of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th century. He sought to find a medium between the orthodox scholastic divinity and the wants of practical religion, and endeavored to reconcile ecclesiastical orthodoxy with freedom of thought. See Ernesti, Neue Theol. 5, 185; Walch, Bibl. Theol. 1, 62; Ersch und Gruber, Ally. Encyklopadie; Herzog, Real — Encyklop. 6, 240; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctr. 2, 263, 264, 339; Gass, Geschichte d. Dogmat. 2, 495 sq.; Kurtz, Church. Hist. 2, 245; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref. 7, 16 sq.; Dorner, Gesch. d. Dogmat. p. 430 sq.

## Hollebeck, Ewald[[@Headword:Hollebeck, Ewald]]

             A Dutch theologian, born at Hamstede in 1719, was educated at the University of Leyden. In 1762 he was called to his alma mater as professor  of theology. He is especially distinguished in the Church of Holland by his revolutionary efforts in the homiletical field of theology. He was the first to condemn the old method of making a sermon an exegetical dissertation, and to introduce the English method of preaching to the edification of the people. He set forth his views in De optimo concionum genere (Leyden, 1768; much enlarged, 1770, 8vo). At first he encountered great opposition; but, as he bore himself calmly in the contest, he soon got the better of his opponents, and, as a mark of his popularity at the university, he was elected rector in 1764. He died Oct. 24, 1796. — Schröckh, Kirchengesch. s. d. Reform. 8, 653 sq.; Walch, Neuest. Religionsgesch. 2, 411 sq.; Ernesti, U. Theolog. Biblioth. 1, 230 sq.; Adelung's Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex. 2, 2098; Biog. Univ. 20, 480.

## Holleshow, Johann Von[[@Headword:Holleshow, Johann Von]]

             A Benedictine monk, born at Holleshow, in Bohemia, in 1366, was educated at Paris. He was one of the most violent opponents of Huss, and contributed more than any other person to his execution. This explains why the Hussites afterwards (1420) destroyed the monastery to which Holleshow belonged. He died in 1436. A list of his works is given in Adelung's Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex. 2, 2098. (J. H.W.)

## Holley, Horace, LL.D[[@Headword:Holley, Horace, LL.D]]

             A Unitarian minister, was born in Salisbury, Conn., Feb. 13, 1781; graduated at Yale College in 1803; in 1805 was minister of Greenfield Hill, Fairfield, and in 1809 minister of Hollis Street, Boston. In 1818 he became the president of Transylvania University, Lexington, Ky., which office he retained until 1827. He died on a voyage to New York July 31, 1827. He had great reputation as a pulpit orator, and published several occasional sermons and addresses. See Memoir of Dr. Holley, by his Widow; North American Review, 37, 403; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, I, 866.

## Holliday, Charles[[@Headword:Holliday, Charles]]

             A Methodist Episcopal minister, born in Baltimore Nov. 23, 1771, was licensed to preach in 1797, and entered the itinerancy in 1809. He was made presiding elder on Salt River District in 1813; located in 1816; was again presiding elder on Cumberland District, Tennessee Conference, 1817-21; on Green River District, Kentucky Conference, 1821-25 and on Wabash District, Illinois Conference, 1825-28. At the General Conference  of 1828 he was appointed Book Agent at Cincinnati, where he remained eight years. After this he was for several years presiding elder in the Illinois Conference. He was superannuated in 1846, and died March 8, 1850. Mr. Holliday was a “clear, sound, and practical preacher,” a deeply pious Christian, and amiable and beloved in all the relations of life. — Minutes of Conferences, 4, 528; Redford, History of Methodism in Kentucky, 2, 95 sq. (G.L.T.)

## Holliday, William Harrison, D.D[[@Headword:Holliday, William Harrison, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Berkeley County, West Virginia, August 31, 1835. He was converted at the age of eleven, preached his first sermon at sixteen, entered Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania in 1853, and in 1855 was admitted to the Baltimore Conference. He served as junior preacher successively on Winchester, Hillsborough, and Warrentoll circuits. In 1858 he was sent to Summerfield Circuit, late ill that year was transferred to the Iowa Conference, and appointed to Cascade; returned a year later to the Baltimore Conference, and successively served Baltimore, South River, and Montgomery circuits, South Baltimore Station, East Washington, Winchester District, Eutaw Street, and Harford Avenue. He died March 23, 1879. Dr. Holliday was a self-sacrificing, warm-hearted, heroic, successful preacher. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1879, page 15.

## Hollingshead, William, D.D[[@Headword:Hollingshead, William, D.D]]

             A Congregational minister, born at Philadelphia Oct. 8,1748, was educated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1770, and entered the ministry in 1772. His first pastoral charge was at Fairfield, N. J. In 1783 he accepted a call from a church in Charleston, S. C. In 1793 Princeton College conferred on him the degree of D.D. He died Jan. 26,1817. He published several sermons (1789, 1794,1805). — Sprague, Annals of Amer. Pulpit, 2, 58.

## Hollingworth, Richard, D.D[[@Headword:Hollingworth, Richard, D.D]]

             an English clergyman, was vicar of Westham, and rector of St. Botolph's, Aldgate. He published six Sermons (1673-93), and several treatises upon the famous Eikon-Basilike controversy. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Hollis, Thomas, Jr[[@Headword:Hollis, Thomas, Jr]]

             Nephew of the preceding, was born in London in 1720, and devoted himself to literature and to the propagation of the principles of civil and religious liberty. He traveled over the Continent from 1748 to 1750, and then settled down on his estate at Corsecombe, Dorset. It is said that half of his large fortune was given away for benevolent purposes. Among his benefactions was a donation of books to the library of Harvard College to the value of £1400 sterling. He died at Corsecombe in 1774. His Memoirs  were published in 1780, in two splendid quartos, with engravings. See Gentl. Mag. vol. 74; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 866.

## Hollis, Thomas, Sr[[@Headword:Hollis, Thomas, Sr]]

             One of the early benefactors of Harvard College, was born in London in 1659. His father, though a Baptist, was a member of the Independent Church at Pinner's Hall, and he followed in the same relation. Having accumulated a fortune in trade, he gave large sums to charity and to advance the Baptist and Independent Churches. Still more substantial marks of his liberality were conferred on Harvard College, Mass., in which he founded a professorship of mathematics and one of theology, and endowed scholarships for poor students, enriched the library and the cabinets, etc. He died in London in 1731. See Crosby, Hist. of the Baptists, 4, 229; Bogue and Bennett, History of the Dissenters, 2, 414; Christian Examiner, 7, 64; Skeats, Free Churches of England, p. 323.

## Hollister, Theorem O[[@Headword:Hollister, Theorem O]]

             A Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in 1822 at Sharon, Conn. He was converted in early life, preached under the presiding elder in the state of New York, removed to Wisconsin, and joined the Wisconsin Conference in 1853. His appointments were: Summit, Fort Atkinson, Lake Mills, Greenbush, Sheboygan Falls, Fond du Lac Station, Fond du Lac District, Oconomowoc, Waukesha, and Hart Prairie. “He was truly a laborer in God's harvest, zealously affected always in every good thing, serving the Lord most emphatically with all his heart, and soul, and mind, and strength.” He died at Salem, Wisconsin, March 13,1869. Hollister was a self-educated man, but good native talent, a logical mind, and vivid imagination atoned for his earlier deficiency, and he ranked among the first in his Conference. See Min. Ann. Conf. 1869, p. 225.

## Hollman, Samuel Christian[[@Headword:Hollman, Samuel Christian]]

             A distinguished German theologian, born at Stettin Dec. 3, 1696, was educated at the University of Wittenberg. After lecturing a short time at the universities of Greifswald and Jena. he returned in 1723 to Wittenberg, and was made adjunct professor of philosophy in 1724. Two years later he was promoted to an extraordinary professorship, and in 1734 was called as a regular professor to the University of Göttingen, then opening. He died in 1787. Hollman devoted his time mainly to philosophical studies. He was at first an opponent of Wolf's philosophy, later an admirer of it, and finally became an Eclectic. He wrote text books in metaphysics, which were well received, and used so long as eclecticism was in vogue in Germany. He was also active in awakening an interest in his contemporaries for the study of the natural sciences. His most important works are: De stupendo naturae mysterio anima sibi ipsi ignota (Greifs. and Wittenb. 1722-24, 4to) — Commentatio philos. de harmoni inter animam et corpus praestabilita (Wittenb. 1724, 4to) — Apologia Praelectionum in N.T. Grec. habitarum (ibid. 1727, 4to) — Comm. phil. de miraculis et genuinis eorundem criteriis, etc. (Frankf. and Lpz. 1727, 4to) — Instit. philos. (Wittenberg, 1727, 2 vols. 8vo) — Ueberzeugender Vortrag v. Gött u. Schrift (ibid. 1733, 8vo, and often) — Von d. menschl. Erkenntniss u. d. Quell. der Weltweisheit (ibid. 1737, 8vo) — Hist pneumatologiae et  theologize naturalis (Göttingen 1740, 8vo), etc. A list of his works is given in Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex. Adelung's Add. 2, 2099 sq. See Krug, Philos. Lex. 2, 451 sq.

## Holm, Peter Jr[[@Headword:Holm, Peter Jr]]

             A Danish divine, born at Moum, Norway, June 6,1706, was educated at the university at Copenhagen, and afterwards lectured at his alma mater. In 1738 he was appointed professor of theology and philosophy, when, in addition to the duties of his chair, he instructed in Greek and Hebrew, and assisted in the revision of the Danish version of the Bible. In 1746 he was promoted to a regular professorship of theology. He died June 9,1777. His writings, which; on account of his excessive labor in the revision of the Bible, were few in number, are mainly in the form of dissertations. A list of them may be found in Adelung's Addenda 2 to Jocher's Gelehrt. Lex. p. 2102. (J. H.W.)

## Holm-tree[[@Headword:Holm-tree]]

             (πρῖνος, ilex) occurs only in the apocryphal story of Susanna (ver. 58). The passage contains a characteristic play on the names of the two trees mentioned by the elders in their evidence. That on the mastich (σχῖνον...ἄγγελος σχίσει σε) will be noticed under that head. SEE MASTICK. That on the holm-tree (πρῖνον) is: “The angel of God waiteth with the sword to cut thee in two” (ἵνα πρίσαι σε). For the historical significance of these puns, SEE SUSANNA. The πρῖνος of Theophrastus (Hist. Plant. 3, 7, § 3, and 16, § 1, and elsewhere) and Dioscorides (1, 144) denotes, there can be no doubt, the Quercus coccifera, or the Q. pseudococcifera, which is perhaps not specifically distinct from the first- mentioned oak. The ilex of the Roman writers was applied both to the holm-oak (Quercus ilex), and to the Q. coccifera, or kermes oak. See Pliny (N.H. 16, 6). For the oaks of Palestine, see a paper by Dr. Hooker in the Transactions of the Linnaean Society, vol. 23, pt. 2, p. 381-387. — Smith, s.v. SEE OAK.

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

             A Congregational minister, was born in Sutton, Mass., Dec. 13, 1777. He entered the sophomore class at Brown University in 1800, and graduated in 1803. He studied theology with his brother, the late Rev. Nathan Holman, of Attleborough, and Rev. Dr. Emmons, of Franklin, commenced  preaching in Douglass, Mass., in the autumn of 1807, and was ordained Oct. 19, 1808. He continued pastor of the church in Douglass until Aug. 17, 1842, when he was obliged to resign on account of impaired health. “In 1848 he renewed his labors among his old flocks, and continued to perform the duties of a pastor for five years. Several revivals of religion were enjoyed during his ministry, as the results of which more than 200 were added to the Church. He died Nov. 16,1866. See Congreg. Quarterly, 9, 208.

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

             A Methodist Episcopal minister, was born April 20, 1790, near Shelbyville, Ky., then in Virginia. He joined the Church in 1812; four years later he entered the Ohio Conference, and was appointed to Limestone Circuit. In 1821 he was sent to the Newport Circuit, and a year later was appointed to Frankfort, the capital of the state. Here he built up a fine society, and remained four years. He next went to Danville and Harrodsburg, where he labored with equal zeal and success. After serving Lexington, Russelville, and Mt. Stirling in succession, he was appointed to Louisville, where he succeeded in building the Brook Street Church. He remained in this city “from 1833 to the close of his ministry, except two years, serving all the churches either as pastor or presiding elder. During the war he separated his connection with the “M. E. Church South,” and, espousing the Federal cause, “accepted a post-chaplaincy, to the arduous duties of which he addressed himself with a faithfulness that was really surprising-visiting hospitals, and administering to the sick and dying night and day.” He died Aug. 1, 1867. — Redford, History of Methodism in Kentucky, 2, 374 sq.

## Holmboe, Kristoffer Andreas[[@Headword:Holmboe, Kristoffer Andreas]]

             a Norwegian Orientalist, was born March 19, 1796. In 1825 he was professor at Christiania, resigned his office in 1876, and died April 2,1882. He is the author of, Traces du Budhisme en Norvege Avant l'Introduction de Christianisme (1857): — Bibelsk Real-Ordbog (1868). (B.P.)

## Holme, John Stanford, D.D[[@Headword:Holme, John Stanford, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Philadelphia, March 4, 1822, and was a descendant of John Holme, one of the first Baptists of Pennsylvania. John S. prepared for college; at New Hampton, N.H.; first studied law in Philadelphia; but afterwards graduated at Madison University in 1850, and became pastor of a church in Watertown, N.Y. Four years later he was called to the pastorate of the Pierrepont Street Baptist Church, now the First, of Brooklyn, where he remained for some years, and then organized Trinity Baptist Church of New York, and was its pastor for fourteen years. He resigned that pastorate to accept that of the Riverside Baptist Church, at Eighty-sixth Street and the Boulevard, but, his health failing, he passed much of his time resting in Europe. He died at Clifton Springs. N.Y., August 26, 1884. Dr. Holme was known for his literary attainments, having prepared the Plymouth Collection of Hymns for the Baptist churches, and compiled a popular work, entitled Light at Evening Time. For some time he had been a member of the staff of The Homiletic Monthly. See Cathcart, Bapt. Encyclop. s.v.

## Holmes, Abiel, D.D[[@Headword:Holmes, Abiel, D.D]]

             A Congregational minister, born in Woodstock, Conn., Dec. 24, 1763, was educated at Yale College (class of 1783), and served his alma mater as tutor a short time. He became pastor in Midway, Georgia, Nov. 1785, and Jan. 25, 1792, pastor of the First Church, Cambridge, Mass. When the increase of new theological opinions caused a division of the society, he retained his connection with the “orthodox” portion of the parish. A colleague having been settled with him, he resigned his share of the duties Sept. 26, 1831, and passed his last days at Cambridge. He died June 4, 1837. Dr. Holmes was a director of the American Education Society, a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society, and of several other well-  known associations. The University of Edinburgh conferred on him the degree of D.D. in 1805. He published Proceedings of A Council at the Ordination of Rev. Abiel Holmes, at Midway, Georgia, with the Pastoral Address (1787) — Life of President Stiles (1798, 8vo) — Memoir of Stephen Pannenius, of Buda, with his Latin Poem translated; also Memoir of the Moheagan Indians: both published in vol. 9, Mass. Hist. Coll. (1804) — American Annals (1805, 2 vols. 8vo) — Biographical Memoir of the Rev. John Lothropp, in Mass. Hist. Coll. vol. 1, 2nd series — Historical Sketch of the English Translations of the Bible (1815) — Memoir of the French Protestants who settled in Oxford, Mass., in 1686, printed in Mass. Hist. Coll. vol. 2, 3rd series (1826) — Annals of America from the Discovery by Columbus in 1492 to the Year 1826 (1829, 2nd edit. 2 vols. 8vo); and a large number of occasional sermons and addresses. — Sprague, Annals, 2, 240; Allen, American Biography; Duyckinck, Cyclop. of American Literature, 1, 511 sq.; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 868; American Almanac, 1836, p. 316.

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

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Newburgh, N.Y., March 16, 1810. He was converted in his youth, and in 1834 entered the Oneida Conference, filling many of its best stations till 1855, when he was transferred to the Southern Illinois Conference. After effective labors in it of five years he was transferred to the North-west Indiana Conference, wherein he served La Porte, Delphi, and Pittsburgh. From 1861 to 1866 he was principal of Battle Ground Collegiate Institute, and in 1867 principal of Northwestern Indiana College. In 1868 he re-entered the regular work, and served successively Simpson Chapel, Greencastle; Brookstown; Monticello, and Battle Ground, Michigan. He died November 14, 1873. Dr. Holmes was a ripe scholar, an excellent logician, a thorough educator, an able preacher, and an author of merited repute. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1874, page 93; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Holmes, Obadiah[[@Headword:Holmes, Obadiah]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Preston, Lancashire, England, in 1606, and was educated at Oxford. He arrived in America in 1639, and continued a communicant with the Congregationalists, first at Salem, and then at Rehoboth eleven years, when he became a Baptist, and joined the Baptist Church in Newport, R.I. In 1652, when the minister, Mr. Clark, sailed for England, Mr. Holmes took charge of the church in Newport, and this relation he held till his death, October 15, 1682. Mr. Holmes underwent great persecution for his religious principles, being imprisoned for several months, and publicly whipped by the Puritan authorities in 1661. See Sprague, Annuals of the Amer. Pulpit, 6:23.

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

             An English divine, born in Hampshire in 1749, was educated at New College, Oxford. He became successively rector of Staunton, canon of Salisbury, and finally (1804) dean of Winchester. In 1790 he succeeded Thomas Warton as professor of poetry at Oxford. He died at Oxford in 1805. Holmes wrote The Resurrection of the Body deduced from- the Resurrection of Christ (Oxford 1777, 4to) — On the Prophecies and Testimony of John the Baptist, and the parallel Prophecies of Jesus Christ (Hampton Lectures for 1782, Oxford 1782, 8vo) — Four tracts on the Principles of Religion as A Test of Divine Authority; on the Principles of Redemption; on the Angelical Message of the Virgin Mary; and on the Resurrection of the Body, with A Discourse on Humility (Oxford 1788); etc. But his principal work was the collation of the Septuagint. “As early as 1788 he published at Oxford proposals for a collation of all the known MSS. of the Septuagint a labor which had never yet been undertaken on an extensive scale, and the want of which had long been felt among Biblical scholars. Dr. Holmes's undertaking was promoted by the delegates of the Clarendon Press. In addition to the learned editor's own labors, literary men were engaged in different parts of the Continent for the business of collation, and Dr. Holmes annually published an account of the progress which was made” (Kitto).

The book of Genesis, successively followed by the other books of the Pentateuch, making together one folio volume, with  one title page and one general preface, was published at Oxford in 1798. From this preface we learn that eleven Greek MSS. in uncial letters, and more than one hundred MISS. in cursive writing (containing either the whole or parts of the Pentateuch), were collated for this edition, of which the text was a copy of the Roman edition of 1587 [that of Sixtus V]: the deviations from three other cardinal editions (the Complutensian, the Aldine, and Grabe's) are always noted. The quotations found in the works of the Greek fathers are also alleged, and likewise the various readings of the ancient versions made from the Septuagint. “The plan of this edition thus bore a close resemblance to what had been already applied by Mill, Wetstein, and Griesbach to the criticism of the Greek Testament, and the execution of it has been highly commended as displaying uncommon industry and apparently great accuracy.” It is to be regretted that “the learned editor died in the midst of this honorable labor; but shortly before his death he had published the book of Daniel, both according to the Sept. version and that of Theodotion, the latter only having been printed in former editions, because the translation of this book is not contained in the common MSS., and was unknown till it was printed in 1772 from a MS. belonging to cardinal Chigi” (Kitto). The work was continued by the Rev. J. Parsons, B.D., and completed on the original plan. The title of the work is Vetus Testamentum Graecum, cum variis Lectionibus (Oxford 1798- 1804, 15 vols. fol.). Tischendorf, however, condemns the work as inaccurately done (Proleg. to el. of Sept. 1856, p. 52-56). See Chalmers, Biographical Dict.; Bp. Marsh, Divinity Lectures, lect. 12; Lowendes, Brit. Lib. p. 28, 29; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 870; Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, 1, 1520; Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit. 2, 318. (J. H.W.)

## Holmnan, Russell, D.D[[@Headword:Holmnan, Russell, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Warwick, Massachusetts, August 14, 1812. He graduated from Brown University, became a pastor in Greene County, Kentucky, in 1839, in 1842 of the Coliseum Church at New Orleans in 1845 secretary of the Southern Baptist Home Mission, an office which he retained (with a pastoral interval from 1851 to 1856) until 1862, after which he labored occasionally as health would permit in Louisiana, Illinois, Kentucky, and Missouri, until disabled by paralysis in 1876. He died December 2, 1879. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. s.v.

## Holmpatrick, Council of[[@Headword:Holmpatrick, Council of]]

             held at Holmpatrick, an island off the eastern coast of Ireland, in 1148, by the advice of the pope, Innocent II, to consider the question of granting the pall to the archbishops of Armagh and Cashel. This synod was attended by fifteen bishops and two hundred priests. The council lasted four days, the first three of which were occupied with questions concerning the general welfare of the Church, confining the question of the palls to the last day. The result was a formal petition to pope Eugenius III (who had meanwhile succeeded Innocent), which Malachy O'Morgais, a former archbishop of Armagh, was commissioned to carry to Rome, in favor of the grant. Todd,  Hist. of Ancient Church in Ireland, p. 113; Landon's Manual of Councils, p. 265, 266.

## Holobolus, Manuel[[@Headword:Holobolus, Manuel]]

             (Μανουὴλ ῾Ολόβωλος), a Byzantine prelate and philologist, who lived in the latter part of the 13th century. From his infancy he was attached to John Lascaris, who was placed upon the throne at nine years of age, and shared with. Michael Palseologus the title of emperor. When Michael ordered the young-prince to be blinded and sent into exile, Holobolus, who then was still a student, could not conceal his indignation, and for this imprudence the emperor ordered that his nose and lips should be cut off. He was then imprisoned in a monastery, where he pursued his studies with so much success that he was put in charge of the younger monks in 1267. Shortly afterwards the emperor was reconciled to Holobolus, and conferred upon him the dignity of a rhetor, or lecturer on the Holy Scriptures. During the discussions which were taking place between the Greek and Latin churches, on the subject of a reunion, he opposed energetically the proposition of Michael Palaeologus.He was consigned to a monastery at Nicmea in 1273. The emperor soon after brought him back to Constantinople with a cord around his neck. A long captivity did not change at all the sentiments of Holobolus, for he took part, in 1283, in the deposition of the patriarch John Veccus, a partisan of the Latin union. Holobolus left Political Verses on Michael Palceologus, which are cited in the Glossarium of Du Cange, under ῾Ρήτωρ and ῾Ερμηνεῖαι See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Holocaust[[@Headword:Holocaust]]

             SEE SACRIFICE.

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

             (ὁλόκαυστος, wholly burned), a kind of sacrifice wherein the whole offering was burned or consumed by fire, nothing being left for the feast. Among the heathen it was analogous to the Scripture burnt-offering.

## Holofernes[[@Headword:Holofernes]]

             Or, rather, OLOFERNES (Ο᾿λοφέρνης), a person mentioned only in the Apocrypha (Jdt 2:4, etc.). The name occurs twice in Cappadocian history, as borne by the brother of Ariarathes I (B.C. cir. 350), and afterwards by a pretender to the Cappadocian throne, who was at first supported and afterwards imprisoned by Demetrius Soter (B.C. cir. 158). The termination (Tissaphernes, etc.) points to a Persian origin, but the meaning of the word is uncertain. — Smith. See Volkmar, Einleitung in die Apokryphen (Tub. 1860-3), 1, 179 sq.; Graitz, Geschichte der Juden, 4, 455. According to the account in the book of Judith, Nebuchadnezzar, “king of Nineveh,” having resolved to “avenge himself on all the earth,” appointed Holofernes general of the expedition intended for this purpose, consisting of 120,000 foot and 12,000 horse. Holofernes marched westward and southward, carrying devastation everywhere he came, destroying harvests, and flocks, and cities, as well as men, old and young; making even the “cities of the sea-coast,” which had submitted to him, feel the weight of his arm. Having reached Esdraelon, he encamped “between Geba and Scythopolis” a whole month to collect his forces. The Jews, however, resolved to resist him, and fortified all the mountain passes. Dissuaded by Achior, “captain of the sons of Ammon,” from attacking the Jews, he resented the advice and delivered Achior into the hands of the Jews in Bethulia, from whom, however, he met with a kind reception. Holofernes proceeded against Bethulia (q.v.) where he was brought to bay; and, instead of attacking it, seized upon two wells on which the city depended for water, and sat down before it to take it by siege. While here he fell a victim to the treachery of Judith, a beautiful Jewish widow, who artfully managed to be brought into his presence, and who, by playing the hypocrite, secured his favor and confidence. Having invited her to a banquet, he drank freely, and, having fallen asleep, fell beneath the arm of his fair guest, who cut off his head with his own sword, and escaped with her bloody trophy to her own people in Bethulia. The Jews immediately fell on their enemies, who, finding their general dead in his tent, fled in  confusion. Such is the story. It is scarcely necessary to add that it is wholly unhistorical. — Kitto. SEE JUDITH.

## Holomerians[[@Headword:Holomerians]]

             SEE SPIRITUALISM.

## Holon[[@Headword:Holon]]

             (Heb. Cholon', חֹלוֹןor חֹלֹן, sandy), the name of one or two places.

1. (Sept. ᾿Ηλών, ᾿Ωλών, etc.; Vulg. Holon, Olon.) A city in the mountains of Judah (Jos 15:51, where it is mentioned between Goshen and Giloh); assigned to the Levites (Jos 21:15, where it is mentioned between Eshtemoa and Debir); in the parallel passage (1Ch 6:58) it is written HILEN (Heb. Chiet', חַילֵן; Sept. Νηλών, but transposes with Jether; Vulg. Helon). De Saulcy is inclined to identify it with the village Nuhhalin, on the hills (Dead Sea, 1, 453, 454) west of Bethlehem, or, according to Dr. Robinson (new ed. of Researches, 3, 284), at the bottom of wady el-Musurr, on its southern side; but this is not in the same group of towns with the others, which all lie in the south-west part of the mountain district (Keil, Comment. ad loc.). The position seems rather to correspond to that of Beit Amreh, a large ruined village on a hill near wady el-Khulil, northwest of Juttah, on the road to Hebron (Robinson, Researches, 2, 629 and note).

2. (Sept. Χελών,Vulg. Helon.) A city of Moab (Jer 48:21). It was one of the towns of the Mishor, the level downs (A.V. “plain country”) east of Jordan, and is named with Jahazah, Dibon, and other known places; but no identification of it has yet taken place, nor does it appear in the parallel lists of Numbers 32 and Joshua 13. Smith. Perhaps it is the same as HORONAIM SEE HORONAIM (q.v.)

## Holon Of Judah[[@Headword:Holon Of Judah]]

             For this place Lieut. Conder conjecturally proposes. (Tent Work, 2:337) Beit 'Alam, a large ruin nine and a half miles west of Halhul, containing "foundations, caves, cistern, with heaps of stones and remains of an ancient road" (Memoirs of Ordnance Survey, 3:321); and Trelawney Saunders (O.T. Map) locates it at Khurbet Hanan, two miles south-west of Hebron. The latter position is possible, but the former is not within the required group of towns.

## Holste or Holstenius[[@Headword:Holste or Holstenius]]

             Lucas, born at Hamburg in 1596, was educated at the University of Leyden, and ranks as one of the first scholars of his time. Failing to secure a professorship, he traveled through Italy, England, and other countries, and settled at Paris, where he became acquainted with the distinguished Jesuits Dupuy, Peiresc, and other learned men of that order and he finally became a Roman Catholic, in consequence, he said, of his careful study of the works of the fathers, and of his seeking for the principle of unity in the  Church; but others think that his conversion was wholly due to his association with the Jesuits, and to his desire to have freer access to the libraries of France and Italy; and some even, among whom is Salmasius (see Moller, Cimbr. Lit. 3, 323), ascribe it to his severe poverty and great ambition. Soon after his conversion his friends introduced him to the pope's nuncio, cardinal Barberini, nephew of Urban VIII, whom he accompanied to Rome in 1527. He lived with the cardinal, and became his librarian. Later, he was promoted canon of St. Peter's, and finally he became librarian of the Vatican and consultore of the Congregation of the Index. He was sent on several missions to Germany; among others, to Innspruck, to receive the abjuration of queen Christina of Sweden. He was also instrumental in effecting the conversion of other distinguished Protestants to Catholicism. Holstenius, even in his eminent positions in the Church of Rome, retained some of the liberal principles imbibed as a Protestant, and they often severely provoked his Romish friends. Thus he advocated earnestly, but in vain, the union of the Greek and Roman churches in 1639, advising liberal action on the part of his own Church. In the Congregation of the Index also, he would never favor any stringency against valuable works of Protestants, and he was even obliged to retire from the council for this reason. In the dispute between the Jansenists and Molinists, he counseled pope Alexander VII against any decision likely to be in favor of the Jesuits, notwithstanding his relation to them. He died at Rome Feb. 2, 1661, leaving his patron, cardinal Barberini, his universal legatee. Holstenius, with much application and a great thirst for knowledge, lacked perseverance. He was apt to desert one branch of study suddenly for another; thus he had collected with great care and much application a vast quantity of scarce books and MSS., but had not progressed sufficiently far in his own works to make them of much value in their unfinished state. Among his published works are the following: Porphyrii liber de Vita Pythagorae, etc. (Rome 1630, 8vo; Cambridge 1655, 8vo), with a Latin version and notes, and a dissertation on the life and writings of Porphyrius, considered a model of learned biography — Demophili, Democratis, et Secundi Veterum Philosophorum Sententice Horales (Rome, 1638, 8vo; Leyden, 1639, 12mo) — Note in Sallustium Philosophum de Diis et Mundo (Rome, 1638, 8vo) — Observationes ad Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica (Leyden, 1641, 8vo) — Arrianus de Venatione, with a Latin version (Par. 1644, 8vo) — Adnotationes in Geographiam Sacrum Caroli a S. Paulo, Italian Antiquam Cluverii, et Thesaurum Geographicum Ortelii (Rome, 1666, 8vo) — Notae et  Castigationes Posthumae in Stephani Byzantini de Urbibus, edited by Ryckius: Liber Diurnus Ponticumae Romanorum, a collection of papal acts and decrees. He also wrote a collection of the rules of the earlier monastic orders, published after his death (Rome, 1661; later at Paris; and, lastly, much enlarged, Augsburg, 1759, 6 vols, fol.), which is considered as among the most valuable of his writings; he also edited in his lifetime the Antiquities of Praeneste, by Snares. Many of his Latin letters have also been published in the Collectio Roman aveterum aliquot histor. eccles. monumentorum, etc. See Wilkens, Leben d. gelehrten Lucae Holstenii (Hamb. 1723, 8vo); English Cyclop.; Herzog, Real-Lex. 6, 241 sq.; Mosheim, Ecclesiastes History vol. 3 (see Index); Gieseler, Church Hist. 3, 185, note; Schröckh, Kirchengeschichte s. d. Reform. 7, 76; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gene. 25, 4 sq.; Dupin, Biblioth. Ecclesiastes (17th century). (J. H. W.)

## Holstein[[@Headword:Holstein]]

             SEE SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN.

## Holtzfus, Barthold[[@Headword:Holtzfus, Barthold]]

             a Reformed theologian of Germany, was born at Riigenwalde, Pomerania, December 11, 1659. In 1685 he was professor of philosophy at Frankfort, in 1686 court-preacher at Stolpe, in 1696 professor, and in 1698 doctor of theology at Frankfort, and died in 1717, He wrote De Praedestinatione, Electione et Reprobatione, and a great many theological treatises, which were published in one volume in 1714. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

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

             a Swiss theologian, was born at Zurich, April 25, 1677. He studied at his native place and at Leyden. was in 1702 professor of biblical literature at Zurich, and died August 4, 1731. He wrote, Exegesis Philologico- Theologica Psalmi 16: — De Dependentia Creaturaea Deo in Esse, Fieri et Operari: — Exercitat Bibl. ad Jac. 4:5: — De Sacra Pauli Mathematica ad Eph 3:18 : — De Satutis non Bonis ad Eze 20:25 : — Typus Theologiae Naturalis. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Holtzmann, Carl Julius[[@Headword:Holtzmann, Carl Julius]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Carlsruhe, May 6, 1804. He studied at Tubingen, was professor at the lyceum in his native place, from 1841 to 1861 preacher, and at the same time teacher in the  theological seminary at Heidelberg. In 1861 he was made a prelate and a member of the higher ecclesiastical court. He was a member of the general synods held in 1861, 1867, 1871, and 1876. He died doctor of theology, February 23, 1877, at Carlsruhe. (B.P.)

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

             an English clergyman, was prebendary of Exeter in 1776, and died February 13, 1798. Some of his publications are, Beauties of Homer (1775): — Extracts from Pope's Translation of the Iliad (1776): — A Mythological, Etymological, and Historical Dictionary (1793). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Holy[[@Headword:Holy]]

             SEE HOLINESS.

## Holy Alliance[[@Headword:Holy Alliance]]

             A compact formed between the sovereigns of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, in 1815, for the humane and liberal administration of their governments. See Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 5, 669; Wing's Hase, Ch. Hist. (see Index); Hurst's Hagenbach, Hist. Christ. Church in 18th and 19th Cent. 2, 342 sq.; and the references in Poole's Index, s.v. SEE ALLIANCE, HOLY.

## Holy Ark[[@Headword:Holy Ark]]

             SEE ARK 3.

## Holy Ashes[[@Headword:Holy Ashes]]

             are called, in the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, the ashes used at the old ceremonial in Lent. SEE LENT.

## Holy Bible[[@Headword:Holy Bible]]

             SEE BIBLE.

## Holy Candle, Blessing with the[[@Headword:Holy Candle, Blessing with the]]

             Bishops Latimer and Tyndale say that in their day “dying persons committed their souls to the holy candle, and that the sign of the Cross was made over the dead with it, ‘thereby to be discharged of the burden of sin, or to drive away devils, or to put away dreams and phantasies.' “Walcott, Sac. Archaeol. p. 313. Compare the use of tapers (holy candles) at Candlemas. SEE CANDLE.

## Holy Catholic Church[[@Headword:Holy Catholic Church]]

             The “congregation of faithful men dispersed throughout the whole world.” Some persons speak of this Church as if it were a visible community, comprising all Christians as its members, as having existed from the earliest days and as retaining the same authority, which it formerly had to frame and promulgate decrees. The opponents of such views maintain that no proof can be offered “that there is or ever was any one community on earth recognized, or having any claim to be recognized as the universal Church, bearing rule over and comprehending all particular churches. They further allege that no accredited organ exists empowered to pronounce its decrees, nor any registry of those decrees. They consider therefore, that the Catholic Church is an invisible community (because its Head is so) in itself and regarded as a whole, though visible in its several parts to those of its members who constitute each separate part. SEE CHURCH.

## Holy City[[@Headword:Holy City]]

             SEE JERUSALEM.

## Holy Coat of Treves[[@Headword:Holy Coat of Treves]]

             A relic preserved with great reverence in the cathedral of Treves, in the southern part of France, and esteemed as one of the greatest treasures of that city. The priests claim that it was the seamless coat of our Savior, and that it was discovered in the 4th century by the empress Helena on her visit to Palestine, and by her deposited at Treves. The Treves relics were concealed from the Normans in the 9th century in crypts, but the holy coat was rediscovered in 1196. It was solemnly exhibited again to the public in 1512. Multitudes flocked to see and venerate it, and Leo X appointed an exhibition of it every seven years. The Reformation and wars prevented the regular observance of this great religious festival, but it was celebrated in 1810 and was attended by a concourse of more than 225,000 persons, and in 1844 by still greater multitudes. Miraculous cures were confidently asserted to be performed by the precious relic. The exhibition of the holy coat in 1844 is otherwise memorable for the reaction, which it produced, leading to the secession of Rongé and the German Catholics from the Church of Rome. See Gildemeister and Sybel, Der heil. Rock zu Trier (1845).

## Holy Cross[[@Headword:Holy Cross]]

             SEE CROSS.

## Holy Cross, Order of[[@Headword:Holy Cross, Order of]]

             SEE CROSS, HOLY, ORDER OF.

## Holy Day[[@Headword:Holy Day]]

             A day set apart by certain churches for the commemoration of some saint or some remarkable particular in the life of Christ. It has been a question agitated by divines whether it be proper to appoint or keep any holy days (the Sabbath excepted). The advocates for holy days suppose that they have a tendency to impress the minds of the people with a greater sense of religion; that if the acquisitions and victories of men be celebrated with the  highest joy, how much more those events which relate to the salvation of man, such as the birth, death, and resurrection of Christ, etc. On the other side, it is observed that, if holy days had been necessary under the present dispensation, Jesus Christ would have said something respecting them, whereas he was silent about them; that it is bringing us again into that bondage to ceremonial laws from which Christ freed us; that it is a tacit reflection on the Head of the Church in not appointing them; that such days, on the whole, are more pernicious than useful to society, as they open a door for indolence and profaneness; yea, that Scripture speaks against such days (Gal 4:9-11). SEE FEASTS; SEE FESTIVALS.

## Holy Family[[@Headword:Holy Family]]

             is the general title, in the language of art, of the various representations of the domestic life of the Virgin Mary and the infant Jesus and his attendants. “In the early part of the Middle Ages, when the object in view was to excite devotion, the Virgin and Child were usually the only persons represented. At a later period, Joseph, Elizabeth. St. Anna (the mother of the Virgin), and John the Baptist were included. Some of the old German painters have added the twelve apostles as children and playfellows of the infant Christ, as well as their mothers, as stated in the legends. The Italian school, with its fine feeling for composition, was the first to recognize how many figures the group must comprise if the interest is to remain undivided and be concentrated on one figure, whether that figure be the Madonna or the Child. Two masters are pre-eminent in this species of representation- Leonardo da Vinci and Raphael” (Chambers). Mrs. Jameson (Legends of the Madonna, p. 252 sq.) also insists on drawing a distinction between the domestic and the devotional treatment. The latter, she says, is a group in which the sacred personages are placed in direct relation to the worshippers, and their supernatural character is paramount to every other. The former, a group of the Holy Family so called, in which the personages are placed in direct relation to each other by some link of action or sentiment which expresses the family connection between them, or by some action which has a dramatic rather than a religious significance.

## Holy Father[[@Headword:Holy Father]]

             I. “The first person of the Trinity was represented as in Daniel's vision, 7:9, and vested in a cope, and wearing a tiara. It was contrary to our  Lord's declaration (Joh 6:46), and indefensible.” Walcott, Sac. Archaeol. p. 312.

II. A title of the pope (q.v.).

## Holy Fire[[@Headword:Holy Fire]]

             A ceremony in the Romish Church, observed on Holy Saturday (q.v.) of Easter, with especial pomp at Rome, where the pope himself is in attendance. A light is kindled by sparks struck from a flint, to commemorate Christ — according to the Missal — as the great cornerstone. This light is hailed by kneeling ecclesiastics saying “Light of Christ” (Lumen Christi), all the lights in the chapel having been previously extinguished, to be rekindled at the new fire. In the Church of the Holy Sepulcher at Jerusalem, at the Easter of the Oriental Church, the Holy Fire is claimed to be miraculous. “The Greek and Armenian clergy combine on this occasion, and amidst processions, solemnities, an excited multitude, and scenes disgraceful not only to the name of religion, but to human nature, the expected fire makes its appearance from within an apartment in which a Greek and an Armenian bishop have locked themselves.”

## Holy Font[[@Headword:Holy Font]]

             The vessel containing the baptismal water. SEE FONT.

## Holy Fridays[[@Headword:Holy Fridays]]

             Fridays in Ember-weeks (q.v.). Walcott, Sac. Archaeol., p. 312. SEE FRIDAY.

## Holy Gates[[@Headword:Holy Gates]]

             SEE JUBILEE (ROMAN CATHOLIC).

## Holy Ghost[[@Headword:Holy Ghost]]

             (πνεῦμα ἃγιον), the third person in the Trinity, proceeding from the Father and the Son, and equal with them in power and glory (see 10th Art. of Religion, Church of England, and 9th of Methodist Episcopal Church). For the significations of the original words rendered in the English version by “Spirit,” “Holy Spirit,” “Holy Ghost,” SEE SPIRIT. The Scriptures teach, and the Church maintains,

I. the Procession;

II. the Personality; and

III. the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. For the offices of the Holy Ghost, SEE SPIRIT, SEE HOLY; SEE PARACLETE; SEE WITNESS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

I. PROCESSION of the Holy Ghost. — The orthodox doctrine is, that as Christ is God by an eternal filiation, so the Holy Ghost is God by an eternal procession. He proceedeth from the Father and from the Son. “When the Comforter is come whom I will send you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me” (Joh 15:26). He is the Spirit of the Father, he is the Spirit of the Son: he is sent by the Father, he is sent by the Son. The Father is never sent by the Son, but the Father sendeth the Son; neither the Father nor the Son is ever sent by the Holy Ghost, but he is sent by both. The Nicene Creed teaches, “And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified.” The Athanasian Creed, “The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.” The article of the Church of England says, “The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.” The term spiration was introduced by the Latin Church to denote the manner of the procession. When our Lord imparted the Holy Ghost to his disciples, “he breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost” (Joh 20:22).

During the first three centuries there was nothing decided by ecclesiastical authority respecting the relations of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son. The Nicene Creed (A.D. 325) declared only that “the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father” (ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον), and the Greek fathers generally adhered to this view; so Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyril of Alexandria, and others. Epiphanius added to the formula, ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, the explanatory clause, ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λαμβάνον (Joh 16:15). John of Damascus represents the Spirit as proceeding from the Father through the Son, as Novatian had done before him, relying on Joh 15:26. With this modification, the formula adopted at the Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381), and appended to the Nicene Creed, was retained in the Greek Church.  “But there were many in the Latin Church who maintained that the Holy Spirit did not proceed from the Father only, but also from the Son. They appealed to Joh 16:13, and to the texts where the Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of Christ, e.g. Rom 8:9 sq. To this doctrine the Greeks were for the most part opposed. It prevailed, however, more and more in the Latin Church; and when, in the fifth and sixth centuries, the Arians, who then prevailed very much in Spain, urged it as an argument against the equality of Christ with the Father, that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father only, and not from the Son, the Catholic churches of that region began to hold more decidedly that the Holy Spirit proceeded from both (ab utroque), and to insert the adjunct Filioque after Patre in the Symibolum Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum. In this the churches of Spain were followed, first by those of France, and at a later period by nearly all the Western churches. But as the Eastern Church still adhered substantially to the more ancient formula, it accused the Western Church of falsifying the Nicene symbol; and thus at different periods, and especially in the 7th and 9th centuries, violent controversies arose between them” (Knapp, Theology, § 43; Hey, Lectures on Divinity, vol. 1). The true causes of these dissensions were, however, very different from those which were alleged, and less animated, it seems, by zeal for the truth than by the mutual jealousies of the Roman and Byzantine bishops. But, however uncertain the reason that provoked these disputes, they terminated in the 11th century in an entire separation of the Eastern and Western churches, continuing to the present time. The addition of the word filioque to the creed of the Western Church first appears in the acts of the Synod of Braga (A.D. 412), and in the third Council of Toledo (A.D. 589). See Procter, On Common Prayer, p. 234; Harvey, History of the Three Creeds, p. 452; and the article SEE FILIOQUE.

The scriptural argument for the procession of the Holy Ghost is thus stated by bishop Pearson: “Now the procession of the Spirit, in reference to the Father, is delivered expressly in relation to the Son, and is contained virtually in the Scriptures.

1. It is expressly said that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, as our Savior testifieth, ‘When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me' (Joh 15:26). This is also evident from what has already been asserted; for inasmuch as the Father and the Spirit are the same God, and, being thus the same in the unity of the nature of  God, are yet distinct in the personality, one of them must have the same nature from the other; and because the Father hath already been shown to have it from none, it followeth that the Spirit hath it from him.

2. Though it be not expressly spoken in the Scripture that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son, yet the substance of the same truth is virtually contained there; because those very expressions which are spoken of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father, for the very reason that he proceedeth from the Father, are also spoken of the same Spirit in relation to the Son, therefore there must be the same reason presupposed in reference to the Son which is expressed in reference to the Father. Because the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, therefore it is called ‘the Spirit of God,' and ‘the Spirit of the Father.' ‘It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you' (Mat 10:20). For by the language of the apostle, ‘the Spirit of God' is the Spirit, which is of God, saying, ‘The things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God; and we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God' (1Co 2:11-12). Now the same Spirit is also called ‘the Spirit of the Son' for ‘because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts' (Gal 4:6). The Spirit of Christ:' ‘Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his' (Rom 8:9); ‘Even the Spirit of Christ which was in the prophets' (1Pe 1:11). The Spirit of Jesus Christ,' as the apostle speaks: ‘I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ' (Php 1:19).

If, then, the Holy Ghost be called ‘the Spirit of the Father' because he proceedeth from the Father, it followeth that, being called also ‘the Spirit of the Son,' he proceedeth also from the Son. Again: because the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, he is therefore sent by the Father, as from him who hath, by the original communication, a right of mission; as, ‘the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send' (Joh 14:26). But the same Spirit which is sent by the Father, is also sent by the Son, as he saith, ‘When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you.' Therefore the Son hath the same right of mission with the Father, and consequently must be acknowledged to have communicated the same essence. The Father is never sent by the Son, because he received not the Godhead from him; but the Father sendeth the Son, because he communicated the Godhead to him: in the same manner, neither the Father nor the Son is ever sent by the Holy Spirit because neither of them received the divine nature from the Spirit;  but both the Father and the Son send the Holy Ghost, because the divine nature, common to the Father and the Son was communicated by them both to the Holy Ghost. As, therefore, the Scriptures declare expressly that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, so do they also virtually teach that he proceedeth from the Son” (Pearson, On the Creed),

II. PERSONALITY of the Holy Ghost.

1. Definition and History of the Doctrine. — A person is “a thinking intelligent being that has reason and reflection;” “a singular, subsistent, intellectual being;” “an intelligent agent.” As personality implies thought, reason, reflection, and an individual existence, distinct from that of other beings, when we speak of the personality of the Holy Ghost we mean his distinct and individual existence as an intelligent and reflecting being. He is represented throughout the Scriptures as a personal agent, and the earlier Christian writers so speak of him, though without any aim at dogmatic precision. It is the habit of some writers, opposed to the orthodox doctrine, to assert that not only was the doctrine of the Holy Ghost not precisely defined in that early period, but that it was not received. “On the contrary, the thorough investigations of recent times show plainly that the ante- Nicene fathers, with the exception of the Monarchians, and perhaps Lactantius, agreed in the two fundamental points that the Holy Ghost, the sole agent in the application of redemption, is a supernatural divine being, and that he is an independent person; closely allied to the Father and the Son, yet hypostatically different from them both” (Schaff, Ch. History, 1, § 80). The first positive and dogmatic denial of the personality and deity of the Holy Ghost seems to have been made by Arius, who applied the doctrine of subordination here, and placed the same distance between the Son and the Spirit as between the Father and the Son. According to him, the Holy Spirit was only the first of created beings, brought into existence by the Son as the organ of the Father. Later anti-Trinitarians represent the Holy Spirit simply as an operation of the divine mind, as the “exerted energy of God,” or as an attribute only of the divine activity.

2. Proof of the Personality of the Spirit. “The Holy Spirit is represented in the New Testament not only as different from the Father and Son, and not only as the personification of some attribute of God, or of some effect which he has produced, but as a literal person (see Semler, Disp. Spiritum Sanctum recte describi personam). The proof of this is thus made out from the following texts:

(1.) From the texts Joh 14:16-17; Joh 14:26; Joh 15:26. The Holy Spirit is here called παράκλητος, not comforter, advocate, nor merely teacher, as Ernesti renders it, but helper, assistant, counselor, in which sense it is used by Philo, when he says, God needs noπαράκλητος (monitor). Of the Paracletus, Christ says that the Father will send him in his (Christ's) name (i.e. in his place) to instruct his disciples. To these three subjects similar personal predicates are here equally applied, and the Paracletus is not designated by the abstract word auxilium, but by the concrete auxiliator; so that we have the Father who sent him, the Son in whose place he comes, and the Holy Spirit who is sent. His office is to carry forward the great work of teaching and saving men which Christ commenced, and to be to the disciples of Christ what Christ himself was while he continued upon the earth. Joh 15:26, When the Paracletus shall come, whom I will send to you from the Father (I mean the Spirit — i.e. teacher — of truth, who proceeds from the Father), he will instruct you further in my religion; where it should be remarked that the phrase ἐκπορεύεσθαι παρὰ Πατρός means to be sent or commissioned by the Father.

(2.) 1Co 12:4-11, There are various gifts (χαρίσματα), but there is one and the same Spirit (τὸ αὐτο Πνεῦμα),from whom they all proceed. Here the χαρίσματα are clearly distinguished from the Spirit, who is the author of them. In 1Co 12:5 this same person is distinguished from Christ (ὁ Κύριος), and in 1Co 12:6 from ὁ Θεός. In 1Co 12:11 it is said all these (various gifts) worketh one and the self-same Spirit, who imparteth to every man his own, as he will (καθὼς βούλεται).

(3.) Those texts in which such attributes and works are ascribed to the Holy Spirit as can be predicated of no other than a personal subject. In Joh 16:13 sq., he is said to ‘speak,' to ‘hear,' to ‘take,' etc. So in 1Co 2:10, God hath revealed the doctrines of Christianity to us by his Spirit (the πάρακλητος before mentioned, who was sent to give us this more perfect instruction). And this Spirit searches (ἐρευνᾷ) all things, even the most secret divine purposes (βάθη Θεοῦ; comp. Rom 11:33 sq.); in his instruction, therefore, we may safely confide. The expressions, the Holy Spirit speaks, sends any one, appoints (any one for particular purpose, and others, which occur so frequently in the Acts and elsewhere, show that the Holy Spirit was understood by the early Christians to be a personal agent (Act 13:2; Act 13:4; Act 20:28; Act 21:11 sq.).

(4.) The formula of baptism, Mat 28:19, and other similar texts, such as 2Co 13:14, where Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are mentioned in distinction (ver. 35), may now be used in proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit, since the other texts upon which the meaning of these depends have already been cited. From all these texts, taken together, we may form the following result: The Holy Spirit is represented in the Bible as a personal subject, and, as such, is distinguished from the Father and the Son. In relation to the human race, he is described as sent and commissioned by the Father and the Son, and as occupying the place, which Christ, who preceded him, held. In this respect he depends (to speak after the manner of men) upon the Father (Joh 14:16) and upon the Son (Joh 14:16; Joh 14:26 : also Joh 16:14, ἐκ τοῦ έμοῦ λήψεται); and in this sense he proceeds from them both, or is sent by them both. This may be expressed more literally as follows: The great work of converting, sanctifying and saving men, which the Father commenced through the Son, will be carried on by the Father and Son, through the Holy Spirit.

“The objectors to this doctrine frequently say that the imaginative Orientalists were accustomed to represent many things as personal subjects, and to introduce them as speaking and acting, which, however, they themselves did not consider as persons, and did not intend to have so considered by others; and to this Oriental usage they think that Christ and his apostles might here, as in other cases, have conformed. But, whenever Christ and his apostles spoke in figurative language, they always showed, by the explanations, which they gave, that they did not intend to be understood literally. But they have given no such explanation of the language, which they employ with regard to the Holy Spirit. We therefore fairly conclude that they intended that their language should be understood literally, otherwise they would have led their readers and hearers into error, and the more so as they well knew that their readers and hearers were accustomed to personifications” (Knapp, Theology, § 39).

The scriptural argument is thus logically developed by Watson.

“1. The mode of the subsistence of the Holy Spirit in the sacred Trinity proves his personality. He proceeds from the Father and the Son, and cannot, therefore, be either. To say that an attribute proceeds and comes forth would be a gross absurdity.

2. Many passages of Scripture would be wholly unintelligible, and even absurd, unless the Holy Ghost is allowed to be a person. For as those who  take the phrase as ascribing no more than a figurative personality to an attribute, make that attribute to be the energy or power of God, they reduce such passages as the following to utter unmeaningness: ‘God anointed Jesus with the Holy Ghost and with power;' that is, with the power of God and with power. That ye may abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost;' that is, through the power of power. ‘In demonstration of the Spirit and of power' that is, in demonstration of power and of power.

3. Personification of any kind is, in some passages in which the Holy Ghost is spoken of, impossible. The reality which this figure of speech is said to present to us is either some of the attributes of God, or else the doctrine of the Gospel. Let this theory, then, be tried upon the following passages: ‘He shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak.' What attribute of God can here be personified? And if the doctrine of the Gospel be arrayed with personal attributes, where is there an instance of so monstrous a prosopopceia as this passage would exhibit? The doctrine of the Gospel not speaking ‘of himself,' but speaking ‘whatsoever he shall hear!' The Spirit maketh intercession for us.' What attribute is capable of interceding, or how can the doctrine of the Gospel intercede? Personification, too, is the language of poetry, and takes place naturally only in excited and elevated discourse; but if the Holy Spirit be a personification, we find it in the ordinary and cool strain of mere narration and argumentative discourse in the New Testament, and in the most incidental conversations. ‘Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.' How impossible is it here to extort, by any process whatever, even the shadow of a personification of either any attribute of God, or of the doctrine of the Gospel! So again: The Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot.' Could it be any attribute of God, which said this, or could it be the doctrine of the Gospel? Finally, that the Holy Ghost is a person, and not an attribute, is proved by the use of masculine pronouns and relatives in the Greek of the New Testament, in connection with the neuter noun Πνεῦμα, Spirit, and also by many distinct personal acts being ascribed to him, as ‘to come,' ‘to go,' ‘to be sent,' ‘to teach,' ‘to guide,' ‘to comfort,' ‘to make intercession,' ‘to bear witness,' ‘to give gifts,' ‘dividing them to every man as he will,' ‘to be vexed,' ‘grieved,' and ‘quenched.' These cannot be applied to the mere fiction of a person, and  they therefore establish the Spirit's true personality” (Watson, Theological Institutes, 1, 637 sq.).

III. DIVINITY of the Holy Spirit.

1. The same arguments that prove the personality of the Holy Ghost, go also, to a certain extent, to establish his divinity. The direct scriptural argument may be thus summed up:

(a.) Names proper only to the Most High God are ascribed to him; as Jehovah (Act 28:25, with Isa 6:9; and Heb 3:7; Heb 3:9, with Exo 17:7; Jer 31:31; Jer 31:34; Heb 10:15-16), God (Act 5:3-4), Lord (2 Corinthians 3:17, 19). “The Lord, the Spirit.”

(b.) Attributes proper only to the Most High God are ascribed to him; as omniscience (1Co 2:10-11; Isa 40:13-14), omnipresence (Psa 139:7; Eph 2:17-18; Rom 8:26-27), omnipotence (Luk 1:35), eternity (Heb 9:14).

(c.) Divine works are evidently ascribed to him (Gen 2:2; Job 26:13; Psa 32:6; Psa 104:30).

(d.) Worship, proper only to God, is required and ascribed to him (Isa 6:3; Act 28:25; Rom 9:1; Rev 1:4; 2Co 13:14; Mat 28:19).

2. The argument for the personal divinity of the Spirit is developed by Watson as follows:

(1.) “The first argument may be drawn from the frequent association, in Scripture, of a Person under that appellation with two other Persons, one of whom, the Father, is by all acknowledged to be divine; and the ascription to each of them, or to the three in union, of the same acts, titles, and authority, with worship of the same kind, and, for any distinction that is made, of an equal degree. The manifestation of the existence and divinity of the Holy Spirit may be expected in the law and the prophets, and is, in fact, to be traced there with certainty. The Spirit is represented as an agent in creation, ‘moving upon the face of the waters;' and it forms no objection to the argument that creation is ascribed to the Father and also to the Son, but is a great confirmation of it. That creation should be effected by all the three Persons of the Godhead, though acting in different respects, yet so that each should be a Creator, and, therefore, both a Person and a divine  Person, can be explained only by their unity in one essence. On every other hypothesis this scriptural fact is disallowed, and therefore no other hypothesis can be true. If the Spirit of God be a mere influence, then he is not a Creator, distinct from the Father and the Son, because he is not a Person; but this is refuted both by the passage just quoted, and by Psa 33:6 : ‘By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath (Hebrew, Spirit) of his mouth.' This is farther confirmed by Job 33:4 : The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life;' where the second clause is obviously exegetic of the former: and the whole text proves that, in the patriarchal age, the followers of the true religion ascribed creation to the Spirit as well as to the Father, and that one of his appellations was ‘the Breath of the Almighty.'

Did such passages stand alone, there might indeed, be some plausibility in the criticism which resolves them into a personification; but, connected as they are with the whole body of evidence, as to the concurring doctrine of both Testaments, they are inexpugnable. Again: If the personality of the Son and the Spirit be allowed, and yet it is contended that they were but instruments in creation, through whom the creative power of another operated, but which creative power was not possessed by them; on this hypothesis, too, neither the Spirit nor the Son can be said to create, any more than Moses created the serpent into which his rod was turned, and the Scriptures are again contradicted. To this association of the three Persons in creative acts may be added a like association in acts of preservation, which has been well called a continued creation, and by that term is expressed in the following passage: These wait all upon thee, that thou mayest give them their meat in due season. Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to dust: thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the earth' (Psa 104:27-30). It is not surely here meant that the Spirit by which the generations of animals are perpetuated is wind; and if he be called an attribute, wisdom, power, or both limited, where do we read of such attributes being ‘sent,' ‘sent forth from God,' ‘sent forth from' God to ‘create and renew the face of the earth?'

(2.) “The next association of the three Persons we find in the inspiration of the prophets: ‘God spake unto our fathers by the prophets,' says Paul (Heb 1:1). Peter declares that these ‘holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost' (2Pe 1:21); and also that it  was ‘the Spirit of Christ which was in them' (1Pe 1:11). We may defy any Socinian to interpret these three passages by making the Spirit an influence or attribute, and thereby reducing the term Holy Ghost into a figure of speech. ‘God,' in the first passage, is unquestionably God the Father; and the ‘holy men of God,' the prophets, would then, according to this view, be moved by the influence of the Father; but the influence, according to the third passage, which was the source of their inspiration, was the Spirit or the influence of ‘Christ.' Thus the passages contradict each other. Allow the Trinity in unity, and you have no difficulty in calling the Spirit, the Spirit of the Father, and the Spirit of the Son, or the Spirit of either; but if the Spirit be an influence, that influence cannot be the influence of two persons, one of them God and the other a creature. Even if they allowed the pre-existence of Christ, with Arians, these passages are inexplicable. by the Socinians; but, denying his pre-existence, they have no subterfuge but to interpret ‘the Spirit of Christ,' the spirit which prophesied of Christ, which is a purely gratuitous paraphrase; or ‘the spirit of an anointed one, or prophet:' that is, the prophet's own spirit, which is just as gratuitous and as unsupported by any parallel as the former. If, however, the Holy Ghost be the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, united in one essence, the passages are easily harmonized. In conjunction with the Father and the Son, he is the source of that prophetic inspiration under which the prophets spoke and acted. So the same Spirit which raised Christ from the dead is said by Peter to have preached by Noah while the ark was preparing, in allusion to the passage ‘My Spirit shall not always strive (contend, debate) with man.' This, we may observe, affords an eminent proof that the writers of the New Testament understood the phrase ‘the Spirit of God,' as it occurs in the Old Testament, personally.

For, whatever may be the full meaning of that difficult passage in Peter, Christ is clearly declared to have preached by the Spirit in the days of Noah; that is, he, by the Spirit, inspired Noah to preach. If, then, the apostles understood that the Holy Ghost was a Person, a point which will presently be established, we have, in the text just quoted from the book of Genesis, a key to the meaning of those texts in the Old Testament where the phrases ‘My Spirit,' ‘the Spirit of God,' aid ‘the Spirit of the Lord' occur, and inspired authority is thus afforded us to interpret them as of a Person; and if of a Person, the very effort made by Socinians to deny his personality itself indicates that that Person must, from the lofty titles and works ascribed to him, be inevitably divine. Such phrases occur in many passages of the Hebrew Scriptures; but in the following the Spirit is also eminently  distinguished from two other Persons: ‘And now the Lord God, and his Spirit, hath sent me' (Isa 48:16) or, rendered better, ‘hath sent me and his Spirit,' both terms being in the accusative case. ‘Seek ye out of the book of the Lord, and read; for my mouth it hath commanded, and his Spirit it hath gathered them' (Isa 34:16). ‘I am with you, saith the Lord of hosts, according to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my Spirit remaineth among you: fear ye not. For thus saith the Lord of hosts, I will shake all nations and the Desire of all nations shall come' (Hag 2:4-7). Here, also, the Spirit of the Lord is seen collocated with the Lord of hosts and the Desire of all nations, who is the Messiah [according to the usual interpretation].

(3.) “Three Persons, and three only, are associated also, both in the Old and New Testament, as objects of supreme worship, and form the one divine ‘name.' Thus the fact that, in the vision of Isaiah, the Lord of hosts. who spake unto the prophet, is, in Act 28:25, said to be the Holy Ghost, while John declares that the glory which Isaiah saw was the glory of Christ, proves indisputably that each of the three Persons bears this august appellation; it gives also the reason for the threefold repetition, ‘Holy, holy, holy!' and it exhibits the prophet and the very seraphs in deep and awful adoration before the Triune Lord of hosts. Both the prophet and the seraphim were, therefore, worshippers of the Holy Ghost and of the Son, at the very time and by the very acts in which they worshipped the Father.”

3. In the Apostolical Benediction, “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all, Amen,” the Holy Ghost is acknowledged, equally with the Father and the Son, “to be the source of the highest spiritual blessings; while the benediction is, from its specific character, to be regarded as an act of prayer to each of the three Persons, and therefore is at once an acknowledgment of the divinity and personality of each. The same remark applies to Rev 1:4-5 : ‘Grace be unto you, and peace, from him which was, and which is, and which is to come; and from the seven spirits which are before his throne' (an emblematical reference, probably, to the golden branch with its seven lamps), ‘and from Jesus Christ.' The style of this book sufficiently accounts for the Holy Spirit being called ‘the seven spirits;' but no created spirit or company of created spirits is ever spoken of under that appellation; and the place assigned to the seven spirits, between the mention of the Father and the Son, indicates with certainty  that one of the sacred Three, so eminent, and so exclusively eminent in both dispensations, is intended.

4. “The form of baptism next presents itself with demonstrative evidence on the two points before us, the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit. It is the form of covenant by which the sacred Three become our one or only God, and we become his people: ‘Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' In what manner is this text to be disposed of if the personality of the Holy Ghost is denied? Is the form of baptism to be so understood as to imply that baptism is in the name of one God, one creature and one attribute? The grossness of this absurdity refutes it, and proves that here, at least, there can be no personification. If all the Three, therefore, are persons, are we to have baptism in the name of one God and two creatures? This would be too near an approach to idolatry, or, rather, it would be idolatry itself; for, considering baptism as an act of dedication to God, the acceptance of God as our God, on our part, and the renunciation of all other deities and all other religions, what could a heathen convert conceive of the two creatures so distinguished from all other creatures in heaven and in earth, and so associated with God himself as to form together the one name, to which, by that act, he was devoted, and which he was henceforward to profess and honor, but that they were equally divine, unless special care was taken to instruct him that but one of the Three was God, and the two others but creatures? But of this care, of this cautionary instruction, though so obviously necessary upon this theory, no single instance can be given in all the writings of the apostles.”

5. A further argument is derived from the fact that the Spirit is “the subject of blasphemy: The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men' (Mat 12:31). This blasphemy consisted in ascribing his miraculous works to Satan; and that he is capable of being blasphemed proves him to be as much a person as the Son; and it proves him to be divine, because it shows that he may be sinned against, and so sinned against that the blasphemer shall not be forgiven. A person he must be, or he could not be blasphemed: a divine person he must be to constitute this blasphemy a sin against him in the proper sense, and of so malignant a kind as to place it beyond the reach of mercy. He is called God: ‘Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie unto the Holy Ghost? Why hast thou conceived this in thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God' (Act 5:3-4). Ananias is said to have lied particularly ‘unto the Holy  Ghost,' because the apostles were under his special direction in establishing the temporary regulation among Christians that they should have all things in common: the detection of the crime itself was a demonstration of the divinity of the Spirit, because it showed his omniscience, his knowledge of the most secret acts” (Watson, Theol. Institutes, 1, 629 sq.).

See, besides the works already cited, Hawker, Sermons on the Divinity of the Holy Ghost (London 1794, 8vo); Owen, Discourses on the Spirit; Pye Smith, On the Holy Ghost (London 1831, 8vo); Christian Review, 18, 515 (on the personality of the Spirit); Neander, History of Dogmas, 1, 171, 303; Neander, Ch. History, vol. 1, 2; Kahnis, Die Lehre vom-Heil. Geist (Leipsic, 1847, 8vo); Dewar, Personality, Divinity, etc., of the Holy Ghost (London, 1848, 8vo); Fritzsche, De Spiritu. Sancto (Halle, 1840); Büchsenschütz, Doctrine de l'Esprit de Dieu (Strasburg, 1840); Hase, Evangel. Dogmatik, § 175; Guyse, Godhead of the Holy Spirit (London, 1790, 12mo); Pierce, Divinity and Personality of the Spirit (London, 1805, 12mo); Heber, Personality and Office of the Spirit (Bampton Lecture, 1816); Foulkes, Divis. in Christendom, 1, 70, 101 sq.; Bickersteth, Christ. Stud. Assist. p. 453; Bull, Trinity, 1, 135 sq.; 2, 470 sq.: Wilson, Apost. Fathers; Baur, Dogmengesch. vol. 1, 2; Maonsell, Redemption, p. 156 sq.; Waterland, Works, vol. 6; Hefele, Conciliengesch. vol. 1; Milman, Latin Christ. 1, 98; Burnet, Articles of the Christian Faith, see Index; Walcott, Sacred Archaeol. p. 312; Wesley, Works, 1 34 sq.; Leidner, Philosophy, p. 99; Stillingfleet, Works, vol. 1; Smeaton, Atonement, p. 293, 296; Bethune, Lect. on Catechism, vol. 2: see Index; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doct. 1, 125, 258, 262, 453; Stud. u. Krit. 1856, 2:298; 1867, vol. 3; Mercersburg Rev. Jan. 1867, p. 464; Bib. Sac. 1863, p. 600, 877; 1864, p. 119; Am. Presb. Rev. April, 1863, p. 336; Chr. Rev. 15, 115; April, 1852, art. 4; Bullet. Theol. 1, 1868; Christian Observer, vol. 20; London Quart. Review, April, 1867, 63, 257; Ev. Ch. Reg. vol. 1; Brit. and For. Ev. Review, April, 1869; Congreg. Quart. July, 1869; Baptist Quart. Oct. 1869, p. 498; Christ. Remember. July, 1853. SEE MACEDONIANS; SEE TRINITY; SEE SOCINIANISM.

## Holy Ghost, Blasphemy against the[[@Headword:Holy Ghost, Blasphemy against the]]

             SEE BLASPHEMY.

## Holy Ghost, Orders of[[@Headword:Holy Ghost, Orders of]]

             1. Order of the Holy Ghost di Sassia (Order of the Holy Ghost de Montpellier), established in 1178 by Guido of Montpellier, according to the rule of St. Augustine for hospital knights, In 1204 the order obtained the Hospital di Sassia, in Rome, in which the superior of the order took his seat as grandmaster. Henceforth the members of the order were divided into hospital knights, with simple, and into regular canons, with solemn vows. Pius II abolished the knights in 1459 in Italy, but in France they survived. Having been restored in 1693, the order was divided into the degrees of Knights of Justice and Grace, Serving Brothers and Oblates, and in 1700 was changed into regular canons, who still exist. At an early period in the history of the order a female branch was established.

2. Sisters of the Holy Ghost of Poligsy, established in 1212 and still continuing in France, a branch of the White Sisters.

3. Hospitallers (brothers and sisters) of the Holy Ghost in France, established in 1254 as a secular association, and connected with the Order of the Holy Ghost di Sassia. The sisters, on account of their dress commonly called the White Sisters, are still numerous; they are devoted to the nursing of the sick and the poor, and to the education of young girls.

4. Canons of the Holy Ghost, probably founded in Lorraine by Jean Herbert, and confirmed in 1588 by Sixtus V, are devoted to instruction.

5. The Society of Missionary Priests of the Holy Ghost was founded in 1700 by abbé Desplaces and Vincent le Barbier for missions, seminaries, and the nursing of the sick; newly established in 1805; still exists, and is active in the foreign missionary fields of the Roman Catholic Church.

## Holy Grass[[@Headword:Holy Grass]]

             (Hierochloa borealis), a grass about a foot high, of a brownish glossy lax panicle, found in the northern parts of Europe, has a sweet smell like that of vernal grass. In Iceland, where it is plentiful, it is used for scenting apartments and clothes. In some countries it is strewed on the floors of places of worship on holy days, whence its name.

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

             “It is said that one of the women who followed Jesus to the crucifixion lent him her handkerchief to wipe the sweat and blood from his face, and that the impress of his features remained upon it. Of course, St. Veronica (q.v.) very carefully preserved the cloth, and it is now at Rome. Jesus, according to tradition, sent another handkerchief to Agbarus (q.v.), king of Edessa, who had requested a portrait of him. Veronica is only a mythical personage, the name being a hybrid compound signifying ‘true image.' Eadie, Ecclesiastes Dict. p. 303. SEE CHRIST, IMAGES OF.

## Holy Hours[[@Headword:Holy Hours]]

             SEE HOURS, HOLY.

## Holy Innocents[[@Headword:Holy Innocents]]

             A festival in commemoration of the slaughter of infant martyrs (at Bethlehem, Mat 2:16), of which the Greek menology and Ethiopic liturgy give the number at 40,000, is alluded to by the early Christian fathers, especially Irenaeus and Cyprian, Origen and Augustine, as of memorial observance. In the 4th century, Prudentius celebrates it in the hymn “All hail, ye infant Martyr-Flowers,” and, in connection with the Epiphany, also Fulgentius, in his homilies for the day. St. Bernard also alludes to them: “Stephen was a martyr before men: John before angels, but these before God, confessing Christ by dying, not by speech, and their merit is known only to God.” Violet was used on this day in memory of the sorrow of their mothers, and the Te Deum, Alleluia, and doxologies were forbidden. In England, at Norton (Worcestershire), “a muffled peal is rung to commemorate the slaughter, and then a peal of joy for the escape of the infant Christ; a half-muffled peal is rung at Minety, Maisemore, Leigh-on- Menldip, Wick, Rissington, and Pattington.” — Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, p. 313. SEE INNOCENTS.

## Holy Land[[@Headword:Holy Land]]

             SEE PALESTINE.

## Holy League[[@Headword:Holy League]]

             I. The name given to an offensive and defensive alliance contracted between the party of the Guises in France, king Philip II of Spain, the pope, the monks, and the French Parliament, in consequence of the edict of toleration of May 14,1576. The object of the league was the overthrow of the Huguenot party in France, and of its chief, king Henry III, whom one of the Guises was to succeed on the throne. Duke Henry of Guise (surnamed Le Balafre) was the head of the league. In order to avoid the danger, Henry joined the anti-Protestant movement himself, and was thus led to renew the persecutions against the Huguenots. The war commenced in 1577, but soon ended by the peace of Bergerac. When the duke of Aleneon died in 1584, leaving Henry of Navarre, a Protestant, heir presumptive to the throne, the league sprung again into existence under the influence of the adherents of the Guises, the strict Roman Catholic members of the Parliament, the fanatical clergy, and the ultra conservative party. The states, especially the sixteen districts of Paris (whence the association also took the name of Ligue des Seize), took an active part in it. A treaty was finally concluded with Spain, and signed at the castle of Joinville Jan. 3, 1585, to prevent the accession of Henry of Navarre to the throne. The contracting parties also pledged themselves to the total uprooting of Protestantism in France and the Netherlands. The results of the league soon became manifest in the intolerant edict of Nemours in 1585, and led in 1587 to the war, known as the war of the three Henrys. ( SEE FRANCE, ) Henry III having caused Henry of Guise to be murdered at Blois in 1588, his brother, the duke of Mayenne, became chief of the league. Henry III was in turn murdered near Paris in 1589, and the war continued until the abjuration of Henry IV in 1588. The pope having absolved him, the members of the league gradually joined the royal standard, and the party ceased to exist. See Mignet, Hist. de la Ligue (Par. 1829,5 vols.); Labitte, De la Democratie chez les Predicateurs de la Ligue (Paris, 1841); Riddle, Persec. of Popery, 1, 309 sq.; De Felice, Hist. of Protestantism in France (London 1853, 12mo); Ranke, History of Papacy (see Index); Wright, Hist. of France, 1, 680 sq.; Poujoulat, Nouv. Coll. de Memoires pour servir AI'hist. de France (Paris, 1839, 4to, 1st series, 4, 1  sq.); Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 10, 374. SEE GUISE, HOUSE OF; SEE HUGUENOTS.

II. HOLY LEAGUE OF NUREMBERG, LIGA SANCTA, contracted July 10, 1538, by the emperor Charles V, the archbishops of Abayence and Salzburg, dukes William and Louis of Bavaria, George of Saxony, Erich and Henry of Brunswick, for the defense of the Roman Catholic faith against the league of Smalcald (q.v.). The treaty was concluded for eleven years. The armies of the contracting parties were to be divided into two parts, respectively commanded by duke Louis of Bavaria and duke Henry of Brunswick. The truce of April 19,1539, rendered, however, these combinations unnecessary. Leo, Universalgesch. 3, 157 sq.; Hardwick, Church History during the Reformation, p. 63 sq.; Kurtz, Ch. Hist. from the Reform p. 83; Pierer, Universal-Lex. 10. 374.

## Holy Mortar[[@Headword:Holy Mortar]]

             Is the “mortar used in cementing altar stones, and made with holy water.” — Eadie, Ecclesiastes Cyclop. p. 314.

## Holy Mother[[@Headword:Holy Mother]]

             SEE MARY, VIRGIN.

## Holy Mountain[[@Headword:Holy Mountain]]

             SEE HERMON; SEE SINAI; SEE ZION.

## Holy Night[[@Headword:Holy Night]]

             The night before Holy Day, is the first Sunday in Lent. “By Theodulph's Chapters, the previous week was employed in shriving penitents.” — Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, p. 313.

## Holy Of Holies[[@Headword:Holy Of Holies]]

             SEE TABERNACLE; SEE TEMPLE.

## Holy Office[[@Headword:Holy Office]]

             SEE MINISTRY; SEE INQUISITION.

## Holy Oil[[@Headword:Holy Oil]]

             A name applied in the 4th century to oil brought to Europe from Jerusalem. “It was carried in cotton within little phials, and distributed to the faithful at a time when relics were sparingly distributed.” In Gregory of Tour's time, oil blessed at saints' tombs was very general, and in St. Gregory's day oil taken from lamps which burned before the graves of martyrs in the Catacombs was called “holy oil.” “Several of these phials, which Gregory the Great gave to queen Theodolinda, are preserved at Monza.” — Walcott, Sacred Archaeol. p. 313, 314. SEE AMPULLA; SEE CHRISMI.

## Holy Orders[[@Headword:Holy Orders]]

             SEE ORDINATION.

## Holy Phial or Sainte Ampoule, Order of[[@Headword:Holy Phial or Sainte Ampoule, Order of]]

             The name of an old order of knighthood in France, which was composed of four persons, of the very first families in the province of Champagne, and were styled Barons de la Sainte Ampoule. At the coronation of the French kings they were hostages to the dean, priors, and chapter of Rheims until the return of the holy phial in which the coronation oil was kept, and which, according to the legend, was brought from heaven by the Holy Ghost under the form of a dove, and put into the hands of St. Remy at the coronation of Clovis, an enormous crowd having prevented the messenger from bringing in time that which had already been prepared. The knights of this order were only knights while the holy phial was used at the coronation service. They wore as a badge a cross of gold enameled white, cantoned with four fleurs-de-lis, and on the cross a dove descending with a phial in its beak, and a right hand receiving it. — Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 393.

## Holy Place[[@Headword:Holy Place]]

             SEE TABERNACLE; SEE TEMPLE.

## Holy Places[[@Headword:Holy Places]]

             SEE HEBRON; SEE JERUSALEM; SEE MECCA; SEE PALESTINE, etc.

## Holy Rood[[@Headword:Holy Rood]]

             (rode or rod), “the name of the cross so often erected in churches.”-Eadie, Ecclesiastes Dict. p. 312. SEE CROSS; SEE ROOD.

## Holy Saturday[[@Headword:Holy Saturday]]

             In some churches the Saturday before Easter is so called. SEE HOLY WEEK.

## Holy Scripture[[@Headword:Holy Scripture]]

             SEE SCRIPTURE, HOLY.

## Holy Sepulcher[[@Headword:Holy Sepulcher]]

             SEE SEPULCHER OF CHRIST.

## Holy Sepulcher (2)[[@Headword:Holy Sepulcher (2)]]

             Orders of.

1. A religious order in the Roman Catholic Church according to the rule of St. Augustine, founded in 1114 by the archdeacon (subsequently patriarch of Jerusalem) Arnold; according to others, it was founded in 1099 by Godfrey of Bouillon. It embraced regular canons and canonesses, was at one time established all through Europe, and received a new rule under Urban VIII. The canons became extinct soon after the renewal of their rule, but the canonesses still have a number of houses in France, Germany (Baden), and the Netherlands, and, living in strict seclusion, occupy themselves with the instruction and education of young girls.

2. The Order of Knights of the Holy Sepulcher in England, established in 1174; extinct since the 16th century. The knights were obliged to guard, at least during two years, the Holy Sepulcher of Jerusalem.  3. Knights of the Holy Sepulcher, an order founded very likely by pope Alexander VI to guard the Holy Sepulcher, and at the same time to afford relief and protection to pilgrims to the Holy Land. Originally the pope was the grand master of the order, but he finally ceded this right to the “guardian father of the Holy Sepulcher.” The knights must be, according to the rules of the order, of noble descent, hear mass daily, fight, live, and die for the Roman Catholic faith, etc. But they enjoyed also extraordinary privileges, as exemption from taxation, permission to marry, possession of Church property, etc. When Jerusalem was recaptured by the Turks, the knights of the Holy Sepulcher went to Perugia, in Italy. “After a temporary union with the Hospitallers, the order was reconstructed in 1814 both in France and in Poland, and is still in existence within a very small circle of knights elected by the guardian father from the most respectable pilgrims who come to Jerusalem.”

## Holy Spear[[@Headword:Holy Spear]]

             (ἁγία λόγχη), as it is called in the Greek Church, is a kind of spear with a long handle, ending in a cross, “with which the altar-bread, called sphragis or holy lamb, is cut out from the loaf for consecration by the priest, with a solemn form in the liturgy of Chrysostom founded on Isa 53:7-8; Joh 19:34.” — Walcott, Sacred Archaeol. p. 314.

## Holy Spirit[[@Headword:Holy Spirit]]

             SEE SPIRIT, WORK OF THE; SEE HOLY GHOST; SEE PARACLETE; SEE WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT.

## Holy Synod[[@Headword:Holy Synod]]

             Is the title in the Greek Church of the highest governing body.

## Holy Table[[@Headword:Holy Table]]

             As it is called in some churches, is the table on which are placed the bread and wine, the appointed emblems of the Savior's death. SEE ALTAR.

## Holy Thursday[[@Headword:Holy Thursday]]

             (called also MAUNDY THURSDAY, from mandatum [commandment]. The first word with which the Church services of the day begin), a day observed in some churches in commemoration of our Lord's ascension. In  the Roman calendar it is the thirty-ninth day after Easter Sunday. SEE ASCENSION DAY; SEE HOLY WEEK.

## Holy Union[[@Headword:Holy Union]]

             SEE HOLY LEAGUE.

## Holy Wars[[@Headword:Holy Wars]]

             SEE CRUSADES.

## Holy Water[[@Headword:Holy Water]]

             In the Romish, as also in the Greek, Russian, and Oriental churches, denotes water blessed by a priest or bishop for certain religious uses. The theory of its first introduction seems to have been that water is a fitting symbol of purity, and accordingly, in most of the ancient religions, the use of lustral or purifying water not only formed part of the public worship, but also entered largely into the personal acts of sanctification prescribed to individuals. The Jewish law also prescribed this, and it was a practice held in common by many Pagan nations (compare Riddle, Christ. Ant. p. 725). The sprinkling of the hands and face with water before entering the sanctuary, still generally observed by the adherents to that law, was retained, or, no doubt, may have given rise to its adoption by the early Christian Church. But its use was certainly for a very different purpose. Thus bishop Marcellus ordered Equitius, his deacon, to sprinkle holy water, hallowed by him, in houses and churches, to exorcise devils, which is said to have been done also by pope Alexander I. “Joseph, the converted Jew, Epiphanius says, used consecrated water in exorcism. Holy water was used in all benedictions of palm and olive branches, vestments, corporals, candles, houses, herds, fields, and in private houses. By the canon law it is mingled with salt. The Council of Nantes ordered the priest before mass to sprinkle the church court and close, offering prayers for the departed, and to give water to all who asked it for their houses, food, cattle, fodder, fields, and vineyards. By the Capitulars of Charlemagne, Louis, and Lothaire, on Easter and Whitsun eves all the faithful might take, for purposes of aspersion in their houses, consecrated water before its admixture with chrism (q.v.). In monasteries, a novice carried the holy water before the cross in procession” (Walcott, Sac. Archaeol. p. 314).

In the Romish Church of today holy water is directed to be made of pure spring water, with the admixture of a little consecrated salt. This water  (generally placed at the entrance of places of worship, and sanctified by a solemn benediction, prescribed in the diocesan ritual) the Romanist has come to look upon with the most superstitious regard, and it is used not merely for the sprinkling of persons on entering and leaving the church, but also in sprinkling books, bells, etc., and it is frequently taken to their homes, as having some peculiar virtue. Its use has thus become nothing more than a charm. In the Greek Church, holy water is usually consecrated by the bishop or his vicar-general on the eve of the Epiphany. No salt is employed, and they regard the use of it by the Latins as a grievous and unauthorized corruption. The Greeks perform the ceremony on January 6, the day on which they believe that Christ was baptized by John, and twice a year it is usual to drink a portion, viz. at the end of the midnight mass of Christmas and on the feast of Epiphany. In the Armenian Church, holy water is consecrated by plunging a cross into it on the day of the Epiphany, after which it is distributed among the congregation, who take it to their homes. The offerings made on this occasion form a considerable portion of the emoluments of the Armenian priesthood. On the practice of using water for baptism, SEE BAPTISM, — Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes bk. 8, ch. 3 § 67; Eadie, Eccl. Cyclop. p. 313, 658, 659; Coleman, Anc. Christianity, p. 369, 395; Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 394. For monographs, see Volbeding, Index Program. p. 142.

## Holy Week[[@Headword:Holy Week]]

             The last week of Lent (q.v.), i.e. the week before Easter, and specially devoted to commemorating the sufferings and death of Christ. In English use, it is also called Passion Week (a name appropriated, in Roman use, to the week before Palm Sunday). This institution is of very early origin, and was “formerly called the ‘Great Week,' and in medieval times the ‘Authentic,' with the same meaning; in Germany and Denmark, the popular title is ‘Still Week,' in allusion to the holy quiet and abstraction from labor during its continuance.” In the Roman Catholic Church, the special characteristics of the celebration of the Holy Week are increased solemnity and gloom, penitential rigor, and mourning. If any of the ordinary Church festivals fall therein, they are transferred till after Easter. All instrumental music is suspended in the churches, the altars are stripped of their ornaments, the pictures and statues are veiled from public sight, manual labor is voluntarily suspended, the rigor of fasting is redoubled, and alms- deeds and other works of mercy and sedulously enjoined and practiced. The days specially solemnized are Palm Sunday, Spy Wednesday, Holy (or Maundy) Thursday, Good Friday (q.v.), Holy Saturday. Holy Thursday (q.v.), in the Roman Catholic Church, is specially designed as a commemoration of the Last Supper, and of the institution of the Eucharist. Besides these services, there are still others annexed to the day, as the solemn consecration of the oil or chrism (q.v.) used in baptism, confirmation, orders, and extreme unction, the washing of pilgrims' feet,  and the chanting of the Tenebrae (darkness), consisting of the matins and lauds for the following mornings, which it is customary to recite at night. “During the service, a large candlestick, supporting fifteen lights, arranged in the form of a triangle, which denote Christ and the prophets who predicted his coming, stands in the sanctuary; the lights are one by one extinguished until only the upper one remains, which is taken down and placed under the altar until the close of the office, and then brought back; this symbolizes Christ's burial and resurrection.” On Holy Saturday follow the solemn blessing of fire and the water of the baptismal font; the baptism of catechumens, and the ordination of candidates for the ministry. From the fire solemnly blessed on this day is lighted the Paschal Light, which is regarded as a symbol of Christ risen from the dead. This symbolical light is kept burning during the reading of the gospel at Mass throughout the interval between Easter and Pentecost. Wetzer, Welte, Kirchen-Lex. vol. 2, art. Charwoche; Procter, Cornm. Prayer, p. 279 sq.; Guericke, Antiquities, p. 144 sq.; Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 394; Walcott, Sacred Archeology, p. 315; Appleton, Amer. Cyclop. 9, 240, 241. SEE PASSION.

## Holy Wells[[@Headword:Holy Wells]]

             Sacred springs in Popish countries scenes of pilgrimage and expected miracles.

## Holy of Holies[[@Headword:Holy of Holies]]

             SEE TABERNACLE; SEE TEMPLE.

## Holy of Holies (2)[[@Headword:Holy of Holies (2)]]

             SEE TABERNACLE; SEE TEMPLE.

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

             SEE TRISAGION.

## Holy, Holy, Holy (2)[[@Headword:Holy, Holy, Holy (2)]]

             SEE TRISAGION.

## Holy-Bread[[@Headword:Holy-Bread]]

             Skep or Maund is called, in the Roman and Anglican Churches, the basket used for the eulogia (q.v.). — Walcott, Sac. Archaeol. p. 312.

## Holy-Cross-Day[[@Headword:Holy-Cross-Day]]

             SEE CROSS, EXALTATION OF THE.

## Holy-Rood Day[[@Headword:Holy-Rood Day]]

             A festival on the 14th of September to commemorate in churches the Exaltation of the Cross; the Invention or Finding of the Holy Cross being celebrated on the 3rd of May. — Walcott, Sac. Archaeol. p. 314; Eadie, Eccl. Dict. p. 312. SEE CROSS.

## Holy-water Sprinkler[[@Headword:Holy-water Sprinkler]]

             “the aspergill, a brush for scattering holy water. A horrible Tudor mace, with radiating spikes, was called the morning star, or sprinkler.” — Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, p. 314.

## Holy-water Stock[[@Headword:Holy-water Stock]]

             (i.e. pillar) or Stoup (1.e. bucket). A stationary stone basin (any porous substance which could suck it up was to be carefully avoided) for holy water, placed at the entrance of the house of worship, called by the French benitier. Pope Leo III erected one at Ostia. “The stoup is found in all periods of architecture, formed in the wall, set on a pillar, or in the porch, or standing on a pedestal.” The vessel used by the Temple priests was a brazen laver (see Isa 1:16; Isa 52:2; Exo 30:20; 2Co 7:1; Psa 51:2; Psa 51:7). — Walcott, Sac. Archaeology, p. 314 sq.

## Holy-water Vat[[@Headword:Holy-water Vat]]

             (French, benitier; Latin, situla, vas), a vessel in which the holy water was carried about, and which, according to Micrologus, was first consecrated by pope Alexander V, as Cranmer says, to “put us in remembrance of our baptism, and the blood of Christ for our redemption, sprinkled on the cross.” Eadie says “this vessel was termed ama or amula. Du Cange recognizes aspersol, aspergillum, and aspersorium as the vessels from which the priests sprinkled the water, and guadalerium as that which contained it. The first three are plainly the same as the περιῤῥαντήριον of paganism.” “The fixed holy-water stoup (q.v.) was used by those who came too late into church to receive the aspersion by the sprinkler and water carried in the portable vat, which in the churches of the West represented the bodily ablution made by the Oriental Christians. Walcott, Sacred Archeology, p. 315; Eadie, Eccles. Dictionary, p. 313.

## Holyday, Barten, D.D[[@Headword:Holyday, Barten, D.D]]

             a learned English divine, was born in the parish of All-Saints about 1593, and educated at Christchurch College, Oxford. He was chaplain to Charles I, and archdeacon of Oxford. He died in 1661. His best known works are a Translation of Juvenal and Persius (1673): — Survey of the World (1661): — Twenty Sermons. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

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

             an English prelate of the 16th century, was born at Codington, Buckinghamshire, educated at New College, Oxford, became a Benedictine at Reading until that monastery was dissolved, and was preferred by queen Mary bishop of Bristol in 1554. Holyman lived peaceably, not imbruing his hands in the blood of Protestants. He died December 20, 1558. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 1:97.

## Holyoke, Edward[[@Headword:Holyoke, Edward]]

             A Congregational minister, was born in 1690 at Boston. He graduated at Harvard College in 1705, was elected tutor in 1712, and on April 25, 1716, was ordained first pastor of the Second Church in Marblehead. In 1737 he was elected president of Harvard College, and remained in that office until his death, June 1, 1769. He published an Answer to Whitefield (1744), and a few occasional sermons. — Sprague, Annals, 1, 293. (G.L.T.)

## Holzapfel, Johann Tobias Gottlieb[[@Headword:Holzapfel, Johann Tobias Gottlieb]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born February 24, 1773, at Marburg. In 1798 he was pastor and professor of Oriental languages at Rinteln, and died May 9, 1812. He wrote, Disquis. Quisnam Ies. 11 intelliqendus sit Rex Etatem Auream Restitutus (Rinteln, 1808): — Obadiah neu ubersetzt und erldute-t (1798):-S. F. N. MAorus: Prcelect. in Epist. Pauli ad Romanos (ed. 1794). See Ftirst, Bibl. Jud. i, 406; Winer. HIandbuch der theol. Lit. i, 218, 226, 256. (B.P.)

## Holzhauser, Bartholomaus[[@Headword:Holzhauser, Bartholomaus]]

             Founder of the order of Bartholomites (q.v.) was born at Langnau, Switzerland, in 1613, and was brought up to his father's trade, shoemaking. By the exertions of some charitable persons he was admitted into an establishment for poor students at Neuburg, and afterwards studied philosophy at Ingolstadt under the Jesuits. Ordained priest in 1639, he conceived the idea of bringing back the priesthood to the common life of the primitive Church. He founded at Tittmoningen an institution intended  to show the working of his system, and in 1640 founded a preparatory seminary at Salzburg in connection with it. He was successively curate of Tittmoningen, Loggenthal, and Bingen, where he died in 1658. His zeal and ascetic practices inclined him to revery and exaltation, so that he claimed to have visions; and it is said that, having been visited by Charles II, then a fugitive, he predicted that a better future awaited him. He wrote, Constitutiones cum exercitiis clericorum (Colon. 1662 sq.; approved by the Church of Rome in 1680) — De humilitate, together with a treatise On the Love of God (Mayence, 1663) — Opusculuns visionum variarum. A biography of Holzhauser, and a German translation of his works, were published by Clarus (Ratisbon, 1852); a French translation, with a biography, by Gaduel (Paris, 1861). — Ersch und Gruber, Ally. Encyklopadie; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 14; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 1, 700. (J.N.P.)

## Holzy[[@Headword:Holzy]]

             in Slavonic mythology (changed by the ancient chroniclers into Aicis, Alces, and Altschis), were idols of the Wends and Slavs, represented as two brothers. The giant-range of mountains seems to have been the seat of their worship. The priest who served them lived in a sacred wood, which at the same time was the dwelling-place of the gods. The Romans affirmed that the Holzy were Castor and Pollux, and that the priests wore women's dresses.

## Homaeousian[[@Headword:Homaeousian]]

             A term used to describe the orthodox view of the person of Christ, established at the Council of Nice in opposition to Arius, viz., that the Son of God is “of the same substance (or essence) with the Father,” (ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρί). SEE ARIANISI; SEE CHRIST, PERSON OF; SEE TRINITY.

## Homage[[@Headword:Homage]]

             SEE ADORATION; SEE DULIA; SEE FIEF; SEE WORSHIP.

## Homagium[[@Headword:Homagium]]

             Is a term applied in ecclesiastical language to the adoration (q.v.), which the clergy in the Roman Catholic Church pay to the pope. — Fuhrmann, Handworterb. d. Relig. und Kirchengesch. 2, 333.

## Homam[[@Headword:Homam]]

             (Heb. Homan, הוֹמָם, discomfiture; Sept. Αἰμάν, Vulg. Homan), the second named of the two sons of Lotan, son of Seir the Horite (1Ch 1:39). In the parallel passage (Gen 36:22) his name is written HEMAMI (Heb. Heyman הֵימָם, Sept.Αἱμάν, Vulg. Henlan). B.C. considerably ante 1964. Homam is assumed by Gesenius to be the original form (Thes. p. 385 a). By Knobel (Genesis, p. 254) the name is compared with that of el-Homaima, a town now ruined, though once important, half way between Petra and Ailath, on the ancient road at the back of the mountain, which the Arabic geographers describe as the native place of the Abassides (Robinson, Res. 2, 572). (See Laborde, Journey, p. 207, Ameinmz; also the Arabic authorities mentioned by Knobel.)

## Homberg, Herz[[@Headword:Homberg, Herz]]

             a Jewnish writer and teacher, who died at Prague, August 24, 1841, is the author of, באור לס דברים, a commentary on Deuteronomy, prepared for and printed in Mendelssohn's Pentateuch (Berlin, 1783, and often):הכור, glosses on the Pentateuch, also printed in Mendelssohn's work: — Ueber die moralische und politische Verbesserung der Israeliten in Bodhmen (1796): — בןאּציון, catechism for Israelites (Augsburg, 1812):אמרי שפר, or ethics according to the Mosaic law and the Talmud (Vienna 1802, 2 parts): — בן יקיּר, or Ueber Glaubenswahrheiten unzd Sittenlehren fur die israelitische Jugend (1814, and often). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:406. (B.P.)

## Hombergk zu Vach, Johann Friedrich[[@Headword:Hombergk zu Vach, Johann Friedrich]]

             A learned jurist, born at Marburg April 15, 1673, was educated at the University of Utrecht. He visited England, remaining for some time in London, Oxford, and Cambridge, and formed an intimate acquaintance with Richard Bentley. He died April 20, 1748. In addition to works on professional topics, he published, as the result of his private study of the New Testament, Parerga Saca sen interpretatio succincta et nova quorundam textuum Novi Testamenti (Ultraj. 1708, 8vo), and enlarged and improved under the title Parerga Sacra seu. observationes quaedam ad Novum Testamentum (Ultraj. 1712, 4to). The criticisms contained in this work were attacked by Elsner, and defended by the author's son, — Emilius Ludwig, also a jurist — J. H. Hombergk zu Vach Parerga sacra ab impugnationibus J. Elsneri vindicata (Marb. 1739, 4to), replied to by a relative of Elsner: Brevem Hombergianarum vindicarum adv. J. Elsnerum profligationem (Berlin, 1742, 4to). “Hombergk takes a medium position between the Hebraists and the Purists.” — Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. 2, 319; Bucher, Gel. Lex. 2, 1686.

## Homburg, Ernst Christoph[[@Headword:Homburg, Ernst Christoph]]

             A German hymnologist, was born at Mühla, near Eisenach, in 1605. His profession was that of lawyer. In his early years he wrote secular verses, but in his riper years he was led to turn his thoughts to sacred themes, and the results are some very beautiful hymns, of which a few are found in the Liturgy and Hymns for the use of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren (1836), and in the Christian Psalmist (1832). The “Man of Sorrows” is generally regarded as the best of these. He died June 21, 1681. — Miller (Josiah), Our hymns, their Authors and Origin (London 1867, 12mo), p. 32.

## Home Missions[[@Headword:Home Missions]]

             SEE MISSIONS.

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

             A French divine of Scottish birth, who flourished towards the close of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th century, “was engaged by James I to attempt the impracticable task of uniting all the Protestant divines in Europe in one system of religious belief.” The most important of his writings is Apologia Basilica, seu Machiavelli Ingenium Examinatum. He is also supposed to be the author of two satires against the Jesuits, entitled Le Contre Assassin, ou reponse a l'Apologie des Jesuites (1612, 8vo), and  L'assassinat du Roi, ou maximes du Viel de la Montagme Vaticane, etc. (1617, 8vo). — Nouv. Dict. Hist. 1, 271; Gorton, Biogr. Dict. vol. 2.

## Home, Henry, Ibrd Kames[[@Headword:Home, Henry, Ibrd Kames]]

             a Scotch lawyer and philosopher, was born in 1696 at Kames, Berwickshire. He studied law at the University of Edinburgh, and. became advocate in 1724. By a large number of publications on the subject of jurisprudence, he obtained from the beginning a large clientship; then, in 1752, he secured the post of judge at the court of sessions, and finally, in: 1763, the dignity of a justice of the high court of Scotland. His taste for agriculture and metaphysics gave rise to some of his finest works. There are, among others, Essays on the Principles of Morality and Natural Religion (1751), in which he attempts to prove that the laws which prevail in the conduct of man have their foundation in the constitution of the human being, and are as certain and immutable as the physical laws which govern the whole system of the world: — Elements of Criticism (1762), in which the author tries to connect literary criticism with the principles of  philosophy, very much admired, and still read: Sketches of the History of Man (1773): — The Gentleman Farmer (1777), being an attempt to improve agriculture by subjecting it to the test of rational principles: — Loose Hints upon Education (1781), chiefly concerning the culture of the heart. Home died December 27, 1782.

## Home, Thomas Hartwell, D.D[[@Headword:Home, Thomas Hartwell, D.D]]

             a minister of the Church of England, was born in London, October 20, 1780. He was a scholar at Christ's Hospital, but did not attend the university. He was a barrister's clerk for many years; was ordained in 1819, and did parochial duty in London, chiefly at St. James's Church, Westmoreland Street, Marylebone; held an important literary appointment in the British Museum for a long time; and in 1833 the archbishop of Canterbury appointed him to his city rectory, a position which he held at the time of his death, January 27, 1862. Dr. Horne was an author and editor of considerable celebrity. Among his works may be mentioned, An Introduction to the Critical Study of the Holy Scriptures, by which he is chiefly known, SEE INTRODUCTIONS: — A Compendium of the Admiralty Laws and Regulations of the Court of Admiralty: — An Illustrated Record of Important Events (in conjunction with Dr. Gillies and professor Shakespeare): — Deism Refuted: — Willis's Itinerary: Jewish and Christian Privileges Compared: — Potts's Law Dictionary: — Murphy's Arabian Antiquities of Spain: — Crosby's Gazetteer: — Van Leenween's Commentaries on the Dutch Law. For other ecclesiastical and Scriptural works see Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1862, page 741.

## Homer[[@Headword:Homer]]

             (לֶמֶר, cho'mer, a heap, as in Exo 8:14), a Hebrew measure of capacity for things dry, containing. ten baths (Lev 27:16; Num 11:32; Eze 45:11; Eze 45:13-14). In later writers it is usually termed a COR. SEE MEASURE.

The le'thek (לֶתֶךְ, vessel for pouring; Sept. ἡμίκορος, Vulg. corus dimidius, English. Vers. “half a homer”) was a measure for grain of half the capacity of the homer or cor, as seems probable from the only passage where it is mentioned (Hos 3:3). See Stud. u. Krit. 1846, 1, 123.

## Homer, Jonathan, D.D[[@Headword:Homer, Jonathan, D.D]]

             A Congregational minister, was born October 1759. He graduated at Harvard College in 1777, was ordained pastor of the First Church in Newton Feb. 13, 1782, resigned in April 1839, and died Aug. 11, 1843. Dr. Homer published a Description and History of Newton in the Massachusetts Historical Collection, vol. 5 (1798), and a few occasional sermons. He also superintended an edition of Teal's Columbian Bible. — Sprague, Annals, 2, 173.

## Homer, William Bradford[[@Headword:Homer, William Bradford]]

             A Congregational minister, was born in Boston Jan. 31, 1817. He was educated at Amherst College, from which he graduated in 1836, and immediately entered on a course of theological study at Andover. While in the middle year of his course he declined the offer of a tutorship in Amherst College. He was ordained pastor of South Berwick, Me., Nov. 11, 1840, where he died, March 22, 1841. The remarkable development of Homer's intellect was a matter of great surprise to all of his instructors. When only eleven years old he was already thoroughly conversant with the Latin, the Modern Greek, and French languages. The last two he is said to have spoken with fluency. At Andover he closed the exercises of his class by an essay so scholarly in its bearings that he was requested to publish it.  An oration of his, delivered on leaving the president's chair of the Porter Rhetorical Society of the Theological Seminary, was also printed. His “writings” have been published, with an Introductory Essay and a Memoir, by Prof. Edward A. Park, of Andover Theological Seminary (2nd ed. Boston, 1849, 8vo). See also the Christian Review (May, 1849). — Sprague, Annals, 2. 753 sq.

## Homerites[[@Headword:Homerites]]

             SEE HIMYARITES.

## Homes or Holmes, Nathaniel[[@Headword:Homes or Holmes, Nathaniel]]

             A learned English divine, was for a time incumbent of the living of St. Mary Staining, London, but was ejected for nonconformity in 1662. He died in 1678. His publications, now become rare, include The Resurrection Revealed (London 1654, fol.; 2nd ed. 1833, 8vo) — The Resurrection Revealed raised above Doubts and Difficulties, in ten Exercitations (London, 1661, folio) — A Continuation of the Histories of Foreign Martyrs from the Reign of Queen Elizabeth to these Times (in Fox's Acts and Monuments, ed. 1684, 3:865) — The New World, or the New Reformed Church discovered out of 2Pe 3:13 (London, 1641, 4to). See Wood, Athenae Oxon.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, vol. 1; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 873.

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

             Was born in Ireland in 1663, and was ordained in that country in 1692. He immigrated to America in 1714, and became minister at Martha's Vineyard, Mass. He died in 1746. Homes published four sermons (1732, 1747, etc.). — Allen's American Biographical Dictionary.

## Homicide[[@Headword:Homicide]]

             SEE MAN-SLAYER.

## Homiletics[[@Headword:Homiletics]]

             is the science of Christian address. The term is derived from ὁμιλία, converse, which, in early Christian usage, signified a religious address; or, more directly, from the adjective ὁμιλητικὀς, conversational, or pertaining to verbal communion. It came into permanent use during the  17th century, at a period when, under the influence of the scholastic method, the principal branches of theology received scientific designations derived from the Greek language: e.g. Apologetics, Dogmatics, Hermeneutics, Polemics. Although promptly naturalized on the continent of Europe, the term Homiletics was not for a long time generally adopted in England. In fact, its present accepted use in the English language is largely due to American authorship. — In Germany some attempts have been made to introduce other terms also derived from the Greek. Stier proposed Keryktics, from, κήρυξ a herald; and Sickel Halieutics, from, ἁλιεύς a fisherman; the latter being used tropically in the Gospels in application to the disciples as “fishers of men.” Both of these terms have been regarded as fanciful and undeserving of perpetuation, even though limited to missionary preaching. The term Homiletics is not entirely unexceptionable, but is retained and employed for lack of a better.

I. History. — With some authors, especially in Germany, the use of a scientific term to designate the theory of preaching has seemed to extenuate, if not to suggest, some practical errors in its treatment. Setting out with the idea of exhibiting a science in a scientific manner, not a few writers have ignored the proper origin and the religious design of preaching. They have treated it exclusively from the rhetorical and human point of view. They have cumbered it with artificial and arbitrary rules, apparently not having conceived of it as an agency specially and divinely appointed for the moral renovation of the world. But a perverted use of terms was not the origin of mistakes on this subject, nor was error in reference to it first developed in modern times. Indeed, misconceptions of the true design of preaching, as well as of the Christian truth it had been appointed to propagate, became common at a very early period in the history of the Church.

1. The true scriptural idea of preaching was corrupted in the ancient Church by (1) ritualistic tendencies; (2) rhetorical ambition. No sooner had the idea that the Christian ministry is a priesthood gained prevalence in the Church than preaching became secondary to sacerdotal rites, and the power of the Gospel waned under an increasing array of forms and ceremonies. Instead of being foremost as the grand agency of Christian propagandism, it became an appendage to public worship. Instead of going forth to find hearers in the marketplaces and by the wayside, preaching began to be regarded as one of the mysteries of the Church from which the heathen, and even catechumens of the first degree, were excluded.  Catechumens of the second degree were called by the Greek Church ἀκροώμενοι, and by the Latin audientes, “from their being admitted to hear sermons and the Scriptures read in the church; but they were not allowed to stay during any of the prayers, not even during those that were said over the rest of the catechumens, or energumens, or penitents; but before these began, immediately after the sermon, at ‘the word of command then solemnly used — ' Ne quis audientium; Let none of the hearers be present — they were to depart the church” (Bingham, Orig. Eccl. bk. 10, c. 2, § 3).

Preaching, having become a ceremony, was next corrupted by embellishments, and an artificial style adopted from the Greek rhetoricians. Exhortations and sermons of a scriptural character began to be substituted by formal orations, and panegyrics upon martyrs and confessors subsequently worshipped as saints. Nevertheless, homilies, or familiar expositions of Scripture, were maintained by the ablest of the fathers, and were sometimes furnished for the use of clerics incompetent to produce original addresses (see Augustine, Doctrina Christiana, lib. 4). The 5th century has been called the oratorical period of the Church, with reference to the distinguished preachers who then flourished, such as Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, and Augustine. Two books which have come down to us from the last-named fathers are often quoted as containing the best specimens of homiletical literature that appeared both in the Greek and Latin churches during the long period of a thousand years, if indeed they have ever been excelled in those churches; yet neither of these words formally or fully discussed the subject of preaching. Chrysostom's περὶ ῾Ιερωσύνης, being devoted to the subject of the priesthood, only alluded to preaching incidentally; nevertheless, it embodied some excellent precepts concerning it, such as may be supposed to have governed the studies and the habits of the writer himself, and by means of which he obtained his wonderful success.

Yet no estimate of Chrysostom (the golden-mouthed) can be accepted as just which does not concede to him extraordinary genius and transcendent abilities as an orator. Augustine, in his Doctrina Christiana, treated the subject of preaching more fully, and discussed it more systematically. He divided his treatise into four books. Three of them are entitled De inveniendo, and treat of invention in a broad sense, including the interpretation of the Scriptures. These books have not in modern times been very highly valued. The fourth relates to expression, De projerendo. Although a brief fragment, it has  been pronounced the best homiletical production that appeared between the days of Paul and Luther. It has been translated into various languages, and its most important precepts have often been quoted, and in various forms reproduced.

The chief intrinsic interest of this fragment from the pen of Augustine consists in its showing the best views of an eminent Christian bishop of the 4th century, who, after his conversion, made his Roman rhetorical education in a high degree subservient to the promulgation of Christian truth. Well would it have been for the Church of the following centuries had the spirit and power of Augustine's instructions to preachers been held in remembrance and kept in practice. But, unhappily, even this light became obscured. The Scriptures of truth having lapsed out of use, ceremonies became multiplied more and more. The doctrine of Christ's eternal sacrifice for sin having become corrupted by incipient theories of transubstantiation, the pretended sacrifice of the Mass rose to greater prominence, and so far usurped the time of public worship that sermons and homilies gave place to a diminutive form of public religious address called postils. Even the function of postillating was chiefly confined to bishops, the common clergy not attempting or being allowed to preach. As if such a degradation of one of the highest offices ever committed to men was not sufficient, preaching sank still lower by being employed for the promotion of error under the guise of truth. Medieval preaching was largely occupied in eulogizing the Virgin Mary, and in exciting reverence for the pictures and images of saints. Thus preaching was made to corrupt the very religion it was designed to promote. Beyond this, it even became the agency of exciting millions of men to war and bloodshed. Successive crusades were preached by popes and friars, and even the cruel persecutions of the Albigenses were stimulated by the preaching of vengeance against innocent men, who sought to follow Christ in sincerity. For such ends, more than for the promulgation of truth, were several orders of preaching and mendicant monks established in the 13th century. Among these, the Dominicans were the founders and principal abettors of the Inquisition, while others, of less cruel temper, went about to harangue the masses in the interests of papal supremacy, and to promote the sale of indulgences.

2. It was not till medieval superstition had culminated in the grossest abuses, and the Reformation had begun to exert a counter influence, that the Scriptures began to be restored to their proper supremacy. From that period the original design and true character of preaching came to be better  comprehended. Much of the preaching of the Reformation was indeed controversial, but so far as it was founded on the Word of God it tended to revive scriptural conceptions of the preaching office. The diligence of the Protestant reformers in promulgating their views made preaching also necessary to Roman Catholics, among whom, from that time, it became more common, and, especially in Protestant countries, it was no longer confined to bishops, but enjoined upon the clergy of all grades.

II. Literature. — The inspired Scriptures, especially those of the New Testament, must ever be considered the primary and most valuable source of homiletical instruction. Patristic literature on this subject, as already shown, is meager and fragmentary. Homiletical literature, in following ages, may be classified in four principal departments:

1. Treatises on preaching;

2. Aids to preaching, so called;

3. Sermons, or the products of preaching;

4. Biographies of preachers and miscellaneous articles relating to the objects and manner of preaching.

The first only of these departments will be particularly considered in this article. Immediately consequent upon the revival of preaching in the 16th century, there also occurred a renaissance of homiletical productions, which have continued to multiply ever since. Prior to the middle of the 17th century there were extant some seventy different treatises, “writ particularly upon this subject,” chiefly in the Latin language. These books were classified by Draudius in his Bibliotheca Classica, under the head of “Concionatorum instructio,” and by Molanus, in his Bibliotheca Materiarum, under the head of “Concionandi munus.” To these, bishop Wilkins remarks, “may be added those many other discourses wherein these things have been largely handled by the by, though not chiefly intended, in all which many learned men have laid down such rules as, according to their several geniuses and observations, seemed most useful.” In the enumeration of works referred to, no proper distinction was made between the office of preacher and pastor. Hence we find enumerated in the list the works of Bowls and Hemingius, both entitled De Pastore; also that of Hen. Diest, styled De ratione studii Theologici. Some of the earlier books on the subject of preaching by English authors were written in Latin, e.g. that of William Perkins, entitled “Arte of Prophecying, or a treatise concerning the sacred and only true manner & method of preaching. First  written in Latin by Mr. William Perkins, and now faithfully translated into English (for that it containeth many worthy things fit for the knowledge of men of all degrees) by Thomas Tuke. Motto, Neh 8:4-6 (Cambridge, 1, 613).” Cotton Mather's Malnductio ad Ministerinum, written about 1710, in addition to a Latin title, had a very formal and sonorous Latin preface. In the text of his treatise the learned author makes this remark concerning homiletical literature prior to the period in which he wrote: “There is a troop of authors, and even an host of God, who have written on the Pastoral care from the days of Gregory down to the days of Gilbert; yea, and since these, every year some to this very day. I cannot set you so tedious a task as to read a tenth part of what has been offered on the art, and the gift, and the method of preaching.”

In modern times, several different epochs of homiletical literature may be recognized corresponding to the character of preaching at different periods and in different countries. In Germany, the Lutheran reformation was characterized by great earnestness and even bluntness in the mode of preaching, not only in controversial discourses, but even in the proclamation and enforcement of evangelical truth. Luther wrote no work on preaching, but by his example and occasional precepts, some of which are recorded in his Table Talk, he greatly influenced his coadjutors and followers as to their theory and practice as preachers. The following are some of Luther's characteristic sayings. Portrait of a good preacher: “A good preacher should have these virtues and qualities:

1. He should be able to teach plainly and in order;

2. He should have a good head;

3. A good voice;

4. A good memory;

5. He should know when to stop;

6. He should study diligently, and be sure of what he means to say;

7. He should be ready to stake body and life, goods and glory, on its truth;

8. He should be willing to be vexed and criticized by everybody.”

Advices to young preachers: “Tritt ferisch auf, this maul auf, hor bald auf;” i.e. Stand up cheerily, speak up manfully, leave off speedily. “When you are about to preach, speak to God and say, ‘My Lord God, I wish to preach to thine honor, to speak of thee, to praise thee, and to glorify thy name.” “Let all your sermons be of the simplest. Look not to the princes,  but to the simple and unlearned people. We should preach to the little children, for the sake of such as these the office of preaching is instituted. Ah! what pains our Lord Christ took to teach simply. From vineyards, sheep, and trees he drew his similes; anything in order that the multitudes might understand, embrace, and retain the truth.” “If we are found true to our calling we shall receive honor enough, not, however, in this life, but in the life to come.”

After Luther's death a reaction occurred, in which there was a return to scholastic formulas and other objectionable features of the mediaeval homilies and postils. This second period has sometimes been called that of the postilists, in allusion as well to Protestants as Catholics. In the following period the pietism of Spener and Francke promoted a healthful reform in the Protestant pulpit of Germany, although the reform was to some extent neutralized by the nearly simultaneous development of the Wolfian philosophy, which gloried more in logical forms than in the power of the cross. This philosophy was fascinating to students, and, having gained an ascendency in the universities, it antagonized the plainer and more evangelical mode of preaching commended by Luther and Francke.

Mosheim, the Church historian of the middle of the 18th century, was also a celebrated preacher, and is regarded as having introduced another homiletical epoch in Germany. His style was majestic and oratorical, similar to that of Tillotson in England, and Bourdaloue in France. By him it was well applied to religious instruction, but after him it greatly degenerated — many of his imitators being more noted for the form of sound words than for the spirit of vital piety. By degrees, preaching declined in its religious power, until sermons scarcely aimed at being more than didactic or rhetorical entertainments.

Reinhard, court preacher in Dresden about 1800, not only inaugurated a better style of preaching, but illustrated his theory in numerous published sermons (a collection of his sermons was published at Sulzb. 1831-7, in 39 vols. 8vo), and also in a series of letters entitled his “Confessions.” His style was characterized by richness of thought, clearness, definiteness, force, and dignity of expression. It prevailed both among the rationalists and the orthodox to the time of Schleiermacher. The power of Schleiermacher as a preacher corresponded to his great influence as a theologian, and his example is regarded as having introduced another period in German homiletics, although he did not write specially on that  topic. In the course of his life his own style of preaching improved, rising from the moralisms with which he commenced to a more evangelical tone in subsequent years.

Apart from those who have treated of preaching as a branch of practical theology, the more prominent German authors on homiletics during the current century have been Schott, Reinhard, Marheinecke, Theremin, Stier, Lentz, Paniel, Palmer, Ficker, and Schweitzer.

In France the golden age of pulpit oratory occurred about the close of the 17th and at the beginning of the 18th century. It was the age of Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon, and Fenelon, among the Roman Catholics, and of Claude, Superville, and Saurin, among the Protestants. Fénelon and Claude became representative authors of the two churches: the former by his Dialogues on Eloquence, particularly that of the Pulpit; the latter by his Essay on the Composition of a Sermon. These valuable contributions to homiletical literature are still read with interest, not only in the French, but also in the English language. Even the former has been more appreciated and oftener reprinted by Protestants than by Romanists. France, in the 19th century, has also produced many examples of great preachers and good writers on homiletics. Without attempting to enumerate the former, the principal authors are Vetu, Martin, Bautain, and Mullois, of the Catholics, and Vinet, Vincent, and Coquerel, of the Protestants.

In Great Britain, the principal homiletical writers of the 18th century were John Edwards, 1705; Dr. Doddridge, 1751; Fordyce, 1754; and George Campbell, 1775.

Apart, however, from the influence of any of these writers, there arose during that century a style of Christian address destined to have a great influence upon the subsequent preaching of English-speaking countries. Allusion is made to the reformation that commenced in connection with the labors of Wesley, Whitefield, and others about 1740. The preaching of these men was characterized by a return to scriptural simplicity and fervor, and was followed by extensive religious awakenings, which in due time extended a quickening influence to ministers of all the churches. The Wesleyan reformation was further characterized by field-preaching, and by the employment of unordained men as lay preachers, who gave evidence of a divine impulse to call sinners to repentance. John Wesley, like Luther, though he wrote no treatise on preaching, gave numerous advices and some rules to preachers, which largely influenced the practice of those who  became associated with him, and which did not, as in the case of Luther, soon after become obsolete under the influence of formalistic reaction. In the minutes of one of his early conferences, Wesley gave rules for his preachers which have been officially perpetuated in Methodist societies and churches ever since. These rules pointed out in the briefest words the grand objects and essentials of preaching, regarding all rhetorical precepts and “smaller advices” as merely auxiliary. “Quest. What is the best general method of preaching? Ans. 1. To invite. 2. To convince. 3. To offer Christ. 4. To build up.” Here was the essence of the evangelical idea of preaching, and its fruits followed. Fletcher's portrait of St. Paul expanded and illustrated the same idea; but no extended work on preaching was produced by any Methodist of that period.

The early part of the 19th century witnessed the publication in England of but few, if any, homiletical works of permanent value. Between 1808 and 1819 the Rev. Charles Simeon, of Cambridge, laboriously developed the system of Claude on the composition of a sermon in a series of plans of sermons on the principal texts of Scripture from Genesis to Revelation. This work, which attained the magnitude of twenty-one octavo volumes, was designed to be a thesaurus of help and guidance in sermonizing. It contained no less than 2536 “skeletons,” enough to supply two sermons each Sabbath for nearly a quarter of a century. What more could a minister want? Such a wealth of supply would not have been provided had there not been a demand. The demand may have been healthy as far as it indicated a disposition on the part of the English clergy to escape from the still more indolent practice, not yet entirely extinct, of copying sermons in full, and reading manuscripts prepared for market, and sold in the shambles. Nevertheless, the idea that sermon plans for use, any more than sermons for delivery, could be an article of merchandise, was inherently wrong, and, as far as adopted, could only tend to mental torpor, and a servile dependence on the brain-work of others. Yet pulpit assistants, pulpit cyclopedias, books of sketches, and other devices for “preaching made easy,” have had their day in England, as well as in Germany and France. Simeon's Horae Homileticae, notwithstanding inherent faults, was by far the noblest of its class. It may now be pronounced obsolete in reference to its primary design, yet one of its features is imitated in some of the best commentaries of the present day, by the insertion in a less formal manner of homiletical notes on important texts and passages.  Several valuable works on preaching have been published in England during the last thirty-five years. The following deserve mention: The Ministerial Character of Christ practically considered by Charles R. Sumner, bishop of Winchester (London, 1824, 8vo); Apostolical Preaching considered, by John Bird Sumner, lord bishop of Chester (1839; 9th ed. 1850); Ecclesiastes Anglicanus, a treatise on preaching as adapted to a Church-of England congregation, by W. Gresley (London 3rd edition 1844, 12mo); Preaching, its Warrant, Subject, and Effects, by W. S. Bricknell (London, 1845); The Modern Pulpit, viewed in Relation to the State of Society, by Robert Vaughan (London 1842, post 8vo); Paul the Preacher, by John Eadie, D.D. (London 1859, post 8vo; reprinted, N. Y. 12mo); Thoughts on Preaching, specially in Relation to the Requirements of the Age, by Daniel Moore (London 1861, cr. 8vo); The Duty and Discipline of Extemporary Preaching, by F. Barham Zincke (reprint, N.Y. 1867, 12mo); Sacred Eloquence, or the Theory and Practice of Preaching, by Thomas J. Potter (Roman Catholic) (Dublin, 1868).

As to homiletical authorship in America, Cotton Mather's Manductio ad Ministerium, or Angels preparing to sound the Trumpets, although rare and little known, had the pre-eminence of being the first and only work of its class up to 1824. At that date Henry Ware, Jun., of Cambridge, Mass., published his Hints on Extemporaneous Preaching, a truly valuable work. In 1819 Ebenezer Porter, of Andover, republished Fénelon's Dialogues, Claude's Essay, and several minor works, under the title The Young Preacher's Annual (Boston, 1839, 8o). Subsequently the following principal works have appeared: Lectures on Homiletics and Preaching, by Ebenezer Porter, D.D. (And. and N. Y. 1834, 8vo); — Sacred Rhetoric, or Composition and Delivery of Sermons, by Henry J. Ripley (N. Y. 1849, 12mo); The Power of the Pulpit, Thoughts addressed to Christian Ministers, by Gardiner Spring, D.D. (1854); Preaching required by the Times, by Abel Stevens, LL.D. (N. Y. 1856, 12mo); The Model Preacher, a Series of Letters on the best Mode of Preaching the Gospel, by William Taylor, of California (Cincinnati, 1859, 12mo); Preachers and Preaching, by Nicholas Murray, D.D. (1860); Thoughts on Preaching, by James W. Alexander, D.D. (1861, 12mo); A Treatise on Homiletics, by Daniel P. Kidder, D.D. (1864, 12mo); Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, by W. G. T. Shedd, D.D. (1867, 8vo); Office and Work of the Christian Ministry, by James M. Hoppin (1869, 12mo). The larger part of the last-named work is devoted to the subject of homiletics, although not so indicated in the title.

From the foregoing lists it may be seen that recently American authorship on this subject is somewhat in excess of English. Several of the last-named books have been written by teachers of practical theology representing different churches, and have the merit of discussing the subject not only from an evangelical point of view, but in the light of the most modern developments and applications of Christianity. The state of society in the United States of America is favorable to the illustration of the true theory of preaching, as well as to its most efficient practice. All the churches, as were those of primitive times, are dependent on voluntary support. Neither their congregations nor their success can be maintained without attractive, and, in some degree, effective preaching. Even the Roman Catholic Church has adopted regular Sunday sermons and weekday missions, a species of revival efforts. Contrary to its universal custom where maintained as a religion of the state, it here builds its churches and cathedrals with pews or sittings for audiences instead of open naves for processions and moving crowds. The people of America, of whatever class, are free to hear whom they choose, or not to hear at all, unless addressed in a manner adapted to please or profit them. Corresponding to this state of things, the preachers of all churches, together with errorists of every description, are in active competition for the ears and hearts of the masses. The people, too, having great advantages for education, and no reverence for prescriptive authority, demand the best forms of Christian address, and such appeals to their reason and their emotions as challenge their respect. To none of these conditions does a true Christianity object since it relies for its propagation upon truth and legitimate persuasion. Nevertheless, these circumstances make it obligatory on preachers of the Gospel to comprehend well their vocation, and the manner of “rightly dividing the truth.” That this necessity is more and more recognized is an omen of promise to the Church of the future, especially as facilities for the easier and better comprehension of this branch of the minister's work increase.

III. Principles. — Homiletics, in a human point of view, may thus be considered a progressive science. It grows with the growing experience of the Church, and becomes enriched with the ever-accumulating examples of good and great preachers. It avails itself of the agency of the press to perpetuate specimens of the ever-multiplying homiletical productions of successive generations, and also to discuss the great problems of human destiny and influence. Thus the modern study and discussions of homiletics have had a tendency to place the subject in a clearer light, and to make it  more justly comprehensible than it has been at any former period since the days of the apostles. This result has not been attained by means of modern inventions, but rather by a return to the original idea of preaching, as indicated and illustrated by the author and finisher of the Christian faith; at the same time, all science is made auxiliary to the Savior's grand design in the appointment of preaching as an instrumentality for the diffusion of truth and the salvation of men. Space only remains for a brief summary of demonstrated and now generally accepted homiletical principles.

1. The true Idea of Preaching. — Preaching is an original and peculiar institution of Christianity. It was not derived from any pre-existing system. It had no proper counterpart even in Judaism, although a limited teaching office was committed to both the priests and prophets of the Jewish dispensation. SEE PROPHET. Old Testament examples of persons called preachers, like Noah, Solomon, and Ezra, fall far below the idea of preaching as appointed by Christ. SEE APOSTLE. Only in the Messianic prophecies was the office of Christian evangelism clearly foreshadowed (see Isa 61:1-2). SEE GOSPEL. In the fullness of time, the Lord Jesus Christ, recognizing his predicted mission, authoritatively established and appointed the office and work of preaching as a principal means of evangelizing the world. SEE PREACHING.

In preparation for this office he instructed his disciples both by precept and example, giving them before his ascension a worldwide commission to “go and teach all nations,” and “preach the Gospel to every creature.” In this appointment the Savior availed himself of no pre-existing rhetorical system, but rather a universal capacity of the human race now for the first time specially devoted to the divine use, and consecrated to the propagandism of revealed truth. SEE JESUS CHRIST. Yet he left his followers free to adopt, as auxiliary to their great work, whatever good thing might be derived from human study, whether of logic, rhetoric, or any other science. Thus, as Christianity multiplied its achievements and extended its influence along the ages, facilities for comprehending the philosophy and the art of preaching would of necessity increase.

The peculiarity of the preaching office is seen in the specialty of its address for moral ends, not merely to the judgment, but to the consciences of men; also in the grandeur of its aims, which are nothing less than the salvation of the human soul from sin in the present life, and its complete preparation for the life everlasting. As the objects of preaching are peculiar, so are the necessary prerequisites. Of these a true Christian experience and a special preaching may be taken up and laid aside as easily as other forms, but true preaching, the preaching that Christ instituted and designed to be maintained in the Church, demands the constant power of an active faith, a holy sympathy, and a conscious mission from God.

2. The Subject Matter of Preaching. — In secular oratory, themes are perpetually changing with circumstances. In preaching, the theme is one. Nevertheless, the one theme prescribed to the preacher is adapted to all circumstances and all times. It may be summarily stated to be God manifested in Christ Jesus for the redemption of men. This central truth, which is the special burden of revelation, embraces in its correlations all other truths, natural as well as revealed. The word of God should be considered not only the textbook, but the grand treasury of truth for the preacher. In it he is furnished with history, poetry, experience, and philosophy, as well as perceptive instruction and full statements of the Gospel scheme; nevertheless, he may bring to its illustration whatever truth will aid in its corroboration and comprehension. Still, the preacher's great work must be to publish the doctrine of the cross, “the truth as it is in Jesus.” To do this effectually, he not only needs an intellectual perception of its excellence, but the consciousness of its power as bestowed by the baptism “of the Holy Ghost and of fire.” Thus the persecuted disciples “went everywhere preaching the word” (Act 8:4), and Paul, as a representative apostle, emphatically declared, “We preach Christ crucified;” “We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord;” “Christ in you the hope of glory whom we preach, warning every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus” (Col 1:28).

3. Agencies of Homiletical Preparation. — In addition to the essential preliminaries of character and experience heretofore alluded to, the preacher must bring to bear on his theme such mental exercises as will enable him to elaborate it appropriately and to the best effect. The following are indispensable

(1.) Interpretation, by which the true meaning of God's word is elicited.

(2.) Invention, by which suitable materials, both of fact and of thought, are gathered from the universe of matter and of mind. Invention is exercise.

(3.) Disposition, by which all material employed is arranged in the most appropriate and effective order, whether in the introduction, argument, or conclusion of the discourse.

4. Different Forms of Homiletical Production. — The proclamation of Christian truth is not confined to any one form of address. Our Lord opened his public mission by a sermon-the Sermon on the Mount. Most of his other discourses were brief and informal, and many of his most important utterances fell from his lips in parables and conversations. The reported addresses of the apostles were exhortations rather than sermons according to the modern idea. In the early patristic age explanatory and hortatory addresses prevailed, resulting in the homily as the leading product of that period. As preaching declined in mediaeval times, the homily dwindled into the postil. The Reformation brought the sermon again into use, and secured for it the prominence, which it still maintains. In addition to re-establishing the sermon in its original prominence, modern Christianity has developed the platform address, in which a semi secular style of oratory is made auxiliary to various phases of Christian benevolence. At the present time, it is essential to both ministers and laymen, who would participate in the most prominent activities of the Church, such as Sunday-schools and missionary efforts, that they should cultivate the talent of effective platform speaking. Nevertheless, the sermon is likely to remain as it was in the beginning, the first and most important of homiletical productions. ‘Hence it should be specially studied, and thoroughly comprehended in all its capacities and bearings, as the standard form of clerical Christian address. SEE SERMON.

5. Style and Qualities of Sermons. — It is due to the dignity of Christian truth that the words in which it is uttered should be well chosen and fitly arranged. Hence the general qualities of a good style, such as purity, precision, perspicuity, unity, and strength, should be regarded as of primary and absolute necessity in pulpit style. At the same time, Christian discourse sternly rejects all the faults of style, which rhetorical laws condemn, such as dryness, tautology, floridity, and bombast. Preaching also requires more than mere rhetoric. In order to its higher objects, it demands certain peculiar combinations, such as a blending of dignity with simplicity, of agreeableness with pointedness, and of energy with love. The style of the  sermon should at once be fully within the comprehension of its hearers, and yet elevated by a certain scriptural congruity, which shows that it emanated from communion with God, and a familiarity with his inspired word.

Beyond mere verbal expression, sermons should possess several important qualities.

(1.) They should be evangelical, setting forth the unadulterated truth of the Gospel in its just proportions, and in an evangelical spirit.

(2.) Sermons should be interesting. To this end, the preacher must be deeply interested himself. He must utter his thoughts with clearness and vividness. He must use frequent illustrations. He must group things new and old in just and graphic combinations.

(3.) Sermons should be instructive. The minister of the Gospel must never forget the Savior's command to TEACH. Hence every sermon should be tributary to the diffusion of knowledge as well as holiness.

(4.) Sermons should be efficient. Failing to accomplish some of the special objects of preaching, they are failures themselves. Hence their great essentiality must be considered an adaptation to high and true religious results. If possible, all these qualities should be combined in every sermon, though in proportions to suit occasions.

6. Delivery. — Four different modes of delivery are recognized in Christian oratory:

(1.) the extemporaneous;

(2.) the recitative;

(3.) that of reading;

(4.) the composite, in which two or all of the foregoing are blended. The last finds little favor among theorists, and is rarely practiced with any high degree of success.

The first is the normal mode of human speech. No other was practiced by the Great Preacher, the apostles, or the early fathers. Recitative came into the Church in the 4th and 5th centuries, and reading in the 16th. Few questions pertaining to Homiletics have during the last 300 years been more zealously discussed than the relative advantages and disadvantages of the different modes of pulpit delivery. While it may justly be conceded that each mode has both advantages and disadvantages, especially when  considered in reference to the peculiar capacity of individuals, yet it may be affirmed as the result of all discussion and experience that the primitive mode of extemporaneous address is commended by the best modern opinion as a gift to be earnestly coveted by every minister of the Gospel, and as a result of proper effort within the reach of most, if not all earnest preachers.

7. Conditions and Elements of Success in Preaching. Mere eloquence, although a great auxiliary, is not of itself a guaranty of success in the proclamation of God's word. There is an infinite difference between the form and the power of preaching. The form is easy; the power is the gift of God crowning the highest human effort. To attain this great gift various conditions are prerequisite. A preacher must have clear and abiding conceptions of the dignity and overwhelming importance of his sacred vocation. With these must be associated a consuming love for his work, evidenced by tireless diligence and unslumbering faithfulness in its discharge. He must make preaching his great business, his absorbing employment. He must have discretion in the adaptation of his subjects, and style of address both to his hearers and to occasions. He must cultivate the habit of making all his observations, reading, and experience subservient to his capacity of instruction and religious impression. Above all, he must aim at the supreme glory of God, and at the end of his most earnest efforts depend with trustful confidence upon the divine blessing to give efficiency to his labors, and crown them with success. SEE PASTORAL CARE. (D.P.K.)

IV. Additional Treatises. —

1, Foreign (Latin. French, and German): Lange (Joannes), Oratoria sacra (Frankf. and Lpz. 1707, 8vo; Halle, 1713, 8vo); Vitringa (Camp.), Animadversiones ad Method. homiliar. ecclesiasticar. rite instituendar. (Jena, 1722, 8vo); Maitre (J. H. Le), Rèflexions sur la manière de prêcher (Halle, 1745, 8vo); Hollebeck (Eberhard) De Opft. Concionum genere (Leycd 1768, 8vo); Ammon (C. F.), Handbuch d. Anleit. z. Kanzelberedsamkeit (Gött. 1799; 3rd edit. Nürnb. 1858, 8vo); Gesch. d. Homiletik 5. Huss b. Luther (Gött. 1804,8vo); Tittmann (J. A. H.), Lehrb. d. Homiletik (Breslau, 1804; 2nd ed. Lpz. 1824, 8vo); Schott (A. H.), Entw. einer Theorie d. Beredsamkceit, imit besonderer Anwenmd. a. d. Kanzelberedsamrkeit (Lpz. 1807, 1815, 8vo); Theorie d. Beredsamkeit (Lpz. 1815-28; 2nd edit. 1828-47, 3 vols. in 4 pts. 8vo); Fénelon (Fr.  Salignac de la Motte), Dialogues sur l'éloquence de la chaire (Paris, 1714, 8vo; translated by Stevens, London 1808; Bost. 1832, 12mo); Dahl (J. Ch.W.), Lehrbuch d. Homiletik (Lpz. and Rost. 1811, 8vo); Marheinecke (Ph.), Grundleg. d. Homiletik (Hamburg, 1811, 8vo); Theremin (F.), Die Beredsamkeit eine Tugend; oder. Crundlinien e. systemat. Rhetorik (Berl. 1814; 2nd ed. 1837, 8vo), Kaiser (G. Ph. Ch.), Entwurf e. Systems d. geistlichen Rhetorik (Erlangen, 1816, 8vo); Grotefend (J. G.), Ansicht. Gedank. Eu Efahrungen ü. d. geistl. Beredsankeit (Hannov. 1822); Ziehnert (J. G.), Casual-Homilet. und Liturg. (Meissen, 1825); Schmidt (A. G.), Die Homilie (Halle, 1827); Van Hengel (W. A.), Institutio oratoris sacri (Lugd. 1829); Sickel (G. A F.), Grundr. d. christlichen Halieutik (Lpz. 1829, 8vo); Stier (Rudolf), Kurz. Grundriss e. bibl. Keyltik (Halle, 1830); Cheneviere (J. J.), Observations sur l'éloquence (Gen. 1834); Brand (J.), Handb. d. geistl. Beredsamk. (edit. by Hahn, Frankf. 1836, 1839; new ed. Const. 1850, 2 vols.); Zarbl (J. B.), Handb. d. Kathol. Homiletik (Landsh. 1838); Alt (J. K. W.), Kurze Anleiturg z. Kirchl. Beredsamk. (Lpz. 1840); Palmer (Ch.), Evang. Homiletik (Stuttgard, 1842; 4th edition, 1857, 8vo); Ficker (Ch. G.), Grundlinien d. evang. Fomilet. (Lpz. 1847, 8vo); Schweizer (A.), Homilet. d. evang. prot. Kirche (Lpz. 1848, 8vo); Baur (Gustav,) Grundzüge d. Homilet. (Giessen, 1848, 8vo); Gaupp (K. F.), Pract. Theol. (Berl. 1848, 1852, 2 vols. 8vo; vol. 2:pt. 1, Homiletics); Lutz (J.), Handbuch d. Kathol. Kanz Beredsamk. (Tübing. 1851); Vinet (A.), Homiletique on theorie de la predication (Paris, 1853); Beyer (J. H. F.), Das Wesen d. christl. Predigt. n. Norm u. Urbild d. apostol. Predigt (Göttingen, 1861, 8vo); Hagenbach (K. R.), Grundlin. d. Lit. u. Homiletik (Leipzig, 1863, 8vo); Lang (Gust.), Handb. z. homilet. Behandl. d. Evangelien und der Episteln (Bresl. 1865. 1869, 8vo); Wapler, Disposit. ü. d. evangel. Perikopen (Stendal, 1865, 8vo); Pröhle, Predigt Entwürfe (2nd ed. Nordhausen, 1865, 8vo); Roder (Max), Homilet. Handbuch z. Gebr. b. Predigten (a very superior work, to be in 5 volumes when completed, Nürnburg, 1863 sq. 8vo); Thym, Homilet. Handb. (lst part, Gratz, 1866, 8vo; 2nd part, 1868, 8vo); Zimmermann (Karl), Beitr. z. vergleichenden Homilet. (Darmst. and Lpz. 1866, 8vo); Palmer (Chr.), Evangel. Homilet. (5th ed. Stuttg. 1867, 8vo); Geissler (M.), Pred. — Entwürfe mit Anleit. z. Predigt-Ausarbeiten (Hamb. 1867, 8vo); Meineke (J. H. F.), Tägl. Handb. Für Prediger, edited by Dr.,Wohlfarth (Quedlinburg and Lpz. 1867, 8vo); Stock (Prof. Chrn.), Homilet. Real- Lexikon (new edit. St. Louis, Mo;, and Lpz. 1867, 4to); Wallroth, Ged.  und Anl. z. Predigten (Oldenb. 1868, 8vo); Sommer (J. L.), Predigtstudien (Erlangen, 1868, 8vo).

2. In English: Barecroft (J.), Ars Concionandi, or, Preaching, etc. (London 1715; 4th ed. 1751); D'Oyley (Samuel), Christ. Eloquence in Theory and Pract. (London 1718, 1 2mo); Henley (John), On Action in Preaching (London 1730); Blackwell (S.), Method of Preaching (London, 1736, 24mo); Jennings (John), Discourses (London 1754, 12mo); Fordyce (David), Theodorus; Dialogue on the Art of Preaching (London 1755, 12mo); Glanville, Essay concerning Preaching (London, 1768,12mo); Franke, The most useful Way of Preaching (London 1790, 8vo); Claude (John), On the Composition of A Sermon (5th ed. Cambr. 1827, 8vo; edited by the Rev. Chas. Simeon, N. Y. 1849, 18mo); Bickersteth (Edward), On Preaching and Hearing (4th ed. London, 1829,12mo); Close (Francis), Sermons on the Liturgy (London, 1835, 12mo); Williams, Christian Preacher (collection of treatises by Wilkins, Jennings, Franck, Claude, etc., London 1843, 12mo); Beveridge (Bp.William), Sermons (vol 1-4 of his Works, Oxford, 1844-45, 8vo); Thesaurus Theologicus (vol. 9 and 10 of his Works, Oxford, 1847, 8vo); Ryland, Pulpit and People (1847, 8vo); Gouldburn (Edward M.), Sermons (London 1849, 8vo); Russell (W.), Pulpit Eloquence (2nd ed. Andover, 1853); Short Sermons (London, 1855, 2 vols. 12mo); Styles, Nature and effect of Evangelical Preaching (London 1856, 2 vols. 12mo): Moore, Thoughts on Preaching (London 1861, cr. 8vo).

## Homiliare[[@Headword:Homiliare]]

             or Homiliarius is a term applied to a collection containing such homilies of the early fathers of the Church as were read on Sunday, on the festal days of the saints, on Easter, and Pentecost. See Durandi, Rationale, bk. 6:ch. 1; Fuhrmann, Handwörterbuch der Kirchengeschichte, 2, 337.

## Homiliarium[[@Headword:Homiliarium]]

             The name given to collections of sermons for the ecclesiastical year, to be read in case of incapacity preventing the preacher from delivering a sermon of his own. The idea of such a collection arose in the early part of the Middle Ages. The most celebrated work of the kind, which took the place of all preceding ones, is that known as Charlemagne's Homiliarium (see Neander, Church Hist. 3, 174). The title of the Cologne edition, 1530, sets forth Alcuin as its author (Homilie seu mavis sermones sive conciones ad  populum, praestantissirnorum ecclesice doctorun, Hieronmni, Augustini, Ambrosii, Gregorii, Origenis, Chrysostomi, Bedoe, etc., in hunc ordinem digeste per Alchuinum Levitam, idque injungente ei Carolo M. Romans Imp. cui Asecretis fuit). According to other accounts, however and even to the instruction by Charlemagne himself which accompanies the work — Charlemagne had caused this work to be done by Paulus Diaconus because (see Ranke in the Stud. u. Krit. 1855, 2:387 sq.) “the Hours contained a number of fragments from the fathers used for reading which were full of faults and badly selected.” But it is possible that both had a part in it, Alcuin forming the plan and Paulus Diaconus executing it. The work acquired great importance from the fact that it established more firmly the system of Church lessons introduced by Jerome, which had heretofore been subject to various alterations. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 249 sq.; Rheinwald, Kirchl. Archaöl. p. 276; Siegel, Handb. d. christl. — kirchl. Alterth. 2, 331; Neander, Ch. History, 3, 126; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. 2, 35; and the art. SEE HOMILY.

## Homilies[[@Headword:Homilies]]

             SEE HOMILY.

## Homilists[[@Headword:Homilists]]

             Among the homilists who have distinguished themselves in the primitive Church, Origen (3rd century) ranks first. The schools of Alexandria and Antioch appear to have been the great centers of this class of sacred literature and in the early centuries we find the names of Hippolytus, Metrodorus, Clement of Alexandria, and Gregory Thaumeaturgus principally distinguished. But it was in the following centuries that the homily received its full development in the hands of the early Greek fathers Ephraim the Syrian, Athanasius, the two Gregories of Nazianzum and of Nyssa, Basil the Great, Chrysostom, the two Cyrils of Alexandria and of Jerusalem, and Theodoret; in the Latin Church, Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine, Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, Peter Chrysologus, Fulgentius and Caesar of Aries. In later centuries, Venerable Bede, the popes Saobinian, Leo II and III, Adrian I, and the Spanish bishops Isidore of Seville and Ildefonsus, continued to use the homiletic form. — Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 399. SEE CATECHETICS; SEE CATECHISTS; SEE HOMILETICS; SEE HOMILIARIUM; SEE HOMILY.

## Homilius, Gottfried, August[[@Headword:Homilius, Gottfried, August]]

             One of the most celebrated German organists and Church composers of the 18th century was born at Rosenthal Feb. 2, 1714. In 1742 he became organist at the “Frauenkirche” at Dresden, and in 1755 was promoted musical director. He died June 1, 1785. Among his published musical works those considered best are, Passionscantate (1755), and Weihnachtscantate (1777). — Brockhaus, Conv. Lex. 8, 76.

## Homily[[@Headword:Homily]]

             (Gr. ὁμιλία, communion, a meeting; hence A discourse adapted to the people), the name of a certain class of sermons. It is now applied to a simple exposition of a text, in contradistinction from the discussion of a topic. In the early Church the term λόγος, oration, was applied to less familiar discourses; ὁμιλία to the plainer, much as the term lecture is now used.

1. The distinction between the homily and the sermon is thus set forth by Vinet. “The special character of the homily is, not that it has to do most frequently with recitals, or that it is more familiar than other discourses, but that its chief business is to set in relief the successive parts of an extended text, subordinating them to its contour, its accidents, its chances, if we may so speak, more than can be done in the sermon, properly so called. Nothing distinguishes, essentially, the homily from the sermon except the comparative predominance of analysis; in other terms, the prevalence of explanation over system. The difficulty as to unity presented by this kind of discourse never amounts to impossibility. We do not at random cut from the general text of the sacred book the particular text of a homily. The selection is not arbitrary. The limit of the text is predetermined by reference to unity, which, therefore, we shall be at no loss to discover in it. The only danger is that unity of subject will be relinquished, as the thread of a path may be buried and lost beneath an intertwined and tufted vegetation. As the preacher appears to be more sustained by his text in the homily than in the synthetic sermon, the former is thought to be easier of execution. It certainly is easier to make a homily than a sermon, but a good sermon is made with more facility than a good homily. The great masters in the art of preaching — Bourdaloue, for example — have not succeeded in homily. The most excellent judges in the matter of preaching have recommended the homily” (Homiletics, p. 148 sq.).

2. In the primitive Church we find the style of the homily already in the discourses of Christ and his apostles. They frequented the synagogues of the Jews wherever they went, and in these it was customary, after the reading of the Scriptures, to give an invitation to any one to comment upon what had been read. In this way the disciples frequently took occasion to speak of Christ and his doctrines. Thus we find in the Acts (Act 1:15; Act 2:14; Act 4:7; Act 5:29; Act 13:40-41; Act 17:22; Act 20:18; Act 20:22-24) brief notices of several addresses made by Peter and Paul, and one by Stephen, which give us quite a distinct impression of their style of address. Tertullian and Justin Martyr inform us that a like practice was common in the churches of Africa and Asia. “We meet together to read the Holy Scriptures, and, when circumstances permit, to admonish one another. In such sacred discourse we establish our faith, we encourage our hope, we confirm our trust, and quicken our obedience to the word by a renewed application of its truths” (Tertullian, Apol. p. 39).

(a) A similar mode of discourse we find again in the early Greek Church, beginning with Origen (A.D. 320). This was in some respects, however, a new style of address, as it inclined to an allegorical mode of interpreting the Scriptures. But, aside from this characteristic, the sermons, or rather, homilies of this period, were soon followed by all the preachers, as Origen was considered by all a standard who was to be imitated, while there were others less commendable. In general they were faulty in style, corrupt with “philosophical terms and rhetorical flourishes, forms of expression extravagant and farfetched, Biblical expressions unintelligible to the people, unmeaning comparisons, absurd antitheses, spiritless interrogations, senseless exclamations, and bombast.” The causes which contributed to form this style are due to the prevalence of pagan philosophy among the Christian preachers of this time, many of whom were converts from paganism, and had received an imperfect preparation before entering on the discharge of their sacred office.

(b) In the early Latin Church, the homilies of this period are, if anything, even greatly inferior to those in the Greek. The cause of this was, as in the Greek Church, the imperfect education of those in the ministry, more especially their ignorance of the original languages of the Bible. See Eschenburg, Versuche. Gesch. der öffenil. Religionsvorträge, p. 300 sq.

3. In the Church of Rome, at an early period, when few of the priests were capable of preaching, discourses were framed out of the fathers, chiefly  expository, to be read from the pulpits. These were also called homilies. SEE HOMILILRIUM.

4. In England, homilies were early in use in the Anglo-Saxon Church. AElfric, archbishop of Canterbury, who, after Alfred, ranks first among the Anglo-Saxon vernacular writers, finding that but few persons of his day (latter part of the 10th century) could read the Gospel doctrines, as they were written in the Latin, the language of the Church, was led to compile a collection of eighty homilies, some of which were perhaps written by himself, but most of which he translated from the Latin. In these Anglo- Saxon homilies “almost every vital doctrine which distinguished the Romish from the Protestant Church meets with a direct contradiction,” and they proved of no little value in the religious controversy at the period of the English Reformation. They condemn especially, among other things, without reserve, the doctrine of transubstantiation (q.v.) as a growing error, and go to prove that the novelties, which are generally charged to the Protestants, are really of older date than the boasted argument of apostolical tradition. Some of the MSS. of these homilies, however, which had been stored away in monastic libraries, are found to be mutilated by the removal of all such obnoxious passages (comp. Soames, Inquiry into the Doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church, Bampton Lecture, Oxford, 1830, 8vo). A second collection of AElfric's, undertaken at the request of Ethelward, commemorates the different saints revered by the Anglo-Saxon Church, and, like the former collection, was divided into two books. Of these homilies were published, An English-Saxon Homily on the Birthday of St. Gregory, used anciently in the English-Saxon Church, giving an Account of the Conversion of the English from Paganism to Christianity, translated into modern English, with notes, etc., by Elizabeth Elstob (London 1709, 8vo; new ed. London 1839, 8vo); Elfrici Homilie, ed. Eliz. Elstob (of which only 36 pages were ever published; Oxford 1710, fol.). Another attempt was The English-Saxon Homilies of Elfrici, translated by Eliz. Elstob (Oxford 1715, folio, of which only two leaves were printed, now preserved in the British Museum). Besides these, there are some Anglo-Saxon homilies extant, to which the name of Lupus Episcopus is generally affixed. They are by Wanley (Catalog. of A. — S. MSS. p. 140 sq.), and apparently with good reason attributed to Wulfstan (q.v.), one of the Anglo-Saxon prelates of the 11th century. “The most remarkable of these is the one entitled in the MS. Sermo lupi ad Anglos quando Dani maxinmepersecuti sunt eos, in which the author sets before the eyes of his  countrymen the crimes which had disgraced the age preceding that in which he wrote, and the increasing wickedness of their own time.” See Wright, Biog. British Lit. p. 487 sq., 506 sq. SEE ELFRIC.

5. In the Church of England, the term homily has acquired a special meaning from the fact that in the time of the Reformation, a number of easy and simple discourses were composed to be read in the churches. “The Thirty-fifth Article of religion says, The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward VI; and, therefore, we judge them to be read in churches by the ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understanded of the people.' The following are the titles of the homilies:

1. Of the right use of the church.

2. Against peril of idolatry.

3. Of repairing and keeping clean of churches.

4. Of good work,; first of fasting.

5. Against gluttony and drunkenness.

6. Against excess of apparel.

7. Of prayer.

8. Of the time and place of prayer.

9. That common prayers and sacraments ought to be ministered in a known tongue.

10. Of the reverend estimation of God's Word.

11. Of alms doing.

12. Of the nativity of Christ.

13. Of the passion of Christ.

14. Of the resurrection of Christ.

15. Of the worthy receiving of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.

16. Of the gifts of the Holy Ghost.

17. For the Rogation days.

18. Of the state' of matrimony.

19. Of repentance.

20. Against idleness.

21. Against rebellion.”

“The first volume of these homilies is supposed to have been composed by archbishop Cranmer and bishop Ridley and Latimer at the beginning of the Reformation, when a competent number of ministers of sufficient abilities to preach in a public congregation was not to be found.” It was published, as already stated, in the article above cited, in the beginning of the reign of Edward VI. The second volume was perhaps prepared under Edward VI, but it was not published until 1563, during the reign of Elizabeth (comp. Hardwick, Church History during the Reformation, p. 206, 211. 249). “In neither of these books can the several homilies be assigned to their several authors with any certainty. In the second book no single homily of them all has been appropriated. In the first, that on ‘Salvation' was probably written by Cranmer, as also those on ‘Faith' and ‘Good Works.' Internal evidence, arising out of certain homely expressions and peculiar forms of ejaculation, the like of which appear in Latimer's sermons, pretty clearly betray the hand of the bishop of Worcester as having been engaged in the homily against ‘Brawling and Contention;' the one against ‘Adultery' may be safely given to Thomas Becon, one of Cranmer's chaplains, in whose works, published in 1564, it is still to be found; of the rest nothing is known but by the merest conjecture. All members of the Church of England agree that the homilies ‘contain a godly and wholesome doctrine,' but they are not agreed as to the precise degree of authority to be attached to them. In them, the authority of the fathers of the first six general councils, and of the judgments of the Church generally, the holiness of the primitive Church, the secondary inspiration of the Apocrypha, the sacramental character of marriage and other ordinances, and regeneration in holy baptism, and the real presence in the Eucharist, are asserted” (Bp. Burnet). One of the best editions of the Homilies is that by Corrie at the University press (Cambridge, 1850, 8vo), and the latest, and perhaps most complete edition, is that published at Oxford (1859, 8vo). See also Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 1, 1524; Wheatly, Common Prayer, p. 272; Baxter, Ch. History, p. 379 sq., 486 sq.; Browne, Exposit. 39 Articles, p. 782 sq.; Wesley, Works — (see Index, vol. 7); Forbes, On the 39 Articles, 2, 685 aq.; Buchanan, Justific. p. 193, 198; Hook, Ch. Dict. p. 303.

6. For the Clementine Homilies, SEE CLEMENTINES; and on the points above given, see Schmidt, Die Homilie (Halle, 1827, 8vo); Augusti, Denkwürdigk. a. d. Christi. Archaeol. 6, 266 sq.; Schone, Geschichtsforsch. fiber die Kirsch. Gebr. 1, 74 sq.; 2, 226-53; De concionibus veterum, in Hoornbeck's Discellanae sacrae (Ultraj. 1689);  — Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 4, 20, 21, 81 sq.; Neander, Ch. Hist. 3, 126; Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch. 2, 335; Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes book 14 ch. 4; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, ch. 18; Primit. Ch. p. 387; Apostol. and Primit. Ch. 13; Bickersteth, Christ. Stud. Ass. p. 325, 470; Taylor, Anc. Christ.; Siegel, Handb. christl. — kirchl. Alterth. 2, 328 sq.; London Review, June 1854, Jan. 1857; Bib. Sacr. May and Aug. 1849; Presb. Quart. Rev. April, 1862, art. 2; Methodist Quart. Rev. 1, 283; 7, 63 sq. SEE HOMILETICS; SEE HOMILISTS; SEE POSTILLE.

## Homines intelligentiae[[@Headword:Homines intelligentiae]]

             (French hommes intelligence, men of understanding), a heretical sect which flourished in the Netherlands about 1412, most likely a later branch of the Brethren of the Free Spirit (q.v.). It was founded by AEgidius Cantor, and the most celebrated of their leaders was the German Carmelite Hildernissen. AEgidius Cantor asserted that “he was the savior of the world, and that by him the faithful should see Jesus Christ, as by Jesus Christ they should see God the Father; that the ancient law was the time of the Father, the new law the time of the Son; and that there should shortly be a third law, which was to be the time of the Holy Ghost, under which men would be at full liberty.” They also held that there was no resurrection, but an immediate translation to heaven; and advanced the pernicious doctrines that prayer had no merit, and that sensual pleasures, being natural actions, were not sinful, but rather foretastes of the joys of heaven. They were accused of heresy, and, Hildernissen having recanted, the sect finally dissolved. — Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sacr. 1, 405; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. 2, 399; Pierer, Univers. Lex. 8, 511; Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch. p. 339.

## Hommel, Johann Christoph[[@Headword:Hommel, Johann Christoph]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born September 13, 1685, at Weissenfels. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1712 bachelor of theology, in 1729 superintendent at Neustadt, and died October 17, 1746, member of consistory, first court-preacher, and general superintendent of the duchy of Hildburghausen. He wrote, Disp. inz Mat 24:29 (Leipsic, 1712): — De Fidelibus Veteris Testanenti Extra Ecclesiam Judaicam Visibilen Dispersis: — De Consequentiis Evangelico-Lutheranae Ecclesiae ab Adversariis Falso Imputais: — De Praerogativis Judaeorum Vet. Test. See Krauss, Memorabilia von Hildburghausen, page 254; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.).

## Hommius, Festus[[@Headword:Hommius, Festus]]

             a Reformed theologian, was born in 1576 at Hulst, Holland, and died July 5, 1642, a doctor of theology, preacher and.proefect of the theological college at Leyden. Hommius was one of the translators of the Dutch Bible, published by the Statesgeneral, and wrote, Collegium Anti- Bellarminianum, sive Disputationes Theologiae poro Evangelicis contra Pontificios: — Harmonia Synodorum Belgicarum. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:182, 331; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.).

## Homninicolae[[@Headword:Homninicolae]]

             (from homo, "man," and colo, "to worship "), a term of reproach, applied by the Apollinarians (q.v.) and others, to those who worshipped Jesus Christ.

## Homoeousian or Homoiousian[[@Headword:Homoeousian or Homoiousian]]

             A term describing the opinions of Arius and his fellow-heretics who declared the Son of God to be only of like substance (ὁμοιούσιος) with the Father. SEE ARIANISM.

## Homologoumena[[@Headword:Homologoumena]]

             (ὁμολογούμενα, universally acknowledged), the name given by Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 3,5, 25) to those books of the New Testament, of the canonical authority of which no doubts had been expressed. Eusebius includes under the term the four gospels, the Acts, the fourteen epistles of  Paul, and the first epistles of Peter and John, while the epistle of James, the second epistle of Peter. and the second and third epistles of John, and the epistle of Jude, were placed among the Antilegomena. In a third or lower class, some, Eusebius says, placed the Apocalypse, though others placed it among the acknowledged books. It therefore properly belonged to the Antilegomena. Eadie, Ecclesiastes Dict. SEE ANTILEGOMENA.

## Honain, Ibn-Isaac[[@Headword:Honain, Ibn-Isaac]]

             An Arabic-Nestorian philosopher and physician of the Abadite tribe, was born near Hirah in A.D. 809. He went to Greece, and there studied the Greek language and philosophy, and returned to Baghdad with a large collection of Greek books, part of which he translated into the Arabic and Syriac. He was assisted in this work by his son Isaac Ibn-Honain and his grandson Hobaish, who likewise distinguished themselves as philosophers. In this manner many works of the Greeks became accessible to the Arabians and the Syrians, and promoted among them more especially the study of Greek philosophy. It is to be regretted that after the completion of the translations the original works were burned, according, it is said, to a command of the caliph Al Mammun. Besides these translations, Honain wrote largely on medicine, philosophy, theology, and philology. He left also a Syriac grammar and a Syriac-Arabic dictionary, the first dictionary of the kind ever prepared. He died in 877. — Herbelot, Biblioth. Orientale, p. 423; Assemani, Bibl. Orientale, 2, 270, 438; 3, pt. 2, p. 168; Krug, Philosoph. Lex. 2, 455 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 15, 75.

## Honduras[[@Headword:Honduras]]

             SEE CENTRAL AMERICA.

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

             An Independent minister, whose father is said to have been an occasional preacher among the Dissenters, was born in 1779 at Bath. He was brought  up in rigid religious notions, and in his early years not suffered to read out of any other book than the Bible. At the age of ten he was apprenticed to an attorney, but he finally quitted the law, and became a bookseller in London in 1800. He devoted himself at the same time to the study of literature, and wrote several works on that subject. In 1823 he published a work entitled Ancient Mysteries described, especially the English Miracle Plays, founded on the apocryphal N.T. Storyn extant among the unpublished MSS. in the British Museum, etc. (8vo). “This is a curious work, not at all addressed to the multitude, or chargeable with any irreverence of design or manner, but treating an interesting antiquarian subject in the dispassionate style of a studious inquirer.” His acquaintance with members of the “Independents” led him to join the Independent Church, and finally he became a minister of that society. He died Nov. 6, 1842. Hone also published The Apocryphal N.T. (London 1820, 8vo; 4th ed. 1821), for an account of which see Horne, Introduction to the Study of the Script., and London Quart. Rev. vol. 25 and 30. See his Early Life and Conversion (1841, 8vo); English Cyclopaedia; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 1, 1525; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 874. (J.H.W.)

## Honert (Tako Hajo), Van Den[[@Headword:Honert (Tako Hajo), Van Den]]

             a distinguished Dutch divine, was born March 6, 1666, at Norden, East Frisia. He studied at Marburg, Leydlen, and Dort, was preacher in 1689, and succeeded in 1714 his former teacher, Solomon van Til, as professor of theology at Leyden. He died February 23, 1740, leaving, Vorlooper over  den Brief an de Romeinen (1698): — Verklaring van den Brief Pauli an de Romeinen (Leyden, eod.): — Beknoopte Scheets der Goddelyke Waarheeden (1703): — Verklarung over Luk 7:35 (1706): — Thoge Priesterschap van Christus niaar de Ordenung van Melchizedek (1712): — Verklaring van den 110 Psalm. (1714): — Theologia Naturalis et Revelata (1715): — Diss. de Theologio Propheticae, Necessitate (1721): — Dissertationes Historiae: 1. De Cireatione Mundi; 2. De Situ Edenis; 3. De Lingua Primaeva (1738). See Moser, Lexikon der Theologen; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:125, 199; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Honert, Johann Van Den[[@Headword:Honert, Johann Van Den]]

             A distinguished Dutch divine, was born near Dortrecht Dec. 1,1693. His early years were spent in military service, but on his father's accession to a professor's chair in the University of Leyden he decided to follow a literary life, and, after four years of study, he became a candidate for the ministry in his twenty-fourth year. In 1718 he was appointed minister at Catwick, on the Rhine; later, at Enkhuysen, and then at Haarlem. In 1727 he was called as professor of theology to the University at Utrecht, and in 1731 was honored with the professorship of Church History. In 1734 the University of Leyden called him as professor of theology, to which was added, in 1738, the department, which he last filled at the Utrecht University, and in 1746 the department of Homiletics. He died April 7, 1758. A complete list of his works, which in a great part have now nearly gone out of date, is given by Adelung (in Jöcher's Gel. Lexik. Addenda 2, 2123 sq.). His De gratia Dei non universali, sed particulari (Lugd. 1723, 8vo), which was intended to serve as al intermediator at the time when the Calvinistic predestinarian doctrine was much softened by the French and Swiss theologians, so rigidly opposed by many systematic theologians, involved him in a controversy with some of the Remonstrants (q.v.). (Comp. Aeta hist. eccl. 2, 819 sq.) His Oratio de hist. eccles. studio  Theologis maxime necess. (Lugd. 1734, 4to) was, like many other translations of German theological works, of great value to the Church of his country. He wrote also Instit. Theol. (Lugd. 1735). Honert was regarded by all parties as a very scholarly divine, and was consulted by all of them without distinction. — Gass, Gesch. der Protest. Dogmat. 3, 1862; Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch. 2, 339 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Honestus, St[[@Headword:Honestus, St]]

             SEE DAMIAN, PETER.

## Honey[[@Headword:Honey]]

             (דְּבִשׁ, debash', sometimes rendered “honeycomb,” in composition with , יר, ya'ar or צוּ, tsuph; while נֹפֶת, no'pheth, singly, is sometimes translated “honey-comb;” Greek μέλι) is represented by several terms, more or less accurately, in the original languages of Scripture.

1. יר, ya'ar, which only occurs (in this sense) in 1Sa 14:25; 1Sa 14:27; 1Sa 14:29; Son 5:1; and denotes the honey of bees, and that only. The word properly signifies a copse or forest, and refers to the honey found in the woods.

2. נֹפֶת, no'pheth, honey that drops (from נוּ, to sprinkle or distil), usually associated with the comb, and therefore bee-honey. This occurs in Psa 19:10; Pro 5:3; Pro 24:13; Pro 27:7; Son 4:11.

3. דְּבִשׁ, debash' (from its glutinous nature). This is the most frequent word. It sometimes denotes beehoney, as in Jdg 14:8, but may also refer to a vegetable honey distilled from trees, and called manna by chemists; also the sirup of dates, and even dates themselves. It appears also sometimes to stand as a general term for all kinds of honey, especially the sirup of grapes, i.e. the newly-expressed juice or must boiled down. At the present day this sirup is still common in Palestine, under the same Arabic name dibs (Robinson's Researches, 2:442, 453), and forms an article of commerce in the East; it was this, and not ordinary bee-honey, which Jacob sent to Joseph (Gen 43:11), and which the Tyrians purchased from Palestine (Eze 27:17). The mode of preparing it is described by Pliny (14:11): the must was either boiled down to a half (in which case it was called defurutum), or to a third (when it was called siracum, or sapa, the σίραιος οϊvνος, and ἕψημα of the Greeks): it was mixed either with  wine or milk (Virg. Georg. 1, 296; Ovid, Fast. 4:780): it is still a favorite article of nutriment among the Syrians and has the appearance of coarse honey (Russell, Aleppo, 1, 82). It was used for sweetening food, like sugar with us (Exo 16:31).

4. צוּ, tsuph (literally a flowing), denotes rather the cells of the honey- comb full of honey (Pro 16:24; Psa 19:11).

5. The “wild honey” (μέλι ἄγριον) which, with locusts, formed the diet of John the Baptist, was, according to some, the manna or vegetable honey noticed under debash (No. 3, above), but may very naturally refer to the honey stored by bees in the rocks of Judaea Deserta, in the absence of the trees to which they usually resort. Such wild honey is clearly referred to in Deu 22:13; Psalm 81:17. Josephus (War, 4, 8, 3) specifies bee-honey among the natural productions of the plain of Jericho: the same Greek expression is certainly applied by Diodorus Siculus (19:94) to honey exuding: from trees; but it may also be applied, like the Latin mel silvestre (Pliny, 11:16), to a particular kind of bee honey. A third kind has been described by some writers as “vegetable” honey, by which is meant the exudations of certain trees and shrubs, such as the Tamnarix mannifera, found in the peninsula of Sinai, or the stunted oaks of Luristan and Mesopotamia. A kind of honey is described by Josephus (1. c.) as being manufactured from the juice of the date.

Honey was not permitted to be offered on the altar (Lev 2:11). As it is coupled with leaven in this prohibition, it would seem to amount to an interdiction of things sour and sweet. Aben Ezra and others allege that it was because honey partook of the fermenting nature of leaven, and when burnt yielded an unpleasant smell-qualities incompatible with offerings made by fire of a sweet savor unto the Lord. The prohibition appears to have been grounded on the fermentation produced by it, honey soon turning sour, and even forming vinegar (Pliny, 21:48). This fact is embodied in the Talmudical word hidbish “to ferment” derived from debash. Other explanations have been offered, as that: bees were unclean (Phil. 2, 255), or that the honey was the artificial dibs (Bahr, Symbol. 2, 323). But Maimonides and others think it was for the purpose of making a difference between the religious customs of the Jews and the heathen, in whose offerings honey was much employed. The first fruits of honey were, however, to be presented, as these were destined for the support of the priests, and not to be offered upon the altar (2Ch 31:5). It is  related in 1Sa 14:24-32, that Jonathan and his party, coming to the wood, found honey dropping from the trees to the ground, and the prince extended his rod to the honey-comb to taste the honey. From all this it is clear that the honey was bee-honey, and that honey-combs were above in the trees, from which honey dropped upon the ground; but it is not, clear whether Jonathan put his rod into a honey-comb that was in the trees or shrubs, or into one that had fallen to the ground, or that had been formed there (Kitto's Pict. Bible, ad loc.). Moreover, the vegetable honey is found only in small globules, which must be carefully collected and strained before being used (Wellsted, 2, 50).

In India, “the forests,” says Mr. Roberts, “literally flow with honey; large combs maybe seen hanging on the trees as you pass along, full of honey” (Oriental Illustrations). We have good reason to conclude, from many allusions in Scripture, that this was also, to a considerable extent, the case formerly in Palestine. It is very evident that the land of Canaan abounded in honey. It is indeed described as “a land flowing with milk and honey” (Exo 3:8, etc.); which we apprehend to refer to all the sweet substances which the different Hebrew words indicate, as the phrase seems too large to be confined to the honey of bees alone. Yet the great number of bees in Palestine has been noticed by many travelers; and they were doubtless still more common in ancient times, when the soil was under more general cultivation. Where bees are very numerous, they sometimes resort to places for the deposit of their honey, which we would little think of. The skeleton of a lion, picked clean by birds, dogs, and insects, would afford no bad substitute for a hive, as in Jdg 14:8-9 (Kitto's Daily Bible Illus. ad loc.). A recent traveler, in a sketch of the natural history of Palestine, names bees, beetles, and mosquitoes as the insects, which are most common in the country (Schubert, Reise im Morgenlande, 2, 120). In some parts of Northern Arabia the hills are so well stocked with bees that no sooner are hives placed than they are occupied (Wellsted's Travels, 2:123). Dr. Thomson speaks of immense swarms of bees in the cliffs of wady Kum, and compares Deu 22:13 (Land and Book, 1, 460). Prof. Hackett saw hives in several places in Palestine (Illustrations of Script. p. 96). Milk and honey were among the chief dainties in the earlier ages, as they are now among the Bedawin; and butter and honey are also mentioned among articles of food (Isa 7:15). The ancients used honey instead of sugar (Psa 119:103; Pro 24:13); but when taken in great quantities it causes nausea, a fact employed in Pro 25:16-17, to inculcate moderation in pleasures. Honey and milk are put also for sweet  discourse (Son 4:11). The preservative properties of honey were known in ancient times. Josephus records that the Jewish king Aristobulus, whom Pompey's partisans destroyed by poison, lay buried in honey till Antony sent him to the royal cemetery in Judsea (Ant. 14, 7, 4). SEE BEE.

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

             A portion of which, with milk, was sometimes given to newly baptized persons in allusion to the name anciently given to Canaan, and in token that they belonged to the spiritual Israel. Honey and milk had a distinct consecration (Eadie, Ecclesiastes Dict.). See Augusti, Christ. Archaöl. 2, 446 sq.; Riddle, Christ. Antig. p. 519 sq.; Wheatly, Common Prayer, p. 326.

## Honolulu[[@Headword:Honolulu]]

             SEE SANDWICH ISLANDS.

## Honor[[@Headword:Honor]]

             (1.) Respect paid to superiors, those to whom we owe particular deference and distinction.

(2.) It is sometimes, in Scripture, used to denote real services: Honor thy father and mother (Exo 20:12);” that is, not only show respect and deference, but assist them, and perform such services to them as they need. By honor is also understood that adoration which is due to God only: “Give unto the Lord the honor due unto his name (Psa 29:2).”

(3.) Specifically, it is used to denote the testimony of esteem or submission, by which we make known the veneration and respect we entertain for any one on account of his dignity or merit. The word is used in general for the esteem due to virtue glory, reputation, and probity. In every situation of life, religion only forms the true honor and happiness of man. “It cannot arise from riches, dignity of rank, or office, nor from what are often called splendid actions of heroes, or civil accomplishments; these may be found among men of no real integrity, and may create considerable fame; but a distinction must be made between fame and true honor. The former is a loud and noisy applause; the latter a more silent and internal homage. Fame floats on the breath of the multitude; honor rests on the judgment of the thinking. In order, then, to discern where true honor lies, we must not look  to any adventitious circumstance, not to any single sparkling quality, but to the whole of what forms a man; in a word, we must look to the soul. It will discover itself by a mind superior to fear, to selfish interest, and corruption; by an ardent love to the Supreme Being, and by a principle of uniform rectitude. It will make us neither afraid nor ashamed to discharge our duty, as it relates both to God and man. It will influence us to be magnanimous without being proud; humble without being mean; just without being harsh; simple in our manners, but manly in our feelings. This honor, thus formed by religion, or the love of God, is more independent and more complete than what can be acquired by any other means. It is productive of higher felicity, and will be commensurate with eternity itself; while that honor, so called, which arises from any other principle, will resemble the feeble and twinkling flame of a taper, which is often clouded by the smoke it sends forth, but is always wasting, and soon dies totally away” (Blair, Sermons, Serm. 33).

(4.) The term “honor” is also used to denote the personal quality of magnanimity, especially in relation to truth and fidelity. Among men of the world, the “sense of honor,” so called, takes the place of conscience; perhaps it might more justly be said that it is conscience, regulated, however, by the personal pride of the individual. Coleridge remarks that wherever “genuine morality has given way, in the general opinion, to a scheme of ethics founded on utility, its place is soon challenged by the spirit of HONOR. Paley, who degrades the spirit of honor into a mere club-law among the higher classes, originating in selfish convenience, and enforced by the penalty of excommunication from the society which habit had rendered indispensable to the happiness of the individuals, has misconstrued it not less than Shaftesbury, who extols it as the noblest influence of noble natures. The spirit of honor is more, indeed; than a mere conventional substitute for honesty; but, on the other hand, instead of being a finer form of moral life, it may be more truly described as the shadow or ghost of virtue deceased; for to take the word in a sense which no man of honor would acknowledge may be allowed to the writer of satires, but not to the moral philosopher.

Honor implies a reverence for the invisible and super sensual in our nature, and so far it is virtue; but it is a virtue that neither understands itself nor its true source, and therefore often unsubstantial, not seldom fantastic, and often more or less capricious. Abstract the notion from the lives of lord Herbert of Cherbury, or Henry the Fourth of France, and then compare it with 1 Corinthians 13 and the  Epistle to Philemon, or, rather, with the realization of this fair ideal in the character of St. Paul himself. This has struck the better class even of infidels. Collins, one of the most learned of our English deists, is said to have declared that, contradictory as miracles appeared to his reason, he would believe in them notwithstanding if it could be proved to him that St. Paul had asserted any one as having been worked by himself in the modern sense of the word miracle; adding, ‘St. Paul was so perfect A gentleman, and a man of honor!' I know not a better test. Nor can I think of any investigation that would be more instructive where it would be safe, but none, likewise, of greater delicacy from the probability of misinterpretation than a history of the rise of honor in the European monarchies as connected with the corruptions of Christianity, and an inquiry into the specific causes of the inefficacy which has attended the combined efforts of divines and moralists against the practice and obligation of dueling.” Of the merely worldly sense of honor, Carlyle remarks, sharply enough, that it “reveals itself too clearly as the daughter and heiress of our old acquaintance, Vanity” (Essays, 2, 74). Montesquieu remarks that what is called honor in Europe is unknown, and of course unnamed, in Asia; and that it would be difficult to render the term intelligible to a Persian.” See Montesquieu, Spirit of Laws, bk. 3, ch. 8; Coleridge, Friend, p. 377.

## Honor Cathedrae[[@Headword:Honor Cathedrae]]

             an expression used in Spain in the 6th century, to denote the honorary acknowledgment which the bishops received in their parochial visitations.

## Honoratus, St[[@Headword:Honoratus, St]]

             Bishop of Marseilles, was born about 420 or 425, and is said to have been educated at the school of Lerins. He was the successor of the celebrated Tillemont in the episcopacy (probably in 475), but of his works very little is known at present. Some ascribe to him the authorship of a life of St. Hilarius, which other critics suppose to be the production of Viventius. He  died about 492, counting pope Gelasius I among his admirers. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé. 25, 78.

## Honoratus, St.[[@Headword:Honoratus, St.]]

             a Manichaean, and archbishop of Aries, was born, according to Baillet, in Belgian Gaul, in the second half of the 4th century. He belonged to a noble family who were pagans; and when he and his brother Venantius became Christians, they left their country and parents, and traveled through Achaia, and afterwards founded a monastery on the island of Serino, opposite Camles, which acquired great celebrity. Some of the most eminent bishops and theologians of the 5th and 6th centuries came out of this convent. Honoratus himself became archbishop of Aries A.D. 426, and died A.D. 429. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 78.

## Honorius[[@Headword:Honorius]]

             Roman emperor, son of Theodosius I, was born in 384. He was named Augustus Nov. 20, 393, and succeeded his father Jan. 17, 395, as first emperor of the Western empire, with Rome as its capital, while the Eastern fell to the lot of his brother Arcadius. Honorius was at this time only ten years of age, and he was therefore put under the guardianship of Stilicho, a Vandal, who had aided him in ascending the throne, and whose daughter Maria he married. Honorius, soon after his accession, renewed and even rendered more stringent his father's enactments against heathenism; but the weakness of his government, together with the fears or heathenish tendencies of some of the governors, rendered these regulations almost of no effect in several provinces. It having been represented to Honorius that the continued existence of heathen temples kept up the heathen spirit among the people, he ordered (399) that all such temples should be quickly destroyed, so that the people should no longer have this temptation before them. As the heathen laid great stress on a prediction that Christianity would disappear in its 365th year, the destruction of their own temples at that time made great impression on them. Yet in some districts of Northern Africa the heathen still remained numerous enough not only to resist, but even to oppress the Christians. After the death of Stilicho, Honorius modified his severe course against heathenism: a law was promulgated for the Western empire in A.D. 410 “ut libera voluntate quis cultum Christianitatis exciperet” by which the penalties pronounced by preceding laws against all who participated in any but Christian worship were suspended. This law, however, remained in force but a short time, and the old enactments came again into use. An edict of 416 excluded the heathen from civil and military offices, yet we are told by Zozimus (5, 46) that such was the weakness of Honorius that at the request of a heathen general, who declined continuing in his service on any other terms, the edict was at once taken back. This vacillating, irresolute prince was also led to take part in discussions on the points of doctrine then agitating the Church.

In 418 he promulgated an edict against Pelagius and the Pelagians and Caelicolae, which was framed more in a theological than an imperial style. He acted in the same manner towards the Donatists. The envoys of the North African Church succeeded in obtaining from the emperor a rule that the penalty of ten pounds of gold to which his father Theodosius had condemned heretic  priests, or the owners of the places where heretics assembled to worship, should only be enforced against those Donatist bishops and priests in whose dioceses violence had been offered to the orthodox priests. In an edict Honorius issued against the Donatists (405), he condemned them as heretics, and this with more severity even than the Council of Carthage demanded. Later he appointed a council, to be held at Carthage (411), to decide the difficulty between the Donatists and the orthodox party. The imperial commissioners, of course, decided for the latter, and new edicts were published exiling Donatist priests, and condemning their followers to be fined. The fanaticism of the oppressed party was excited by these measures, and the heresy only spread the more rapidly. While the reign of Honorius is thus of great importance in the history of the Church, the emperor himself showed the greatest want of energy in all his dealings, and his death, which occurred in August, 423, cannot be said to have been a loss to either the State or the Church. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 251; Mosheim, Ch. History, vol. 1; Gibbon, Decline and Fall, chap. 29-33; Sozomen, Hist. Eccles, chap. 8-10; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 2, 66 sq.; Lea, Sacerdotal Celibacy, p. 54, 72, 83; Christ. Remembrancer, July 1868, p. 237. SEE DONATISTS.

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

             An archbishop of Canterbury in 627. He instituted parishes in England; but little is known of his life and works. He died in 653.

## Honorius (3)[[@Headword:Honorius (3)]]

             archbishop of Canterbury, was a Roman by birth, and was distinguished among his contemporaries for having been a pupil of Gregory the Great. He was chosen as the successor of Justus, to occupy the see of Canterbury. His consecration probably occurred in 627. His reign was one of long duration. He did much for England in the way of prospering her Church. The music of Canterbury, introduced by Honorius, was imitated even in the Celtic churches, and the tendency it had to promote civilization in England cannot be denied. He died at a good old age, greatly lamented by his people, and was buried at St. Augustine, September 30, 653. See Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, 1:111 sq.

## Honorius I, Pope[[@Headword:Honorius I, Pope]]

             Was a native of the Campania, and succeeded Boniface V in 625. His general administration of Church affairs has been favorably commented upon by historians, and his name is very prominent in the history of the paschal controversy in Ireland, and in that of the early Anglo-Saxon Church. The feast of the elevation of the cross was organized during his time (about 628), and he was very active in converting the heathen. He died in 638. Some of his letters are preserved in Labbe's Collect. Conciliorum, vol. 3. Honorius is especially distinguished for the part he took in the Monotheistic controversies of that period. While the controversy was gaining ground in the West, Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, wrote to Honorius, explaining the Monotheistic doctrines in the most favorable light, and suggested that Honorius should impose silence on both parties in a dispute, which really did not affect the substance of the Catholic doctrine. Misled, it is alleged, by this statement of Sergius, Honorius consented, and even expressed himself in language, which would appear to condense the doctrine of two wills in Christ. After his death, attempts were made at Rome to exculpate his memory from all accusation of heresy, yet he was condemned and anathematized by the (Ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 680, and this sentence was confirmed at different times, as, for instance, by Leo II, who anathematized him as heretic for having attempted apostolicam ecclesiam — profi ana proditione immaculatam subvertere (Mansi, 10, 731). Modern Roman Catholic historians have tried in various ways to exonerate Honorius.

Baronius says that the acts of the Council of Constantinople were falsified; Bellarmine says that this was the case with Honorius's letter to Sergius; while Garier and Ballerini claim that he was not anathematized for heresy, but propter negigentiam. Some Roman Catholic historians, however, maintain that even in disclaiming the belief of two wills in Christ, Honorius merely denied the existence in Christ of two discordant or conflicting wills, that is, of a corrupt and sinful human will opposed to the divine will, and that he did not put forth any dogmatic declarations irreconcilable with the strict ultramontane doctrine of infallibility. Orsi went even so far as to maintain that Honorius composed this letter to Sergius as “a private teacher;” but the expression doctor privatus, when used of a pope, is like talking of wooden iron (comp. Janus, The Council and the Pope, p. 405). In modern times, the agitation of the question of papal infallibility has given a special interest to the letters of Honorius. The champions of infallibility,  following the lead of the above-mentioned writers, tried all kinds of arguments to explain away the assent of Honorius to the heretical doctrines of Sergius, without being able to adduce any new argument. The Jesuit Damberger even attempted a full justification of the course of Honorius. Most of the Roman Catholic writers, however, admitted that the words, though they may bear an orthodox construction, must have appeared as favoring the heretics, and that Honorius probably fell into a trap, which the shrewd patriarch of Constantinople had set for him. The Galileans, and the opponents of papal infallibility, have in general endeavored to show that Honorius was really a favorer of Monotheism. The ablest treatment of the subject from this school in the Roman Catholic Church may be found in the work on The Pope and the Council by Janus; two works by P. Le Page Renouf (The Condemnation of Pope Honorius, London, 1868); and [in reply to the-ultramontane reviews of the first work by Dr. Ward, the editor of the Dublin Review, and the Jesuit Bottalla] The Case of Pope Honorius reconsidered (London, 1869); in two letters, by the distinguished French Oratorian and member of the French Academy, P. Gratry (L'eveque d'Orleans et l'archeveque de Malines, Paris, 1870); and in an essay by bishop Hefele, published in Naples, 1870. Renouf, whose thoroughness and keenness is admitted by all his opponents, in his works, undertakes to prove three assertions:

1. Honorius, in his letters to Sergius, really gave his sanction to the Monotheistic heresy;

2. Honorius was, on account of heresy, condemned by general councils and popes;

3. Honorius taught a heresy ex cathedra. The fact that Honorius was condemned by general councils and popes as a heretic is admitted by many of those Catholic writers who insist that his words may be indeed, though they are obscure, explained in an orthodox sense. Since the convocation of the Vatican Council in 1869, many Roman Catholic theologians (among them Döllinger and Gratry), who were formerly regarded as personally favorable to the doctrine of papal infallibility, now, after a new investigation of the question, strongly urge the case of Honorius as an irrefutable argument against it. The literature on the Honorius question is so voluminous that, according to the opinion of the learned Döllinger, during the last 130 years more has been written on it than on any other point of Church History within 1500 years. Recent monographs on the  subject, besides the works already mentioned, have been written by Schneemann (Studien iber die Honoriusfrage, 1864) and Reinerding (Beitrage zur Honoriusund Liberiusfrage, 1865). It is also extensively discussed in a number of articles in the theological reviews, especially those of the Roman Catholic Church, in the larger works on Church History, and in particular, since 1869, in a vast number of works treating of the question of papal infallibility. SEE INFALLIBILITY. See Richer, Historiae Concil. Géneralé. 1, 296; Du Pin, De antiqua eccles. disciplina, p. 349; M. Havelange, Ecclesie infallibilitas infactis dogmaticis (Journ. hist. — et litt. April 1, 1790); F. Marchesius, Clypeus fortium (1680); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 88; Chambers, Cyclopedia, 5, 407; Ceillier, Hist. des aut. sac. 17, 522 sq.; Llorente, Die Papste, 1, 196-200; Schröckh Kirchengesch. 19, 492 sq.; Bower, History of the Popes, 3, 11 sq.; Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch. 2, 340 sq.; Neander, Ch. History, 3, 179, 195; Dogmas, 2, 439; Milman, Latin Christianity, 2, 169; Riddle, History of the Papacy, 1, 195; Hardwick, Church Hist. (Middle Ages), p. 70 and n. 3, p. 75 and n. 8; Hagenbach, fist. of Doctrines, vol. 2; West. Review, Oct. 1868, p. 239; Edinb. Rev. Oct. 1869, p. 160; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, 3, 322 sq.; Lefevre, in Revue Cathol. de Louvaiz, February, 1870; Hefele, Honorius u. d. sechste allgem. Concil. (Tüb. 1870, 8vo). SEE MONOTHEISM. (J. H. W.)

## Honorius II[[@Headword:Honorius II]]

             (Peter Claudius), Antipope, was elected in 1061, through the influence of Henry IV, in opposition to Alexander II, who had been chosen by the cardinals without his assent. The election took place in a council convened at Basle, and Honorius afterwards went to Rome. The German bishops, however, under the influence of Hanno, archbishop of Cologne, sided with Alexander II at the Synod of Augsburg, 1062; and, finally, the Synod of Mantua, 1064, pronounced the deposition of Honorius, and he was obliged thereafter to confine himself to the bishopric of Padua, which he held before his election. Yet he upheld his pretensions to the pontifical see until his death in 1072. He was accused of simony and of concubinage. He is generally not counted among the popes on account of his deposition. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vol. 5; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 22, 382, 385 sq.; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, 2, 119; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 5, 318 sq.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 3, 323. SEE ALEXANDER II.

## Honorius II (2)[[@Headword:Honorius II (2)]]

             (cardinal Lambert), Pope, originally bishop of Ostia, was elected pope by the cardinals in 1124, after the death of Calixtus II, while most of the bishops assembled at Rome elected Tebaldus, cardinal of Santa Anastasia. Tebaldus, finding that Honorius was supported by the powerful family of the Frangipani, and that the people were divided in opinion, to avoid further strife, waived his claim. Honorius himself also expressed doubts concerning the validity of his own election; he was subsequently reelected by the clergy and the people of Rome without opposition, and was consecrated Dec. 21, 1124. He refused the investiture of the duchies of Apulia and Calabria to Roger, count of Sicily; and Roger having besieged the pope within Benevento, Honorius excommunicated him; but afterwards peace was concluded between them, and Honorius granted the investiture. He confirmed the election of Lothaire II to the empire, and excommunicated his rival, Conrad of Franconia. He also confirmed the organization of the order of Premonstratensis, and at the Synod of Troyes (1128) that of the Templars; and condemned the abbots of Cluny and of Mount Cassin against whom complaints had been made. He died in the convent of St. Andrew, Feb. 14, 1130. — English Cyclopedia; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé. 25, 89; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 6, 19 sq.; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, 2, 169; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 26, 95 sq.; Milman, Lat. — Christianity, 4, 144, 151 sq.; Wetzer ü.Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 5, 317 sq.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 3, 323 sq.

## Honorius III[[@Headword:Honorius III]]

             (Cencio Savelli) — Pope, a native of Rome, was cardinal of St. John and St. Paul, and succeeded pope Innocent III in 1216. He showed a very accommodating spirit in his relations with the temporal powers. Thus, when Frederick II permitted his son Henry, already king of Sicily, to be elected king of Germany, in April 1220, he even consented to officiate at the coronation (November, 1220). But it is generally believed that the object of the pope in consenting so readily to the desires of Frederick II was to gain him for the great crusade against the Mussulmans in the East, which he contemplated. This good understanding between the pope and the emperor was interrupted when the latter, instead of proceeding directly to Palestine, tarried in Apulia and Sicily, and attempted to regain those countries. Honorius sent his chaplain, Alatrinus, to the imperial diet at Cremona in 1226, and the emperor was obliged to renounce his plan of  aggrandizement. Honorius even went so far as to threaten him (1225) with excommunication if he did not start for the Holy Land by August 1227, and he would probably have executed his threat had not death interfered. This conciliatory spirit Honorius failed to manifest towards count Raymond VII of Toulouse. He excited Louis VIII of France to make war against Raymond; but neither Honorius nor Louis lived to see the end of the conflict. He was also frequently at variance with the nobles and people of Rome, by whom he was a number of times driven from the city. His pontificate was therefore not a very quiet one. He died March 12,1227. Officially Honorius confirmed the organization of the Dominicans in 1216, and of the Franciscans in 1223. He was the first pope who granted indulgences at the canonization of saints. He was considered a learned man in his day, and is supposed to have been the author of the Conjurationes adversus principem tenebrarum (Rome, 1629, 8vo). — Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, vol. 5; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 90; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 6, 216-221; Neander, Ch. History, 4, 41, 177, 270, 341; Milman, Lat. Christianity, 5 (see Index); Hefele, Conciliengesch. 3, 811 sq.; Ebrard, Dogmengesch. 2, 180; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 26, 328; 25, 145 sq., 329 sq.; 29, 632; Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. der Kirchengesch. 2, 341; Cave, Hist. lit. script. eccl. 2, 287; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 5, 319; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 3, 324; Raumer, Geschichte d. Hohenstaufen, 3, 307 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Honorius IV[[@Headword:Honorius IV]]

             (Giacomo Savelli), was pope from April 2, 1285, to April 3, 1287. He espoused the cause of Charles of Anjou against the Aragonese, who had occupied Sicily; and he even incited to a crusade against the latter, qualifying it as a “holy war.” He distinguished himself greatly by his zeal for the preservation and augmentation of the privileges of the Church, and for the recovery of the Holy Land. He cleared the Papal States of the bands of robbers with which they were overrun, and imparted a new impulse to arts and sciences, which up to his time had been much neglected; among other improvements, he attempted to establish a course of Oriental languages at the University of Paris, but he did not succeed. During his brief pontificate he is said to have succeeded in enriching his family. Migne, Dict. Ecclesiastes; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 91; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. 2, 301; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 26, 511 sq.; Bower, History of the Popes, 6, 326 sq.; Milman, Latin Christianity, 6, 172; Riddle, Hist. of the  Papacy, 2, 235; Neander, Ch. Hist. 4, 65, 627; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen- Lex. 5, 322; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 3, 325.

## Honorius de Sancta Maria[[@Headword:Honorius de Sancta Maria]]

             Who was also known as Blaise Vauxelle, was born at Limoges, in France, July 4,1651. He joined the Carmelites at Toulouse in 1671, and then went on a mission to the Levant. Returning to France, he taught theology for some years, and became prior, counselor, provincial, and, finally, visitor general of the French Carmelites. He died in 1729. The most important and useful of his publications is entitled Reflexions sur les Regles et sur Usage de la Critique, touchant l'Histoire de l'Eglise, les Ouvrages des Peres, les Actes des anciens Martyrs, les Vies des Saintes, etc. (Paris and Lyons, 1712-1720, 3 vols. 4to). He wrote several treatises against Jansenism, and in favor of the bull Unigenitus; also Vie de Saint Jean de la Croix (Tournay, 1724) Observations sur Histoire ecclesiastique de Fleury (Mechlin, 1726-1729) — Expositio Symboli Apostolorum, etc. (Perpignan, 1689) — Traditions des Peres et auteurs eccles. sur la Contemplation (Paris, 1706, 2 vols. 8vo), which last was translated into Italian and Spanish, and to which he subsequently added Des Motifs et de la Pratique de l'amour de Dieu (Paris, 1713, 8vo); etc. — Moreri, Nouv. Dict. History; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 83.

## Honorius of Autun[[@Headword:Honorius of Autun]]

             (Augustodunensis), surnamed “the Solitary,” a scholastic theologian of the first half of the 11th century, is generally supposed to have been born in France, and was connected with a church at Autun, in Burgundy. His personal history is rather obscure; but if he be really the author of the Elucidarium, a summary of theology, published in France as the work of Anselm (Paris, 1560, 8vo), he deserves to be ranked among the most celebrated men of his century. The Elucidarium shows that Honorius was devoted to a practical mysticism, and in his work he seems to have followed the new Platonic-Augustinian theology. He condemned the Crusades and pilgrimages to Jerusalem, all decorations of the altar, the extreme unction, etc. On the doctrine of the Trinity, he held that the godhead consists of three distinct powers. He is also said to have been the author of a work, De Praedestinatione et libero arbitrio (Col. 1552; also  found in Cassander's Works, p. 623 sq.). In this work he holds that “God's foreknowledge has no compelling influence upon our actions, nor his predestination any necessitating power over our fate; for, as all futurity is present to an omnipresent Being, he knows our future acts, because he sees them as already done; and his predestination to either life or death is the consequence of his foreknowing the line of conduct which his creatures would choose to pursue.” In many respects he agreed with Abelard (q.v.). Honorius also wrote several Biblical works, among which his Introduction to the Explanation of Solomon's Song is considered as his best production. All his theological and philosophical works are collected in the Bibl. Max. Patr. vol. 20. See Dupin, Bibl. Nouv. des ant. eccl. 9, 154; Oudin, De Script. Ecclesiastes; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 24, 361 sq.; 28, 335, 416 sq., 427 sq.; 29, 341; Ritter, Gesch. der Philos. 7, 435 sq.; Clarke, Succession of Sacred Lit. 2, 680; Waterland, Works (see Index); Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch. 2, 342; Aschbach, Kirchen- Lex. 3, 321 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 19 sq.; Darling, Encyklop. Bibliog. 1, 1526. (J. H.W.)

## Honorius, Bartholomew[[@Headword:Honorius, Bartholomew]]

             A Premonstratist, who flourished in the second half of the 16th century, was born at Eerfel, in Brabant, became canon at Floreffe, near Naumur, later preacher at Helmont, and finally, being persecuted by the Calvinists, went to Rome; He wrote Admonitio adfratres inferioris Germanice (Her, zogenb. 1578) — Hodoeporicon celebriorum ordinis Prae monstratensis per orbem universum Abbatiarum- (ibid. 1584) — Quaestiones theologicae LXX adverseu Calvinis' tas (ibid. 1586) — Elucidarium Anselmi Cantuariensis (ibid. 1586); and a number of other, but less valuable works. — Pierer, Univers. Lex. 8, 522.

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

             One of the apostles of Protestantism in Transylvania, was born at Cronstadt in 1498; studied at Wittenberg under Luther, and then went as a teacher to Cracow, whence he moved to Basle to continue his studies. In 1533 he returned to his native city, where he started a printing establishment, and published Luther's writings. He also published at his own expense a translation of Luther's works in Hungarian. In 1544 he was appointed pastor, and became quite popular as a preacher. He died Jan. 23, 1549. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 254; Hardwick, Ch. Hist. of the Reformation, p. 98; Hist. of Prot. Church in Hungary, p. 59.

## Hontheim, John Nicolas Von[[@Headword:Hontheim, John Nicolas Von]]

             (known commonly as FEBRONIUS), suffragan bishop of Treves (in Rhenish Prussia), was born Jan. 27, 1701, and educated at the Jesuits College and university of that place. Having completed his studies, he went on a journey to Rome, and after his return (1727) was appointed successively to several high positions in the Church, and finally became suffragan bishop May 13, 1748, which post he filled until 1788. He died Sept. 2, 1790. His Historia Trevirensis, diplomatica et pragmatica (Trevir, 1750, 3 vols. fol., with a Prodromus, 1757, 2 vols. fol.; Augsb. 1757, 2 vols. fol.) is considered a work of great merit; but it was as the author of De Statu Ecclesiae et legitima Potestate Romani Pontificis Liber singularis, ad reuniendos dissidentes in religione Christiana composites (Bullioni apud Guillelmum Evrard, 1763, 4to), published under the  pseudonym of “Justinus Febronius,” that he attracted the attention of the Christian world. The daring expressions of independent thought, which characterize the entire work, created general excitement. As early as 1763- 5 he issued an enlarged edition, and a third, still more enlarged, in 1770-74.

An abridgment of the work appeared in German in 1764, another in Latin in 1777, and the translations into the various modern languages soon made it known throughout Europe (French, Sedan and Paris, 1767; Italian, Venice, 1767, etc.). Many Roman celebrities wrote against it, especially Zaccaria (to whose writings an answer is given in Nova defensio Febronii contrap. Zaccaria, Bullioni, 1763, 3 vols.) and Ballerini (De potestate ecclesiastica Roman. Pontif. et concil. generalium contra opus J. Febronii (Verona, 1768, 4to, and often). Pope Clement XIII caused the book to be entered on the Index, although it was dedicated to himself. Hontheim seeks especially to draw a line of distinction between the spiritual and the ecclesiastical, power of the Roman see. He seems to say to his readers, “Without becoming Protestants, you may very well oppose the encroachments and abuse of power of the papal court.” The principal points of which the work treats are, the constitution of the primitive Church, the representative character of general councils, the thoroughly human basis on which rests the primacy of the bishop of Rome, the fatal influence of the pseudo-Isidorian decretals, the tendency to usurpation of power by the nuncios, the illegal influence of the mendicant orders, and the monopoly of episcopal elections possessed by the chapters at the expense of the rights of the lower clergy and the people. As his assertions are accompanied by historical proofs, and his book contains hardly anything but quotations from the fathers in support of his views, it exerted great influence.

As the work had been published under the nom de plume of Justinius Febronius, the system of Church government, which Hontheim propounded, is generally called Febronianism. During the years, which followed its publication, papal authority was greatly restricted in many countries. Hence, as soon as the real author of the Dee Statu Ecclesiae was known, he became the object of ceaseless persecutions. Pope Pius VI showed himself especially the enemy of Hontheim. The ex-Jesuit Beck, privy councilor of the elector Clement Wenceslas, not satisfied with persecuting Hontheim, persecuted also all the members of his family, most of whom held offices in the province of Trier. The old man (Hontheim was then nearly seventy-nine), tired of all these annoyances, and-perhaps frightened at the prospect of what he might still have to undergo, finally gave way, and submitted to the pope. When his recantation reached Rome  in 1778, Pius VI held a special consistory in order to apprise the whole Roman Catholic world of the event; but several Roman Catholic governments opposed the publication of the acts of this consistory in their states. Moreover, the effects of the dispute had been too widely felt to be obliterated by a tardy expression of repentance. The author himself wrote to his friends, “I gave way, like Ednelon, in order to avoid ceaseless annoyance.

My recantation can do no harm to the Christian religion, neither can it in any way benefit the court of Rome; the thinking world has read my arguments, and has indorsed them.” Some of the more liberal- minded Roman Catholic historians say that Hontheim, in his (first) recantation, declared his object to have been to affect a union of the Roman Catholic and the Protestant churches. He believed that this could only be accomplished by altering or removing some of the institutions of the Romish Church. Later, he modified his recantation greatly by a subsequent Commentary (Frankfort-on-the-Maine, 1781), to which cardinal Gardi replied, at the special request of the pope. But eventually Hontheim made full submission to the Church. In 1788 he resigned his charges, and spent the last years of his life on his estate of Monquentin, in Luxemburg. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 91; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 6, 255; Hase, Church Hist. p. 528; Mohler, Symbolism, p.45; Menzel, Neuere Gesch. d. Deutschen, 11, 456 sq.; Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. der Kirchengesch. 2, 343 sq.; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 22, 13; s. d. Reform. 6 — 532 sq.; Walch, Neueste Relig. Gesch. 1, 145 sq.; 7, 175 sq., 210 sq., 453 sq.; Henke, Kirchengesch. 7, 133 sq.; Baur, Gallerie hist. Genmalde d. 18ten Jahrh. 4, 402 sq.; Kurtz, Text-book of Ch. History, 2, 234; Hase, Ch. Hist. p. 528. On the Roman Catholic side: Aschbach, Kirch. Lex. 2, 745 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 5, 324 sq.; Real-Encyklop. j.d. Kathol. Deutschland 5, 473; Werner, Gesch. d. kathol. Theol. p. 209 sq., 273, and especially Briefwechsel zw. d. Churfursten Clemens Wene, 5. Trier u. d. Weihbisch. N. V. Hontheim 2. d. Buch J. Fabronius etc. (Frankfort-a-M. 1813).

## Honthorst, Gerard[[@Headword:Honthorst, Gerard]]

             (called Gherardo dalle Notti), anl eminent Dutch painter, was born at Utrecht in 1592. After studying under Abraham Bloemaert he visited Rome, and applied himself to the study of the works of Michael Angelo Caravaggio. He was patronized by prince Giustiniani, for whom he painted some of his best works, among which are two flue pictures of St. Peter Delivered Joom Prison, and Christ before Pilate. There is a torch-light scene by Holthorst, in the Church of the Madonna della Scala, at Rome, representing the Beheading of St. John. He died in 1660. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Honyman, Andrew[[@Headword:Honyman, Andrew]]

             a Scotch prelate, was archdeacon of St. Andrews, author of the Seasonable Case, and Survey of Naphtali. He was made bishop of Orkney in 1664, and died in February 1676. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 228.

## Hood[[@Headword:Hood]]

             (צָנַי, tsaniph'), a tiara round the head, spoken of a female head band (Isa 3:23); elsewhere Tendered “diadem,” e.g. a man's turban (Job 29:14); the high-priest's “mitre” (Zec 3:5); the king's crown (Isaiah lxii, 3, marg.). SEE HEAD DRESS, etc.

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

             (Saxon hod; comp. German hut, hat), borrowed from the Roman cuculus, is (1.) the cowl of a monk. (2.) In England, an ornamental fold that hangs down the back of a graduate to mark his degree. This part of the dress was formerly not intended for distinction and ornament, but for use. It was generally fastened to the back of the cope or other vesture, and in case of rain or cold was drawn over the head. In the universities the hoods of the graduates were made to signify their degrees by varying the colors and materials. By the fifty-eighth canon of the Church of England “every minister saying the public prayers, or ministering the sacraments, or other rites of the Church, if they are graduates, shall wear upon their surplices, at such times, such hoods as by the orders of the universities are agreeable to their degrees.” — Hook, Church Dictionary, s.5.; Wheatly, Book of Common Prayer, p. 102, 103.

## Hood, Edwin Paxton[[@Headword:Hood, Edwin Paxton]]

             an English Independent minister and author, was born in London, October 24, 1820. He was early trained in religious work, especially as a speaker in the temperance cause; in 1857 became pastor at Islington, in 1862 at Brighton, in 1873 at Islington again, in 1877 at Manchester, in 1881 at Falcon Square, Lond., and died June 12, 1885. He visited America in 1880. He was an eloquent speaker, and wrote over sixty volumes of a popular character. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1886, page 178.

## Hoof[[@Headword:Hoof]]

             (פִּרְסָה, parsah', cloven, i.e. a cleft hoof as of neat cattle, Exo 10:26; Ezekiel 22; Mic 4:13, etc.; hence of the horse, though not cloven, Isa 5:28; Jeremiah 57:3; “claws” of any animal, Zec 11:16). In Lev 11:3 sq.; Deu 4:6 sq., the “parting of the hoof” is made one of the main distinctions between clean and unclean animals; and this is applied even to the camel, after a popular rather than a scientific classification. SEE CAMEL.

## Hooght, Eberhard Van Der[[@Headword:Hooght, Eberhard Van Der]]

             A distinguished Dutch Orientalist, was born in the latter half of the 17th century. He was a Reformed preacher at Nieuwendam, but spent the greater part of his time in the study of the Oriental languages, especially the Hebrew. He died in 1716. He wrote Janua linguae sanctae (Amst. 1687, 4to; ibid. 1696 [?], 8vo) — Medulla gramm. Hebr. (Amst. 1696, 8vo) — Syntaxis Ebraea, Chald. et Syr. Lex. Nouv Test. Graeco-Latinum, etc. Especially celebrated is his edition of the Biblia Hebraic (Amsterd. and Utrecht, 1705, Oxford 1750, London, 1774, and often; lately again by Tauchnitz. Lpz. 1835, and often). — Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8, 524; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 2, 381; 4, 117. SEE CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.

## Hoogstraten[[@Headword:Hoogstraten]]

             (also called HOCHSTRATEN), JACOB VAN, prior of the Dominican convent of Cologne, and an ardent adversary of Reuchlin, Luther, and Erasmus, was born at Brabant in 1454. He studied at the University of Cologne without much success. Nevertheless, he was received master of arts in 1485, and afterwards made prior. His great zeal and opposition to the Reformation secured him the nomination of inquisitor at Louvain, besides a professorship of theology at the University of Cologne, for which he was in nowise qualified. In 1513 he summoned Reuchlin to appear before him, thereby transcending his powers, as Reuchlin, residing in another state, could only be summoned by the provincial of the order. He had already published his Libellus accusatorius contra speculum ocul. Joh. Reuchlini, when the chapter of Mentz took Reuchlin's case in hand. But pope Leo X gave commission to bishop George of Speer to settle the controversy. Hoogstraten, not appearing, lost his cause, and was condemned to pay the costs; but, as he refused to submit to the decree, the whole matter was brought before Leo X, and Hoogstraten was summoned to Rome. Unwilling either to offend the humanists in the person of Reuchlin, or the powerful Dominicans represented by Hoogstraten; the pope issued a mandatum de supersedendo. Returning to Cologne, Hoogstraten published in 1518 two so-called Apologies, full of malice, and in 1519 his Destructio cabale, seu cabalistae perfidice a Joh. Reuchlino seu Capnione (Col. 1519). He also opposed Luther in the most violent manner, proposing that he should be burned at once. Hoogstraten died at Cologne Jan. 21, 1527. His collected works were published at Cologne in 1526. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 257; Echard, Scriptor. Ord. Praedicatorum; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 105; Raumer, Gesch. Europa's, 1, 210; Mayerhoff, Joh. Reuchlin u. s. Zeit, p. 158 sq.; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 30, 248; s. d. Reform. 1, 139; Bayle, Hist. Dict. 3, 471 sq.; Mosheim, Church History, 3, 22.

## Hook[[@Headword:Hook]]

             Is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of the following terms in the original. SEE FISH-HOOK; SEE FLESH-HOOK; SEE PRUNING-HOOK. The idea of a thorn enters into the etymology of several of them, probably because a thorn, hooked or straight, was the earliest instrument of this kind. Tacitus thus describes the dress of the ancient Germans. “A loose mantle fastened  with a clasp, or, when that cannot be had, with a thorn” (Germ. 17). SEE THORN.

1. חָח, chach (lit. a thorn), a ring inserted in the nostrils of animals, to which a cord was fastened in order to lead them about or tame them (2Ki 19:28; Isa 37:29; Eze 29:4; Eze 38:4; compare Job 40:26); also a “chain” for a captive (Eze 19:4; Eze 19:9), and “bracelets” for females (Exo 25:22, where others a nose-ring, others a clasp for fastening the dress). In the first two of the above passages, Jehovah intimates his absolute control over Sennacherib by an allusion to the practice of leading buffaloes, camels, dromedaries, etc., by means of a cord, or of a cord attached to a ring, passed through the nostrils (Shaw, Travels, p. 167-8, 2nd ed.). Such a ring is oftentimes placed through the nose of a bull, and is likewise used in the East for leading about lions, camels, and other animals. A similar method was adopted for leading prisoners, as in the case of Manasseh, who was led with rings (2Ch 33:11). An illustration of this practice is found in a bas-relief discovered at Khorsabad (Layard, 2, 376; see also the cut under EYE). The term מוֹקֵשׁis used in a similar sense in Job 40:24 (A.V. “bore his nose with a gin.” margin). Another form of the same term, חוֹח(A.V. “thorn”), is likewise properly a ring placed through the mouth of a large fish, and attached by a cord (אִגְמֹן) to a stake for the purpose of keeping it alive in the water (Job 41:2); the word meaning the cord is rendered “hook” in the A.V. See below.

2. The cognate word חִכָּה, chakkah', means a fishhook (Job 41:1, “angle;” Isa 19:8; Hab 1:15). This passage in Job has occasioned the following speculations (see, for instance, Harris's Nat. Hist. of the Bible, art. Leviathal, London 1825). It has been assumed that Bochart has completely proved the Leviathan to mean the crocodile (Rosenmüller on Bochart, 3, 737, etc., 769, etc., Lips. 1796). Herodotus has then been quoted, where he relates that the Egyptians near Lake Maeris select a crocodile, render him tame, and suspend ornaments to his ears, and sometimes gems of great value; his fore feet being adorned with bracelets (2, 69); and the mummies of crocodiles, having their ears thus bored, have been discovered (Kenrick's Egypt of Herodotus, p. 97, London 1841). Hence it is concluded that this passage in Job refers to the  facts mentioned by Herodotus; and, doubtless, the terms employed, especially by the Sept. and Vulg., and the third and following verses, favor the supposition, for there the captive is represented as suppliant and obsequious, in a state of security and servitude, and the object of diversion, “played with” as with a bird, and serving for the sport of maidens.

Herodotus is further quoted to show that in his time the Egyptians captured the crocodile with a hook (ἄγκιστρον),with which (ἐξελκύσθη εἰς τῆν γῆν) he was drawn ashore; and accounts are certainly given by modern travelers of the continuance of this practice (Maillet, Descrip. d'Egypte, 2, 127, ed. Hag., 1740). But does not the entire description go upon the supposition of the impossibility of so treating Leviathan? Supposing the allusions to be correctly interpreted, is it not as much as to say, “Canst thou treat him as thou canst treat the crocodile and other fierce creatures?” Dr. Lee has, indeed, given reasons which render it doubtful, at least, whether the leviathan does mean the crocodile in this passage, or whether it does not mean some species of whale, as was formerly supposed the Delphinus orca communis or common grampus, found in the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, and also in the Nile. (See his examination of Bochart's reasonings, etc., in Translation and Notes on Job, p. 197 and 529-539, London 1837). So the above term in Ezekiel 29 : “I will put my hooks in thy jaws, and I will cause thee to come up out of the midst of thy rivers,” where the prophet foretells the destruction of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, by allusions to the destruction, possibly, of a crocodile, the symbol of Egypt. Thus Pliny (Hist. Nat. 8, 25) states, that the Tentyritee (inhabitants of Egypt) followed the crocodile, swimming after it in the river, sprung upon its back, thrust a bar into its mouth; which being held by its two extremities, serves as a bit, and enables them to brace it on shore (comp. Eze 29:3-4). Strabo relates that the; Tentyritae displayed their feats before the Romans (17 560, ed. Casaub.). SEE LEVIATHAN.

3. וָו, vav, a peg or pin, upon which the curtains of the Tabernacle were hung, springing out of the capitals(Exo 26:32, etc.). The Sept. and Jerome seem to, have understood the capitals of the pillars; and it has been urged that this is more likely to be the meaning than hooks, especially as 1775 shekels of silver were used in making these וָוַים for the pillars, overlaying the chapiters, and filleting them (ch. 38, 28), and that the hooks are really the קרסים, taches (Exo 26:6; Exo 26:11; Exo 26:33; Exo 26:35; Exo 39:33). Yet the Sept. also renders ווים, κρίκοι, rings or clasps (Exo 27:10-11, and ἀγκύλαι, Exo 38:17; Exo 38:19); and from a comparison of these, two  latter passages, it would seem that these hooks, or rather tenters, rose out of the chapiters or heads of the pillars. The word seems to have given name to the letter וin the Hebrew alphabet, possibly from a similarity of the form in which the latter appears in the Greek Digamma, to that of a hook. Mr. Paine (Solomon's Temple, etc., p. 25) regards these “hooks” as having been rather pins driven into the heads of the pillars, and thus projecting upward from them like a small tenon, upon which the silver rods were slipped by means of a small hole or eye in the latter. This would serve: to keep the pillars together. SEE TABERNACLE.

4. צַנָּה, tsinnah' (lit. thorn), Afish-hook (Amo 4:2; elsewhere a shield). SEE FISHING, etc.; SEE ANGLE.

In the same verse, סַירוֹת, siroth', “fish-hooks,'” where both Sept. and Vulg. seem to have taken סירin. the sense of a pot or caldron instead of a fish-hook. SEE CALDRON.

5. מִזְלֵג, mazleg' (1Sa 2:13-14), “flesh-hook,” and the מִזְלְגוֹת, “the flesh-hooks” (Exo 27:3, and elsewhere). This was evidently in the first passage a. trident “of three teeth,” a kind of fork, etc., for turningthe sacrifices on the fire, and for collecting fragments, etc. SEE FLESH-HOOK.

6. מִזְמֵרוֹת, mazmeroth' (Isa 2:4, and elsewhere),. “beat their spears into pruning-hooks” (δρἐπανα, falces). The Roman poets have the same metaphor (Martial, 14:34, “Falx ex ense”). In Mic 4:3, in ligones, weeding-hooks, or shovels, spades, etc. Joel reverses the metaphor “pruning-hooks” into spears (3, 10, ligo-nes); and so Ovid (Fasti, 1, 697, in pila ligones). SEE-PRUNING-HOOK.

7. Doubtful is שְׁפִתִּיַם, shephatta'yim, stalls for cattle: (“pots,” Psa 48:13), also the cedar beams in the Temple court with hooks for flaying the victims (Eze 40:43). Other meanings given are ledges (Vulg. la- bia), or eaves, as though the word were שְׂפָתִיַםpens for keeping the animals previous to their being slaughtered; hearthstones, as in the margin of the A.V.; and lastly, gutters to receive and carry off the blood from the slaughtered animals. Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 1470) explains the term as signifying stalls in the courts of the Temple where the sacrificial victims were fastened: our translators give in the margin “andirons, or the two hearthstones.” The Sept. seems equally at a loss, καὶπαλαιστὴν ἕξουσι  γεῖσος; as also Jerome, who renders it labia. Schlcusner pronounces γεῖσος to be a barbarous word formed from חיוֹ, and understands epistylium, a little pillar set on another, and capitellum, columned. The Chaldee renders עונקלין, short posts in the house of the slaughterers on which to suspend the sacrifices. Dr. Lightfoot, in his chapter “on the altar, the rings, and the laver,” observes, “On the north side of the altar were six orders of rings, each of which contained six, at which they killed the sacrifices. Near by were low pillars set up, upon which were laid overthwart beams of cedar; on these were fastened rows of hooks, on which the sacrifices were hung; and they were flayed on marble tables, which were between these pillars” (see vers. 41, 42; Works, vol. 11, ch. 20, 14, London 1684-5-6). SEE TEMPLE.

8. Obviously an incorrect rendering for אִגְמוֹן, ag-mon', a rush-rope, used for binding animals, perhaps by ‘means of the ring in their nose (Job 41:2; elsewhere “‘rush” or “caldron”). SEE FLAG.

9. Finally, δρεπανηφόρα in 2Ma 13:2 is rendered “armed with hooks,” referring to the scythe-armed chariots of the ancients. SEE CHARIOT.

## Hook, James, LL.D.[[@Headword:Hook, James, LL.D.]]

             An English prelate, was born in London in 1771, and educated at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford. He became archdeacon of Huntingdon in 1814, dean of Worcester in 1825, and held also other preferments in the English Church. He died in 1828. Besides some dramatic pieces and novels which are ascribed to Hook, he published Anguis in Herba, A true Sketch of the Church of England and her Clergy (London 1802, 8vo) — Sermons, etc. (1812, 8vo, and another series in 1818, 8vo). For a biographical sketch of Hook, see the London Gent. Mag. April 1828. — Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 875.

## Hook, Walter Farquhas, D.D[[@Headword:Hook, Walter Farquhas, D.D]]

             an eminent Anglican divine, son of Dr. James Hook (1771-1828), dean of Worcester, grandson of James Hook (1746-1827), organist at St. George's Chapel, Windsor, and nephew of Theodore Edward Hook (1788-1841), an eminent English author, was born in London, March 13, 1798. He graduated at Christchurch College, Oxford, in 1821, and was successively curate at Wappingham, Isle of Wight, and in Birmingham, and vicar of Trinity Church, Coventry, till 1837, when he was made vicar of Leeds. Here, during his incumbency of twenty-two years, 21 new churches, 32 parsonages, and more than 60 schools were erected in his parish, chiefly through his instrumentality. He was especially popular among the working classes. In 1859 he became dean of Chichester, and in 1862 a Fellow of the Royal Society. He was appointed chaplain in ordinary to George IV, in 1827, and retained' the office under William IV and Victoria, preaching on the accession of the latter his celebrated sermon on Hear the Church, of which more than 100,000 copies were sold. He died October 20, 1875. Dean Hook was eminently conservative in theology, and a High- Churchman. His publications are, Church Dictionary (7th ed. 1854, 8vo): — Eccles. Biography (1845-52, volumes 1-8, 12mo): — Sermons on the Miracles (1847-48, 2 volumes 8vo): — Sermons on Various Subjects (2d ed. 1844, 8vo): — Sermons before the University of Oxford (1847, 12mo): — The Rights of Presbyters Asserted (anonymous): — Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, from the Anglo-Saxon period to Juxon (Lond. 1860-77, 12 volumes, 8vo): — Disestablished Church in the United States (Lond. 1869, 8vo). Dr. Hook's wife, a model of a saintly and beautiful character, was the author (anon.) of Meditations for Every Day of the Year, and The Cross of Christ. She died in 1871. See Church of England Quar. Rev. April 1881, art. 10; Men of the Time (Lond. 1856); Rel. Revelation 4 th series, 12:502; Fraser's Magazine, 19:1; Life and Letters of W.F. Hook, D.D., F.R.S., by his son-in-law, W.R.W. Stephens, prebendary of Chichester (Lond. 1880).

## Hooke, Luce Joseph[[@Headword:Hooke, Luce Joseph]]

             A French theologian of English origin, was born about 1716, and educated at the seminary of “Saint Nicolas du Chardonnet.” He received the doctor's degree from the Sorbonne, and was appointed professor of theology in 1750. The following year he presided at the discussion of abbé Parades's (1 5.) thesis, which contained many heterodox doctrines, and which he had signed without reading. Hooke was deposed from his professorship; but the professors of the Sorbonne and of the College of  Navarre interceded in his behalf, and obtained the revocation of the order. At the outbreak of the French Revolution he was made librarian of the Mazarin Library, but he held this place only a short time, when he retired to St. Cloud. He died in 1796. Hooke published Religionis naturalis revelatae et Catholiae Principil (Paris, 1754, 2 vols. 8vo; 2nd ed. 1774, 3 vols. 8vo) — Discours et Reflex. crit. sur l'hist. et le gouvernement de l'anc. Rome (Paris, 1770-84, 4 vols. 12mo-a translation of one of his father's works from the English) — Principe sur la Nature et l'Essence du Pouvoir de l'Eglise (Paris, 1791, 8vo) (J. H.W.)

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

             A Congregational minister, was born in Southampton in 1601, and educated at Trinity College, Oxford. After having received orders in the Church of England, he became vicar of Axmouth, in Devonshire. About 1636 he emigrated to this country, as his nonconforming views had caused him considerable trouble, and in 1644 or 1645 he was installed pastor at New Haven, Conn. He was by marriage a cousin of Oliver Cromwell, after whose ascendency he returned to England, and became Cromwell's domestic chaplain. After the death of Cromwell, Hooke became an ejected and silenced minister, and he spent his remaining days in retirement. He died near London March 21, 1678. Besides several sermons among them, New England's Tears for Old England's Fears, a Fast sermon (Tauntoli, 1640, London, 1641, 4to), which is considered one of the best productions of his day he published The Privileges of the Saints on Earth beyond those in Heaven, etc., containing also a Discourse on the Gospel Day (1673). Sprague, Ann. Am. Pulpit, 1, 104 sq.; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 878.

## Hooker, Asahel[[@Headword:Hooker, Asahel]]

             A Congregational minister, was born in Bethlehem, Conn., Aug. 29, 1762. He graduated at Yale College in 1789, and was installed pastor at Goshen in September 1791. This charge he resigned on account of ill health June 12, 1810. After preaching in various pulpits, he became pastor of Chelsea parish, Norwich, Conn., Jan. 16, i812, where he remained until his death, April 19, 1813. Mr. Hooker published several occasional sermons, and a number of articles in the Connecticut Evangelical Magazine. — Sprague, Annals, 2, 316.

## Hooker, Edward William, D.D[[@Headword:Hooker, Edward William, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, son of Reverend Asahel Hooker, was born at Goshen, Connecticut, November 24, 1794. He graduated from Middlebury College in 1814, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1817; was ordained at Green Farms, August 15, 1821, over which church he remained pastor until 1829, when he became associate general agent of the American Temperance Society, and was also editor of the Journal of Humanity. He was installed pastor of the Church at Bennington, Vermont, February 22, 1832, and was dismissed in the spring of 1844. From August 25 of the latter year, for four years, he was professor of sacred rhetoric and ecclesiastical history in the Theological Inustitute of Connecticut, at East Windsor Hill. From 1849 to 1856 he was the regular pastor of the church at South Windsor; after which, until 1862, he served in the same relation at Fair Haven, Vermont. He died at Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin, March 31, 1875. Dr. Hooker was a trustee of Middlebury College from 1834 to 1844, and was a corporate member of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions from 1840. Among his published works are, Life of Thomas Hooker: — Early Conversions: — Elihu Lewis, etc.; also several pamphlets, among them, Marks of Spiritual Declension: Plea for Sacred Music: — Believing the Truth: — Character and Office of the Holy Spirit, etc., with various addresses and sermons. He was also a writer for various magazines and other periodicals. See Cong. Quarterly, 1876, page 427.

## Hooker, Henry Brown, D.D[[@Headword:Hooker, Henry Brown, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, son of Dr. Thomas Hooker, was born at Rutland, Vermont, August 31, 1802. After attending the Castleton Academy, he entered Middlebury College, from which he graduated in 1821. Four years afterwards he graduated from Andover Theological Seminary. He was ordained an evangelist, October 10, 1825, and for one year was a home missionary in South Carolina. From May 2, 1827, to May 17, 1836, he was pastor in Lanesboro', Massachusetts; from February 1837, to June 1858, was pastor in Falmouth; from 1857 to 1873 was secretary of the Massachusetts Home Missionary Society, and continued to assist in the office of that society until his death, July 4, 1881. From 1844 to 1851 he was a member of the Massachusetts Board of Education; from 1845 he was a corporate member of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. The American Tract Society  published eight tracts from his pen; and he also wrote three tracts for the Tract Society of Boston. He was also the author of two Sunday-school books: Plea for the Heathen, and Put Off and Put On. See Cong. Yearbook, 1882, page 33.

## Hooker, Herman, D.D[[@Headword:Hooker, Herman, D.D]]

             A Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Poultney, Vt., in 1804; graduated at Middlebury College in 1825, and later at the Princeton Theological Seminary, and was licensed as a Presbyterian, with great promise both as a scholar and speaker. He finally joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, but the partial loss of his sight and of his voice soon compelled his retirement from the ministry; and he became a bookseller at Philadelphia, continuing, however, at the same time, his theological studies. He died at Philadelphia, Pa., Sept. 26,1865. His principal works are, The Portion of the Soul (Philadelphia 1835, 32mo, and republished in England) — Popular Infidelity (Philadelphia 1836, 12mo) — Family Book of Devotion (1836, 8vo) The Uses of Adversity and the Provisions of Consolation (Philadelphia 1846, 18mo) — Thoughts and Maxims (Philadelphia 1847, 16mo) — The Christian Life A Fight of Faith (Philadelphia 1848,18mo). He also published a large number of English and American works. “Dr. Hooker was a vigorous and close thinker, a clear writer, a devout and conscientious Christian, full of true and consistent charity. He made the Nashotah Seminary a residuary legatee, which bequest probably amounted to about $10,000.” See Church Rev. Jan. 1866; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 878.

## Hooker, Herman, D.D (2)[[@Headword:Hooker, Herman, D.D (2)]]

             an Episcopal clergyman; was born at Poultney, Vermont, about 1806. He graduated from Middlebury College in 1825, studied two years in Princeton Theological Seminary, and subsequently took orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church; but on losing his health became a bookseller in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania where he died, July 25, 1865. He is the author of, The Portion of the Soul (1835): — Popular Infidelity: — Uses of Adversity: — Maxims: — The Christian Life.

## Hooker, Horace, D.D[[@Headword:Hooker, Horace, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister and author, was born in 1793. He was a graduate of Yale College, and was remarkable for the elegance and purity of his style as a writer. He early, in. connection with Reverend Thomas H. Gallaudet, LL.D., undertook the preparation of religious books for the young. Among them are, The Youth's Book of Natural Theology, in two parts, and a series of twelve volumes of Bible History; also a popular spelling-book and definer. For a period of more than twenty years he was secretary of the Connecticut Missionary Society; also for several years chaplain of the insane retreat at Hartford, where he died, December 17, 1864. See Appleton's Annual Cyclop. 1864, page 623.

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

             One of the most eminent divines in the history of the Church of England, was born in or near Exeter about 1553, according to Walton, or about Easter, 1554, according to Wood. His early education was received at the expense of his uncle, John Hooker, chamberlain of Exeter, and he was afterwards introduced by the same relative to the notice of bishop Jewel, who procured him in 1567 a clerkship in Corpus Christi College, Oxford. In December 1573, he became a student in that college, and a fellow and Master of Arts in 1577. In 1579 he was appointed lecturer on Hebrew in the university, and in October of the same year he was expelled his college, with Dr. John Reynolds and three other fellows, but he was restored the same month. About two years after he took orders, and was appointed to preach at Paul's Cross. Having married the following year, he lost his fellowship, but he was presented to the living of Drayton-Beauchamp, in Bucks, by John Cherry, Esq., in 1584. Through the influence of the archbishop of York, he was appointed Master of the Temple in 1585. Here he became engaged in a controversy on Church discipline and some points  of doctrine with Walter Travers, afternoon lecturer at the Temple, who had been ordained by the Presbytery at Antwerp, and held most of the opinions of the divines of Geneva. Travers, being silenced by archbishop Whitgift, appealed to the Privy Council, but without success.

His petition to the council was published, and answered by Hooker. Travers had many adherents in the Temple, and it was their opposition, according to Izaak Walton, which induced Hooker to commence his work on the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. Finding that he had not leisure at the Temple to complete that work, he applied to Whitgift for removal to a more quiet station, and was accordingly presented to the living of Boscombe in Wiltshire in 1591. On the 17th of July in the same year he was made a prebendary of Salisbury. At Boscombe he finished four books of the Ecclesiastical Polity, which were published in 1594. On the 7th of July 1595, he was presented by the queen to the living of Bishopsbourne in Kent, which he held till his death, on the 2nd of November 1600. “Hooker's manner was grave even in childhood; the mildness of his temper was proved by his moderation in controversy; and his piety and learning procured him the general esteem of his contemporaries. His great work is his defense of the constitution and discipline of the Church of England, in eight books, under the title of The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. This work obtained during the author's lifetime the praise of a pope (Clement VIII) and a king (James I), and has ever since been looked upon as one of the chief bulwarks of the Church of England and of ecclesiastical establishments in general. As a work of solid learning, profound reasoning, and breadth and sustained dignity of style, it is indeed beyond praise; but the common objection is a just one, that Hooker's reasoning is too frequently that of an advocate. The publication of the first four books has been mentioned above; the fifth was published in 1597. He completed the last three books, but they were not published till several years after his death.

The account which Walton gives of the mutilation of the last three books is very improbable, and little doubt can be entertained of their authenticity, though they are certainly imperfect, and probably not in the condition in which he left them” (English Cyclopedia). Hooker was charged with Romanizing tendencies, but the charge had no better foundation than his prelatical theory of the Church. For a series of shrewd and genial notes and criticisms on Hooker, see Coleridge, Consplete Works, N.Y. edition, 5, 28 sq. Of the Ecclesiastical Polity many separate editions have appeared. His Works, with Life, edited by Dr. Gauden, were published in London, 1662 (fol.); again in 1666 (fol.), with life by Izaak  Walton. The latest editions are Hanbury's, with life of Cartwright, and Notes, from the dissenting point of view (London, 1830, 3 vols. 8vo); Keble's (London 1836, 4 vols. 8vo, and 1841, 3 vols. 8vo; without the Introduction and notes, 2 vols. 8vo). See Hook. Eccl. Biography, 6, 126 sq.; Orme, Life of Baxter, 1. 22; Stanley, Life of Amold, 2. 64; Hallam, Literature of Europe, 2, 98; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 880; Grant, Ch. Hist. 1, 443; Baxter, Ch. Hist. of Engl. p. 489, 537 sq., 543; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, 1, 206; Bennett, Hist. of the Dissenters, p. 226; Skeats, Hist. of the Free Churches of English. p. 29 sq.; Cunningham, Ch. Principles. p. 321, 391 sq.; Shedd, Hist. of Doctrines (see Index); Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctr. (see Index, vol. 2); Lecky, Hist. of Rationalism, 2, 79, 199 sq.; Bickersteth, Stud. Assist. p. 245; Tulloch, English Puritanism and its Leaders, p. 24 sq.; Calamy, Hist. Account of my Life, 1, 235 sq.; 2, 236; Journ. Sac. Lit. 27, 467, Theolog. Magazine, vol. 2.

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

             An eminent Congregational minister, was born July 7, 1586, at Marfield, Leicestershire, Eng. He was successively student and professor at Emanuel College, Cambridge. After preaching a short time in London, he settled in 1626 at Chelmsford as assistant minister. In 1630 he was silenced by archbishop Laud for nonconformity, and enjoined, under a bond of fifty pounds, to come before the Court of High Commission; but forfeiting the bond, he escaped to Holland, and remained three years, when he returned, and sailed, July, 1633, for Boston. He arrived in this country Sept. 4, and was ordained first pastor of the church in Cambridge, Oct. 11. After a stay of nearly three years (June, 1636), in company with Mr. Stone, the teacher in his church, and others, he started into what was then the wilderness, and settled at Hartford. He died at that place July 7, 1647. Hooker published The Soul's Ingrafting into Christ (1637) — The Soul's Implantation; A Treatise containing The Broken Heart, The Preparing of the Heart, The Soul's Ingrafting into Christ, Spiritual Love and Joy (1637) — The Soul's Preparation for Christ. (1638) — The Unbeliever's Preparation for Christ, parts 1 and 2 (1638) — The Soul's Exaltation-embracing Union with Christ, Benefits of Union with Christ, and Justification (1638) — The Soul's Vocation, or Effectual Calling to Christ (1638) — Ten Particular Rules to be practiced every day by Converted Christians (1641) — Survey of the Sum of Church Discipline (1648) — Christ's Prayer for Believers; A Series of Discourses founded on John 17, 20-26 (1657) — The Soul's  Possession of Christ — The Soul's Justification; Eleven Sermons on 2Co 5:21; Pro 1:28-29; and a number of occasional sermons. See Neal, Hist. of Y. England; Sprague, Annals, 2:317; Hagenbach, Hist. of' Doctrines, 2:192, 298; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, 1, 317; Contrib. to Ecclesiastes Hist. of Connecticut (1861, 8vo), p. 16,. 23, 87, 404, 412.

## Hoole, Elijah, D.D[[@Headword:Hoole, Elijah, D.D]]

             an eminent Wesleyan missionary, was appointed in 1819 to Bangalore, in the Mysore country, to which, in 1823, Seringapatam was added. "He rapidly acquired an accurate knowledge of the Tamil, one of the first-fruits of which was a translation of the Methodist Hymns. It was thus that he laid the foundation of that proficiency as an Oriental scholar which was afterwards duly acknowledged by the Royal Asiatic Society and other learned bodies; at the same time travelling widely and laboring with unwearied diligence in his evangelical efforts, and enduring hardship as a good soldier of Christ." After nine years he returned to England sick, and was never afterwards free from pain. From 1830 to 1835 he was superintendent of schools in Ireland. Removing to London, he was, in  1834, appointed assistant secretary, and in 1836 one of the general secretaries of the Missionary Society, a position he held to the end of his life. In the administration of missionary affairs his punctuality, suavity, and' diligence rendered him singularly efficient, and his unobtrusive services became more and more valuable every year. He was also honorary secretary of the British Society for the Propagation of the Gospel among the Jews, and also for the Home of the Asiatics, in London. Gentle, uniformly cheerful, Dr. Hoole was to the end of life a diligent student. He died in London, June 17, 1872, in the seventy-fifth year of his age. Dr. Hoole wrote, Madras, Mysore, cad the South of India: — A Narrative of a Mission to those Countries, from 1820 to 1828 (2d ed. Lond. 1844, 12mo): — The Year Book of Missions. (Lond. 1847, 8vo): — The Missionary, a poem from the Swedish, edited by Dr. Hoole (1851, 24mo): — Byron and the Wesleys (1864): — Ladies' Tamil Book (1860). See Minutes of the British Conference, 1872, page 32; Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, 3:346; Osborn, Meth. Bibliography, page 117.

## Hooper[[@Headword:Hooper]]

             (HOPER, or HOUPER), John, an English, bishop, and one of the martyrs of the Reformation, was born in Somersetshire about 1495. He was educated at Merton College, Oxford. Having embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, he was obliged to leave the university, and finally the country in 1540. He went to Switzerland, passing most of his time at Zurich. On the accession of Edward VI (1547) he returned to England, and acquired great reputation in London as a preacher. In 1550 he was made bishop of Gloucester, but his repugnance to wearing the vestments of that office caused considerable delay in his consecration. After entering on his duties, he labored with great zeal for the cause of the Reformation. In 1552 he  was appointed bishop of Worcester in commendam. In the early part of the reign of Mary (1553), he was arrested and condemned to be burned at the stake for his Protestant zeal. He firmly refused all offers of pardon which required the abandonment of his principles, and though, on account of the wood with which he was burned being green, he suffered the severest torments for nearly an hour, he manifested unshaken fortitude. He died. Feb. 9,1555. Hooper was the author of a number of sermons and controversial treatises. Among his best works are A Declaration of Christ and his Office (1547, 8vo) — Lesson of the Incarnation of Christ (1549, 8vo) — Twelve Lectures on the Creed (1581, 8vo). Several letters of Hooper are preserved in the archives of Zurich. We have recent reprints, by the Parker Society, of The Early Writings of Bishop Hooper, edited by the Rev. S. Carr (Cambridge, 1843, 8vo); and of his Later Writings, with Letters, etc., edited by the Rev. C. Nevinson (Cambridge, 1852, 8vo). A sketch of his life and writings is given in the British Reformers, vol. 4 (London Tract Society). See Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, vol. 1; Fox,. Book of Martyrs; Middleton, Evangel. Biogr.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 123; Burnet, Hist. of English. Reformation, vols. 2 and 3; Hook, Eccl. Biography, 6, 148; Tulloch (John), English. Puritanism and its Leaders (1861, 12mo), p. 8 sq.; Baxter, Ch. Hist. of English. p. 408,. 446; Skeats, Hist. of the Free Churches, p. 8 sq.; Middleton, Reformers, 3, 242; Hardwick, Reform. p. 215 sq. 409, 425 sq.; Wesley, Works, 2, 292; 5, 368; 6, 67,197; Collier, Ecclesiastes Hist. 5, 376 sq.; Fuller, Ch. Hist. 4, bk.. 7, p. 66; Brit. and For. Rev. Oct. 1868, p. 881; Soames,. Hist. of the Reform. 3, 558 sq.; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, 1, 51 sq.; Bennett, Hist. of Dissenters, p. 133; Punchard (George), Hist. of Congregationalism (N. Y. 1865, 2 vols. 12mo), 2, 194 sq., 297.

## Hooper, George, D.D[[@Headword:Hooper, George, D.D]]

             An English prelate, born in Worcestershire in 1640, was educated at St. Paul's and Westminster School, and afterwards at Christ Church Oxford. He first became chaplain of Morley, bishop of Winchester, and, later, archbishop Sheldon gave him the living of Lambeth. In 1677 he was appointed almoner of the princess of Orange. On the accession of William, the queen chose Hooper for her chaplain, and he was appointed dean of Canterbury in 1691. In 1703 he was: made bishop of St. Asaph, and in March following was transferred to the see of Bath and Wells. He died at; Barkley, Somersetshire, in September 1727. His principal works are, A fair and methodical Discussion of the first and great Controversy between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, concerning the Infallible Guide (London 1687) — De Valentinianorum Haeresi Conjecturae, quibus illius origo ex Egyptiac Atheologia de ducitur (ibid. 1711) — An Inquiry into Ancient Measures, etc., and especially the Jewish, with an Appendix concerning our old English Money and Measures of Content (ib. 1721). There has been but one complete edition of his. Works, namely, that published by Dr. Hunt, Hebrew professor (Oxford 1757, fol.). See Todd, Lives of the Deansof Canterbury; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 124.

## Hooper, William, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Hooper, William, D.D., LL.D]]

             a distinguished Baptist minister, was born near Wilmington, N. C., Aug. 31, 1792, being a grandson of William Hooper, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. He graduated from the University of North Carolina, at Chapel Hill, in 1808; studied theology one year at Princeton; was appointed professor of ancient languages in his alma mater in 1817; took orders in the Episcopal Church in 1818; was rector of a church in Fayetteville from 1822 to 1824; changed his sentiments on baptism, and joined a Baptist Church; returned to the University of North Carolina, first as professor of rhetoric, and then resumed his former chair as professor of ancient languages. In 1838 he was called to South Carolina, where, for eight years, he was in the department of instruction in the Furman Institute. He was then chosen president of Wake Forest College, N.C., and held this office for six years. He was pastor in Newbern, then president of the Chowan Female Institute, and for the last years of his life was engaged in teaching at Fayetteville and Wilson. He died at Chapel Hill, August 19, 1876. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 15. (J.C.S.)

## Hoornbeek, Johann[[@Headword:Hoornbeek, Johann]]

             A distinguished Dutch divine, was born at Harlem Nov. 4,1617. He entered the ministry at Cologne in 1639, and was appointed to Utrecht as minister and professor of theology in 1644. In 1654 he went to Leyden as professor, where he died Sept. 1, 1666. He was a prolific and much esteemed writer. Among those of his works which max yet be of interest to the scholar are, Epistola ad Joh. Duraeum de Independentismo (Lugd. Bat. 1659) — Brevis instit. studii theologici (Ultraj. 1658) — Summa controversiarum religionis (1653), which is still, with Spanheim's, one of the most useful compendiums of reformed polemics — Socinianismus conjutatts (Utrecht and Amst. 1650-1664, 3 vols. 4to), an extract of which  was given by Knibble (Leyd. 1690) — Miscellanea Sacra (Utrecht, 1677). Of especial value is his Theologia practica cum irenica (Ultraj. 1663-1698, 3 vols. 4to: new edit. 1672). — Herzog, Real Encyklop. 6, 260; Bayle, Gen. Dictionary, s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biography, 6, 149; Staiudlin, Geschichte d. theol. Moral s. d. Wiederauflebung d. Wissenschaft, p. 429 sq.; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. s. d. Reform. 8, 603 sq.; Gass, Gesch. d. Dogmat. 2, 287, 293.

## Hope[[@Headword:Hope]]

             (ἐλπίς), a term used in Scripture generally to denote the desire and expectation of some good (1Co 9:10); specially to denote the assured expectation of salvation, and of all minor blessings included in salvation, for this life and the life to come, through the merits of Christ.

(1.) It is one of the three great elements of Christian life and character (1Co 13:13). Faith is the root, love the fruit-bearing stem, and hope the heaven-reaching crown of the tree of Christian life. Faith appropriates the grace of God in the facts of salvation; love is the animating spirit of our present Christian life; while hope takes hold of the future as belonging to the Lord, and to those who are his. The kingdom of God, past, present, and future, is thus reflected in faith, love, and hope. Hope is joined to faith and love because spiritual life, though present, is yet not accomplished. It stands in opposition to seeing or possessing (Rom 8:24 sq.; 1Jn 3:2 sq.); but it is not the mere wish or aspiration for liberation and light which is common to all creation (Rom 8:19-22), nor the mere reception of the doctrine of a future life, which may be found even among the heathen philosophers. It is, beyond these, the assurance that the spiritual life, which dwells in us here, will be prolonged into eternity. Hence, in the scriptures of the N.T., Christians are said to have hope rather than hopes (Rom 15:4; Rom 15:13; Heb 3:6; Heb 6:11; Heb 6:18). The Holy Spirit imparted to believers is the ground and support of their hope (1Pe 1:3; Act 23:6; 2Co 5:5; Rom 8:11; Rom 15:13; Gal 5:5). Hence the notion of hope appeared first in the disciples in its full force and true nature, after the resurrection of Christ and the descent of the Holy Ghost. In the test we do not find it with its significance (see Heb 7:19).

Thus hope is an essential and fundamental element of Christian life, so essential, indeed, that, like faith and love, it can itself designate the essence  of Christianity (1Pe 3:15; Heb 10:23). In it the whole glory of the Christian vocation is centered (Eph 1:18; Eph 4:4); it is the real object of the propagation of evangelical faith (Tit 1:2; Col 1:5; Col 1:23), for the most precious possessions of the Christian, the σωτηρία ἀπολύτρωσις, υἱοθεσία, δικαιοσύνη, are, in their fulfillment, the object of his hope (1Th 5:8 sq.; Rom 8:23; comp. Ezekiel 1:14; 4:30; Gal 5:5; 2Ti 4:8). Unbelievers are expressly designated as those who are without hope (Eph 2:12; 1Th 4:13), because they are without God in the world, for God is a God of hope (Rom 15:13; 1Pe 1:21).

But the actual object of hope is Christ, who is himself called ἡ ἐλπίς, not only because in him we place all our dependence (the general sense of ἐλπίς), but especially because it is in his second coming that the Christian's hope of glory shall be fulfilled (1Ti 1:1; Col 1:27; Tit 2:13). The fruit of hope is that through it we are enabled patiently and' steadfastly to bear the difficulties and trials of our present existence, and thus the ὑπομονὴ is a constant accompaniment of the ἐλπίς, (1Th 1:3; Rom 8:25), and even is sometimes put in its place with faith and love (Tit 2:2; compare 2Ti 3:10; 1Ti 6:11). As it is the source of the believer's patience in suffering, so it is also the cause of his fidelity and firmness in action, since he knows that his labor “is not in vain in the Lord” (1Co 15:58). Christianity is the religion of hope, and it is an essential point of its absolute character, for whatever is everlasting and eternal is absolute. To the Christian, as such, it is therefore not time, but eternity; not the present, but the future life, which is the object of his efforts and hope. See Herzog, Real- Encyklop, 6, 195; Krehl, N.T. Handwörterbuch, p. 372.

(2.) “One scriptural mark,” says Wesley, “of those who are born of God, is hope. Thus St. Peter, speaking to all the children of God who were then scattered abroad, saith, ‘Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope' (1Pe 1:3) — ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν a lively or living hope, saith the apostle, because there is also a dead hope as well as a dead faith; a hope which is not from God, but from the enemy of God and man, as evidently appears by its fruits, for as it is the offspring of pride, so it is the parent of every evil word and work; whereas, every man that hath in him the living hope is ‘holy as he that calleth him is holy' — every man that can truly say to his brethren in Christ, ‘Beloved, now are we the sons of  God, and we shall see him as he is,' ‘purifieth himself even as he is pure.' This hope (termed in the Epistle to the Hebrews, Heb 10:22, πληροφορία πίστεως, and elsewhere πληροφορία ἐλπίδος, Heb 6:11; in our translation, ‘the full assurance of faith, and the full assurance of hope,' expressions the best which our language could afford, although far weaker than those in the original), as described in Scripture, implies, first, the testimony of our own spirit or conscience that we walk ‘in simplicity and godly sincerity;' but, secondly and chiefly, the testimony of the Spirit of God ‘bearing witness with' or to ‘our spirit that we are the children of God,' ‘and if children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.” The passage, “Thou didst make me hope when I was upon my mother's breasts” (Psa 21:9), suggests that hope is an inbred sentiment. Considered as such, it implies (a) a future state of existence; (b) that progress in blessedness is the law of our being; (c) that the Christian life is adapted to our constitution. See, besides the works above cited, Homilist, 5, 116; Jay, Sermons, vol. 2; Tyerman, Essay on Christian Hope (London 1816, 8vo); Craig, Christian Hope (London 1820, 18mo); Garbett, Sermons, 1, 489; Wesley, Sermons, 1, 157; Liddon, Our Lord's Divinity (Bampton Lecture), p. 72, 75; Martensen, Dogmatics, p. 450 sq.; Pye Smith, Christian Theology, p. 622 sq.; Pearson, On the Creed, 1, 24, 401, 460, 501; Fletcher, Works (see Index, vol. 4); Jahrb. deutsch. Theol. 10:694; Bates, Works (see Index in vol. 4); Harless, Systen of Ethics (Clark's Theol. Libr.), p. 174 sq.; Nitzsch, System d. christl. Lehrb, § 209 sq.

## Hope, Matthew B[[@Headword:Hope, Matthew B]]

             A distinguished Presbyterian minister, and professor at Princeton, was born in Pennsylvania in 1812, and was educated at Jefferson College in that state. He entered the theological seminary at Princeton in 1831, and, after completing his theological course, he also studied medicine, and received the appropriate degree from the University of Pennsylvania: his object, in this additional course of study, being the more completely to prepare himself for the missionary work. He was ordained as a missionary, and stationed at Singapore, India; but his health failing him, he returned home, after a stay of two years only. He was soon afterwards elected assistant secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Education. In 1846 he accepted the office of professor of belles-lettres in the College of New Jersey. In 1854 he was also made professor of political economy. During the fourteen years of his connection with the college, he continued in the diligent and  thorough discharge of the duties of his professorship, with the exception of all interval of about fifteen months, the most of which was passed in Southern Europe, whither he had gone to seek some alleviation of a deeply-seated neuralgic affection. He died suddenly at Princeton, Dec. 17, 1859. He published a Treatise of Rhetoric (a syllabus for his college classes), and was a frequent contributor to the Princeton Review. — Presbyterian, Dec. 1859; Presbyterian Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 90; Newark Daily Advertiser, Dec. 1859.

## Hopfner, Heinrich[[@Headword:Hopfner, Heinrich]]

             A German theologian, was born at Leipsic in 1582, and educated at the university of his native place, and at Jena and Wittenberg. In 1612 he was appointed professor of logic at Leipsic, and very soon after was called to Jena as professor of theology. He died in 1642. Höpfner wrote Commentarii in veterem quam vocant logicam (Leipsic, 1620) Tractatus in priorum et posteriorum Anal. libr. Aristotelis (ibid. 1620) — Saxonia evangelica (ibid. 1625,1672): — De justificatione hominis peccatoris coram Deo (ibid. 1639 and 1653; new ed. 1728 and often). — Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8, 530.

## Hopfner, Johann Georg Christian[[@Headword:Hopfner, Johann Georg Christian]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born March 4, 1765, at Leipsic, and died there, December 20, 1827, doctor of theology and professor of  philosophy. He wrote, In LXX Versionem Jonae Spec. 1-3 (Leipsic, 1787, 1788): — De Origine Dogmatis Rom.-Pontif. de Purgatorio Nonnulla (Halle, 1792): — Historia Tobiae (1802): — Ueber das Leben und die Verdienste des verewigten Morus (1793). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:407; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:51, 194, 300, 469, 865. (B.P.)

## Hophni[[@Headword:Hophni]]

             (Heb. Chophni', חָפְנַי, perh. pugilist, according to others client; Sept. Ο᾿φνί), the first-named of the two sons of the high-priest Eli (1Sa 1:3; 1Sa 2:34), who fulfilled their hereditary sacerdotal duties at Shiloh. Their brutal rapacity and lust, which seemed to acquire fresh violence with their father's increasing years (1Sa 2:22; 1Sa 2:12-17), filled the people with disgust and indignation, and provoked the curse which was denounced against their father's house first by an unknown prophet (1Sa 2:27-36), and then by the youthful Samuel in his first divine communication (1Sa 3:11-14). They were both cut off in one day in the flower of their age, and the ark, which they had accompanied to battle against the Philistines, was lost on the same occasion (1Sa 4:10-11). B.C. cir. 1130. The predicted ruin and ejectment of Eli's house were fulfilled in the reign of Solomon. SEE ZADOK. The unbridled licentiousness of these young priests gives us a terrible glimpse into the fallen condition of the chosen people (Ewald, Gesch. 2, 538-638). The Scripture calls them “sons of Belial” (1Sa 2:12). SEE ELT.

## Hophra[[@Headword:Hophra]]

             (Heb. Chophra', חָפְר;ִ Sept. Οὐαφρῆ [compare Clem. Alex. Strom. 1, 143j, Vulg. Ephrec), or PHARAOH-HOPHRA, king of Egypt in the time of Zedekiah, king of Judah, and of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. B.C. 588. He formed alliance with the former against the latter, and his advance with an Egyptian army constrained the Chaldaeans to raise the siege of Jerusalem (Jer 37:5); but they soon returned, and took, and destroyed the city. This momentary aid, and the danger of placing reliance on the protection of Hophra, led Ezekiel to compare the Egyptians to a broken reed, which was to pierce the hand of him that leaned upon it (Eze 39:6-7). This alliance was, however, disapproved by God; and Jeremiah was authorized to deliver the prophecy contained in his forty- fourth chapter, which concludes with a prediction of Hophra's death, and the subjugation of his country by the Chaldaeans. SEE EGYPT.

This Pharaoh-Hophra is identified with the Apries ( Α᾿πρίης)', Herod. 2, 161 sq., 169; 4, 159; Diod. Sic. 1, 68; Α᾿πρίας, Athen. 13, 560) of ancient authors, and the Ouaphris (Οὐάφρις) of Manetho, the eighth king of the twenty-sixth or Saitic dynasty (Eusebius, Chronicles 1, 219). Under this identification, we may conclude that his wars with the Syrians and Cyreneans prevented him from affording any great assistance to Zedekiah. Apries is described by Herodotus (2, 169) as a monarch who, in the zenith of his glory, felt persuaded that it was not in the power even of a deity to dispossess him of his kingdom, or to shake the stability of his sway; and this account of his arrogance fully accords with that contained in the Bible. Ezekiel (29:3) speaks of this king as “the great dragon that lieth in the midst of the rivers, which hath said, My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself.” His overthrow and subsequent captivity and death are foretold with remarkable precision by Jeremiah (44:30): “I will give Pharaoh-Hophra, king of Egypt, into the hands of his enemies, and into the hands of them that seek his life.” This was brought about by a revolt of the troops, who placed Amasis at their head, and, after various conflicts, took Apries prisoner. B.C. 569. He was for a time kept in easy captivity by Amasis, w-ho wished to spare his life; but he was at length constrained to give him up to the vengeance of his enemies, by whom he was strangled (Rawlinson, Herod. 2, 209 sq.). See Raphel, De Pharaone Hophra, Luneb. 1734.) SEE PHARAOH.

## Hopital (also Hospital), Michel de L[[@Headword:Hopital (also Hospital), Michel de L]]

             A distinguished French statesman and opponent of the Inquisition, was born at Aigueperse, in Auvergne, about 1504. He studied law at Toulouse, and first became known as an advocate in the Parliament of Paris; and after discharging various public functions, he became chancellor of France in 1560, during the minority of Francis II. That country at this time was torn by contending factions. “The Guises, in particular, were powerful, ambitious, and intensely Catholic; and when one of the family, the Cardinal de Lorraine, wished to establish the Inquisition in the country, Hôpital boldly and firmly opposed it, and may be said to have saved France from that detestable institution. He summoned the states general, which had not met for 80 years, and, being supported by the mass of moderate Catholics, he forced the Guises to yield.” His speech at the opening of the assembly was worthy of his wise and magnanimous spirit: “Let us do away,” said he, “with those diabolical words of Lutherans, Huguenots, and Papists names of party and sedition; do not let us change the fair appellation of Christians.” An ordinance was passed abolishing arbitrary taxes, regulating the feudal authority of the nobles, and correcting the abuses of the judicial system. He also secured various benefits for the persecuted Huguenots in various ways, but especially by the edict of pacification, which granted to the Protestants the free exercise of their religion (issued January 17, 1562). In 1568 he was instrumental in establishing the peace of Longjumeau, when, on account of his opposition to Catharine de Medicis, who was inclined to break the compact, he was suspected of being a Huguenot. Finding it impossible to prevent the execution of Catharine's plans, he resigned his position (October 7, 1568), and retired to his estate at Vignay, near Etampes. He died May 13,1573. Hôpital's family had all embraced the Protestant faith, and this was well known even at court while he occupied his prominent position there. But his character was so blameless that he held his position for some time even during the fearful contests preparatory to the massacre of St. Bartholomew. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 31, 86 sq.; Chambers, Encyclop. 5, 414 sq.; Pierer, Univers. — Lex. 8, 334; Bayle, History Dict. p. 505 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 283 sq.; Raumer, Gesch. Europa's, 2; Soldan, Gesch. d. Prot. in Frankf. 2. SEE HUGUENOTS. (J. H. W.)

## Hopkins, Daniel, D.D[[@Headword:Hopkins, Daniel, D.D]]

             A Congregational minister, was born Oct. 16, 1734, at. Waterbury, Conn., and graduated at Yale College in 1758. After being licensed, he preached in Halifax, N. S., a short time. In 1775 he was chosen member of the Provincial Congress, and in 1778 one of the Council of the Conventional Government. He was ordained pastor of the Third Church in Salem Nov. 18, 1778, and remained in this place until his death, Dec. 14, 1814. He published two or three occasional sermons. — Sprague, Annals, 1, 581.

## Hopkins, Ezekiel, D.D[[@Headword:Hopkins, Ezekiel, D.D]]

             An English prelate and author, was born at Sandford, Devonshire, in 1633. He was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, and, after holding a short time the chaplaincy to the college; he became minister of St. Mary Woolnoth, London, and later of St. Mary's, Exeter. He finally removed to Ireland with his father-in-law, lord Robartes (afterwards earl of Truro), and was made dean of Raphoe in 1669, and bishop of the same place in 1671. He was transferred to Londonderry in 1681, but in consequence of the Roman Catholic troubles in Ireland he returned to England in 1688, and was appointed minister of Aldermanbury, London, in 1689. He died June 22, 1690. In his doctrines he was a Calvinist. His works are remarkable for clearness, strength of thought, originality, and pureness of style; the most important are, Exposition of the Lord's Prayer (1691) — An Exposition of the Ten Commandments (1692, 4to) — The Doctrine of the two Covenants (London 1712, 8vo); and Works, now first collected, with Life of the Author, etc., by Josiah Pratt (London 1809, 4 vols. 8vo). See Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, vol. 2; Prince, Worthies of Devon; Chalmers, Genesis Biogr. Dict.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 25, 128; Darling, Cyclopedia Bibliog. 1, 1535. (J. H.W.)

## Hopkins, Henry Harvey, D.D[[@Headword:Hopkins, Henry Harvey, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Chester County, Pennsylvania, November 12, 1804. He graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1832; was licensed by the Presbytery of New Castle the same year; obtained permission to labor without the bounds of the presbytery, and at once proceeded to Clinton, Louisiana. After this he went to Big Spring and Taylorsville, Kentucky, and served as pastor. This relation continued about nine years, and was dissolved April 2, 1844. Dr. Hopkins next took charge of two churches at Cane Run and Plum Creek, in Shelby County, and subsequently of a church at Owensboro. He died April 19, 1877. He was a devoted pastor, a wise counsellor, practical, judicious, and of large Christian experience. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1878, page 28.

## Hopkins, John Henry, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Hopkins, John Henry, D.D., LL.D]]

             Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Vermont, was born of English parents in Dublin, Ireland, Jan. 30, 1792, and came to this country when about eight years old. He was educated chiefly by his mother. In 1817 he entered the legal profession, but six years later he quitted the bar for the ministry, and was ordained in 1824 as rector of Trinity Church, Pittsburg. In 1827 he was a prominent candidate for the office of assistant bishop of Pennsylvania, but as the vote of Mr. Hopkins was to decide between himself and Dr. H, U. Onderdonk, another  candidate, he cast his vote in favor of the latter. In 1831 he became assistant minister at Trinity Church, Boston, and professor of divinity in the Episcopal Theological Seminary of Massachusetts. In 1832 he was elected bishop of Vermont, and was consecrated Oct. 31. At the same time he accepted also the rectorship of St. Paul's Church, Burlington, Vt., which he held until 1856. Besides this, he also established a school for boys, employing poor clergymen and candidates for orders as teachers. His heavy expenses from this enterprise embarrassed him seriously for many years. After relinquishing this school, he projected and established the “Vermont Episcopal Institute,” a semitheological school, over which he presided until his death, January 9, 1868. In 1867, bishop Hopkins was present at the Pan-Anglican Synod held in Lambeth, and took a prominent part in its proceedings.

In the dissensions dividing the Anglican Church he was a decided champion of the High-Church party, and refused to sign the protest of a majority of the American bishops against Romanizing tendencies. Several of the posthumous works of bishop Hopkins will be published by one of his sons. Bishop Hopkins was one of the most learned men of his denomination. He had remarkable versatility of mind, and was a persevering and successful student in the field of theology. Indeed, “it was hard to find a highway or byway of ingenious investigation where he has not left his footprint.” The great mistake of his life, and one which he undoubtedly regretted before his death, was his apology for the institution of human slavery. But we have every reason to believe that the bishop was sincere in what he preached, and that, notwithstanding this failing, he was a devout and consistent man of God. He was a voluminous writer. Besides a number of pamphlets, sermons, and addresses, he published Christianity vindicated in a series of seven discourses on the external Evidences of the V. Test. (Burlington, 1833, 12mo) — The primitive Creed examined and explained (1834, 12mo) — The primitive Ch. compared with the P. E. Ch. (1835,12mo) — The Ch. of Rome in her primitive purity compared with the Ch. of Rome at the pres. day (1839, 12mo) — Causes, Principles, and Results of the Brit. Reform. (Philadelphia 1844, 12mo) Hist. of the Confessionals (N. Y. 1850, 12mo) — Refutation of Milner's End of Controversy (1854,2 vols. 12mo). An answer has recently been published by Kenrick, Vindication of the Catholic Church (Baltimore, 1855,12mo). Bishop Hopkins's last works are a little brochure on the law of ritualism — an argument based on scriptural and historical grounds in behalf of the beauty of holiness in the public services of his Church; and a History of the Church in verse for Sunday-schools. — Amer. Ch. Review, April, 1868, p.  160; Allibone, Dict. of Authors; Vapereau, Dict. des Contemporains, p. 897. (J. H. W.)

## Hopkins, Johns[[@Headword:Hopkins, Johns]]

             an American philanthropist, a member of the Society of Friends, was born in Anne Arundel County, Maryland, May 19, 1795. He received a liberal education, and engaged in the wholesale grocery business, from which he retired in 1847 with an ample fortune. He then became president of the Merchants' Bank, and a director of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. He died in Baltimore, December 24, 1873. Mr. Hopkins' benefactions amount in the aggregate to over $8,000,000. In 1873 he founded the Hopkins Free Hospital of Baltimore, at a cost of about $4,000,000. He also founded an orphanage for colored youth, a convalescent hospital, and the Johns Hopkins University. This institution is located at Clifton, near Baltimore, and has four hundred acres of land and an endowment of $3,000,000. Poor and deserving youth of Maryland and Virginia receive free scholarships.

## Hopkins, Josiah, D.D[[@Headword:Hopkins, Josiah, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Pittsford, Vermont, April 26, 1785. He never attended college, though he had a good academical education. He was licensed by the Paulet Congregatinal Association in 1809, and was  ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in New Haven, Vermont, in 1811. He subsequently became pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Auburn, N.Y. He died at Geneva, June 27, 1862. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, page 298.

## Hopkins, Mark, D.D., LL. D[[@Headword:Hopkins, Mark, D.D., LL. D]]

             an eminent Congregational educator, was born in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, February 4, 1802. He graduated from Williams College in 1824; was a tutor there from 1825 to 1827; graduated from the Berkshire Medical College in 1829; was professor of rhetoric and moral philosophy  in Williams College, 1830-36; of moral and intellectual philosophy and president from 1836 to 1872; professor of theology, 1858-72, and died June 17, 1887. He was a fellow of the American Academy, corporate member of the American Board from 1838, and president from 1857. Dr. Hopkins was the author of seventy-five different publications, including pamphlets and addresses. A complete list is to be found in the Cong. Year- book, 1888, page 28.

## Hopkins, Samuel, D.D[[@Headword:Hopkins, Samuel, D.D]]

             A noted Calvinistic divine, was born at Waterbury, Conn., Sept. 17, 1721, and was at once set apart by his father for the ministry of the Gospel. He entered Yale College in September 1737. During his collegiate course the town of New Haven was stirred by the preaching of Whitefield and Gilbert Tennent. The students were deeply affected, and Hopkins was one of the converted. After graduation he commenced the study of theology with president Edwards, and, though not an imitator of the president, he was more powerfully influenced by him than by any other man. In 1741 he began to preach, but with great embarrassment and despondency. During his first few months of probation he declined five invitations for settlement. On Dec. 23, 1743, he was ordained over an infant church of five members in Housatonick, now Great Barrington, Mass. He remained in this pastorate twenty-five years. He often preached extemporaneously, and was indefatigable in parochial labor. He gave offence to his people by his practice of reading portions of Scripture in the Sabbath services, a practice which was then unusual in New England. From 1744 to 1763 the prosperity of the church was more or less interrupted by the French and Indian war. Hopkins was obliged often to remove his family, and sometimes to go himself, for safety from Great Barrington. His criticisms on the military movements of the British army are quite acute: “Our generals are very grand.

The baggage of each one amounts to five cartloads. Mighty preparations, but nothing done.” On the banks of the Monongahela Washington was uttering almost the same words to general Braddock. His church, during his pastorate, increased in membership from five to 116. He labored faithfully among the Indians of his vicinity, and spent much of his time in personal intercourse with Jonathan Edwards, then of Stockbridge. He became unpopular with some members of his parish on account of his strict terms of Church communion, his bold assertions of Calvinistic doctrine, and his staunch patriotism. He was especially disliked by the British Tories. Some of his parishioners would give nothing for his support, and others had nothing to give. In great poverty, he left his parish in 1769. In April 1770, he was installed pastor of the church at Newport, which town was then a port of commercial importance, and for many years the rival of New York. During the first year of his pastorate Hopkins enjoyed a visit from Whitefield. His church in  Newport flourished until the outbreak of the Revolutionary War. In 1776 the town was captured by the British, and remained in their possession three years. Hopkins continued at his post until the last moment, and then was compelled to flee. He spent the interval in assisting his friend, Dr. Samuel Spring, of Newburyport (see Life and Times of Gardiner Spring [N. Y. 1866, 2 vols. 12mo], 1, 12 sq.), and in supplying destitute churches in Connecticut. During his absence his people were scattered, and his meetinghouse nearly demolished. He returned in 1779, and began to preach in a private room, but soon received aid from his friends in Boston and Newburyport for the restoration of his church edifice. He rejected eligible offers of settlement in other places, and remained faithful to his people, receiving no regular salary, but depending on precarious and meager contributions.

As soon as Hopkins commenced his pastoral labors at Newport he began to agitate the subject of slavery. At that time Newport was the great slave- market of New England. Hopkins affirmed that the town was built up by the blood of the Africans. Some of the wealthiest members of his church were slave-traders, and many of his congregation were slave owners. He astonished them by his first sermon against the slave system. The poet Whittier says: “It may well be doubted whether on that Sabbath day the angels of God, in their wide survey of his universe, looked down upon a nobler spectacle than that of the minister of Newport rising up before his slaveholding congregation, and demanding, in the name of the Highest, the deliverance of the captive, and the opening of the prison-doors to them that were bound.” Only one family left his church; the others freed their slaves. He continued to preach on the subject, and made himself intensely unpopular throughout Rhode Island. In 1776 he published his celebrated Dialogue concerning the Slavery of the Africans, together with his Address to Slaveholders, copies of which were sent to all the members of the Continental Congress, and to prominent men throughout the country. It was reprinted by the New York Manumission Society as late as 1785. Hopkins entered into correspondence with Granville Sharp, Zachary Macaulay, and other English abolitionists. From them he borrowed the idea of colonizing the blacks; and he devised a colonization scheme, in which he manifested a practical statesmanship unusual for a clergyman. When the Federal Constitution was framed in 1787, he pointed to the clause recognizing slavery in the United States, and said, “I fear this is an Achan, which will bring a curse, so that we cannot prosper.” Of a movement so  vast as the anti-slavery reform in the United States no one man can claim to be the author; but Dr. Hopkins was most certainly the pioneer in that movement.

It is not, however, as a philanthropist, but as a theologian, that Hopkins is generally known. In his extreme indigence he writes: “I have been saved from anxiety about living, and have had a thousand times less care and trouble in the world than if I had had a great abundance. Being unconnected with the great and rich, I have had more time to attend to my studies, and particularly have had leisure to write my ‘System of Divinity,' which I hope will not prove useless.” By this system, and by his various independent treatises, he gave occasion for the name “Hopkinsian,” as applied to the views of eminent New England divines. He regarded himself as an Edwardean. He had been the most intimate of president Edwards's companions, had revised the president's manuscripts, had carefully edited some of them, and was more exactly acquainted than any other man with the president's original speculations. He wrote the first memoir of Edwards, of which the Encyclopedia Britannica says, it is “equal in simplicity, though by no means in anything else, to the most exquisite biographies of Izaak Walton.”

The prominent tenets of Hopkinsianism are the following:

1. All real holiness consists in disinterested benevolence.

2. All sin consists in selfishness.

3. There are no promises of regenerating grace made to the doings of the unregenerate.

4. The impotency of sinners with respect to believing in Christ is not natural, but moral.

5. A sinner is required to approve in his heart of the divine conduct, even though it should cast him off forever.

6. God has exerted his power in such a manner as he purposed would be followed by the existence of sin.

7. The introduction of moral evil into the universe is so overruled by God as to promote the general good.

8. Repentance is before faith in Christ.

9. Though men became sinners by Adam, according to a divine constitution, yet they have, and are accountable for, no sins but personal.

10. Though believers are justified through Christ's righteousness, yet his righteousness is not transferred to them.

Dr. Nathanael Emmons (q.v.), who was the most eminent defender of Hopkinsianism, and who described it as characterized by the ten preceding articles, added the following (see Park, Memoir of Emmons) as his own views, and as supplemental to those of his friend Hopkins:

1. Holiness and sin consist in free voluntary exercises.

2. Men act freely under the divine agency.

3. The least transgression of the divine law deserves eternal punishment.

4. Right and wrong are founded in the nature of things.

5. God exercises mere grace in pardoning or justifying penitent believers through the atonement of Christ, and mere goodness in rewarding them for their good works.

6. Notwithstanding the total depravity of sinners, God has a right to require them to turn from sin to holiness.

7. Preachers of the Gospel ought to exhort sinners to love God, repent of sin, and believe in Christ immediately.

8. Men are active, not passive, in regeneration.

Some of these eight propositions are distinctly avowed, others more or less clearly implied in the writings of Hopkins. Emmons regarded Hopkinsianism as in some respects high and intense Calvinism; as, in other respects (the doctrine of general atonement for example), moderate Calvinism; and as, on the whole, “consistent Calvinism.”

Amid his labors as a reformer and theologian, Dr. Hopkins vigorously discharged his parochial duties, until he was struck with paralysis, in his seventy-eighth year. He continued to preach during the next four years. With a revival of religion his ministry had commenced, with a revival also it ended-the rising and the setting of his sun. He wrote out a list of his  congregation, and offered a separate prayer for each individual. Thirty-one conversions followed. After his discourses on the 16th of Oct. 1803, he exclaimed, “Now I have done; I can preach no more.” He staggered from the pulpit to his bed, from which he never rose. He died on the 20th of December 1803.

In person Dr. Hopkins was tall and vigorous; in his movements dignified, though unwieldy. His head was large and square, and his face beamed with intelligence. The movements of his mind were like those of his body, powerful, but often clumsy. Inflexible faithfulness to what he deemed his duty, with utter self-sacrifice for the right, was his main characteristic. “Love to being in general” was with him not the mere byword of a sect, but the enthusiastic purpose of his life. He had not the temperament, which inspires enthusiasm, and he had but little tact in personal intercourse with men; but in the depths of his indigence he was true to himself, and showed all the courage of a Hampden. He studied hardly ever less than fourteen hours a day, and sometimes even as many as eighteen in a little room of eleven feet by seven. Every Saturday he fasted, and thus gained spiritual strength for the toils of earth by communion with Heaven. He labored for Indians and selfish white men; for poor Negroes who had then no other friend; and for theological science, which gave him respect, but little bread — vixit propter alios. In 1854 his Works (before repeatedly reprinted) were published by the Massachusetts Doctrinal Tract Society (3 vols. 8vo), containing over 2000 pages, with a Memoir by Prof. Edward A. Park of 266 pages.

The character and writings of Dr. Hopkins have recently been depicted for general readers in a very striking way in Mrs. Stowe's Minister's Wooing. See also Congreg. Quar. Rev. 1864, p. 1 sq.; Hagenbach, History of Doctr. 2, 436, 438; Shedd, Hist. of Doctr. 1, 383, 408; 2, 25, 81,489; Buchanan, Justification, p. 190. For the diffusion of Hopkinsianism and its later modifications, SEE NEW ENGLAND THEOLOGY. On the relation of Hopkins's theory to the orthodox view of redemption, see Bangs, Errors of Hopkinsianism (N. York, 12mo); Hodgson, New Divinity Examined (N. York, 12mo); art. Edwards, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop.; Christian Examiner, 1843, p. 169 sq.; Adams, View of all Religions, p. 168; Spring, On the Nature of Duty; Ely, Contrast between Calvinism and Hopkinsianism (N. Y. 1811); Bib. Sac. April, 1852, p. 448 sq.; Jan. 1853, p. 633, — 671; July, 1862 (art. 6); New Englander, 1868, p. 284 sq.; Life  and Times of Gardiner Spring (N. Y. 1866, 2 vols. 12mo), 2 5 sq. (W. E. P.)

## Hopkins, Samuel, Jun., D.D[[@Headword:Hopkins, Samuel, Jun., D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, son of the foregoing, was born-in West Springfield, Massachusetts, October 31, 1729. He graduated from Yale College in 1749, and was a tutor there from 1751 to 1754; was ordained pastor at Hadley, in February, 1755, and died there, March 8, 1811. A volume of sermons was published by him in 1799. In many respects he was a remarkable man; distinguished for his good-humor, and his Calvinism was of a type opposed to Hopkirisianism. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:520.

## Hopkins, Samuel, Sen[[@Headword:Hopkins, Samuel, Sen]]

             a Congregational minister, son of John Hopkins, of Waterbury, Connecticut, graduated from Yale College in 1718; was ordained pastor in West Springfield, Massachusetts, June 1, 1720, and died suddenly in October, 1755, in the sixty-second year of his -age. He published Historical Memoirs Relating to the Housatonic Indians (1753). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:519.

## Hopkins, Theodore Asa, D.D[[@Headword:Hopkins, Theodore Asa, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Hartford, Connecticut, July 25, 1805. He graduated from Yale College in 1824; studied theology privately, and was licensed by the Cayuga Presbytery, June 19, 1828. In 1829 he accepted a call from the Congregational Church at Pawtucket, Massachusetts. His ministry there was successful and very acceptable. In 1836 he accepted a call from the First Presbyterian Church in Brooklyn, where he remained until his death, November 18, 1847. See Sprague. Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4:741.

## Hopkins, William, 1[[@Headword:Hopkins, William, 1]]

             An English divine, was born at Evesham, Worcestershire, and educated at Trinity College, Oxford. He entered the ministry in 1675, and, after holding several minor appointments, was made vicar of Lindridge in 1686, and in 1697 master of St. Oswald's Hospital, Worcester. He died in 1700. He published Sermons (1683, 4to) — Bartram (or Rartram), on the Body and Blood of the Lord (2nd ed. 1688) — Animad. on Johnson's Answer to Jovian (London 1691, 8vo) — Latin translated of A Saxon Tract on the Burial places of the Saxon Saints (in Hickes's Septentrional Grammar, Oxford 1705). After his death, Dr. Geo. Hickes published Seventeen Sermons, with Life (London 1708, 8vo).

## Hopkins, William, 2[[@Headword:Hopkins, William, 2]]

             A Church of England clergyman, but an Arian in theology, was born at Monmouth in 1706. He entered All Souls College, Oxford, in 1724, and became vicar of Bolney, Sussex, in 1731. In 1756 he became master of the grammar school of Cuckfield, and died in 1786. His principal works are An Appeal to the Common Sense of all Christian People on the doctrine of the Trinity (London 1754,12mo) — Exodus, A Correct Translation, with Notes critical and explanatory (London 1784, 4to). He published also several anonymous pamphlets against compulsory subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. — Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 886; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, p. 1537.

## Hopkinsianism[[@Headword:Hopkinsianism]]

             A name given to the theological system of Dr. Samuel Hopkins (q.v.).

## Hoplotheca[[@Headword:Hoplotheca]]

             ( ῾Οπλοθήκη, an armory) is the title of a book which contains the decisions of the Church fathers against heretical doctrines, and which was used to controvert such doctrines. It was most probably prepared at the request of the emperor Emanuel Comenus. — Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. der Kirchengesch. 2, 347. (J. H.W.)

## Hoppenstedt, August Friedrich Ludwig[[@Headword:Hoppenstedt, August Friedrich Ludwig]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born March 22, 1763. In 1789 he was inspector of the Teachers' Seminary at Hanover, in 1792 court- chaplain, in 1796 superintendent, in 1805 general superintendent at Harburg, in 1815 at Celle, and died April 24, 1830, doctor of theology,  abbot of Loccum, and director of consistory at Hanover. He published, Predigten (Hanover, 1818-19; 3 vols.): — Liederfur Volksschulen (1793; 4th ed. 1814). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:864; 2:99, 171, 265, 385; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:585. (B.P.)

## Hopper, Christopher[[@Headword:Hopper, Christopher]]

             one of the most efficient early Methodist preachers, was born at Low- Coalburne, Ryton Parish, Durham County, England, December 25, 1722. In his Autobiography (in Jackson's Lives) he gives an interesting account of his conversion under Methodist preaching, about 1743, and of his subsequent labors after 1749. For fifty years he preached throughout the land, in churches, ale-houses, cock-pits, now before a conference, then before a mob, now amid the prayers and tears of the people, then amid rotten eggs, the sound of horns and bells, brickbats, blows, and bludgeons. Four times he visited Ireland (1750, 1752, 1756, 1776, the first time with Wesley). In 1751 he and Wesley visited Scotland, the latter returning in a few days, but Hopper pressing on, and in 1759 introducing Methodism as far as Old Aberdeen and Peterhead, thus planting Methodism in North Britain. Wesley being absent from the conference at Bristol in 1780, Hopper was elected president. After 1790 he resided chiefly at Bolton, preaching till January 1802. He died March 5 following. Hopper played an important part in British Methodism, and not merely in extending its borders. He was one of the men who gave to it Bramweell and Benson, and his melting prayers contributed to its peace and union during the critical conferences of the last decade of the 18th century (see Entwistle's Memoirs). He was of an original turn of mind, had fine natural abilities, was a diligent student, a pioneer preacher, and a soul-saver. See Jackson, Early Methodist Preachers, 1:179; Crowther, Portraiture of Methodism, page 350; Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, 1, 3 (see index); Smith, Hist. of Wesl. Methodism, 1, 3 (see index); Wesl. Meth. Magazine, September 1803; Everett, Keen and Able Little Sketch; Wesleyan Centenary Takings (3d ed. Lond. 1841), 1:332.

## Hoppus, John, LL.D[[@Headword:Hoppus, John, LL.D]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born in London in 1789. He studied theology at Rotherham and Dunbar, then proceeded to the University of Glasgow, where he took his degree of M.A., and was the most distinguished pupil of his year. Thence he returned to London and  took the ministerial charge of the Carter Lane Chapel, where he labored two years. He next became professor of mental and moral philosophy and logic in University College, London, which chair he occupied for thirty-six years, preaching frequently and writing extensively. He died in London, January 29, 1875. The life of Dr. Hoppus was an exemplification of his oft- repeated assertion that "No service a man can render his generation is greater than this, to try to 'justify the ways of God to men.'" He wrote a masterly exposition of Bacon's Novum Organon, and many other treatises for the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge: — a prize essay on Schism as Opposed to the Unity of the Church: — a valuable pamphlet on The Crisis of Popular Education, as well as contributing largely to the Psychological Journal and Eclectic. See (Loud.) Cong. Year-book, 1876, page 341; (Lond.) Evangelical Magazine, 1875, page 281.

## Hopton, Susannah[[@Headword:Hopton, Susannah]]

             A religious writer, born in Staffordshire, England, in 1627, was the wife of Richard Hopton, a Welsh judge. She became at one time a Roman Catholic, but, realizing her mistake, she returned to the Protestant Church. She died in 1709. Her writings are all on religious topics, intended to lead the reader to a devout and holy life. They are Daily Devotions (London 1673, 12mo; 5th ed. 1713) — Meditations, etc. (publ. by N. Spinckes, London 1717, 8vo). — She also remodeled the Devotions in the ancient Way of Offices (originally by John Austin, who died in 1669), with a preface by Dr. George Hickes (q.v.) (1717, 8vo; new ed. 1846, 8vo). — Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 887; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliograph. 1, 1538.

## Hor[[@Headword:Hor]]

             (Heb. id. הוֹרor הֹר; Sept. ῞Ωρ), the name of two eminent mountains (הֹר הָהָר, i.e. “Hor the mountain,” remarkable as the only case in which the name comes first; Sept. ῎Ωρ τὸ ὄρος, Vulg. Mons Hor). The word Hor is regarded by the lexicographers as an archaic form of ar, the usual Heb. term for “mountain” (Gesen. Thes. p. 391 b; Ftirst, Handw. s.v.), so that the meaning of the name is simply “the mountain of mountains,” as the Sept. have it in one case (see below, No. 2) τὸ ὄρος τὸ ὄρος; Vulg. mons altissimus; and Jerome (Ep. ad Fabiolam) non in monte simpliciter sed in montis monte. SEE MOUNTAIN.

1. An eminent mountain of Arabia Petraea, on the confines of Idumaea, and forming part of the mountain chain of Seir or Edom. It is first mentioned in Scripture in connection with the circumstances recorded in Num 20:22-29. It was “on the boundary line” (Num 20:23) or “at the edge” (Num 33:37) of the land of Edom. It was the next halting-place of the people after Kadesh (Num 20:22; Num 33:37), and they quitted it for Zalmonah (Num 33:41), in the road to the Red Sea (Num 21:4). It was during the encampment at Mt. Hor that Aaron was gathered to his fathers (Num 33:37-41). At the command of Jehovah, he, his brother, and his son ascended the mountain, in the presence of the people, “in the eyes of all the congregation.” The garments, and with the garments the office, of high priest were taken from Aaron and put upon Eleazar, and Aaron died there in the top of the mountain. In the circumstances of the ascent of the height to die, and in the marked exclusion from the Promised Land, the end of the one brother  resembled the end of the other; but in the presence of the two survivors, and of the gazing crowd below, there is a striking difference between this event and the solitary death of Moses. SEE AARON. The Israelites passed the mountain several times in going up ‘and down the Arabah; and the station Mosera (Deu 10:6) must have been at the foot of the mount (Deu 32:50). SEE MOSERA.

The mountain now identified with Mount Hor is the most conspicuous in the whole range of Mount Seir, and at this day bears the name of Mount Aaron (Jebel-llarun). It is in N. lat. 30° 18', E. long. 35° 33', about midway between the Dead Sea and the AElanitic Gulf. It may be open to question if this is really the Mount Hor on which Aaron died, seeing that the whole range of Seir was anciently called by that name; yet, from its height, and the remarkable manner in which it rises among the surrounding rocks, it seems not unlikely to have been the chosen scene of the high- priest's death (Kinneir, p. 127). Accordingly, Stanley observes that Mount Hor “is one of the very few spots connected with the wanderings of the Israelites which admit of no reasonable doubt” (S. and P. p. 86). It is almost unnecessary to state that it is situated on the eastern side of the great valley of the Arabah, the highest and most conspicuous of the whole range of the sandstone mountains of Edom, having close beneath it, on its eastern side though, strange to say, the two are not visible to each other — the mysterious city of Petra. The tradition has existed from the earliest date. Josephus does not mention the name of Hor (Ant. 4, 4, 7), but he describes the death of Aaron as taking place “on a very high mountain which surrounded the metropolis of the Arabs,” which latter “was formerly called Arke (῎Αρκη), but now Petra.” In the Onomasticon of Eusebius and Jerome it is Ormons — “A mountain in which Aaron died, close to the city of Petra.” When it was visited by the Crusaders (see the quotations in Robinson, Researches, 2:521) the sanctuary was already on its top, and there is little doubt that it was then what it is now — the Jebel Nebi- Harlun, “the mountain of the prophet Aaron.”

Of the geological formation of Mount Hor we have no very trustworthy accounts. The general structure of the range of Edom, of which it forms the most prominent feature, is new red sandstone, displaying itself to an enormous thickness. Above that is the Jura limestone, and higher still the cretaceous beds, which latter in Mount Seir are reported to be 3500 feet  thick (Wilson, Bible Lands, 1, 194). Through these deposited strata longitudinal dikes of red granite and porphyry have forced their way, running nearly north and south, and so completely solidifying the neighboring sandstone as often to give it the look of a primitive rock. To these combinations are due the extraordinary colors for which Petra is so famous. One of the best descriptions of the mountain itself is that given by Irby and Mangles (Travels, p. 433 sq.). It is said to be entirely sandstone, in very horizontal strata (Wilson, 1, 290). Its height, according to the latest measurements, is 4800 feet (Eng.) above the Mediterranean, that is to say, about 1700 feet above the town of Petra, 4000 above the level of the Arabah, and ore than 6000 above the Dead Sea (Roth, in Peterman's Mittheil. 1858, 1, 3). The mountain is marked far and near by its double top, which rises like a huge castellated building from a lower base, and is surmounted by the circular dome of the tomb of Aaron, a distinct white spot on the dark red surface of the fountain (Laborde, p. 143).

This lower base is the “plain of Aaron,” beyond which Burckhardt was, after all his toils, prevented from ascending (Syria, p. 431). “Out of this plain, culminating in its two summits, springs the red sandstone mass, from its base upwards rocky and naked, not a bush or a tree to relieve the rugged and broken corners of the sandstone blocks which compose it. On ascending this mass a little plain is found to lie between the two peaks, marked by a white cypress, and not unlike the celebrated plain of the cypress under the summit of Jebel Musa, traditionally believed to be the scene of Elijah's vision. The southernmost of the two, on approaching, takes a conical form. The northernmost is truncated, and crowned by the chapel of Aaron's tomb.” The chapel or mosque is a small square building, measuring inside about 28 feet by 33 (Wilson, 1, 295), with its door in the S.W. angle. It is built of rude stones, in part broken columns; all of sandstone, but fragments of granite and marble lie about. Steps lead to the flat roof of the chapel, from which rises a white dome as usual over a saint's tomb. The interior of the chapel consists of two chambers, one below the other. The upper one has four large pillars and a stone chest, or tombstone, like one of the ordinary slabs in churchyards, but larger and higher, and rather bigger at the top than the bottom. At its head is a high round stone, on which sacrifices are made, and which retained, when Stephens saw it, the marks of the smoke and blood of recent offerings. “On the slab are Arabic inscriptions, and it is covered with shawls chiefly red. One of the pillars is hung with votive offerings of beads, etc., and two ostrich eggs are suspended over the chest. Steps in the northwest angle  lead down to the lower chamber, which is partly in the rock, but plastered. It is perfectly dark. At the end, apparently under the stone chest above, is a recess guarded by a grating. Within this is a rude protuberance, whether of stone or plaster was not ascertainable, resting on wood, and covered by a ragged pall. This lower recess is no doubt the tomb, and possibly ancient. What is above is only the artificial monument, and certainly modern.” In one of the walls of this chamber is a “round, polished black stone,” one of those mysterious stones of which the prototype is the Kiaaba at Mecca, and which, like that, would appears to be the object of great devotion (Martineau, p. 419 sq.).

The chief interest of Mount Hor will always consist in the prospect from its summit — the last view of Aaron — “that view which was to him what Pisgah was to his brother” (Ortlob, De Morte Aaronis, Lips. 1704). It is described at length by Irby (p. 134), Wilson (1, 292-9), Martineau (p. 420), and is well summed up by Stanley in the following words: “We saw all the main points on which his eve must have rested. He looked over the valley of the Arabah counter-sected by its hundred watercourses, and beyond, over the white mountains of the wilderness they had so long traversed; and at the northern edge of it there must have been visible the heights through which the Israelites had vainly attempted to force their way into the Promised Land. This was the western view. Close around him on the east were the rugged mountains of Edom, aid far along the horizon the wide downs of Mount Seir, through, which the passage had been denied by the wild tribes of Esau who hunted over their long slopes. On the: north lay the mysterious Dead Sea, gleaming from the depths of its profound basin (Stephens, Incidents). “A dreary moment and a dreary scene such it must have seemed to the aged priest… The peculiarity of the view is the combination of wide extension with the scarcity of marked features. Petra is shut out by intervening rocks. But the survey of the Desert on one side, and the mountains of Edom on the other, is complete; and of these last the great feature is the mass of red, bald-headed sandstone rocks, intersected, not by valleys, but by deep seams” (S. and Pal. p. 87). Though Petra itself is entirely shut out, one outlying buildings if it may be called a building is visible, — that which goes by the name of the Deir, or Convent. Professor Stanley has thrown out a suggestion on the connection between the two, which is well worth further investigation. (See Robinson, Researches, 2:548, 579, 651.) The impression received on the spot is that Aaron's death took place in the small basin between the two peaks, and that the  people were stationed either on the plain, at the base of the peaks, or at that part of the wady Abu-Kusheybeh from which the top is commanded. Josephus says that the ground was sloping downwards (κατάντες ην τὸ χωρίον; Ant. 4:4, 7). But this may be the mere general expression of a man who had never been on the spot. (See Bertou, Le mont Hor, Pat, 1860.)

2. A mountain entirely distinct from the preceding, named in Num 34:7-8, only as one of the marks of the northern boundary of the land which the children of Israel were about to conquer. By many it has been regarded as a designation of Mount Casius, but this is rather the northern limit of Syria. The Targum Pseudojon renders Mount Hor by Unzanos, probably intending Amana. The latter is also the reading of the Talmud (Götting, 8, quoted by Fürst, s.v.), in which it is connected with the Amana named in Son 4:8. But the situation of this Amana is nowhere indicated by them. It cannot have any connection with the Amana or Abana River, which flowed through Damascus, as that is quite away from the position required in the passage. Schwarz (Palest. p. 25), after Parchi (in Benj. of Tudela, p. 413 sq.), identifies it with Jebel Nuria, south of Tripoli, but on frivolous grounds; nor was the mount in question on the Mediterranean, and Palestine did not extend so far north. The original is הֹר הָהִר, mount of the mountain, i.e. by a common Hebrew idiom, the Mountain, by way of eminence, i.q. the lofty mountain; Sept. τὸ ὄρος, Vulg. mons altissimus; and therefore probably only denotes the prominent mountain of that vicinity, i.e. Lebanon, or at most Mount Hermon, which is an offshoot of the Lebanon range. It can hardly be regarded here as a proper name. The northern boundary started from the sea; the first point in it was Mount Hor, and the second the entrance of Hamath. Since Sidon was subsequently allotted to the most northern tribe — Asher, and was, as far as we know, the most northern town so allotted, it would seem probable that the northern boundary would commence at about that point; that is, opposite to where the great range of Lebanon breaks down to the sea. The next landmark, the entrance to Hamath, seems to have been determined by Mr. Porter as the pass at Kalat el-Husn, close to Hums, the ancient Hamath — at the other end of the range of Lebanon. Surely “Mount Hor,” then, can be nothing else than the great chain of Lebanon itself. Looking at the massive character and enormous height of the range, it is very difficult to suppose that any individual peak or mountain is intended and not the whole mass, which takes nearly a straight course  between the two points just named, and includes below it the great plain of the Buka'a, and the whole of Palestine properly so called.

## Hor-hagidgad[[@Headword:Hor-hagidgad]]

             (Hebrew Chor hag-Gidgad', הִגַּדנְגָּי חֹר, hole of the Gidgad; Sept. ὄρος Γαδγάδ,Vulg. mons Gadgad, both apparently reading or misunderstanding הִרor הֹרfor חֹר), the thirty-third station of the Israelites between Bene- Jaakan and Jotbathah (Num 33:32-33); evidently the same with their forty-first station GUDGODHA, between the same places in the opposite direction, and not far from Mount Hor (Deu 10:6; Deu 10:2). Winer (Realwort. s.v. Horgidgad) assents to the possibility of the identity of this name with that of wady Ghudhaghid, in the eastern part of the desert et-Tih (Robinson's Researches, 3, App. 210, b), although the names are spelt and signify differently (this valley would be in Hebrew characters צֲָאעִצ), but objects to the identification thus proposed by Ewald (Isral. Gesch. 2, 207) on the ground that חוֹרcan hardly mean a wide valley. This difficulty, however, does not weigh much, since the wady may only be the representative of the name anciently attached to some spot in the vicinity, more properly called a chasm; and even this spot is sufficiently a gully to form a receptacle for the loose sand washed down by the freshets, which may naturally have partly filled it up in the course of ages. With this identification Rabbi Schwarz likewise agrees (Palest. p. 213). SEE EXODE. The name Gidgad or Gudgod, according to Gesenius, is from an Ethiopic reduplicated root, signifying to reverberate, as thunder; but, according to Furst, signifies a cleft, from גּוּרor גָּדִד, to incise. SEE GUDGODAAH.

## Horam[[@Headword:Horam]]

             (Heb. Horam', הֹרָם, lofty; Sept. ᾿Ωράμ 5. r. Ε᾿λάμ, Αἰλάμ), the king of Gezer, who, coming to the relief of Lachish, was overthrown by Joshua (Jos 10:33). B.C. 1618.

## Horapollo, or Horus Apollo[[@Headword:Horapollo, or Horus Apollo]]

             An Egyptian priest, and author of a treatise on Egyptian Hieroglyphics. Several writers of this name are mentioned by Suidas, Stephanus of Byzantium under Phenebethis, Photius (p. 536, ed. Bekker), and Eustathius (Homer, Od.), but it is doubtful which of them was actually the author of the treatise on Egyptian Hieroglyphics. The probability is that the work was originally written in the Egyptian language, and translated into Greek by Philip Horus was the name of one of the Egyptian deities, who was considered by the Greeks to be the same as Apollo (Herod. 2:141-156). We learn from Lucian (Pro Imag. § 27) that the Egyptians were frequently called by the names of their gods. But, whatever may be thought respecting the author, it is evident that the work was written after the Christian sera, since it contains allusions to the philosophical tenets of the Gnostics. The value of this work in interpreting existing hieroglyphics has been variously estimated. Champollion, Leemans, and other recent scholars esteem it more highly than former critics did. It was printed for the first time by Aldus (Venice, 1505), with the Fables of Esop. The best editions are by Mercer (1551), Hoeschelius (1595), De Pauw (1727), and Leemans (Amst 1834). The last discussed in his Introduction tie date and authorship of the work. See English Cyclopaedia; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé. 25, 166; Bunsen, Egyptens, Stelle in d. Weltgesch. 1, 402; Champollion, Precis du Systeme Hieroglyphique des Anciens Egyptiens, p. 347 sq. SEE HIEROGLYPHICS.

## Horayoth[[@Headword:Horayoth]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Horb, Johann Heinrich[[@Headword:Horb, Johann Heinrich]]

             A distinguished German Pietist, brother-in-law and co-worker of Spener, was born at Colmar, Alsace, June 11, 1645. He studied at the universities of Strasburg, Jena, Wittenberg, and Cologne, afterwards traveled through the Netherlands, England, and France, and finally returned to Strasburgin 1670. In 1671 he received an appointment as minister at Birkenfeld, and in 1673 at Trarbach. Here the boldness with which he presented his so-called pietistic views disturbed the equanimity of the orthodox authorities, and he was obliged to resign. He next became pastor at Windsheim, Franconia, and in 1685 accepted a. call as pastor of St. Nicholas Church, Hamburg, where he found himself associated with two other pietists, John Winkler and Abraham Hinkelmann. Their joint teachings created great excitement, which culminated when, in 1693, Horb published, under the title of D. Klugheit (d. Gerechten, a translation of Pairet's excellent pamphlet, Les vrais principes de l'education Chretienne des enfants.

The agitation became so violent that in 1694 he was formally suspended, after which he retired to Steinbeck, where he died in Jan. 1695. He published Hist. Origeniana, etc. (Frankf. 1670, 4to) — Hist. Manichaeorum (Argent. 1670, 4to) — Disquis. de ultima origine haereseos Simonis Magi (Leipz. 1669, 4to; also in Vogt's Bibl. hist. haeresiol. 1, 308 sq.) — Hist. haeres. Unitarior. (Frankfort, 1671, 4to); and a collection of sermons, D. Leiden Jesu Christi (Hamburg, 1700). — Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie 6, 261; Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch. 2, 847 sq.; Molleri, Cimbr. literata, 2, 355 sq.; Walch, Relig. Streitigkeit. in d. luth. Kirche, 1, 615 sq.; Henke, Kirchengeschichte, 4, 526 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Horbery, Matthew, D.D[[@Headword:Horbery, Matthew, D.D]]

             An English divine, was born at Haxay, Lincolnshire, in 1707; educated at Lincoln College, and elected fellow of Magdalen College. He became successively vicar of Eccleshall canon of Lichfield, vicar of Hanbury, and rector of Staielake. He died in 1773. He was greatly respected as a sound, able, and learned theologian, and an amiable and excellent man. His sermons were praised by Dr. Johnson; they are written in nervous, animated language, yet with great simplicity. Van Mildert classes them “among the best compositions of English divines.” His Works, including the Sermons, and an Essay on the Eternity of Future Punishments, have  been collected and published (Oxford, 1828. 2 vols. 8vo). — Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, 1, 1539; Hook, Ecclesiastes Biog. 6, 150; Waterland, Works,. 1, 116, 242, 254; 6, 416 sq.

## Horch, Heinrich, S.T.D[[@Headword:Horch, Heinrich, S.T.D]]

             A German Pietist and Mystic, was born at Eschwege, Hessen, in 1652. He studied theology and medicine at Marburg, where he came under the influence of the great follower of Spener (q.v.), Theodor Untereyk, and embraced the doctrines of the Mystics. He also studied the Cartesian philosophy with much interest. In 1683 he was appointed minister at Heidelberg, in 1685 court preacher at Kreuznach, but in 1687 he returned again to Heidelberg. At the university of that place he obtained the degree of doctor of theology. In 1689 he went to Frankfort as minister of a Reformed Church, and in 1790 was made professor of theology at Hernborn. By his firm adherence, however, to the Mystic Arnold (q.v.), and his peculiar views of theology, holding, e.g. that divine revelations still continue, that the symbolical books are useless, that the Eucharist and baptism are unnecessary, etc., he finally lost his position (1698). He afterwards traveled about, preaching in city halls and in cemeteries. At times he even entered churches, and preached in spite of the remonstrances of the ministers. He was arrested for this conduct in 1699, and became partially insane. He recovered, however, towards the close of the year 1700, and, by the interposition of his friends, he was granted a pension in 1708, which was continued until his death, August 5,1729. Horch was also a Millenarian; he likewise demanded a second and more complete reformation of the Church, advocated celibacy, though he did not think the married life sinful, and is said to have been a member of the Philadelphia Society (q.v.), founded in 1696 by Jane Leade. He wrote a number of works, of which a complete list is given by Jocher (Gel. Lex., Adelung's Supplem. 2, 2138 sq.), and of which the Mystische u. Prophetische Bibel (Marb. 1712, 4to) is especially celebrated as the forerunner of the Berleburg Bible (q.v.). See Haas (G. Fr. L.), Lebensbeschreib. d. Dr. Horch (Cassel, 1769, 8vo); Gobel (M.), Geschichte d. christliche Lebens in d. rhein. westph. ev. Kirche (Coblenz, 1852), 2, 741-51; Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, 6, 262 sq.; Fuhrmann, Handwörterbuch d. Kirchengesch. 2, 349 sq.; Theol. Univ. Lex. 2, 369. (J. H. W.)

## Hordicalia[[@Headword:Hordicalia]]

             (or Hordicidia), an ancient Roman festival, celebrated April 15, in honor of the goddess Tellus. On these occasions thirty pregnant cows were sacrificed.

## Hore Canoncae, etc[[@Headword:Hore Canoncae, etc]]

             SEE BREVIARY; SEE HOURS, CANONICAL; etc.

## Horeb[[@Headword:Horeb]]

             (Heb. Choreb', חוֹרֵבor חֹרֵב, desert; Sept. Χωρήβ or Χώρηβ; occurs Exo 3:1; Exo 17:6; Exo 33:6; Dent. 1, 2, 6, 19; 4:10, 15; 5:2; 9:8; 18:16; 29:1; 1Ki 8:9; 1Ki 19:8; 2Ch 5:10; Psa 104:19; Mal 4:4; Sir 48:7), according to some, a lower part or peak of Mount Sinai, so called at the present day, from which one ascends towards the south the summit of Sinai (Jebel Musa), properly so called (so Gesenius and others after Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, p. 566 sq.); but, according to others, a general name for the whole mountain, of which Sinai was a particular summit (so Hengstenberg, Auth. des Pentat. 2, 396; Robinson, Bibl. Researches, 1, 177, 551). SEE SINAI.

## Horebites[[@Headword:Horebites]]

             A sect of the Hussites, who, upon the death of Ziska, when they had retired from Bohemia, chose Bedricus of Bohemia as their leader. They called themselves Horebites because they had given the name of Horeb to a mountain to which they had retired. Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 20, 14, 688. SEE HUSSITES.

## Horem[[@Headword:Horem]]

             (Heb. Chorem', חַרֵםconsecrated [butfor-tress according to Furst]; Sept. ᾿Ωράμ [but most texts blend with preceding name into Μεγαλααρίμ,, or Μαγδαλιηωράμ], Vulg. Horemn), one of the “fenced cities” of Naphtali, mentioned between Migdal-el and BethAnath (Jos 19:38). Schwarz (Palest. p. 184) confounds it with the place preceding, and seeks to identify both in the modern village Medj el-Kerum, eight miles east of Akka; but this does not lie within the ancient limits of Naphtali (Keil, ad loc.). Van de Velde (1, 178, 9; Memoir, p. 322) suggests Hurah as the site of Horem. It is an ancient site, in the center of the country, half way between the Ras en- Nakhura and the lake Merom, on a tell at the southern end of the wady el- Ain, one of the natural features of the country. It is also in favor of this identification that Hurah is near Yarun, probably the representative of the ancient IRON, named with Horem. (Compare Seetzen, Reisen durch Syren, Berlin, 1854-9, 2, 130.)

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

             The Hurah, which is accepted by Conder (Tent Work, 2:337) and Tristram (Bible Places, page 274), but not by Saunders (O.T. Map), as the representative of this ancient site, is written Khurbet el-Kurah on the Ordnance Map, three and a half miles north-west from Yarfn (Iron), and so.in the accompanying Memnoirs (1:242), "heaps of stones and cisterns, on a small tell [mound]; a birkeh [pool] in the valley." This last authority suggests (1:205) "the present ruin Harah" whichis laid down at two miles south-east of Tibnln, and described (ibid. 118) as "heaps of small unhewn stones, with two olive-presses and a spring at the ruin;" an identification not adopted by Saunders. Horey, in the mythology of the negroes in East Africa, was a demon, having a resemblance to the devil, whose image probably reached Abyssinia through the Christians. Those people practise circumcision in the thirteenth or fourteenth year. Before the youths are thus dedicated they are exposed to the persecution of this evil spirit, who manifests his presence by a dull, deep howl or cry. As soon as this cry is heard, victuals are prepared and placed under a tree. They are always found to have been eaten. If the food does not suffice, Horey steals a boy and devours him, keeping him in his stomach until more food is brought,  whereupon he gives him up again. Many negroes affirm that they have been ten or twelve days in the stomach of this monster.

## Hori[[@Headword:Hori]]

             (Heb. Chori', חֹרַיor חוֹרַי, prob. a “troglodyte,” or dweller in a cave, חֹל, otherwise an auger; Sept. Χοῤῥοί, Οὐρί, and Χοῤῥέ; Vulg. Hori and Hurt), the name of two men.

1. A son of Lotan and grandson of Seir, of the aboriginal inhabitants of Idumaea (Gen 36:12; 1Ch 1:39). B.C. cir. 1964.

2. The father of Shaphat, which latter was the commissioner of the tribe of Simeon sent by Moses to explore the land of Canaan (Num 13:5). B.C. ante 1657.

3. (Gen 36:30.) SEE HORITE.

## Horim[[@Headword:Horim]]

             (Deu 2:12; Deu 2:22). SEE HORITE.

## Horite[[@Headword:Horite]]

             (Heb. Chori', חוֹרַיor חַרַי, prop. the same word as Hori; but, according to First, noble; often with the art. הִחֹרַי), a designation (both singly and collectively) of the people who anciently inhabited Mount Seir, before their supersedure by the Edomites; rendered “Horites” in Gen 14:6 (Sept. Χοῤῥῖοι, Vulg. Corrhaei),; 36:21 (Χορρῖος, Horrcaus), 29 (Χοῤῥί, fHorrcei); “Horite,” Gen 36:20 (Χοῤῥαῖος, Horrneus), “Horims,” Deu 2:12 (Χοῤῥαῖος, Horrhaeus), 22 (Χοῤῥαῖος, Horrheai), and “Hori,” Gen 36:30 (Χοῤῥί, Horrcei). SEE IDUMAEA. There are indications of Canaanitish affinity between the Horites and the Hittites or Hivites (Michaelis, Spicileg. 1, 169, and De Troglodytis Seir, in his Syntagma Comment. 1759, p. 194; Faber, Archaeol. p. 41; Hamelsveld, 3, 29; but see contra Bertheau, Gesch. der Isr. p. 150). SEE HITTITE. “Their excavated dwellings are still found by hundreds in the sandstone cliffs and mountains of Edom, and especially in Petra. SEE EDOM and SEE EDOMITE. It may, perhaps, be to the Horites Job refers in Job 30:6-7. They are only three times mentioned in Scripture: first, when they were smitten by the kings of the East (Gen 14:6); then when their genealogy is given in Gen 36:20-30, and 1Ch 1:38-42; and, lastly, when they were exterminated by the Edomites (Deu 2:12; Deu 2:22). It appears probable that they were not Canaanites, but an earlier race, who inhabited Mount Seir before the posterity of Canaan took possession of Palestine (Ewald, Geschichte, 1, 304, 5)” (Smith). Knobel (Volkertafel d. Géneralé, p. 195, 206) holds that they formed part of the great race of the Ludim, to which also the Rephaim, the Emim, and the Amorites belonged (comp. Hitzig, Gesch. d. V. Israel, Lpz. 1869, 1, 29-36). In this case the Amorites were of Shemitic descent. According to the account in Gen 36:20 sq., they were divided into seven tribes. SEE CANAAN.

## Hormah[[@Headword:Hormah]]

             (Heb. Chormah', חָרְמָה, devoted city, otherwise peak of a hill; Sept. ῾ερνά 5. r. occasionally ῾Ερμάθ and ἀνάθεμα), a royal city of the Canaanites in the south of Palestine (Jos 12:14; 1Sa 30:30),  near which the Israelites experienced a discomfiture from the Amalekites resident there, as they perversely attempted to enter Canaan by that route after the divine sentence of wandering (Num 14:45; Num 21:1-3; Deuteronomy 1, 44). Joshua afterwards besieged its king (Jos 15:30), and on its capture assigned the city to the tribe of Judah, but finally it was included in the territory given to Simeon (Jos 19:4; Jdg 1:17; 1Ch 4:30). It is elsewhere mentioned only in 1Ch 4:30. It was originally called ZEPHATH (Jdg 1:17), under which name it appears to have been again rebuilt and occupied by the Canaanites (see Bertheau, ad loc.; Hengstenberg, Pentat. 2, 220); whereas the name Hormah was probably given to the site by the Israelites in token of its demolition (see Num 21:3). Hence traces of the older name alone remain. SEE ZEPHATH.

## Horman (or Horeman), William[[@Headword:Horman (or Horeman), William]]

             an English author, was born at Salisbury, Wiltshire, about 1470. He was educated at Eton and at King's College, Cambridge, was made vice- provost of Eton, where he spent the remainder of his days, and died April 12,1535. He was one of the most general scholars of his age. He wrote on Orthography: — On the Quantities of Penultimate Syllables: — A Chronicle, Commentaries, and Indexes to the Chronicles of Others: — Commentaries on Gabriel Biel's Divinity: — On the Divorce of Henry VIII: On Cato, Varro, Columella, Palladius, De Re Rustica. Other books he left unfinished. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 3:335; Lowndes, Bibl. Manual, page 1119.

## Hormann, Simon[[@Headword:Hormann, Simon]]

             With the surname Bavarus, was prior in the monastery of Altenmünster St. Salvator, in Bavaria, and later general of the order. He died in 1701. His works are Breviarium una cum Missali Monialium, and an edition of Revelationes caelestes S. Brigittae, ordinis S. Salvatoris Fundatricis (Munich, 1680, fol.). — Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8, 537.

## Hormisdas[[@Headword:Hormisdas]]

             Pope, born at Frosinone, near Rome, was elected bishop of Rome in 514, as successor of Symmachus. In 515, by invitation of the Eastern emperor Anastasius, he sent an embassy to a council held at Heraclea for the purpose of settling the points of disunion between the Oriental and Occidental churches; but as this council, as well as a second one held in 517, did not bring about any favorable results, Anastasius, wearied by Hormisdas's refusal to make any concessions, broke off all relations with Rome. After his death in 518, his successor Justinus made another attempt at reconciliation, and the union of that Church with Rome was finally restored in 519, after a schism of thirty-five years. Hormisdas's conduct was much more measured in the controversy concerning Faustus of Rhegium, of whom he said that, though his writings may not deserve a place with those of the fathers, yet that such parts of them were to be received as did not conflict with the teachings of the Church. He died Aug. 6, 523. Eighty letters of Hormisdas are preserved in Labbe. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vol. 6; Labbe, Concilia, 4, 1415; Milman, Lat. Christ. 1,  342 sq.; Riddle, Papacy, 1, 199; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 2, 279 sq.; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 2, 325; Neander, Ch. History, 2, 533, 649 sq.; Hist. of Dogmas, p. 384; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctr. 2, 280; Dorner, Lehre v.d. Pers. Christi, 2, 156; Wetzer ü.Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 5, 329; Döllinger, Lehrb. d. Kirchengesch. 1, 151. SEE EUTYCHIANS. (J. H.W.)

## Horn[[@Headword:Horn]]

             (קֶרֶן, ke'ren, identical in root and signif. with the Latin cornu and English. horn; Gr. κέρας) is used in Scripture with a great latitude of meaning.

I. Literally (Jos 6:4-5; compare Exo 19:13; 1Sa 16:1; 1Sa 16:13; 1 Kings 1, 39; Job 42:14). — Two purposes are mentioned in the Scriptures to which the horn seems to have been applied. As horns are hollow and easily polished, they have in ancient and modern times been used for drinking vessels and for military purposes. They were especially convenient for holding liquids (1Sa 16:1; 1Sa 16:13; 1Ki 1:39), and were even made instruments of music (Jos 6:5).

1. Trumpets were probably at first merely horns perforated at the tip, such as are still used upon mountain farms for calling home the laborers at mealtime. If the A.V. of Jos 6:4-5 (“rams' horns,” קֶרֶן הִיּוֹבֵל) were correct, this would settle the question, SEE RAM'S HORN; but the fact seems to be that יוֹבֵל has nothing to do with ram, and that קֶרֶן, horn, serves to indicate an instrument which originally was made of horn, though afterwards, no doubt, constructed of different materials (comp. Varro, L. L. 5, 24,33, “cornua quod ea quae nunc sunt ex aere tune fiebant e cornu bubuli”). SEE CORNET. The horns, which were thus made into trumpets, were probably those of oxen rather than of rams: the latter would scarcely produce a note sufficiently imposing to suggest its association with the fall of Jericho. SEE TRUMPET.

2. The word “horn” is also applied to a flask, or vessel made of horn, containing oil (1Sa 16:1; 1Sa 16:13; 1Ki 1:39), or used as a kind of toilet bottle, filled with the preparation of antimony with which women tinged their eyelashes (Keren-happuch = paint-horn; name of one of Job's daughters, Job 42:14). So in English drinking-horn (commonly called a horn). In the same way the Greek κέρας sometimes signifies bugle, trumpet (Xenoph. An. 2, 2, 4), and sometimes drinking-horn (7, 2, 23). In  like manner the Latin cornu means trumpet, and also oil-cruet (Horace, Sat. 2, 2, 61), and funnel (Virgil, Georg. 3, 509). SEE INK HORN.

II. Metaphorically. — These uses of the word are often based upon some literal object like a horn, and at other times they are purely figurative.

1. From similarity of Form. — To this use belongs the application of the word horn to a trumpet of metal, as already mentioned. Horns of ivory, that is, elephants' teeth, are mentioned in Eze 27:15, either metaphorically, from similarity of form, or, as seems more probable, from a vulgar error. SEE IVORY. But more specific are the following metaphors:

(1.) The altar of burnt offerings (Exo 27:2) and the altar of incense (Exo 30:2) had each at the four corners four horns of shittim-wood, the first being overlaid with brass, the second with gold (Exo 37:25; Exo 38:2; Jer 17:1; Amo 3:14). Upon the horns of the altar of burnt offerings was to be smeared with the finger the blood of the slain bullock (Exo 29:12; Lev 4:7-18; Lev 8:15; Lev 9:9; Lev 16:18; Eze 43:20). By laying hold of these horns of the altar of burnt offering the criminal found an asylum and safety (1Ki 1:50; 1Ki 2:28), but only when the crime was accidental (Exo 21:14). These horns are said to have served as a means for binding the animal destined for sacrifice (Psa 118:27), but this use Winer (Handwörterb.) denies, asserting that they did not and could not answer for such a purpose. These altar- horns are, of course, not to be supposed to have been made of horn, but to have been metallic projections from the four corners (γωνίαικερατοειδεῖς, Josephus, War, 5, 5, 6). SEE ALTAR.

(2.) The peak or summit of a hill was called a horn (Isa 5:1, where hill= horn in Heb.; comp. κέρας, Xenophon, An. 5, 6, 7, and cornu, Stat. Theb. 5, 532; Arab. “Kurun Hattin,” Robinson, Bibl. Res. 2, 370; German Schreckhorn, Wetterhorn, Aarhorn; Celt. cairn).

In Isa 5:1, the emblematic vineyard is described as being literally “in a horn the son of oil,” meaning, as given in the English Bible, “a very fruitful hill” — a strong place like a hill, yet combining with its strength peculiar fruitfulness.

(3.) In Hab 3:4 (“he had horns coming out of his hand”) the context implies rays of light (comp. Deu 23:2).  The denominative קָרִן= “to emit rays,” is used of Moses's face (Exo 34:29-30; Exo 34:35): so all the versions except Aquila and the Vulgate, which have the translations κερατώδης ην, cornuta erat. This curious idea has not only been perpetuated by paintings, coins, and statues (Zornius, Biblioth. Antiq. 1, 121), but has at least passed muster with Grotius (Annot. ad loc.), who cites Aben-Ezra's identification of Moses with the horned Mnevis of Egypt, and suggests that the phenomenon was intended to remind the Israelites of the golden calf! Spencer (Leg. Hebrews 3, Diss. 1, 4) tries a reconciliation of renderings upon the ground that cornua=radii lucis; but Spanheim (Diss. 7, 1), not content with stigmatizing the efforts of art in this direction as “prepostera industria,” distinctly attributes to Jerome a belief in the veritable horns of Moses. SEE NIMBUS.

2. From similarity of Position and Use. — Two principal applications of this metaphor will be found — strength and honor. Of strength the horn of the unicorn, SEE UNICORN, was the most frequent representative (Dent. 32:17, etc.), but not always; comp. 1Ki 22:11, where probably horns of iron, worn defiantly and symbolically on the head, are intended. Expressive of the same idea, or perhaps merely a decoration, is the Oriental military ornament mentioned by Taylor (Calmet's Frag. c14), and the conical cap observed by Dr. Livingstone among the natives of S. Africa, and not improbably suggested by the horn of the rhinoceros, so abundant in that country (see Livingstone's Travels, p. 365,450, 557; comp. Taylor, 1. c.). Among the Druses upon Mount Lebanon the married women wear silver horns on their heads. The spiral coils of gold wire projecting oil either side from the female headdress of some of the Dutch provinces are evidently an ornament borrowed from the same original idea. But it is quite uncertain whether such dresses were known among the covenant people, nor do the figurative allusions in Scripture to horns render it in the least degree necessary to suppose that reference was made to personal ornaments of that description. (See below.)

In the sense of honor, the word horn stands for the abstract (my horn, Job 16:15; all the horns of Israel, Lam 2:3), and so for the supreme  authority (comp. the story of Cippus, Ovid, Met 15, 565; and the horn of the Indian sachem mentioned in Clarkson's Life of Penn).

Perhaps some such idea may be denoted by the horned conical cap peculiar to the regal apparel on the Ninevite sculptures. It also stands for concrete, whence it comes to mean king, kingdom (Dan 8:2, etc.; Zec 1:18; compare Tarquin's dream in Accius, ap. Cicero, Div. 1, 22); hence, on coins, Alexander and the Seleucidae wear horns (see cut in vol., p. 140), and the former is called in Arab. two-horned (Kor. 18:85 sq.), not without reference to Daniel 8. SEE GOAT.

Out of either or both of these last two metaphors sprang the idea of representing gods with horns. Spanheim has discovered such figures on the Roman denadrius, and on numerous Egyptian coins of the reigns of Trajan, Hadrian, and the Antonines (Diss.v., 353). The Bacchus Ταυροκέρως, or cornutus, is mentioned by Euripides (Bacch. 100), and among other pagan absurdities Arnobius enumerates “Dii cornuti” (c. Gent. 6). In like manner river gods are represented with horns (“tauriformis Aufidus,” Hor. Od. 4, 14, 25; ταυρόμορφον ὄμμα Κηφισοῦ, Eurip. Ion. 1261). For various opinions on the ground thought of this metaphor, see Notes and Queries,. 1, 419, 456. Manx legends speak of a tarroo-ushtey, 1.e. water-bull (see Cregeen's Manx Dict.). (See Bochart, Hieroz. 2, 288; and, for an admirable compendium, with references, Zornius, Bibliotheca Antiquaria, 2, 106 sq.).

Some of these metaphorical applications of the word horn require more special elucidation.

(1.) Symbolical. — As horns are the chief source of attack and defense with the animals to which God has given them, they serve in Scripture as emblems of power, dominion, glory, and fierceness (Dan 8:5; Dan 8:9; 1Sa 16:1; 1Sa 16:13; 1Ki 1:39; Jos 6:4-5; 1Sa 2:1; Psa 75:5; Psa 75:10; Psa 132:17; Luke 1, 69; Deu 33:17; Lam 2:3; Mic 4:13; Jer 48:25; Eze 29:21; Amo 6:13). In 1Ki 22:11, we find a striking display of symbolical action on the part of the false prophet Zedekiah. He made him horns of iron, and said, “Thus saith Jehovah, With these thou shalt push the  Syrians, until thou have consumed them.” Hence, to defile the horn in the dust (Job 16:2) is to lower and degrade one's self, and, on the contrary, to lift up, to exalt the horn (Psa 75:4; Psa 148:14), is poetically to raise one's self to eminent honor or prosperity, to bear one's self proudly (comp. also 1Ch 25:5). Something like this is found in the classic authors (see Horace, Carm. 3, 21,18). The expression “horn of salvation,” which Christ is called (Luke 1), is equivalent to a salvation of strength, or a Savior, who is possessed of the might requisite for the work (see Brünnings, Decornu salutis, Heid. 1743).

Horns were also the symbol of royal dignity and power; and when they are distinguished by number, they signify so many monarchies. Thus horn signifies a monarchy in Jer 48:25. In Zec 1:18, etc., the four horns are the four great monarchies, which had each of them subdued the Jews. The ten horns, says Dan 7:24, are ten kings. The ten horns, spoken of in Rev 13:1 as having ten crowns upon them, no doubt signify the same thing, for so we have it interpreted in Rev 17:12. The king of Persia is described by Ammianus Marcellinus as wearing golden rams' horns by way of diadem (69, 1). The effigy of Ptolemy with a ram's horn, as exhibited in ancient sculpture, is mentioned by Spanheim, Dissert. de Numism. Hence also the kings of Media and Persia are depicted by Daniel (Dan 8:20) under the figure of a horned ram. SEE RAM.

When it is said, in Dan 8:9, that out of one of. the four notable horns came forth a little horn, we are to understand that out of one of the four kingdoms represented by the four horns arose another kingdom, “which became exceeding great.” This is doubtless Antiochus Epiphanes; others refer it to one of the first Czesars; and others refer it to the Turkish empire, and will have Egypt, Asia, and Greece to be the three horns torn up or reduced by the Turk. SEE LITTLE HORN.

(2.) Ornamental. — In the East, at present, horns are used as an ornament for the head, and as a token of eminent rank (Rosenmüller, Morg. 4, 85). The women among the Druses on Mount Lebanon wear on their heads silver horns of native make, “which are the distinguishing badge of wifehood” (Bowring's Report on Syria, p. 8). “These tantours have grown, like other horns, from small beginnings to their present enormous size by slow degrees, and pride is the soil that nourished them. At first they consisted merely of an apparatus designed to finish off the headdress so as  to raise the veil a little from the face. Specimens of this primitive kind are still found in remote and semi-civilized districts. I have seen them only a few inches long, made of pasteboard, and even of common pottery. By degrees the more fashionable ladies used tin, and lengthened them; then rivalry made them of silver, and still further prolonged and ornamented them; until finally the princesses of Lebanon and Hermon sported gold horns, decked with jewels, and so long that a servant had to spread the veil over them. But the day for these most preposterous appendages to the female head is about over. After the wars between the Maronites and Druses in 1841 and 1845, the Maronite clergy thundered their excommunications against them, and very few Christians now wear them. Many even of the Druse ladies have cast them off, and the probability is that in a few years travelers will seek in vain for a horned lady” (Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 101). SEE HEADDRESS.

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

             Or, more properly, JOHN ROH (Cornu or Korn being a translation of the surname, which he assumed according to the usage of the times), was a distinguished bishop of the Ancient Unitas Fratrum, or Church of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. He was born at Yauss, in Bohemia, near the close of the 15th century. In 1518 he was ordained to the priesthood, and in 1529 consecrated bishop by a synod assembled at Brandeis, on the Adler. Three years later, (1532) he became senior bishop and president of the Ecclesiastical Council, which position he held until his death, governing the Unitas Fratrum with great wisdom, and furthering its interests with ardent zeal. Supported by John Augusta (q.v.), he inaugurated a new policy, which brought the Church out of its partial obscurity, and made it thereafter an important element in the national history of Bohemia. His immediate predecessor, Martin Skoda, had strictly abstained from all intercourse with the Reformers, following the principles established by Luke of Prague (q.v.). Horn, who had twice been a delegate to Luther (1522 and 1524), and who entertained a high regard for him and his work, reopened a correspondence with him, and induced the publication of a new Confession of the Brethren's faith at Wittenberg, with a commendatory preface of his own (1533). This led to a still closer fellowship, Horn sending two deputations to Luther in 1536, a third in the following year, and a fourth in 1542. In 1538 Luther published another and the principal Confession of the Church, again with a preface from Horn's pen. This Confession had been drawn up in 1535, and formally presented  to the emperor Ferdinand at Vienna (November 14) by several barons and divines in the name of the Unitas Fratrum. Encouraged by his intercourse with Luther, Horn also sent an embassy to the Swiss Reformers in 1540, which resulted in a correspondence with Bucer, Calvin, and others. Thus the Brethren joined hands with the Reformers in carrying on the great work of evangelical truth, and gave the earliest tokens of those efforts to bring about a union among all Protestants, which afterwards resulted in the Consensus Sendomiriensis of the Polish churches. The most important literary production of bishop Horn was the authorized edition of the German Hymn book of the Brethren, published in 1540. He died in 1547. Bishop Blaloslav, the illustrious historian and grammarian of the Church, wrote his biography, which is, however, no longer extant. (E. de S.)

## Hornbeck[[@Headword:Hornbeck]]

             SEE HOORNBECK.

## Hornberger, Lewis P., D.D[[@Headword:Hornberger, Lewis P., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, October 25, 1841. He was converted at the age of fifteen, graduated from Madison University in 1865, became pastor of Spring Garden Church, Philadelphia, the same year, in 1872 of Gethsemane Church, and died in that city, March 27, 1884. He was a very successful pastor. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. s.v.

## Hornblower, William Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Hornblower, William Henry, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Newark, N.J., March 21, 1820. He graduated from Princeton College in 1838; studied law one year; graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1842; became a missionary to "the Pines" in 1843; was ordained pastor at Paterson in 1844, and labored there with great success and usefulness until 1877, when he was elected by the General Assembly professor of homiletics, pastoral theology, sacred rhetoric, and Church government in the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny City, Pa. He died there, July 16, 1883. See N.Y. Observer, July 19, 1883; Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v.; Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1884, page 28. (W.P.S.)

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

             a native of Lincolnshire, bred a Carmelite, received his degree at Cambridge, flourished in 1374, and was buried at his convent in Boston. He participated in a great controversy over the priority of the Dominican and Carmelite orders, John Stock pleading for the precedency of the former, and Hornby preaching and writing for that of the latter. The judges were John Donwick, the chancellor, and the doctors of the university, and they confirmed the opinion of Hornby, under the seal of the university. Henry VIII made them friends by thrusting both out of the land. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 2:288.

## Horne, George, D.D[[@Headword:Horne, George, D.D]]

             An English prelate, was born at Otham, near Maidstone, Nov. 1, 1730. He was educated at University College, Oxford, where he devoted himself especially to the study of Hebrew and of the fathers. He became fellow of Magdalen in 1749, and president in 1768. In 1776 he was made vice chancellor of the University of Oxford, dean of Canterbury in 1781 and, finally, bishop of Norwich in 1789 to died Jan. 17, 1792. In his early youth he imbibed the doctrines of John Hutchinson (q.v.), and defended them in an Apology (1756), which is given in vol. 6 of his collected Works. He was considered the best preacher of his time, a sincere and exemplary Christian, and a thorough scholar. Many of his writings were controversial tracts, arising out of the Hutchinsonian theory, and the quarrels, which it provoked. His more important and durable works are, Commentary on the Psalms (Oxford, 1766, 2 vols. 4to, often reprinted) — Discourses on several Subjects and Occasions (London, 4th ed. 1803, 4 vols. 8vo). These, with his other writings, are collected in The Works of Bishop Horne, with his Life, by William Jones, of Nayland (London, 1795, 6 vols. 8vo). See Hook, Ecclesiastes Biography, 6:160; Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliograph. 1, 1541; Alibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 887; Home (T. H.), Bibliographical Appendix; Ch. Review, 1, 59; Bickersteth, Bib. Stud. Assist. p. 306, 319; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctr. 2, 419; Hardwick, Hist. of the Reformation, p. 252, n. 1; 253, n. 3.

## Horne, James Wesley, LL.D[[@Headword:Horne, James Wesley, LL.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born on the island of Jamaica, W.I., March 24, 1823. He graduated from Wesleyan University, Connecticut, in 1852, and in 1853 became the first principal of Monrovian Academy, Liberia, Africa. Returning in broken health to America, he joined the New York East Conference in 1858, and from that time (with the exception of a visit to Europe and the East in 1870) continued to fill important pastoral  positions until his sudden death, September 6, 1884. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1885, page 98; Alumi Record of Wesleyan University, 1883, pages 116, 586.

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

             A Nonconformist divine, born in 1615, was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. He became successively vicar of Allhallows, Lynn, Regis, and finally Norfolk in 1647. He was ejected for nonconformity in 1662, and died in 1676. “He was a learned man, of most exemplary and primitive piety, very ready in the Scriptures, skilled in the Oriental languages, and an Arminian in doctrine.” Shortly before his ejection he published The open Door for Alan's Approach to God, or A Vindication of the Record of God concerning the Extent of the Death of Christ. His other principal works are, The Brazen Serpent, or God's grand Design on Joh 3:14-15 (London 1673, 4to) — The best Exercise for Christians in the worst of Times, in Order to their Security against Profaneness and Apostasy — on Jude 20:21 (London 1671, sm. 8vo), etc. Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, 1, 1543; Stoughton (John), Ecclesiastes Hist. of England (London 1870, 2 vols. 8vo), 2, 407 sq.

## Horne, Melville[[@Headword:Horne, Melville]]

             A Wesleyan minister, born in England in the latter part of the last century, was originally a lay preacher of the Wesleyan societies, but by the advice, of his brethren he took orders in the Church of England, and went as missionary to Sierra Leone. On his return he was made vicar of Olney, later at Macclesfield, and finally went to West Thurrock, Essex. He died in the early part of the present century. Horne is known especially by his Letters on Missions, addressed to the Protestant Ministers of the British Churches (1794, 8vo; reprinted at Boston, 1835), which, it is generally believed, “prompted the first counsels that led to the formation of the London Missionary Society (comp. Ellis's Hist. of London Miss. Soc. 1, 13-15; Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, 2, 295 sq.). He published also several of his sermons (1791-1811), and an Investigation of the Definition of Justifying Faith (1809, 12mo).

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

             an English prelate of the 16th century, was born in Durham, educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, advanced dean of Durham in 1551, and prebend of York in 1552, but in the persecution under Mary he fled to Germany, and, fixing his residence at Frankfort, became the head of the episcopal party. On returning to England he was made bishop of Winchester, February 16, 1560. He was a worthy man, but ground between the papists and sectaries, who sported with his name, and twitted his person as dwarfish and deformed, apparently having no worthy cause for their opposition. He died in Southwark, June 1, 1580. He published an answer to Fuckenhlam's Declaration of Scruples of Conscience (1566), touching the oaths of supremacy. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 1:482.

## Horne, Thomas Hartwell, D.D[[@Headword:Horne, Thomas Hartwell, D.D]]

             An English Biblical scholar, born October 20, 1780, was educated at Christ's Hospital. At first he became clerk to a barrister. Devoting his leisure hours to the study of the Bible, in 1818 he published his Introduction to the critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures (which has now reached the 11th edition, and is enlarged from 3 to 5 vols. 8vo; it has also been reprinted in this country in 2 vols. imp. 8vo, and 4  vols. 8vo), a work which procured for him admission into orders without the usual preliminaries. Subsequently St. John's College, Cambridge, conferred on him the degree of B.D., and two American colleges that of D.D. In 1824 he found employment in the library of the British Museum as assistant in the department of printed books. In 1833 archbishop Howley appointed him to the rectories of St. Edmund and St. Nicholas, London, which positions he held until his death, Jan. 27,1862. Home was for some years actively engaged in the work of Methodism, numbering among his friends Dr. Adam Clarke and Dr. Bunting. He entered the ministry of the Church of England in deference to the earnest desire of his father with the hope of securing leisure for literary pursuits, but he always maintained a hearty interest in the Church of his early choice, and preserved to the end of his life that simple and earnest godliness which Methodism had taught him to cultivate in his youthful days. He was distinguished as a polemic of considerable ability; his controversial writings alone would have given him a high status among the men of his time; and his versatility is further attested by the variety of his publications, many of which are given to subjects not usually treated by scholars and divines. His researches in bibliography were conducted with amazing industry, and tabulated with great judgment and skill. But he will be best known to posterity by his Introduction to the critical Study of the Scriptures (referred to above), which, at the time of its first appearance, was a marvel of labor and scholarship. Hundreds of Biblical students owe their taste for critical pursuits to the reading of this work; and, though somewhat below the spirit and results of the more recent criticisms, it is yet invaluable to those whose resources will not permit the large outlay, which the collection of a critical library demands. The most important of his other works are, Compend. Introduction to the Study of the Bible, or Analysis of the Introduction to the Holy Scriptures (12mo, 1827) — Deism Refuted, or plain Reasons for being a Christian (12mo, 1819) — Romanism contradictory to Scripture, or the peculiar Tenets of the Church of Rome, as exhibited in her accredited Formularies, contrasted with the Holy Scriptures (12mo, 1827) — Mariolatry, or Facts and Evidences demonstrating the Worship of the blessed Virgin Mary by the Church of Rome (2nd ed. 1841) — The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity (12mo) — Manual of Parochial Psalmody (18mo, 1829) — Manual for the Afflicted (18mo, 1832), etc. A list of all the productions of Dr. Home is given by Allibone (Dict. of Authors, 1, 889-892). See Reminiscences, personal and bibliographical, of Thomas Hartwell Horne, with Notes by his daughter, Sarah Anne  Cheyne, and a short Introduction by the Rev. Joseph B. M'Caul (London 1862); Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 419; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. 2, 324; Keil, Introduction to N.T. p. 38; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 1, 154 sq.; Vorth 4 Am. Review, 17, 130 sq.; Journ. Sac. Lit. 5, 29, 250. (J. H. W.)

## Horneck, Anthony, D.D.[[@Headword:Horneck, Anthony, D.D.]]

             An English divine, was born at Baccharack, in the Lower Palatinate, in 1641. He studied at Heidelberg and at Leyden, and finally went to England, and entered Queen's College, Oxford, at the age of nineteen. Two years after he became tutor to lord Torrington, who gave him the living of Doulton, in Devonshire, and procured him a prebend in the church of Exeter. In 1671 he was chosen preacher at the Savoy, upon which he resigned his living in Devonshire. Admiral Russel, afterwards earl of Orford, recommended him to the queen for preferment, and, by the advice of Dr. Tillotson, then archbishop, he was presented to the prebendary of Westminster in 1693. He died Jan. 31,1697. He was a good linguist, a learned divine, an excellent preacher, and a faithful pastor. His church was so crowded that it was often difficult for him to reach the pulpit. In the reign of James II, when it became clear that there was danger of a revival of popery, he spared no pains in resisting the movement. His zeal for the promotion of practical religion was incessant; and, among other means, he made use of the so called Religious Societies of the time, of which, indeed, some suppose him to have been the original founder. The rules of these societies seem in some points to have suggested to Wesley his class meetings (q.v.). The following is a summary of them:

“1. All that enter the society shall resolve upon a holy and serious life.

2. No person shall be admitted into the society until he has arrived at the age of sixteen, and has been first confirmed by the bishop, and solemnly taken upon himself his baptismal vows.

3. The members shall choose a minister of the Church of England to direct them.

4. They shall not be allowed in their meetings to discourse on any controverted point of divinity.

5. Neither shall they discourse on the government of Church or State.

6. In their meetings they shall use no prayers but those of the Church, such as the litany and collects, and other prescribed prayers; but still they shall not use any that peculiarly belongs to the minister, as the absolution.

7. The minister whom they choose shall direct what practical divinity shall be read at these meetings.

8. They shall have liberty, after prayer and reading, to sing a psalm.

9. After all is done, if there be time left, they may discourse to each other about their spiritual concerns; but this shall not be a standing exercise which any shall be obliged to attend to.

10. One day in the week shall be appointed for this meeting for such as cannot come on the Lord's day; and he that absents himself without cause shall pay three pence to the box.

11. Every time they meet they shall give sixpence to the box.

12. On a certain day in the year, viz. Whit Tuesday, two stewards shall be chosen, and a moderate dinner provided, and a sermon preached; and the money distributed (necessary charges deducted) to the poor.

13. A book shall be bought in which these orders shall be written.

14. None shall be admitted into this society without the consent of the minister who presides over it; and no apprentice shall be capable of being chosen.

15. If any case of conscience shall arise, it shall be brought before the minister.

16. If any members think fit to leave the society he shall pay five shillings to the stock.

17. The major part of the society shall conclude the rest.

18. The following rules are more especially recommended to the members of this society, viz.: To love one another. When reviled, not to revile again. To speak evil of no man. To wrong no man. To pray, if possible, seven times a day. To keep close to the Church of England. To transact all things peaceably and gently. To be helpful to each other. To use themselves to holy thoughts in their coming in and going out. To examine themselves every night. To give every one their due. To obey superiors, both spiritual  and temporal.” Dr. Horneck's writings include the following: Sermons on the fifth of St. Matthew, with The Life of the Author, by Richard (Kidder), lord bishop of Bath and Wells (London 2nd ed. 1706, 2 vols. 8vo) — The crucified Jesus, or A Treatise on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, etc. (London, 6th edit. 1716, 8vo) — The great Law of Consideration (London 11th ed. 1729, 8vo). — The happy Ascetic, or the best Exercise (on 1Ti 4:7), to which is added A Letter concerning the holy Lives of the primitive Christians (London 3rd ed. enlarged, 1693, 8vo) — The Fire of the Altar, A Preparation for the Lord's Supper (London, 13th ed. 1718, 12mo) — Sermon on Rom 8:20 (London 1677, 4to). — Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliograph. 1, 1547; Hook, Ecclesiastes Biography, 6, 166; Birch, Life of Tillotson.

## Hornejus (Horney) Konrad[[@Headword:Hornejus (Horney) Konrad]]

             A German Lutheran divine, was born in Brunswick Nov. 25, 1590. He studied theology, philosophy, and philology at Helmstadt, where he settled in 1612. Here he became professor of logic and ethics in 1619, and of theology in 1628. He died Sept. 26, 1649. As a theologian, especially in the Synergistic controversy (q.v.), he was distinguished for his moderation. His principal works are, Disputationes ethicae (Helmst. 1618; 7th ed. 1666) — Exercitationes et disputationes logicae (1621) — Disputationes metaphysicae (1622) — Institutiones logicae (1623) — Compendium dialecticce succinctun (1623; 12th ed. 1666) — Compendium historie eccles. (1649) — Commentar z. Hebraer und den Katholischen Briefen (1654) — Compendium theologie (Brunsw. 1655). Pierer, Universal- Lexikon, 8, 542; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 265; Gass, Dogmengesch. 2, 147, 159, 210; Kurtz, Ch. Hist. 2, 201.

## Hornemann, Claudius Frees Von[[@Headword:Hornemann, Claudius Frees Von]]

             a Danish theologian, born in 1751, was in 1801 professor of theology at Copenhagen, and died in 1830. He wrote, Specimen Exercitationum Crit.  in Versiona. LXX Interpr. ex Philone (1-3, Gottingen, 1773-78): — Observationes ad Illustrationem Doctrinae de Canone Vet. Test. ex Philone (Copenhagen, 1775): — Sylloge Lectionum Variorum LXX (1773): — Observationes de Harmonia Linguarum Orientalium, Ebraicae, Chaldaicae, Syriaces et Arabiae (1826-29): — Scripta Genuina Graec. Patrum Apostolicor., Graece et Latine, Edidit (1828, 2 volumes). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:51, 77, 882; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:407 sq. (B.P.)

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

             a minister of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. He was Dr. McDowel's colleague in Mary's Abbey, Dublin, ordained co-pastor in 1791, and died in January 1843. He was intrusted by the synod of Ulster with the management of much of its public business, "and was remarkable for his tact and shrewdness." He was one of the first missionary agents of the synod, and was also appointed by it on the committee for the preparation of a code of discipline. See Reid, Hist. of the Presb. Church in Ireland.

## Hornet or Wasp[[@Headword:Hornet or Wasp]]

             (צַרְעָה, tsirah', Exo 23:28; Deu 7:20; Jos 24:12; Sept. σφηκία, Vulg. crabro). The Heb. term appears to be indicative of stinging; and the ancient versions with the Rabbins favor the interpretation of “hornet” rather than “wasp,” as appears from the application of the above Greek and Latin words (comp. Aristotle, Hist. Anim. 5, 19, 617; 9, 65, 66; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 11, 24). The above passages in which the word occurs refer to some means of expulsion of the Canaanites before the Israelites. Not only were bees exceedingly numerous in Palestine, but from the name Zoreah (Jos 15:33) we may infer  that hornets in particular infested some parts of the country: the frequent notices of the animal in the Talmudical writers (Lewysohn, Zool. § 405) lead to the same conclusion. Gesenius, however, maintains that the term is not to be taken in a literal sense, but metaphorically, as the symbol of the panic with which God would inspire the inhabitants, adducing the expressions “terror of God” (Gen 35:5), “mighty destruction” (Deu 7:23), and the antithesis of the angel to defend them (Exo 23:20, etc.), in favor of this interpretation (see Thesaur. Heb. p. 1186). Indeed, the following arguments seem to decide in favor of a metaphorical sense: (1) that the word “hornet” in Exo 23:28 is parallel to “fear” in Exo 23:27; (2) that similar expressions are undoubtedly used metaphorically, e.g. “to chase as the bees do” (Deuteronomy 1, 44; Psa 118:12); (3) that a similar transfer from the literal to the metaphorical sense may be instanced in the classical aestrus, originally a “gad-fly,” afterwards terror and madness; and, lastly (4), that no historical notice of such intervention as hornets occurs in the Bible. We may therefore regard it as expressing under a vivid image the consternation with which Jehovah would inspire the enemies of the Israelites, as declared in Deu 2:25; Jos 2:11. Among the moderns, Michaelis has defended the figurative sense.

In addition to other reasons for it, he doubts whether the expulsion of the Canaanites could be effected by swarms of σφηκίαι, and proposes to derive the Hebrew from a root signifying “scourges,” “plagues,” scutica plagae, etc. (Supplem. ad Lexic. Hebr. 6, 2154); but his reasons are ably refuted by Rosenmüller, apud Bochart (Hieroz. Lips. 1796, 3, ch. 13, p. 402, etc.). In favor of the possibility of such an event, it is observed that AElian relates that the Phaselitae were actually driven from their locality by such means (Φασηλίτας δὲ σφῆκες κ.τ.λ.. Hist. Anim. 9, 28), and Bochart has shown that these Phaselitae were a Phoenician people (ut sup. p. 412). For a parallel case of an army being seriously molested by hornets, see Ammian. Marcell. 24, 8. Even Rosenmüller himself adopts the figurative sense in his Scholia on Exo 23:28; but on Jos 24:12 he retracts that opinion, and amply refutes it. His reasonings and refutations have been adopted by numerous writers (among others, see Paxton's Illustrations of Scripture 1, 303, etc., Edinb. 1819). Michaelis's doubt of the abstract possibility seems very unreasonable when the irresistible power of bees and wasps, etc., attested by numerous modern occurrences, and the thin and partial clothing of the Canaanites, are considered. It is observable that the event is represented by the author of the apocryphal book of Wisdom (12, 8) as a  merciful dispensation, by which the Almighty, he says, “spared as men the old inhabitants of his holy land,” and “gave them place for repentance.” If the hornet, considered as a fly, was in any way connected with their idolatry, the visitation would convey a practical refutation of their error. Ewald (Gesch. d. V. Israel, 3rd ed. Getting. 1864-8, 2:116 sq.) connects the word (reading צָרְעָה i.q. צראעת) with Manetho's story (Josephus, Apion, 1, 26) of the expulsion of the Israelites from Egypt on account of a disease. See BAALZEBUB.

The hornet (Vespa crabro) is a hymenopterous insect with six legs and four wings. It bears a general resemblance to ‘the common wasp, but is of a darker color, and much larger. It is exceedingly fierce and voracious, especially in hot climates, but even in Western countries its sting is frequently dangerous. Roberts observes on Deu 7:20, “The sting of the hornet and wasp of the East is much more poisonous than in Europe, and the insect is larger in size. I have heard of several who died from having a single sting; and not many days ago, as a woman was going to a well ‘to draw water,' a hornet stung her in the cheek, and she died the next day. The god Siva is described as having destroyed many giants by hornets.” It may be remarked, that the hornet, no less than the whole species of wasps, renders an essential service in checking the multiplication of flies and other insects, which would otherwise become intolerable to man; and that in regard to their architecture, and especially their instincts and habits, they do not yield to their more popular congener, the bee, but even, in several respects, greatly excel it. The hornet, in common with the other social wasps, displays great ingenuity in the manufacture of its nest. It is made of a coarse gray paper, much like the coarsest wrapping paper, but less firm. This is arranged in several globose leaves, one over the other, not unlike the outer leaves of a cabbage, the base of which is attached by a small footstalk to the upper part of the cavity in which it is enclosed. Within this protecting case the combs are built in parallel rows of cells, exactly like those of the bee, but made of paper, and ranged horizontally instead of vertically, and in single series, the entrances always being downwards. Each story is connected with that above it by a number of pillars of the common paper, thick and massive. These cells do not contain honey, but merely the eggs, and in due time, the young, being in fact nursing cradles. The paper with which the hornet builds is formed either from decayed wood or the bark of trees, the fibers of which it abrades by means of its jaws, and kneads into a paste with viscid saliva. When a  morsel as large as a pea is prepared, the insect flies to the nest and spreads out the mass in a thin layer at the spot where it is required, molding it into shape with the jaws and feet. It is soon dry, and forms real paper, coarser than that of the common wasp. (Kirby and Spence, Introduct. to Entomology, 8vo, London 1828, 1, 273, 274; Raumur, Histoire des Insectes, vol. 6, Mem. 6, 4to, Par. 1734-42; Wood, Bible Animals, London 1869, p. 614 sq.). SEE WASP.

## Horning, Friedrich Theodor[[@Headword:Horning, Friedrich Theodor]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1809 in Alsace. In 1835 he was pastor at Grafenstaden, in 1845 at Strasburg, and died there in 1882, president of the consistory. Horning was a strict Lutheran, and founded, in 1849, the Lutheran Missionary Society. He wrote, Evangelisch - lutherische Kirche: — and with Rittelmeyer he published, in 1863, Gesangbuch fur Christen Augsburger Confession. He also edited Kirchenblatt fur die Kirche Augsburger Confession. See Lichteriberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v. (B.P.).

## Horologion[[@Headword:Horologion]]

             (ὡρολόγιον, literally Adial) is the title of one of the “office-books” of the orthodox Eastern Church. It contains the daily hours of prayer, so far as respects their immovable portions, and answers in a. measure to the Officium Hebdomade which is found at: the opening of each volume of the breviary of the Eastern Church. But it generally contains also other formularies of that Church. See Neale, Introduction to the Hist. of the Eastern Church, 2, 848. SEE HOURS.

## Horon[[@Headword:Horon]]

             SEE BETH-HORON; SEE HORONAIM.

## Horonaim[[@Headword:Horonaim]]

             (Heb. Chorona'yim, חֹרֹנִיַם, two caverns; Sept. Α᾿ρωνιείμ and ᾿Ωρωναϊvμ), a Moabitish city near Zoar, Luhith, Nimrim, etc., on a declivity along the route of the invading Assyrians (Isa 15:5; Jer 48:3; Jer 48:5; Jer 48:34); probably the same called HOLON (חֹלוֹן, perhaps by an error for חֹרוֹן, Horon, which would appear to be the original form of the word Horonaim; from חֹר, a hole) in Jer 48:22 (Sept. Χελών,Vulg. Helon). The associated names only afford a conjectural locality east of the north end of the Dead Sea, probably on some one of the great roads (דֶּרֶךְ) leading down from the plateau of Moab to the Jordan valley. It is doubtless the Oronse (᾿Ωρῶναι) of Josephus (Ant. 13, 15, 4; 14, 1, 4). Sanballat “the Horonite” (חֹרֹנַי, Neh 2:10; Neh 2:19; Neh 13:28) was probably a native of this place, and not (as stated by Schwarz, Palestine, p. 147) of Beth- horon, which was entirely different.

## Horonite[[@Headword:Horonite]]

             [many Hor'onite] (Heb. with the art. ha-Clhoroni', הִחֹרֹנַי; Sept. οΑ῾᾿ρωνί, Οὐρανίτης, Vulg. Horonites), the designation of Sanballat (q.v.), who was one of the principal opponents of Nehemiah's works of restoration (Neh 2:10; Neh 2:19; Neh 13:28). It is derived by Gesenius (Thes. p. 459) from Horonaim, the Moabitish town, but by Furst (Handw.) from Horon, i.e. Bethhoron. The latter supposition agrees with the local relations of Sanballat towards the Samaritans, but the ‘former suits better his heathenish affinities, as well as the simple form of the primitive.

## Horror[[@Headword:Horror]]

             a passion excited by an object which causes a high degree of fear and detestation. It is a compound of wonder and fear. Sometimes it has a mixture of pleasure, from which, if predominant, it is denominated a pleasing horror. Such a horror, seizes us at the view of vast and hanging precipices, a tempestuous ocean, or wild and solitary places. This passion is the original of superstition, as a wise and welltempered awe is of religion. Horror and terror seem almost to be synonymous; but the former refers more to what disgusts, the latter to that which alarms us. Horse- sacrifice, a ceremony celebrated by various ancient nations, in which a  horse was offered in sacrifice to a deity, usually the sun. The Massagetee, a great and powerful nation, whose territories extended beyond the Araxes to the extreme parts of the East, sacrificed horses to the sun. The practice prevailed in Persia in the time of Cyrus, and may have been anterior to that sovereign. Horses were sacrificed to Neptune and the deities of the rivers, being precipitated into the sea or into the rivers. The Lacedemonians sacrificed a horse to the winds, which, by their force, carried the ashes of the victim to a distance. Among the ancient Romans a horse was sacrificed annually to Mars in the Campus Martius, in the month of October. The blood that dropped from the tail of the October horse, as it was called, was carefully preserved by the vestal virgins in the temple of Vesta, for the purpose of being used at the Palilia or shepherd festival. In the Rig Veda are two hymns in honor of the horse-sacrifice, called Aswanzedha, which describe the horse as "bathed, and decorated with rich trappings, the variously-colored goat going before him." The horse is led three times round the sacrificial fire; he is then bound to a post and slaughtered with an ax; and the flesh is roasted on a spit, boiled, made into balls, and eaten; and finally "The horse proceeds to that assembly which is most excellent; to the presence of his father and his mother (heaven and earth). Go, horse, today, rejoicing to the gods, that (the sacrifice) may yield blessings to the donor." The horse-sacrifice at this day is one of the great annual ceremonies of the Hindus.

## Horse[[@Headword:Horse]]

             סוּס,sias, ἵππος, of frequent occurrence; other less usual or proper terms and epithets are סוּסָהּ, susah', a mnare, rendered “company of horses,” i.e. cavalry, Song of Solomon 1, 9; פָּרָשׁ, parash', Ahorse for riding, “horseman,” of frequent occurrence; רֶכֶבor רָכִב, re'keb or Raakab,' a beast of burden, also a chariot, charioteer, or chariot-horse, especially a team, variously rendered, and of frequent occurrence; אִבַּיר, abbir', “strong,” as an epithet of the horse, only in Jeremiah, as Jer 8:16; Jer 47:3; Jeremiah 1, 11; רֶכֶּשׁ, re'kesh, a horse of a nobler breed, a courser, rendered “dromedary” in 1Ki 4:8; “mule,” Est 8:10; Est 8:14; “swift beast,” Mic 1:13; רִמָּךְ, ramm-ak', a mare, rendered “dromedary,” Est 8:10. The origin of the first two of these terms is not satisfactorily made out; Pott (E'tym. Forsch. 1, 60) connects them respectively with Susa and Pares, or Persia, as the countries whence the horse was derived; and it is worthy of remark that sus was also employed in Egypt for a — marme, showing that it was a foreign term there, if not also in Palestine. There is a marked distinction between the sus and the parash; the former were horses for driving in the war-chariot, of a heavy build, the latter were for riding, and particularly for cavalry. This distinction is not observed in the A.V. from the circumstance that parash also signifies horseman; the correct sense is essential in the following passages 1Ki 4:26, “forty- thousand chariot-horses and twelve thousand cavalry-horses;” Eze 27:14, “driving-horses and riding-horses;” Joe 2:4, “as riding-horses, so shall they run;” and Isa 21:7, “a train of horses in couples.”

The most striking feature in the Biblical notices of the horse is the exclusive application of it to warlike operations; in no instance is that  useful animal employed for the purposes of ordinary locomotion or agriculture, if we except Isa 28:28, where we learn that horses (A.V. “horsemen”) were employed in threshing, not, however, in that case put in the gears, but simply driven about wildly over the strewed grain. This remark will be found to be borne out by the historical passages hereafter quoted, but it is equally striking in the poetical parts of Scripture. The animated description of the horse in Job 39:19-25, applies solely to the war-horse; the mane streaming in the breeze (A.V. “thunder”) which “clothes his neck;” his lofty bounds as a grasshopper;” his hoofs “digging in the valley” with excitement; his terrible snorting are brought before us, and his ardor for the strife. The following is a close rendering of this fine description of the war-horse: Canst thou give to the horse prowess?

Canst thou clothe his neck [with] a shuddering [mane]? Canst thou make him prance like the locust? The grandeur of his snorting [is] formidable. They will [eagerly] paw in the valley, And [each] rejoice in vigor; He will go forth to meet [the] weapon: He will laugh at dread, Nor will he cower, Nor' retreat from before [the] sword: Against him may rattle quiver, Flaming lance or dart [in vain]. With prancing and restlessness he will absorb [the earth [by fleetness]; Nor can he stand still when the sound of the trumpet [is heard]: As oft [as the] trumpet [sounds], he will say, “Aha!” For from afar he can scent [the battle], The thunder of the captains and shouting.

So, again, the bride advances with her charms to an immediate conquest “as a company of horses in Pharaoh's chariots” (Son 1:9); and when the prophet Zechariah wishes to convey the idea of perfect peace, he represents the horse, no more mixing in the fray as before (Song of Solomon 9:10), but bearing on his bell (which was intended to strike terror into the foe) the peaceable inscription, “Holiness unto the Lord” (Song of Solomon 14:20). Lastly, the characteristic of the horse is not so much his speed or his utility, but his strength (Psa 33:17; Psa 147:10), as shown in the special application of the term abbir (אִבַּיר), i.e. strong, as an equivalent for a horse (Jer 8:16; Jer 47:3; Jeremiah 1, 11). Hence the horse becomes the symbol of war, or of a campaign (Zec 10:3; comp.  Psa 45:5; Deu 32:13; Psa 56:12; Isa 58:14, where horsemanship is made typical of conquest), especially of speedy conquest (Jer 4:13), or rapid execution of any purpose (Revelation 6).

The Hebrews in the patriarchal age, as a pastoral race, did not stand in need of the services of the horse, and for a long period after their settlement in Canaan they dispensed with it, partly in consequence of the hilly nature of the country, which only admitted of the use of chariots in certain localities (Jdg 1:19), and partly in consequence of the prohibition in Deu 17:16, which would be held to apply at all periods. Accordingly they hamstrung the horses of the Canaanites (Jos 11:6; Jos 11:9). David first established a force of cavalry and chariots after the defeat of Hadadezer (2Sa 8:4), when he reserved a hundred chariots, and, as we may infer, all the horses; for the rendering “houghed all the chariot-horses” is manifestly incorrect. Shortly after this Absalom was possessed of some (2Sa 15:1). But the great supply of horses was subsequently effected by Solomon through his connection with Egypt; he is reported to have had “40,000 stalls of horses for his chariots, and 12,000 cavalry-horses” (1Ki 4:26), and it is worthy of notice that these forces are mentioned parenthetically to account for the great security of life and property noticed in the preceding verse.

There is probably an error in the former of these numbers; for the number of chariots is given in 1Ki 10:26; 2Ch 1:14, as 1400, and consequently, if we allow three horses for each chariot, two in use and one as a reserve, as was usual in some countries (Xenoph. Cyrop. 6, 1, § 27), the number required would be 4200, or, in round numbers, 4000, which is probably the correct reading. Solomon also established a very active trade in horses, which were brought by dealers out of Egypt, and resold at a profit to the Hittites, who lived between Palestine and the Euphrates. The passage in which this commerce is described (1Ki 10:28-29) is unfortunately obscure; the tenor of 1Ki 10:28 seems to be that there was a regularly established traffic, the Egyptians bringing the horses to a mart in the south of Palestine, and handing them over to the Hebrew dealers at a fixed tariff. The price of a horse was fixed at 150 shekels of silver, and that of a chariot at 600; in the latter we must include the horses (for an Egyptian war-chariot was of no great value), and conceive, as before, that three horses accompanied each chariot, leaving the value of the chariot itself at 150 shekels. In addition to this source of supply, Solomon received  horses by way of tribute (1Ki 10:25). He bought chariots and teams of horses in Egypt (1Ki 10:28), and probably in Armenia, “in all lands” and had them brought into his dominions in strings, in the same manner as horses are still conducted to and from fairs for this interpretation, as offered by professor Paxton, appears to convey the natural and true meaning of the text; and not “strings of linen yam,” which here seem to be out of place (2Ch 1:16-17; 2Ch 9:25; 2Ch 9:28). The cavalry force was maintained by the succeeding kings, and frequent notices occur both of riding-horses and chariots (2Ki 9:21; 2Ki 9:33; 2Ki 11:16), and particularly of war-chariots (1Ki 22:4; 2Ki 3:7; Isa 2:7). The force seems to have failed in the time of Hezekiah (2Ki 18:23) in Judah, as it had previously in Israel under Jehoahaz (2Ki 13:7). Josiah took away the horses, which the kings of Judah, his predecessors, had consecrated to the sun (2Ki 23:11). SEE SUN. The number of horses belonging to the Jews on their return, from Babylon is stated at 736 (Neh 7:68).

In the countries adjacent to Palestine the use of the horse was much more frequent. It was introduced into Egypt probably by the Hyksos, as it is not represented on the monuments before the 18th dynasty (Wilkinson, 1, 386, abridgm.). Yet these animals are not mentioned among the presents which Abraham received from Pharaoh (Gen 12:16), and occur first in Scripture among the valuables paid by the Egyptians to Joseph in exchange for grain (Gen 47:17). They were still sufficiently important to be expressly mentioned in the funeral procession, which accompanied the body of Jacob to his sepulcher in Canaan (Gen 1:9). At the period of the Exodus horses were abundant in Egypt (Exo 9:3; Exo 14:9; Exo 14:23; Deu 17:17), and subsequently, as we have already seen, they were able to supply the nations of Western Asia. The Tyrians purchased these animals from Solomon, and in the time of Ezekiel imported horses themselves from Togarmah or Armenia (Eze 27:14). The Jewish kings sought the assistance of the Egyptians against the Assyrians in this respect (Isa 31:1; Isa 36:8; Eze 17:15). The Canaanites were possessed of them (Dent. 20:1; Jos 11:4; Jdg 4:3; Jdg 5:22; Jdg 5:28),  and likewise the Syrians (2Sa 8:4; 1Ki 20:1; 2Ki 6:14; 2Ki 7:7; 2Ki 7:10) notices, which are confirmed by the pictorial representations on Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, 1, 393, 397, 401), and by the Assyrian inscriptions relating to Syrian expeditions. But the cavalry of the Assyrians themselves and other Eastern nations was regarded as most formidable; the horses themselves were highly bred, as the Assyrian sculptures still testify, and fully merited the praise bestowed on them by Habakkuk (Hab 1:8),” swifter than leopards, and more fierce than the evening wolves;” their riders “clothed in blue, captains and rulers, all of them desirable young men” (Eze 23:6), armed with “the bright sword and glittering spear” (Nah 3:3), made a deep impression on the Jews, who, plainly clad, went on foot; as also did their regular array as they proceeded in couples, contrasting with the disorderly troops of asses and camels which followed with the baggage (Isa 21:7, rekeb in this passage signifying rather a train than a single chariot). The number employed by the Eastern potentates was very great, Holofernes possessing not less than 12.000 (Jdt 2:15). At a later period we have frequent notices of the cavalry of the Graeco-Syrian monarchs (1Ma 1:18; 1Ma 3:39, etc.).

The above notices of the use of the horse by the ancient Egyptians derives abundant illustration from their monuments. In the sculptured battle- scenes, which are believed to represent victories of Sesostris, or of Thothmes II and III, over nations of Central Asia, it is evident that the enemy's armies, as well as the foreign allies of Egypt, were abundantly supplied with horses, both for chariots and for riders; and in triumphal processions they are shown as presents or tribute-proving that they were portions of the national wealth of conquered states sufficiently valuable to be prized in Egypt. That the Assyrians and Babylonians were equally well supplied with this valuable animal is likewise attested by the martial scenes depicted on the sculptures discovered among the ruins of Nineveh and the vicinity. They are represented in almost every variety of position and employment, such as the chase, and for other purposes of pleasure; but chiefly in war, for which the Assyrians used them both with the saddle and in the: chariot. According to Mr. Layard (Nineveh, 1st series, 1, 275 sq.), the horses of the Assyrians were well formed and of noble blood, as  appears from the figures no doubt faithfully copied on the sculptures. Cavalry formed an important part of the Assyrian army. The horsemen carried the bow and spear, and wore coats of mail, high greaves, and the pointed helmet. Their horses also were covered, and even, it would seem, with a kind of leather armor, from the head to the tail, to protect them from the arrows of the enemy. It consisted of several pieces fastened together by buttons or loops. Over it was thrown an ornamented saddlecloth, or a leopard's skin, upon which the rider sat. Under the head of the horse was hung a bell (comp. Zec 14:20) or a tassel. The reins appear to have been tightened round the neck of the horse by a sliding button, and then dropped as the war Tior was engaged in fight. Between the horse's ears was an arched crest, and the different parts of the harness were richly embroidered, and ornamented with rosettes (Layard's Nin. 2nd ser. p. 456). SEE HORSEMAN.

With regard to the trappings and management of the horse among the Hebrews and adjoining nations, we (have little information; the bridle (resen) was placed over the horse's nose (Isa 30:28), and a bit or curb (metheg) is also noticed (2Ki 19:28; Psa 32:9; Pro 26:3; Isa 37:29; in the A.V. it is incorrectly given “bridle,” with the exception of Psalms 32). The harness of the Assyrian horses was profusely decorated, the bits being gilt (1Es 3:6), and the bridles adorned with tassels; on the neck was a collar terminating in a bell, as described by Zechariah (Zec 14:20). Saddles were not used until a late period; only one is represented on the Assyrian sculptures (Layard, 2, 357). The horses were not shod, and therefore hoofs as hard “as flint” (Isa 5:28) were regarded as a great merit. The chariot- horses were covered with embroidered trappings-the “precious clothes” manufactured at Dedan (Eze 27:20) these were fastened by straps and buckles, and to this perhaps reference is made in Pro 30:31, in the term zarzir, “one girded about the loins” (A.V. “greyhound”). Thus adorned, Mordecai rode in state through the streets of Shushan (Est 6:9). White horses were more particularly appropriate to such occasions as being significant of victory (Rev 6:2; Rev 19:11; Rev 19:14).

Horses and chariots were used also in idolatrous processions, as noticed in regard to the sun (2Ki 23:11). As to kinds of harness, etc., by means of which the services of the horse were anciently made available by other nations, it may be well to notice that the riding bridle was long a mere slip-knot,  passed round the under jaw into the mouth, thus furnishing only one rein; and that a rod was commonly added to guide the animal with more facility. The bridle, however, and the reins of chariot-horses were, at a very early age, exceedingly perfect, as the monuments of Egypt, Etruria, and Greece amply prove. Saddles were not used, the rider sitting on the bare back, or using a cloth or mat girded on the animal. The Romans, no doubt copying the Persian Cataphractae, first used pad saddles, and from the northern nations adopted stimuli or spurs. Stirrups were unknown. Avicenna first mentions the rikiab, or Arabian stirrup, perhaps the most ancient; although in the tumuli of Central Asia, Tahtar horse skeletons, bridles, and stirrup saddles have been found along with idols, which proves the tombs to be more ancient than the introduction of Islam. With regard to horseshoeing, bishop Lowth and Bracy Clark were mistaken in believing that the Roman horse or mule shoe was fastened on without nails driven through the horny part of the hoof, as at present. A contrary conclusion may be inferred from several passages in the poets; and the figure of a horse in the Pompeii battle mosaic, shod in the same manner as is now the practice, leaves little doubt on the question. The principal use of horses anciently was for the chariot, especially in war; to this they were attached by means of a pole and yoke like oxen, a practice which continued down to the times of the Romans. (See Bible Animals, p. 248 sq.) SEE CHARIOT; SEE BRIDLE.

It appears that the horse was derived from High Asia, and was not indigenous in Arabia, Syria, or Egypt (Jardine's Naturalist's Library, vol. 12), where his congeners the zebra, quagga, and ass are still found in primitive freedom, although the horse is found in all parts of the world free, it is true, but only as a wild descendant of a once domesticated stock. (See Schlieben, Die Pferde des Alterthums, Neuwied. 1867; Abd el Kader, Horses of the Desert, trans. by Daumas, London, 1863.) All the great original varieties or races of horses were then known in Western Asia, and the Hebrew prophets themselves have not infrequently distinguished the nations they had in view by means of the predominant colors of their horses, and that more correctly than commentators have surmised. Taking Bochart's application (Hieroz. 1, 31 sq.) of the Hebrew names, the bay race, אָדוֹם, adom., emphatically belonged to Egypt and Arabia Felix; the white, לְבֹנַים, lebonim, to the regions above the Euxine Sea, Asia Minor, and northern High Asia; the dun, or cream-colored, שְׂרֻקַּים, serukkim, to the Medes; the spotted piebald, or skewbald, בְּרֻדַּים, beruddim, to the  Macedonians, the Parthians, and later Tahtars; and the black, שָׁחוֹרַים, shachorim, to the Romans; but the chestnut, אִמוֹוֹ,am, otz, does not belong to any known historical race (Zec 1:8; Zec 6:2). SEE ASS; SEE MULE; SEE DROMEDARY. Bay or red horses occur most frequently on Egyptian painted monuments, this being the primitive color of the Arabian stock, but white horses are also common, and, in a few instances, black the last probably only to relieve the paler color of the one beside it in the picture. There is also, we understand, an instance of a spotted pair, tending to show that the valley of the Nile was originally supplied with horses from foreign sources and distinct regions, as, indeed, the tribute pictures further attest. The spotted, if not real, but painted horses, indicate the antiquity of a practice still in vogue; for staining the hair of riding animals with spots of various colors, and dyeing their limbs and tails crimson, is a practice of common occurrence in the East. These colors are typical, in some passages of Scripture, of various qualities, e.g. the white of victory, the black of defeat and calamity, the red of bloodshed, etc. (compare Revelation 6). SEE COLOR.

## Horse-Gate[[@Headword:Horse-Gate]]

             (שׁר הִסּוּסַים, sha'ar has-susim', Gate of the horses; Sept. πύλη ἵππων or ἱππέων,Vulg. porta equorum), a gate in the first or old wall of Jerusalem, at the west end of the bridge leading from Zion to the Temple (Neh 3:28; Jer 31:40), perhaps so called as being that by which the “horses of the sun” (2Ki 23:11) were led by the idolaters into the sacred enclosure (2Ch 23:15; comp. 2Ki 11:16). (See Strong's Harmony of the Gospels, Append. 1, p. 14.) Barclay, however, thinks of a position near the Hippodrome (which, on the contrary, was a later edifice), at the S.E. corner of the Temple wall (City of the Great King, p. 152). SEE JERUSALEM.

## Horse-leech[[@Headword:Horse-leech]]

             (לֲוּקָה, alukah'; Sept. ἡ βδέλλα, Vulg. sanguisuga, A.V. some eds. as two words, “horse leech”) occurs once only, viz. Pro 30:15, “The horseleech hath two daughters, crying, Give, give.” Although the Hebrew word is translated leech in nearly all the versions, there has been much dispute whether that is its proper meaning. Against the received translation, it has been urged that, upon an examination of the context in which it occurs, the introduction of the leech seems strange; that it is  impossible to understand what is meant by its “two daughters,” or three, as the Septuagint, Syriac, and Arabic versions assign to it; and that, instead of the incessant craving apparently attributed to it, the leech drops off when filled. In order to evade these difficulties, it has been attempted, but in vain, to connect the passage either with the preceding or subsequent verse. It has also been attempted to give a different sense to the Hebrew word. But as it occurs nowhere besides in Scripture, and as the root from which it would seem to be derived is never used as a verb, no assistance can be obtained from the Scriptures themselves in this investigation. Recourse is therefore had to the Arabic. The following is the line of criticism pursued by the learned Bochart (Hierozoicon, ed. Rosenmüller, 3, 785, etc.). The Arabic word for leech is alahkah, which is derived from a verb signifying to hang or to adhere to. But the Hebrew word, alukah, he would derive from another Arabic root, aluk, which means “fate, heavy misfortune, or impending calamity;” and hence he infers that allukah properly means destiny, and particularly the necessity of dying which attaches to every mall by the decree of God. He urges that it is not strange that offspring should be ascribed to this divine appointment, since, in Proverbs 27, offspring is attributed to time, a day” Thou knowest not what a day may bring forth.” Now the Hebrews call events “the children of time.” We also speak of “the womb of time.” He cites Pro 27:20, as a parallel passage; “Hell (sheol) and the grave are never full.” Hence he supposes that sheol and the grave are the two daughters of Alukah or Destiny; each cries “give” at the same moment the former asks for the soul, and the latter for the body of man in death; both are insatiable, for both involve all mankind in one common ruin. He further thinks that both these are called daughters, because each of the words is of the feminine or, at most, of the common gender; and in the 16th verse, the grave (sheol) is specified as one of the “things that are never satisfied.” In further confirmation of this view, Bochart cites rabbinical writers, who state that by the word alukah, which occurs in the Chaldee paraphrase on the Psalms, they understand destiny to be signified; and also remark that it has two daughters — Eden and Gehenna, Paradise and Hell — the former of whom never has enough of the souls of the righteous, the latter of, the souls of the wicked. (See also Alb. Schultens, Comment. ad loc.).

In behalf of the received translation, it is urged that it is scarcely credible that all the ancient translators should have confounded alukah with alakah; that it is peculiarly unlikely that this should have been the case with the  Septuagint translator of the book of Proverbs, because it is believed that “this ranks next to the translation of the Pentateuch for ability and fidelity of execution;” and that the author of it must have been well skilled in the two languages (Horne's Introduction, 2, 43 ed. 1828). It is further pleaded that the application of Arabic analogies to Hebrew words is not decisive; and finally, that the theory proposed by Bochart is not essential to the elucidation of the passage. In the preceding verse the writer (not Solomon see Pro 27:1) speaks of “a generation, whose teeth are as swords, and their jaw-teeth as knives to devour the poor from off the earth, and the needy from among men;” and then, after the abrupt and picturesque style of the East, especially in their proverbs, which is nowhere more vividly exemplified than in this whole chapter, the leech is introduced as an illustration of the covetousness of such persons, and of the two distinguishing vices of which it is the parent, avarice and cruelty. May not also the “two daughters of the leech, crying, Give, give,” be a figurative description of the two lips of the creature (for these it has, and perfectly formed), which are a part of its very complicated mouth? It certainly is agreeable to the Hebrew style to call the offspring of inanimate things daughters, for so branches are called daughters of trees (Gen 49:22, margin). A similar use of the word is found in Ecc 12:4, “All the daughters of music shall be brought low,” meaning the lips, front teeth, and other parts of the mouth. It is well remarked by Prof. Paxton that “this figurative application of the entire genus is sufficient to justify the interpretation. The leech, as a symbol in use among rulers of every class and in all ages, for avarice, rapine, plunder, rapacity, and even assiduity, is too well known to need illustration” (see Plautus, Epidic. art. 2; Cicero, ad Attic.; Horace, Ars. Poet. 476; Theocritus, Pharmaceut.; etc.). In confirmation of this view, Prof. Stuart remarks (Comment. ad loc.), “The Arabians have the same word, and in the Camûs, their standard dictionary, it is defined by another Arabic word, viz. Ghouï. This latter the Camûs again defines as meaning, (1) Calamity, (2) Forestdevil, (3) Adaemon man-eating and insatiable. The Arabians, down to the present hour, maintain that it is often met with in the forests of Arabia, and they stand in great terror of it when entering a thick woods. (See Lane's Modern Egyptians, 1, 344.) The Syrians had a like superstition, but, like the Hebrews, they more generally named the sprite lilith. In Isaiah 35:14, this last word occurs (Auth. Version screech-owl), and it is amply and finely illustrated by Gesenius (Comment. ad loc.). In like manner, Western superstition is full of spokes, hobgoblins, elves, imps, and vampires; all.  especially the last of which, are essentially insatiable, blood sucking specters.” (See also Gesenius, Thesaur. Heb. p, 1038.) SEE SPECTER.

There is, then, little doubt that alukah denotes some species of leech, or, rather, is the generic term for any blood-sucking annelid, such as Hirudo (the medicine leech), Haemopis (the horse-leech), Limnatis, Trochetia and Aulastoma, if all these genera are found in the marshes and pools of the Bible-lands. The leech of bloodsucker belongs to the genus vermes, order intestinata, Limn. It is viviparous, brings forth only one offspring at a time, and the genus contains many species “The horse-leech” is properly a species of leech discarded for medical purposes on account of the coarseness of its bite. There is no ground for the distinction of species made in the English Bible. The valuable use of the leech (Hirudo) in medicine, though undoubtedly known to Pliny and the later Roman writers, was in all probability unknown to the ancient Orientals; still they were doubtless acquainted with the fact that leeches of the above-named genus would attach themselves to the skin of persons going barefoot in ponds; and they also were probably cognizant of the propensity horse-leeches (Haemopis) have of entering the mouth and nostrils of cattle, as they drink from the waters frequented by these pests, which are common enough in Palestine and Syria. The use which, from its thirst for blood, we make of the leech, being unknown to the ancient Orientals, as it is unknown in the East at the present day, it is there spoken of with feelings of horror and aversion, particularly as it causes the destruction of valuable animals by fastening under their tongues when they come to drink. The lake called Birket er-Ram, the ancient Phiala, about three hours from Banias, is said to be so crowded with leeches that a man can gather 6000 or even 8000 in a day, while the fountain at Banias is not infested by a single leech.

The mechanism by which the leech is enabled to gratify its greedy thirst for blood is highly curious. The throat is spacious and capable of being everted to a great degree. The front border of the mouth is enlarged so as to form a sort of upper lip, and this combines with the wrinkled muscular margin of the lower and lateral portions to form the sucker. We may even slit down the ventral margin of the sucker, exposing the whole throat. Then the edges being folded back, we see implanted in the walls on the dorsal regions of the cavity three white eminences of a cartilaginous texture, which rise to a sharp crescentic edge; they form a triangular, or, rather, a  triradiate figure, and by a peculiar saw-like motion so abrade the surface as to cause a flow of blood, which is greatly assisted by the contraction of the edges forming a vacuum like a cupping-glass.

## Horseman[[@Headword:Horseman]]

             (properly and usually בּל פָּרָשׁ. ba'al parash', master of a horse). Our translation would make it appear that a force of cavalry accompanied Pharaoh in his pursuit — “his horsemen” (Exo 14:9 etc.). It is, however, a fact not a little remarkable, that in the copious delineations of battle-scenes which occur in the monuments, and which must have been coeval with these events, in which, moreover, everything that could tend to aggrandize the power or flatter the pride of Egypt would be introduced, there never occurs any representation of Egyptian cavalry. The armies are always composed of troops of infantry armed with the bow and spear, and of ranks of chariots drawn by two horses. Both Diodorus and Herodotus attribute cavalry to the early Pharaohs; and some eminent antiquarians, as Sir Gardiner Wilkinson, endeavor to account for the absence of such a force in the pictorial representations consistently with its existence. But professor Hengstenberg has maintained, and not without some degree of probability, that the word “horsemen” of the above passage should rather be rendered “chariot riders.” We quote his words: “It is accordingly certain that the cavalry, in the more ancient period of the Pharaohs, was but little relied on. The question now is, what relation the declarations of the passage before us bear to this result. Were the common view, according to which riding on horses is superadded with equal prominence to the chariot of war, in our passage, the right one, there might arise strong suspicion against the credibility of the narrative. But a more accurate examination shows that the author does not mention Egyptian cavalry at all; that, according to him, the Egyptian army is composed only of chariots of war, that he therefore agrees in a wonderful manner with the native Egyptian monuments. And this agreement is the more minute, since the second division of the army represented upon them, the infantry, could not, ill the circumstances of our narrative, take part in the pursuit. The first and principal passage concerning the constituent parts of the Egyptian army which pursued the Israelites is that in Exo 14:6-7 “And he made ready his chariot, and took his people with him; and he took six hundred chosen chariots, and all the chariots of Egypt, and chariot-warriors upon  all of them.” Here Pharaoh's preparation for war is fully described. It consists, first, of chariots, and, secondly, of chariot warriors. Cavalry are no more mentioned than infantry. This passage, which is so plain, explains the second one (Exo 14:9), where the arrival of this same army in sight of the Israelites is plainly and graphically described, in order to place distinctly before the reader the impression which the view made upon the Israelites: “And the Egyptians followed them and overtook them, where they were encamped by the sea, all the chariot-horses of Pharaoh, and his riders, and his host” (Egypt and Moses, ch. 4). SEE CHARIOT.

In the same connection we may remark that, although the Egyptian warriors usually rode two in a chariot only, yet it appears, from the use of the peculiar term שָׁלַישׁ., shalish' (lit. third, A.V. “captain”), applied to the charioteers destroyed in the Red Sea (Exo 15:4), and to other officers (2Sa 23:8, etc.), that occasionally at least three persons were accustomed to ride together in battle; and this is confirmed by the fact that in some of the delineations on the Egyptian monuments we find two persons represented as principals in a war-car, while a third manages the reins. SEE CAPTAIN.

Among the Assyrians, on the other hand, single riders on horseback were not uncommon, although with them, too, the cavalry arm of the military service consisted chiefly of chariots. SEE ARMY.

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

             an eminent English clergyman and antiquary, was born in 1685, at Mid- Lothian, and was pastor of a dissenting congregation at Morpeth. He died in December, 1731. He wrote Roman Antiquities of Britain (published posthumously, 1732). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

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

             One of the most distinguished divines ever produced by the Church of England, was born in London, October 1733. He was the son of the Reverend John Horsley (whose father was originally a Nonconformist), for many years the clerk in orders at St.Martin's-in-the-Fields, and who held two rectories, Thorley in Hertfordshire, and Newington Butts in Surrey. Samuel Horsley was educated at Westminster School and Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and had the rectory of Newington, which his father resigned to him soon after he had taken orders in 1759. His more public career may be said to have commenced in 1767 when he was elected a fellow of the Royal Society, of which body he became secretary in 1773. His earliest publications were tracts on scientific subjects, but in 1776 he projected a  complete and uniform edition of the philosophical works of Sir Isaac Newton. This design was not accomplished till 1785, when the fifth and last of the five quarto volumes made its appearance. In the earlier years of his public life he found patrons in the earl of Aylesford, and in Lowth, bishop of London; but we pass over the presentations to his various livings, and the dispensations, which the number of his minor preferments rendered necessary. In 1781 he was appointed archdeacon of St. Albans. It was a little before the date last named that he first appeared in the field of theological controversy, in which, from the great extent of his knowledge and from the vigor of his intellect, he soon showed himself a very powerful combatant. His attacks were chiefly directed against Dr. Joseph Priestley, who in a series of publications defended with great subtlety and skill the doctrines of philosophical necessity, materialism, and Unitarianism. Dr. Horsley began his attack in 1778 on the question of Man's Free Agency; it was continued in a Charge delivered in 1783 to the clergy of his archdeaconry, in which he animadverted on many parts of Dr. Priestley's History of the Corruptions of Christianity.

This charge produced a reply from Dr. Priestley, which led to a rejoinder from Dr. Horsley in Seventeen Letters to Dr. Priestley, a masterly defense of the orthodox faith, and the secure foundation of a lasting theological reputation. These writings are believed to have stopped the progress, for that age, of Socinianism in England. The tide of preferment now began to flow in upon him. Thurlow, who was then chancellor, presented him with a prebendal stall in the church of Gloucester, observing, as it is said that “those who defended the Church ought to be supported by the Church;” and in 1788 he was made bishop of St. David's. In Parliament he distinguished himself by the hearty support which he gave to the measures of Pitt's administration. His political conduct gained him the favor of the court: in 1793 he was translated to Rochester, and in 1802 to St. Asaph. He died October 4,1806. Dr. Horsley has been, not inaptly, described as the last of the race of episcopal giants of the Warburtonian school. He was a man of an original and powerful mind, of very extensive learning, and profoundly versed in the subject of ecclesiastical history, of which he gave ample evidence in his controversy with Dr. Priestley, while archdeacon of St. Albans. Even Gibbon says, “His spear pierced the Socinian's shield.” His sermons and critical disquisitions frequently display a rich fund of theological acumen, and of successful illustration of the sacred writings. Besides the works named above, his theological writings include Critical Disquisitions on Isaiah 18 (London 1799, 4to) — The Book of Psalms, translated, with Notes (3rd edit.  London, 1833, 8vo) — Hosea, translated, with Notes (2nd edit. London 1804) — Biblical Criticism on the O.Test. (2nd edit. London 1844, 2 vols. 8vo) — Sermons on the Resurrection (3rd edit. London 1822, 8vo); all which, with his tracts in the Priestley controversy, are to be found in his Collected Works (London 1845,6 vols. 8vo). See English Cyclopedia; Quarterly Review (London), vols. 3 and 9; Edinburgh Review, vol. 17; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 894; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, 1, 1548; Chalmers, Biog. Dictionary; Hook, Ecclesiastes Biog. 6:171 sq.; Skeats, Hist. of the Free Churches of England, p. 513 sq.; Donaldson, Hist. of Christ. Lit. and Doctrines, 1, 72; Ch. Hist. of the 13th Century, p. 445; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2, 418,421; Shedd, History of Doctrines 1, 57, 386; General Repository, 1, 22, 229; 2, 7, 257; 3, 13, 250; Quarterly Review, 3, 398; 9:30; Edinburgh Review, 17, 455; Monthly Review, 84, 82; Analytical Magazine, 4, 268.

## Horst, Georg Conrad[[@Headword:Horst, Georg Conrad]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born June 26, 1767, and died January 26, 1832, doctor of theology. He wrote, Die Visionen Habakuks (Gotha, 1798): — Theurgie (Mayence, 1820): — Das heilige Abendmahl (1815): — Daimonomagie (1818, 2 volumes): — Mysteriosophie (1816, 2 volumes): — Siona (4th ed. 1833, 2 volumes): — Eusebia (2d ed. 1822). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:229, 428, 453, 599; 2:76, 229, 332, 359, 377; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:588; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:408. (B.P.)

## Horstius, Jacob Merlo[[@Headword:Horstius, Jacob Merlo]]

             A Roman Catholic theologian, was born towards the close of the 16th century at Horst, Holland (whence his name). He was priest at the Lyskirchen in Cologne, where he died in 1644. Horstius is the author of several ascetical works. He wrote Enchiridion oficii divini; Paradisus animnce Christianae (translated into French by Nicolaus Fontane, under the title Heures Chretiennes, tirnes de l'Ecriture et des saints Peres) — Septem tubae orbis Christiani (a compilation from the writings of the fathers, and intended for young Roman Catholic priests). He also edited a commentary of Estius on the Pauline Letters; the works of St. Bernard (2 vols.), and of Thomas a Kempis. — Wetzer and Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 12, 593; Theol. Univ. Lex. (Elberf. 1868), 2, 369.

## Hort, Josiah[[@Headword:Hort, Josiah]]

             An Anglican prelate, was born towards the close of the 17th century, and educated at a Dissenting school together with Dr. Isaac Watts. In 1695 he became chaplain to John Hampden, Esq., M.P., and afterwards settled as Dissenting minister at Marshfield. About 1708 he conformed, and became a minister of the Church of England. He now rose quickly to distinguished positions in the Church. In 1721 he was consecrated bishop of Ferns and Leighlin in Ireland, translated in 1727 to Kilmore and Ardagh, and was advanced to the archbishopric of Tuam in 1742, with the united bishopric of Enaghdoen, and with permission to hold also his former bishopric of  Ardagh. He died Dec. 14, 1751. Bishop Hort published, besides, several collections of Sermons (1708-9,1738,1757) — Instructions to the Clergy of Tuam (1742, 8vo; 1768, 8vo; also in Clergyman's Instructor). See Hook, Eccl. Biog. 6, 184 sq.; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 895.

## Hortig, Karl Anton[[@Headword:Hortig, Karl Anton]]

             A distinguished German Roman Catholic (also known by the name given him by his order, JOHANN NEPOMIUCK), was born at Pleistein, Bavaria, in 1774, and was educated at the University of Ingolstadt. He entered the order of the Benedictines in 1794, and in 1799 became chaplain of a nunnery at Nürnburg. In 1802 he was appointed professor of logic and metaphysics at the school of the Andech Cloister, and promoted, after filling various minor positions, to a professorship of theology at Landshut in 1821. In 1826 he removed with the university to Munich, where he received many honors, and died Feb. 27, 1847. His theological works are, Predigtenf. alle Festtage (Landsh. 1821; 3rd edit. 1832) — Predigten ü. d. sontaigigen Evangel. (ibid. 1827; 2nd ed. 1832) — Handb. d. christl. Kirchengesch. (2 vols. 1826-28, of which the second part of vol. 2 was completed by the celebrated Dollinger). Real-Encyklop. d. atho. Deutschl. 12, 1031 sq.; Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8, 550.

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

             An English divine, was born at London, and was educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow. In 1637 he was university preacher, and in July of this year he was chosen master of Queen's College, Cambridge, and minister of St. Mary Colechurch, London. In 1641 he became professor of divinity at Gresham College, and in 1647 preacher of Gray's Inn, and vice-chancellor of Cambridge in 1650. He was ejected for nonconformity in 1662, but he afterwards conformed, and was appointed vicar of Great St. Helen's, London, in 1666. He died in 1673. He was a pious and learned man, especially skilled in the Oriental languages. Of his works, which are very scarce, the principal are Sermon (Psa 87:4-6), Zion's Birth-register unfolded (London 1656, 4to) — Forty-six Sermons on the eighth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans (London 1674, fol.) — Choice and practical Expositions on four select Psalms (4, 42, 59, 63) (London, 1675, fol.) — One hundred select Sermons upon several Texts; fifty upon the Old Testament and fifty on the New: left perfected in the press under his own hands (London1679, fol.). — Stoughton (John),  Ecclesiastes Hist. of England (London, 1870, 2 vols. 8vo), 1, 156, 288; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, 1, 1531; Hook, Ecclesiastes Biog. 6, 185 sq.; Wood, Athen. Oxon. 2 (see Index); Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 895.

## Horton, William, D.D[[@Headword:Horton, William, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Newburyport, Massachusetts, March 14, 1804. He graduated from Harvard College in 1824; from Andover Theological Seminary in 1827; was ordained deacon in November of that year, and presbyter October 15, 1830. He was pastor at St. Paul's Church, Windsor, Vermont; in 1835 of Trinity Church, Saco, Maine; at St. Thomas's Church, Dover, N.H. (1839-47); at St. Paul's Church, Brookline, Massachusetts (1849); at St. Paul's Church, Newburyport (1853). He died there, October 29, 1863. See Trien. Cat. of Andover Theol. Sem. 1870, page 75; Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1864, page 669.

## Horus[[@Headword:Horus]]

             (Ωρος), the Egyptian god of the sun, generally written in hieroglyphics by the sparrow hawk, and represented with a bird's beak. The old derivation from the Hebrew aur, light, is now recognized as incorrect. As an Egyptian divinity he is mentioned generally as the son of Isis and Osiris, and brother of Bubastis, the Egyptian Diana. Various esoteric explanations have been given of him, e.g. that “he represents the Nile, as Typhon the desert, the fruitful air or dew which revives the earth, the moon, the sun in relation to the changes of the year, or the god who presided over the course of the sun.” He also represented three planets Jupiter (Harapshta), Saturn (Harka), and Mars (Harteshr). The sparrow hawk was sacred to him; so were lions, which were placed at the side of his throne. There was a festival to celebrate his eyes on the 30th Epiphi, when the sun and moon, which they represented, were on the same right line with the earth. A movable feast, that of his coronation, is supposed to have been selected for the coronations of the kings of Egypt, who are described as sitting upon his throne. When adult, he is generally represented hawk-headed; as a child, he is seen carried in his mother's arms, wearing the pshent or atf, and seated on a lotus-flower with his finger on his lips. He had an especial local worship at Edfou or Hut, the ancient Apollinopolis Magna, where he was identified with Ra, or the Sun. There were also books of Horus and Isis, probably referring to his legend (Lucian, De Somn. sive Gall. s. 183). The magnet was called his bone; he was of fair complexion (Chambers, Cyclop. 5 430 sq.). He was also worshipped very extensively in Greece, and later at Rome, in a somewhat modified form. In Grecian mythology he was compared with Apollo, and identified with Harpocrates, the last son of Osiris (Plut. De Is. et Os. 19). SEE HORAPOLLO. They were both represented as youths, and with the same attributes and symbols (Artemid. Oneiro 2, 36; Macrobius, Sat. 1, 23; Porphyry ap. Euseb. Prcep. Evang. 5, 10; Iamblichus, DeMyster. 7, 2). In the period of the worship of this god at Rome he seems to have been regarded as the god of quiet life and silence (Varro, De L. L. 4, 17, Bip. Ovid, Met. 9, 691; Ausonius, Epist. ad Paul.  25, 27), which was due no doubt, to the belief that he was born with his finger in his mouth, as indicative of secrecy and mystery. Horus acts also a prominent part in the mystic works attributed to Hermes Trismegistus (q.v.). See Smith, Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities,. 2, 526; Birch, Gall. of Antig. p. 35; Wilkinson, Mann. and Cust. 4, 395; Jablonski, Panth. 2, 4, p. 222; Champollion, Panth. Eg.; Hincks, Dublin Univ. Mag. 28, 187; Bockh, Manetho, p. 61; Buseen, Aegyptens Stelle in d. Weltgesch. 1, 505 sq. SEE VALENTINIAN THEOLOGY. (J. H.W.)

## Horwitz[[@Headword:Horwitz]]

             A Jewish family, several members of which have become distinguished as writers. The most renowned are:

1. HORWITZ (Sabbatai-Scheftel), HA-LEVI BEN-AKIBA, head of the synagogue of Prague at the beginning of the 16th century. He wrote פֶּלִח הָרַמּוֹן(Kerez,. 1793, 4to), or Commentary on Samuel Galicho's

רַמּונַים סֲִיס: — נַשְׁמִת שִׁבְּתִּי הִלֵּוַי (Prague, 1616,4to), a dialogue expounding the Cabalistic doctrine of the soul: שֶׁפ ִטָל, 1780, 4to), a Cabalistic work divided into two parts, making a key to the Jezirah, Zohar, and other Cabalistic books.

2. HORWITZ, ABRAHAM, son of the preceding, and known also under the name of Schefteles, was born at Prague in the first half of the 16th century. He wrote the following Hebrew works: בַּרַית אִבְרָהָם, On Repentance and Confession (Cracow, 1602, and often): חֶסֶד לְאִבְרָהָם, a complete commentary on Maimonides's Introduction to the book Aboth of the Talmud (Cracow, 1577, and often) — — יֵשׁ נוֹחֲלַין (Prague, 1615, 4to), containing moral instructions, especially intended for his own children — עֵמֶק בְּרָכָה(Amst. 1757, 4to), containing remarks on the blessings of the Jews and their origin.

3. HORWITZ, ISAIAH, son of the foregoing, born at Prague about 1550, became the most distinguished of this family. He was Rabbi first at Frankfort, then at Posen, at Cracow, and at Prague. In 1622 he went to Jerusalem. ‘Poverty induced him to leave that city, and he retired to Tiberias, where he died in 1629. He wrote שְׁנֵי לוּחוֹת הִבְּרַית(Amsterd. 1649, fol.; several times reprinted), a work which enjoys great reputation among the Jews. It is divided into two parts: the first treats of the existence  of God, the law, the privileges of the people of Israel, the attributes of God, the sanctuary, judgment, free agency, the Messiah, worship, ceremonies, and feasts. The second part contains ten treatises on six hundred and thirteen precepts, the oral law, etc. Three abridgments have been published, one by Epstein (Amst. 1683, 4to; several edit.); the second by Zoref Ha-Levi (Frankf. 1681, 4to); and the third by (Ettling Ben-Jechia (Ven. 1705, 8vo) — בַּגְדֵּי יֶשׁ,ִ or Commentary on “the book of Mordecai,” was at first published only in part with the Seder Mohed, then separately (Amst. 1757, 4to; Zolkiew, 1826, fol.), and oftener as an appendix to the book of Mordecai, or in some editions of the Talmud — הִגָּהוֹת לְסֵ עֵמֶק בְּרָכָה, reflections on the Emek Berakah of his father, and printed along with it (Crac. 1597, 4to); also in the two separate editions of the preceding work — שַׁעִי הִשָּׁמִיַם; (Amst. 1717, 4to; with a preface and glossaries by one of his descendants, Abraham Horwitz): it is a Cabalistic commentary on the Psalms and on prayers. The same work contains also his father's Sepher Berith Abraham.

4. HORWITZ (Sabbatai Scheftel), son of the preceding, was Rabbi of Frankfort, then of Posen, and finally of Vienna, where he died about 1658. He is the author of three Hebrew works, the first entitled A Treatise on Morals, in six parts, serving as an introduction to his father's work, שְׁנֵי לוּחוֹת בְּרַית, and printed with it (Amst. 1649, fol.; several editions) — צוָּאָה, printed with his grandfather's יֵשׁ נוֹהֲלַין(Amst. 1717 4to), a work on morals already referred to above — חַדּוּשֵׁי מֵסֵּ בְּרָכוֹתprinted with his grandfather's Emek Berakah, on which it is a sort of commentary (Amst. 1757, 4to; Zolkiew, 1826, fol.).

5. HORWITZ, ISAIAH BEN-JACOB, nephew of the foregoing, and grandson of the former Isaiah Horwitz, wa, a native of Poland, and died there in 1695. He wrote בֵּית הִלֵּוַי(Venice, 1663, 4to), and some commentaries on the Talmud relating to Jewish jurisprudence. See J. Buxtorf, Rabbinica Bibliotheca; Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraica; Rossi, Dizionario degli Autori Ebrei; J. First, Biblioth. Judaica; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé. 25, 207. (J. H.W.)

## Hosah[[@Headword:Hosah]]

             (Heb. Chosah', חֹסָה, refuge; Sept. ᾿Ωσά, ῾Ωσά, and ᾿Ωσηέ), the name of a place and also of a Man 1:1. A place on the border of the tribe of Asher, at a point where the line turned from the direction of Tyre to its terminus on the Mediterranean, in the direction of Achzib (Jos 19:29). It is possibly the same with the modern village el-Ghazieh, a little south of Zidon; notwithstanding the objection of Schwarz (who thinks this too far north, and prefers a village called el-Bussah, a little north of Eczib, Palest. p. 194), since it is uncertain which way the boundary is here described as running, and the account is a good deal involved. Van de Velde proposes to identify it with el-Kauzah, “a village with traces of antiquity near wady el-Ain” (Memoir, p. 322), the Kauzih of Robinson (new Researches, p. 61, 62); but to this Keil objects (Comment. on Joshua ad loc.) that “the situation does not suit in this connection,” although it lies very near Ramah, and in the direction from Tyre towards Achzib. SEE ELKOSH.

2. A Levite of the family of Merari, who, with thirteen of his relatives, was appointed by David porter of the gate Shallecheth, on the west side of the Temple (1Ch 16:38; 1Ch 26:10-11; 1Ch 26:16). B.C. 1014.

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

             For this place Lieut. Conder suggests (Tent Work, 2:337) the present 'Ozziyeh, meaning apparently (see Memoirs to Ordnance Survey, 1:51) el- Ezziyah, laid down at six and three quarter miles south-east of Tyre, and described (ibid. page 48) as "a village built of stone, containing seventy Druses; situated on a ridge, with two cisterns. There are two caves to the north of it." The identification is not noted by Saunders.

## Hosai[[@Headword:Hosai]]

             SEE HOZAI.

## Hosanna[[@Headword:Hosanna]]

             (ὡσαννά, from the Heb. הוֹשַׁיעָהאּנָּא, as in Psa 118:25; Isa 59:1; Isa 45:20), a form of acclamatory blessing or wishing well, which signifies Save now! i.e. “succor now! be now propitious!” It occurs in Mat 21:9 (also Mar 11:9-10; Joh 12:13), “Hosanna to the Son of David; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest.” This was on the occasion of our Savior's public entry into Jerusalem, and, fairly construed, would mean, “Lord, preserve this Son of David; heap favors and blessings on him!” It is further to be observed that Hosanna was a customary form of acclamation at the Feast of Tabernacles. This feast was celebrated in September, just before the commencement of the civil year, on which occasion the people carried in their hands bundles of boughs of palms, myrtles, etc. (Josephus, Ant. 13, 13, 6; 3:10, 4). They then repeated the 25th and 26th verses of Psalms 118, which commence with the word Hosanna; and from this circumstance they gave the boughs and the prayers, and the feast itself the name of Hosanna. They observed the same forms, also, at the Encaenia, or Festival of Dedication (1Ma 10:6-7; 2 Macc. 13:51; Rev 7:9), and the Passover. — Kitto. The  psalm from which it was taken, the 118th, was one with which they were familiar, from being accustomed to recite the 25th and 26th verses at the Feast of Tabernacles.

On that occasion the Great Hallel, consisting of Psalms 113-118, was chanted by one of the priests, and at certain intervals the multitudes joined in the responses, waving their branches of willow and palm, and shouting as they waved them Hallelujah, or Hosanna, or “O Lord, I beseech thee, send now prosperity” (Psa 118:25). This was done at the recitation of the first and last verses of Psalms 118, but, according to the school of Hillel, at the words “Save now, we beseech thee” (Psa 118:25). The school of Shammai, on the contrary, say it was at the words “Send now prosperity” of the same verse. Rabban Gamaliel and R. Joshua were observed by R. Akiba to wave their branches only at the words “Save now, we beseech thee” (Mishna, Succah, 3, 9). On each of the seven days during which the feast lasted the people thronged in the court of the Temple, and went in procession about the altar, setting their boughs bending towards it, the trumpets sounding as they shouted Hosanna. But on the seventh day they marched seven times round the altar, shouting meanwhile the great Hosanna to the sound of the trumpets of the Levites (Lightfoot, Temple Service, 16, 2). The very children who could wave the palm branches were expected to take part in. the solemnity (Mishna, Succah, 3, 15; Mat 21:15). From the custom of waving the boughs of myrtle and willow during the service the name Hosanna was ultimately transferred to the boughs themselves so that, according to Elias Levita (Thisbi, s.v.), “the bundles of the willows of the brook which they carry at the Feast of Tabernacles are called Hosannas.” The term is frequently applied by Jewish writers to denote the Feast of Tabernacles, the seventh day of the feast being distinguished as the great Hosanna (Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. s.5. ישׁע). Monographs on this ejaculation have been written in Latin by Bindrim (Ros. 1671), Nothdurfft (Bruisw. 1713), Pfaff (Tübingen, 1789), Winzer (Lips. 1677-78,1703), Bucher (Zittav. 1728), Wernsdorf (Viteb. 1765), Zopf (Lips. 1703). SEE HALLEL.

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

             The early Christian Church adopted this word into its worship. It is found in the apostolical constitutions connected with the great doxology or exclamation of triumph, “Glory be to God on high,” and was frequently used in the communion service, during which the great doxology was also  sung. — Eadie, Eccl. Dict. p. 314; Bingham, Christ. Antig. 1, 41; 2, 690. (J. H.W.)

## Hoschke, Reuben hak-Kohen[[@Headword:Hoschke, Reuben hak-Kohen]]

             a Jewish rabbi of Prague, who died in 1673, is the author of, ראובני ילקוט, a kind of midrashic collectaneum (Prague, 1660):- הגדול ילקוט ראובני, a cabalistic midrash on the Pentateuch, with extracts from Mechilta, Pesikta, Zohar, etc. (Wilmersdorf, 1681). This latter work, without any value, must be distinguished from the famous midrashic work entitled Yalkut Shimeoni. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:412 sq. (B.P.)

## Hose[[@Headword:Hose]]

             (פֵּטַישׁ,pattish', only in the plur., marg. פֶּטֶשׁpe'tesh., Chald., hosen,” Dan 3:21). What article of apparel is here denoted is not certain. Theodotion (perhaps also the Sept.) and the Vulg. understand a tiara; compare Greek πέτασος, Venet. Gr. vers. ἀναξυρίς; but the Heb. interpreters more correctly render a tunic or undergarment (כֻּתֹּנֶת =χιτών), a signification that better agrees with an ample garment (from (פָּטִשׁ, to expand). The term does not elsewhere occur; but see Buxtorff, Lex. Talm. col. 1865. SEE DRESS.

## Hosea[[@Headword:Hosea]]

             (Heb. Hoshe'd, הוֹשֵׁע, deliverance), or “HOSHEA” (as it is more correctly Anglicized in Dent. 32 — 44; 2Ki 15:30; 2Ki 17:1; 2Ki 17:3-4; 2Ki 17:6; 2Ki 18:1; 2Ki 18:9-10; 1Ch 27:20; Neh 10:23; but “Oshea” in Num 13:8; Num 13:6), the name of several men.

1. HOSHEA or OSHEA (Sept. Αὐσή and Ι᾿ησοῦς,Vulg. Osee and Josue), the original name of JOSHUA SEE JOSHUA (q.v.) Moses's successor (Num 13:8; Num 13:16; Dent. 32:44).

2. HOSHEA, the son of Azariah, and viceroy of the Ephraimites under David (1Ch 27:20).

3. HOSEA (Sept. Ο᾿σηέ,Vulg. Osee, N.T. ῾Ωσεή, “Osee,” Rom 9:25), the son of Beeri (Hos 1:1-2), and author of the book of prophecies which bears his name. SEE PROPHET.

The personal history of the prophet Hosea is so closely interwoven with his book of prophecies that it will be most convenient to consider them together; indeed he principal recorded events of his life were a series of prophetical symbols themselves. The figments of Jewish writers regarding Hosea's parentage need scarcely be mentioned (see J. Fredericus, Exercit. de Hosea et vaticiniis ejus, Lips. 1715). His father has been confounded with Beerah, a prince of the Reubenites (1Ch 5:6). So, too, Beeri has been reckoned a prophet himself, according to the rabbinical notion that the mention of a prophet's father in the introduction to his  prophecies is a proof that sire as well as son was endowed with the oracular spirit.

1. Place. — Whether Hosea was a citizen of Israel or Judah has been disputed. The pseudo-Epiphanius and Dorotheus of Tyre speak of him as being born at Belemoth, in the tribe of Issachar (Epiphan. De Vitis Prophet. cap. 11; Doroth. De Proph. cap. 1). Drusius (Critici Sacri, in loc., tom. 5) prefers the reading “Beth-semes,” and quotes Jerome, who says, “Osee de tribu Issachar fuit ortus in Beth-semes.” But Maurer contends strenuously that he belonged to the kingdom of Judah (Comment. Theol., ed. Rosenmüller, 2, 391); while Jahn supposes that he exercised his office, not, as Amos did, in Israel, but in the principality of Judah. Maurer appeals to the superscription in Amos as a proof that prophets of Jewish origin were sometimes commissioned to labor in the kingdom of Israel (against the appeal to Amos see Credner, Joel, p. 66; Hitzig, Kurzgef. exeget. Handb. zum A. T. p. 72). Bat with the exception of the case recorded in 1Ki 13:1 (a case altogether too singular and mysterious to serve as an argument), the instance of Amos is a solitary one, and seems to have been regarded as anomalous by his contemporaries (Amo 7:12). Neither can we assent to the other hypothesis of Maurer, that the mention of the Jewish kings Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, by Hosea in his superscription is a proof that the seer regarded them as his rightful sovereigns, as monarchs of that territory which gave him birth. Hengstenberg has well replied, that Maurer forgets “the relation in which the pious in Israel generally, and the prophets in particular, stood to the kingdom of Judah.

They considered the whole separation, not only the religious, but also the civil, as an apostasy from God. The dominion of the theocracy was promised to be the throne of David.” The lofty Elijah, on a memorable occasion, when a direct and solemn appeal was made to the head of the theocracy, took twelve stones, one for each tribe — a proof that he regarded the nation as one in religious confederation. It was also necessary, for correct chronology, that the kings of both nations should be noted. The other argument of Maurer for Hosea's being a Jew, viz. because his own people are so severely threatened in his reproofs and denunciations, implies a predominance of national prepossession or antipathy in the inspired breast' which is inconsistent with our notions of the piety and patriotism of the prophetic commission (Knobel, Der Prophetismus der Hebraer, 1, 203). We therefore accede to the opinion of De Wette, Rosenmüller, Hengstenberg, Eichhorn, Manger, Uhland, and  Kuinol, that Hosea was an Israelite, a native of that kingdom with whose sins and fates his book is specially and primarily occupied. The name Ephraim occurs in his prophecies about thirty-five times, and Israel with equal frequency, while Judah is not mentioned more than fourteen times. Samaria is frequently spoken of (Hos 7:1; Hos 8:5-6; Hos 10:5; Hos 10:7; Hos 14:1), Jerusalem never. All the other localities introduced are connected with the northern kingdom, either as forming part of it, or lying on its borders: Mizpah, Tabor (Hos 5:1), Gilgal (Hos 4:15; Hos 9:15; Hos 12:12 [11]), Bethel, called also Bethaven (Hos 10:15; Hos 12:5 [4]; Hos 4:15; Hos 5:8; Hos 10:5; Hos 10:8); Jezreel (1:4), Gibeah (Hos 5:8; Hos 9:9), Ramah (Hos 5:8), Gilead (Hos 4:8; Hos 12:12 [11]), Shechem (Hos 6:9), Lebanon (Hos 14:6-7), Arbela (Hos 10:14 [?]).

2. Time. — There is no reason, with De Wette, Maurer, and Hitzig, to doubt the genuineness of the present superscription, or, with Rosenmüller and Jahn, to suppose that it may have been added by a later hand though the last two writers uphold its authenticity. These first and second verses of the prophecy are so closely connected in the structure of the language and style of the narration, that the second verse itself would become suspicious if the first were reckoned a spurious addition. This superscription states that Hosea prophesied during a long and eventful period, commencing in the days of Jeroboam, the son of Joash, extending through the lives of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and concluding in the reign of Hezekiah. As Jeroboam died B.C. 782, and Hezekiah ascended the throne 726, we have the round term of about sixty years, B.C. cir. 784724, as the probable space of time covered by the utterance of these predictions (Maurer, in the Comment. Theol. p. 284, and more lately in his Comment. Gram. Hist. Crit. in Proph. Min. Lips. 1840). The time when they were committed to writing may probably be fixed at about B.C. 725. This long duration of office is not improbable, and the book itself furnishes strong presumptive evidence in support of this chronology. The first prophecy of Hosea foretells the overthrow of Jehu's house; and the menace was fulfilled on the death of Jeroboam, his great-grandson. This prediction must have been uttered during Jeroboam's life. Again, in Hos 10:14, allusion is made to an expedition of Shalmaneser against Israel; and if it was the first inroad against king Hoshea (2Ki 17:4), who began to reign in the twelfth year of Ahaz, the event referred to by the prophet as past must have happened close upon the beginning of the government of Hezekiah. These  data corroborate the limits assigned in the superscription, and they are capable of verification by reference to the contents of the prophecy.

(a.) As to the beginning, Eichhorn has clearly shown that we cannot allow Hosea much ground in the reign of Jeroboam (823-782).

The book contains descriptions which are utterly inapplicable to the condition of the kingdom of Israel during this reign (2Ki 14:25 sq.). The pictures of social and political life which Hosea draws so forcibly are rather applicable to the interregnum which followed the death of Jeroboam (781-771), and to the reign of the succeeding kings. The calling in of Egypt and Assyria to the aid of rival factions (Hos 10:3; Hos 13:10) has nothing to do with the strong and able government of Jeroboam. Nor is it conceivable that a prophet who had lived long under Jeroboam should have omitted the mention of that monarch's conquests in his enumeration of Jehovah's kindnesses to Israel (Hos 2:8). It seems, then, almost certain that very few at least of his prophecies were written until after the death of Jeroboam (781).

(b.) As regards the end of his career, the title leaves us in still greater doubt. It merely assures us that he did not prophesy beyond the reign of Hezekiah. But here, again, the contents of the book help us to reduce the vagueness of this indication. In the sixth year of Hezekiah the prophecy of Hosea was fulfilled, and it is very improbable that he should have permitted this triumphant proof of his divine mission to pass unnoticed. He could not, therefore, have lived long into the reign of Hezekiah; and as it does not seem necessary to allow more than a year of each reign to justify his being represented as a contemporary on the one hand of Jeroboam, on the other of Hezekiah, we may suppose that the life, or, rather, the prophetic career of Hosea, extended from 782 to 725, a period of fifty-seven years.

3. Order in the Prophetic Series. — Hosea is the first in order of the twelve minor prophets in the common editions of the Scriptures (Heb., Sept., and Vulg.), an arrangement, however, supposed to have arisen from a misinterpretation of chap. 1:2, which rather denotes that what follows were the first divine communications enjoyed by this particular prophet (see Jerome, Prefiat. in 12 Prophetas; Hengstenberg, Christol. Keith's translated, 2:23; De Wette, Einleitung, § 225; Rosenmüller, Scholia in Min. Proph. p. 7; Newcome, Pref. to Min. Prophets, p. 45). The probable causes of this location of Hosea may be the thoroughly national character of his oracles, their length, their earnest tone, and vivid representations.  The contour of the book has a closer resemblance to the greater prophets than any of the eleven productions by which it is succeeded. (See below.) There is much doubt as to the relative order of the first four or five of the minor prophets: as far as titles go, Amos is Hosea's only rival; but 2Ki 14:25 goes far to show that they must both yield in priority to Jonah. It is perhaps more important to know that Hosea must have been more or less contemporary with Isaiah, Amos, Jonah, Joel, and Nahum.

4. Circumstance, Scope, and Contents of the Book. — The years of Hosea's public life were dark and melancholy (see Pusey, Minor Prophets, ad loc.). The nation suffered under the evils of that schism which was effected by “Jeroboam, who made Israel to sin.” The obligations of law had been relaxed, and the claims of religion disregarded; Baal became the rival of Jehovah, and in the dark recesses of the groves were practiced the impure and murderous rites of heathen deities; peace and prosperity fled the land, which was harassed by foreign invasion and domestic broils; might and murder became the twin sentinels of the throne; alliances were formed with other nations, which brought with them seductions to paganism; captivity and insult were heaped upon Israel by the uncircumcised; the nation was thoroughly debased, and but a fraction of its population maintained its spiritual allegiance (2Ki 19:18). The death of Jeroboam II was followed by an interregnum of eleven years (B.C. 781- 770), at the end of which his son Zachariah assumed the sovereignty, and was slain by Shallum, after the short space of six months (2Ki 15:10). In four weeks Shallum was assassinated by Menahem. The assassin, during a disturbed reign of ten years (B.C. 769759), became tributary to the Assyrian Pul. His successor, Pekahiah, wore the crown but two years, when he was murdered by Pekah. Pekah, after swaying his bloody scepter for twenty years (B.C. 757-737), met a similar fate in the conspiracy of Hoshea; Hoshea, the last of the usurpers, after another interregnum of eight years, ascended the throne (B.C. 729), and his administration of nine years ended in the overthrow of his kingdom and the expatriation of his people (2Ki 17:18; 2Ki 17:23).

The prophecies of Hosea were directed especially against the country of Israel or Ephraim, whose sin had brought upon it such disasters — prolonged anarchy and final captivity. Their homicides and fornications, their perjury and theft, their idolatry and impiety, are censured and satirized with a faithful severity. Judah is sometimes, indeed, introduced, warned, and admonished. Bishop Horsley (Works, 3, 236) reckons it a mistake to  suppose, “that Hosea's prophecies are almost wholly directed against the kingdom of Israel.” The bishop describes what he thinks the correct extent of Hosea's commission, but has adduced no proof of his assertion. Any one reading Hosea will at once discover that the oracles having relation to Israel are primary, while the references to Judah are only incidental. In Hos 1:7, Judah is mentioned in contrast with Israel, to whose condition the symbolic name of the prophet's son is especially applicable. In Hos 1:11 the future union of the two nations is predicted. The long oracle in chap. 2 has no relation to Judah, nor the symbolic representation in chap. 3. Chap. 4 is severe upon Ephraim, and ends with a very brief exhortation to Judah not to follow his example. In the succeeding chapters allusions to Judah do indeed occasionally occur, when similar sins can be predicated of both branches of the nation. The prophet's mind was intensely interested in the destinies of his own people. The nations around him are unheeded; his prophetic eye beholds the crisis approaching his country, and sees its cantons ravaged, its tribes murdered or enslaved. No wonder that his rebukes were so terrible, his menaces so alarming, that his soul poured forth its strength in an ecstasy of grief and affection. Invitations replete with tenderness and pathos are interspersed with his warnings and expostulations. Now we are startled with a vision of the throne, at first shrouded in darkness, and sending forth lightning, thunders, and voices; but while we gaze, it becomes encircled with a rainbow, which gradually expands till it is lost in that universal brilliancy which itself had originated (chaps. 11 and 14).

5. — The Prophet's Family Relations. — The peculiar mode of instruction which the prophet details in the first and third chapters of his oracles has given rise to many disputed theories. We refer to the command expressed in Hos 1:2 — ”And the Lord said unto Hosea, Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms,” etc.; Hos 3:1, “Then said the Lord unto me, Go yet, love a woman beloved of her friend, yet an adulteress,” etc. Were these real events, the result of divine injunctions literally understood, and as literally fulfilled? Or were these intimations to the prophet only intended to be pictorial illustrations of the apostasy and spiritual folly and unfaithfulness of Israel? The former view, viz. that the prophet actually and literally entered into this impure connubial alliance, was advocated in ancient times by Cyril, Theodoret, Basil, and Augustine; and more recently has been maintained by Mercer, Grotils, Houbigant, Manger, Horsley, Eichhor, Stuck, and others. Fanciful  theories are also rife on this subject. Luther supposed the prophet to perform a kind of drama in view of the people, giving his lawful wife and children these mystical appellations. Newcome (Minor Prophets) thinks that a wife of fornication means merely an Israelite, a woman of apostate and adulterous Israel. So Jac. Capellus (In loseam; Opera, p. 683). Hengstenberg supposes the prophet to relate actions which happened, indeed, actually, but not outwardly. Some, with Maimonides (Joreh Nevochim, pt. 2), imagine it to be a nocturnal vision; while others make it wholly an allegory, as the Chaldee Paraphrast Jerome, Drusius, Bauer, Rosenmüller, Kuino; and Lowth. The view of Hengstenberg (Christology, 2, 11-22), and such as have held his theory (Marki Diatribe de uxore fornicationum accipienda, etc., Lugdun. Batav. 1696), is not materially different from the last to which we have referred (see Libkerk in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1835, p. 647 sq.). Besides other arguments resting on the impurity and loathsomeness of the supposed nuptial contract, it may be argued against the external reality of the event that it must have required several years for its completion, and that the impressiveness of the symbol would therefore be weakened and obliterated.

But this would almost equally apply to the repeated case of Isaiah (Isa 8:3; Isa 20:3). Other prophetic transactions of a similar nature might be referred to. Jerome (Comment. ad loc.) has referred to Eze 4:4. On the other hand, the total absence of any figurative or symbolical phraseology seems to require the command to be taken in a literal sense, and the immediate addition of the declaration that the order was obeyed serves to confirm this view. It is not to be supposed, as has sometimes been argued, that the prophet was commanded to commit fornication. The divine injunction was to marry — “Scortum aliquis ducere potest sine peccato, scortari non item” (Drusius, Comm. ad loc. in Critici Sacri, tom. 5.). Moreover, if, as the narrative implies, and as the analogy of the restored nation requires, the formerly unchaste woman became a faithful and reformed wife, the entire ground of the objection in a moral point of view vanishes (see Cowles, Minor Prophets, ad loc.). In fact, there were two marriages by the prophet: the first, in Hos 1:2 of a woman (probably of lewd inclinations already) who became the mother of three children, and was afterwards repudiated for her adultery; and the second, in chap. 3 of a woman at least attached formerly to another, but evidently reformed to a virtuous wife. Both these women represented the Israelitish nation, especially the northern kingdom, which, although unfaithful to Jehovah, should first be punished and then reclaimed by him. Keil, after combating at length (Minor Prophets,  introduct. to Hosea) against Kurtz's arguments for the literal view, is obliged to assign the moral objection as the only tenable one. This, however, is a very unsatisfactory mode of disposing of the question, for we are not at liberty thus to explain away the reality of the occurrence simply to evade its difficulties. Moreover, if it be a symbol, what becomes of its force unless based upon a fact? Nor do the prophets receive visions respecting their own personal acts. Finally, the internal suggestion of a wrong act to the prophet's mind as one to be not merely tolerated, but committed, would be equivalent, in point of moral obliquity, to the actual deed itself; at least according to our Savior's rule of guilt in such a matter (Mat 5:28). This last remark leads us to the true solution of the whole difficulty, which has simply arisen from judging O.T. morals by a Gospel standard, in neglect of the important principle enunciated by Christ himself on the very question of the relations of the sexes (Mat 19:8). The Mosaic precept (Lev 21:14) has no pertinence here, for Hosea was not a priest.

But in whichever way this question may be solved whether these occurrences be regarded as a real and external transaction, or as a piece of spiritual scenery, or only (Witsi Miscell. Sac. p. 90) as an allegorical description it is agreed on all hands that the actions are typical; that they are, as Jerome calls them, sacramenta futurorum. One question which sprang out of the literal view was whether the connection between Hosea and Gomer was marriage or fornication. Another question which followed immediately upon the preceding was “an Dens possit dispensare ut fornicatio sit licita.” This latter question was much discussed by the schoolmen, and by the Thomists it was avowed in the affirmative.

Expositors are not at all agreed as to the meaning of the phrase “wife of whoredoms,” אֵשֶׁת זְנוּנַים; whether the phrase refers to harlotry before marriage, or unfaithfulness after it. It may afford an easy solution of the difficulty if we look at the antitype in its history and character. Adultery is the appellation of idolatrous apostasy. The Jewish nation were espoused to God. The contract was formed in Sinai; but the Jewish people had prior to this period gone a-whoring. Jos 24:2-14, “Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old time, and they served other gods.” Comp. Lev 17:7, in which it is implied that idolatrous propensities had also developed themselves during the abode in Egypt so that the phrase here employed may signify one devoted to lasciviousness prior to her marriage. Yet this propensity of the Israelites to idolatry had been  measurably covert prior to the Exode. On the other hand, none but a female of previously lewd inclinations would be likely to violate her conjugal obligations; and Eichhorn shows that marrying an avowed harlot is not necessarily implied by אֵשֶׁת זְנוּנַים which may very well imply a wife who after marriage becomes an adulteress, even though chaste before. In any case the marriage must be supposed to have been a real contract, or its significance would be lost. Jer 2:2, “I remember thee, the kindness of thy youth, the love of thine espousals, when thou wentest after me in the wilderness, in a land that was not sown.” The facts in the case of the Israelitish nation correspond with this symbol of a woman who had been of bad repute before marriage, and who proved a notorious profligate afterwards. יִלְדֵי זְנוּנַים, children of whoredoms, refer most naturally to the two sons and daughter afterwards to be born. They were not the prophet's own, but a spurious offspring palmed upon him by his faithless spouse, as is intimated in the allegory, and they followed the pernicious example of the mother. Spiritual adultery was the debasing sin of Israel. “Non dicitur,” observes Manger, “cognovit uxorem, sed simpliciter concepit et peperit.” The children are not his. It is said, indeed, in Jer 2:3, “She bare him a son.” The word לוֹ is wanting in some MSS. and in some copies of the Sept. If genuine, it only shows the effrontery of the adulteress, and the patience of the husband in receiving and educating as his own a spurious brood. The Israelites who had been received into covenant very soon fell from their first love, and were characterized by insatiable spiritual wantonness yet their Maker, their husband, did not at once divorce them, but exhibited a marvelous long-suffering.

The names of the children being symbolical, the name of the mother has been thought to have a similar signification. Gomer Bath-Diblair may have the symbolic sense of one thoroughly abandoned to sensual delights; גֹּמֶר signifies completion (Ewald, Grannmat. § 228); דַּבְלִיַם בִּתאּ, “daughter of grape-cakes,” the dual form being expressive of the mode in which these dainties were baked in double layers. The names of the children are Jezreel, Lo-ruhamah, and Lo-ammi. The prophet explains the meaning of the appellations. It is generally supposed that the names refer to three successive generations of the Israelitish people. Hengstenberg, on the other hand, argues that “wife and children both are the people of Israel: the three names must not be considered separately, but taken together.” But as the marriage is first mentioned, and the births of the children are detailed in  order, some time elapsing between the events, we rather adhere to the ordinary exposition. Nor is it without reason that the second child is described as a female. The first child, Jezreel, may refer to the first dynasty of Jeroboam I and his successors, which was terminated in the blood of Ahab's house shed by Jehu at Jezreel. The name suggests also the cruel and fraudulent possession of the vineyard of Naboth, “which was in Jezreel,” where, too, the woman Jezebel was slain so ignominiously (1Ki 16:1; 2Ki 9:21). But since Jehu and his family had become as corrupt as their predecessors, the scenes of Jezreel were again to be enacted; and Jehu's race must perish. Jezreel, the spot referred to by the prophet, is also, according to Jerome, the place where the Assyrian army routed the Israelites. The name of this child associates the past and future, symbolizes past sins, intermediate punishments, and final overthrow. The name of the second child, Lo-ruhamah, “not-pitied,” the appellation of a degraded daughter, may refer to the feeble, effeminate period which followed the overthrow of the first dynasty, when Israel became weak and helpless as well as sunk and abandoned. The favor of God was not exhibited to the nation: they were as abject as impious. But the reign of Jeroboam II was prosperous; new energy was infused into the kingdom; gleams of its former prosperity shone upon it. This revival of strength in that generation may be typified by the birth of a third child, a son, Lo- ammi, “not-my-people” (2Ki 14:25). Yet prosperity did not bring with it a revival of piety; still, although their vigor was recruited, they were not God's people (Lectures on the Jewish Antiquities and Scriptures, by J. G. Palfrey, 2, 422, Boston, 1841). See each name in its place.

6. Division of the Book. — Recent writers, such as Bertholdt, Eichhorn, De Wette, Stuck, Maurer, and Hitzig, have labored much, but in vain, to divide the book of Hosea into separate portions, assigning to each the period at which it was written; but from the want of sufficient data the attempt must rest principally on taste and fancy. A sufficient proof of the correctness of this opinion may be found in the contradictory sections and allotments of the various writers who have engaged in the task. Chapters 1, 2 and 3 evidently form one division: it is next to impossible to separate and distinguish the other chapters. The form and style are very similar throughout all the second portion.

The subdivision of these several parts is a work of greater difficulty: that of Eichhorn will be found to be based upon a highly subtle, though by no means precarious criticism.

(1.) According to him, the first division should be subdivided into three separate poems, each originating in a distinct aim, and each after its own fashion attempting to express the idolatry of Israel by imagery borrowed from the matrimonial relation. The first, and therefore the least elaborate of these, is contained in chap. 3; the second in Hos 1:2-11; the third in Hos 1:2-9, and Hos 2:1-23. These three are progressively elaborate developments of the same reiterated idea. Hos 1:2-9 is common to the second and third poems, but not repeated with each severally (4, 273 sq.).

(2.) Attempts have been made by Wells, Eichhorn, etc., to subdivide the second part of the book. These divisions are made either according to reigns of contemporary kings, or according to the subject matter of the poem. The former course has been adopted by Wells, who gets five, the latter by Eichhorn, who gets sixteen poems out of this part of the book.

These prophecies — so scattered, so unconnected that bishop Lowth has compared them with the leaves of the Sibyl — were probably collected by Hosea himself towards the end of his career.

8. Style. — The peculiarities of Hosea's style have often been remarked. Jerome says of him, “Commaticus est, et quasi per sententias loquens” (Praef ad XII. Proph.). Augustine thus criticises him: “Osea quanto profundius loquitur, tanto operosius penetratur.” His style, says De Wette, “is abrupt, unrounded, and ebullient; his rhythm hard, leaping, and violent. The language is peculiar and difficult” (Einleitung, § 228). Lowth (Prelect. 21) speaks of him as the most difficult and perplexed of the prophets. Bishop Horsley has remarked his peculiar idioms his change of person, anomalies of gender and number, and use of the nominative absolute (Works, vol. 3). Eichhorn's description of his style was probably at the same time meant as an imitation of it (Einleitung, § 555). His discourse is like a garland woven of a multiplicity of flowers: images are woven upon images, comparison wound upon comparison, metaphor strung upon metaphor. He plucks one flower and throws it down that he may directly break off another. Like a bee, he flies from one flowerbed to another, that he may suck his honey from the most varied pieces. It is a natural consequence that his figures sometimes form strings of pearls. Often he is prone to approach to allegory often he sinks down in obscurity” (compare 5:9; 6:3; 7:8; 13:3, 7, 8, 16). Obscure brevity seems to be the characteristic quality of Hosea; and all commentators agree that, “of all the prophets, he  is, in point of language, the most obscure and hard to be understood” (Henderson, Minor Prophets, p. 2). Unusual words and forms of connection sometimes occur (De Wette, § 228; see also Davidson, in Horne, 2:945).

9. Citation in the N.T. — Hosea, as a prophet, is expressly quoted by Matthew (Mat 2:15). The citation is from the first verse of chap. 11 Hos 6:6 is quoted twice by the same evangelist (Mat 9:13; Mat 12:7). Other quotations and references are the following: Luk 23:30; Rev 6:16; Hos 10:8; Rom 9:25-26; 1Pe 2:10; Hosea 1, 10; Hos 2:23; 1Co 15:4; Hos 6:2; Heb 13:15; Hos 14:2. Messianic references are not clearly and prominently developed (Gramberg, Religionsid. 2, 298). This book, however, is not without them, but they lie more in the spirit of its allusions than in the letter. Hosea's Christology appears written, not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God, on the fleshly tables of his heart. The future conversion of his people to the Lord their God, and David their king, their glorious privilege in becoming sons of the living God, the faithfulness of the original promise to Abraham, that the number of his spiritual seed should be as the sand of the sea, are among the oracles whose fulfillment will take place only under the new dispensation.

10. Commentaries. — The following are the exegetical helps on the w-hole book of Hosea separately, and the most important are designated by an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Origen, Selecta (in Opp. 3, 438); Ephraem Syrus, Explanatio (in Opp. 5, 234); Remigius Antissod., Commentarius [fragment] (in Mai, Script. Fet. VI, 2:103); Jarchi, Aben-Ezra, and Kimchi, Scholia (ed. with Notes, by Coddaeus, L. B. 1623, 4to; by De Dieu, ib. 1631, 4to; also extracts, with additions, by Von der Hardt, Helmst. 1702, 4to [with a historical Introduction ib. eod.]; and by Mercer. Genesis 1574, 1578; L. B. 1621, 4to; and [including several other minor prophets] Genesis 15, fol.; Giess. 1595, 4to; Götting. 1755, 4to); Abrabanei, Comment. (in Lat. with notes, by F. al-Husen, L. B. 1687, 4to); Luther, Enarratio (Vitemb. 1526, 1545; Frcft. 1546, 8vo; also in 0pp. 4, 598; also Senterntie, ib. 684); Capito, Commentarius (Argent. 1528, 8vo); Quinquarboreus, Notae [including Amos, Ruth, and Lam.] (Par. 1556, 4to); Brentz, Commentarius (Hag. 1560, 4to; Tub. 1580, fol.; also in Opp. 4); Box, Commentaria (Coesaraug. 1581, fol.; Ven. 1585, 4to; Lugd. 1587, 8vo; improved edition bv Gyrel, Brix. 1604, 4to), De Castro, Commentaria (Samant. 1586, fol.); Vavassor, Commentarius (in Opp.  Vitemb. 4, 348; Jen. 4, 764); Mcatthoeus, Pralectiones (Basil. 1590, 4to); Polansdorf, Analysis (Basil. 1599, 4to; 1601, 8vo); Zanchius, Commentarius (Neost. 1600, 4to; also in Opp. 5); Gesner, Illustratio (Vitemb. 1601, 1614, 8vo); Pareus, Commentarius (Heidelberg, 1605, 1609, 4to); Downame, Lectures [on. ch. 1-4] (London 1608, 4to); Cocceius, Illustratio (in Opp. 11, 591); Krackewitz, Commentarius (Francof. 1619, 4to); Beisner, Commentarius (Vitemb. 1620, 8vo); Rivetus, Commentarius (L. B. 1625, 4to; also in Opp. 2:488); \*Burroughs, Lectures [chapter 14 by Sibbs and Reynolds] (London 1643 52, 4 vols. 4to; London 1843, 8vo); Lightfoot, Expositio (in Works, 2, 423); Ursinus, Commentarius (Norib. 1677, 8vo); \*Pocock, Commentary (Oxon. 1685, fol.; also in Works, 2, 1); \*Seb. Schmid, Commentarius (F. ad MI. 1687, 4to); Biermann, Ontleding (Utrecht, 1702, 4to); Wacke, Expositio (Ratisb. 1711, 8vo); Graff, Predigten (Dresd. 1716, 4to); Kromayer, Specimen, etc. [including Joel and Amos] (Amst. 1730, 8vo); Terne, Erklarung (part 1, Jen. 1740: 2, Eisenb. 1748, 8vo); Klemmius, Note (Tübing. 1744, 4to) Dathe, Dissertatio [on Aquila's vers. of Ho] (Lips. 1757; also in Opusc. Lips. 1796); Happach, Expositio [on certain passages] (Cobl. 1766 sq., 8vo); Struensee, Uebers. (Frankf. and Lpz. 1769, 8vo); Neale, Commentary (London 1771, 8vo); Michaelis, Chaldea [Jonathan's Targum] (Gött. 1775, 4to); Staudlin, Erlaut. (in his Beitr. 1 sq.); Euren, Exanen [of var. readings] (1, Upsal. 1782; 2, ib. 1786; also in Aurivellii, Dissert. p. 594); Schrier, Erlaut. (Dessau, 1782, 8vo); Manger, Commentarius (Campis, 1782, 4to); Pfeiffer. Uebers. (Erlangen, 1785, 8vo); Uhland, Annotationes (in 12 pts. Tübing. 1785-97, 4to); Volborth, Erklarung (part 1, Gott. 1787, 8vo); Kuinol, Erlauterung (Leips. 1789, 8vo; also in Latin, ibid. 1792, 8vo); Roos, Observationes [on difficult passages] (Erlang. 1780, 4to); Vaupel, Erklar. (Dresden, 1793, 8vo); \*Horsley, Notes (London 1801, 1804, 4to; also in Bib. Crit. 2, 134); Philippson, Commentirung [includ. Joel] (Dessau, 1805, 8vo; also in his Israelitische Bibel); Bickel, Erlaut. (Konigsb. 1807, 8vo); Gaab, Dijudicatio [on the vers. of H. in the London Polyglot] (in 2 pts. Tüb. 1812, 4to); Rosenmüller, Scholia (part 7, vol. 1, 1827, 8vo); Goldwitzer, Anmerk. (Landsh. 1828, 8vo); \*Stuck, Commentarius (Lips. 1828, 8vo); Schroder, Erlaut. [vol. 1 of min. proph.. includ. Hosea, Joel, and Amos] (Lpz. 1829, 8vo); De Wette, Ueber d. geschl. Beziehung, etc. (in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1831, p. 807); Mrs. Best, Dialogues (London 1831, 12mo); Redslob, Die Integritat, etc. [of 7, 4-10] (Hamb. 1842, 8vo); \*Simson, Erklar. (Hamb. 1851 8So); Drake, Notes [includ. Jonah]  (London 1853, 8vo; also Sermons [includ. also Amos], ib. ed. 8vo); Kurtz. Ehe d. H. (Dorpat. 1859, 8vo); Kara, פֵּרוּשׁ(Breslau, 1861, 4to); Winsche, Auslegung [Rabbinical] (Lpz. 1868 sq. 8vo); Bassett, Translation (London, 1869, 8vo). SEE PROPHETS, MINOR. 4, 5. HOSHEA SEE HOSHEA (q.v.).

## Hosein [[@Headword:Hosein ]]

             SEE HOCEIN.

## Hosen SEE HOSE. Hoshai'ah (Heb. Hoshayah', ???????????, whom Jehovah delivers; Sept, ?Osa?va,[[@Headword:Hosen SEE HOSE. Hoshai'ah (Heb. Hoshayah', ???????????, whom Jehovah delivers; Sept, ?Osa?va,]]

but identifies those named in Jer 42:1; Jeremiah 43, 2, yet changes in both passages to Maaaaian'; Vulg. Oscjas), the name of two men

             1. The father of Jehazaniah, which latter besought Jeremiah to favor the flight of the remnant of the Jews into Egypt (Jer 42:1). He is apparently the same with the father of Azariah, which latter is mentioned as rejecting the advice of Jeremiah after he had thus solicited it (Jer 43:2). B.C. 587.

2. One who headed the procession of the chief men of Judah along the southern section of the newly rebuilt walls of Jerusalem (Neh 12:32). B.C. 446.

## Hoshama[[@Headword:Hoshama]]

             [many Hosh'ama] (Heb. Hoshama', הוֹשָׁמָע, whom Jehovah hears; Sept. ῾Ωσαμώ v.r. ᾿Ωσαμάθ and Ι᾿ωσαμώ), one of the sons of king Jehoiachin, born during his captivity (1Ch 3:18). B.C. post 598. (See Strong's Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels, p. 17.) SEE JEHOIACHIN.

## Hoshea[[@Headword:Hoshea]]

             (Heb. the same name as “Hosea,” q.v.), the name of several persons.

1. The original name (Deu 32:44, Sept. Ι᾿ησοῦς, Vulg. Josue; A.V. in Num 13:8; Num 13:16, “Oshea,” Sept. Αὐσὴ,Vulg. Osee) of the son of Nun, afterwards called JOSHUA SEE JOSHUA (q.v.), by the more distinct recognition of the divine name Jah.  2. (Sept. ᾿Ωσή; Vulg. Osee). A son of Azariah in the time of David; also an Ephraimite and prince of his people (1Ch 27:20). B.C. 1014.

3. The prophet Hosea (q.v.).

4. Hosea (Sept. ᾿Ωσηέ, Vulg. Osee), the son of Elah, and last king of Israel. In the twentieth (posthumous) year of Jotham (2Ki 15:30), i.e. B.C. 737-6, he conspired against and slew his predecessor Pekah, thereby fulfilling a prophecy of Isaiah (Isa 7:16). Although Josephus calls Hoshea a friend of Pekah (φίλου τινὸς ἐπβουλεύσαντος αὐτῷ, Ant. 9, 13, 1), we have no ground for calling this “a treacherous murder” (Prideaux, 1, 16). But he did not become established on the throne he had thus usurped till after an interregnum of warfare for eight years, namely, in the twelfth year of Ahaz (2Ki 17:1), i.e. B.C. 729-8. “He did evil in the sight of the Lord.” but not in the same degree as his predecessors (2Ki 17:2). According to the Rabbis, this superiority consisted in his removing from the frontier cities the guards placed there by his predecessors to prevent their subjects from worshipping at Jerusalem (Seder Olam Rabba, cap. 22, quoted by Prideaux, 1, 16), and in his not hindering the Israelites from accepting the invitation of Hezekiah (2Ch 30:10), nor checking their zeal against idolatry (2Ch 31:1). The compulsory cessation of the calf-worship may have removed his greatest temptation, for Tiglath Pileser had carried off the golden calf from Dan some years before (Sed. 01. Rab. 22), and that at Bethel was taken away by Shalmaneser in his first invasion (2Ki 17:3; Hos 10:14). Shortly after his accession (B.C. 728) he submitted to the supremacy of Shalmaneser, who appears to have entered his territory with the intention of subduing it by force if resisted (2Ki 17:3), and, indeed, seems to have stormed the strong caves of Beth-arbel (Hos 10:14), but who retired pacified with a present.

This peaceable temper, however, appears not to have continued long. The intelligence that Hosea, encouraged perhaps by the revolt of Hezekiah, had entered into a confederacy with So, king of Egypt, with the view of shaking off the Assyrian yoke, caused Shalmaneser to return and punish the rebellious king of Israel by imprisonment for withholding the tribute for several years exacted from his country (2Ki 17:4), B.C. cir. 725. He appears to have been again released, probably appeasing the conqueror by a large ransom; but a second relapse into revolt soon afterwards provoked the king of Assyria to march an army into the land of Israel, B.C. 723; and after a three-years' siege Samaria was taken and destroyed, and the ten  tribes were sent into the countries beyond the Euphrates, B.C. 720 (2Ki 17:5-6; 2Ki 18:9-12). The king no doubt perished in the sack of the city by the enraged victor, or was only spared for the torture of an Assyrian triumph. He was apparently treated with the utmost indignity (Mic 5:1). That he disappeared very suddenly, like “foam upon the water,” we may infer from Hos 13:11; Hos 10:7. His name occurs on the Assyrian monuments. The length of the siege was owing to the fact that this “glorious and beautiful” city was strongly situated, like “a crown of pride” among her hills (Isa 28:1-5). During the course of the siege Shalmaneser must have died, for it is certain that Samaria was taken by his successor Sargon, who thus laconically describes the event in his annals: “Samaria I looked at, I captured; 27,280 men (families?) who dwelt in it I carried away, I constructed fifty chariots in their country ... I appointed a governor over them, and continued upon them the tribute of the former people” (Botta, p. 145, 11, quoted by Dr. Hincks, Journ. of Sacr. Lit. Oct. 1858; Layard, Nin. and Bab. 1, 148). For an account of the subsequent fortunes of the unhappy Ephraimites, the places to which they were transplanted by the policy of their conqueror and his officer, “the great and noble Asnapper” (Ezr 4:10), and the nations by which they were superseded, SEE SAMARIA.

Hoshea came to the throne too late, and governed a kingdom torn to pieces by foreign invasion and intestine broils. Sovereign after sovereign had fallen by the dagger of the assassin; and we see from the dark and terrible delineations of the contemporary prophets, SEE HOSEA; SEE MICAH; SEE ISAIAH, that murder and idolatry, drunkenness and lust, had eaten like “an incurable wound” (Mic 1:9) into the inmost heart of the national morality. Ephraim was dogged to its ruin by the apostate policy of the renegade who had asserted its independence (2 Kings 17; Joseph. Ant. 9,14; Prideaux, 1, 15 sq.; Keil, On Kings, 2, 50 sq., English ed.; Jahn, Hebr. Corn. § 40; Ewald, Gesch. 3. 607-613; Rosenmüller, Bibl. Geogr. chap. 1, English translated; Rawlinson, Herod. 1, 149). SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

5. HOSHEA (Sept. ᾿Ωσηέ, Vulg. Osee), one of the chief Israelites who joined in the sacred covenant after the Captivity (Neh 10:23). B.C. cir. 410.

## Hosius or Osius[[@Headword:Hosius or Osius]]

             (῎Οσιος, the saint), an early Christian bishop, was born probably about A.D. 256. It is doubtful whether he was a native of Spain, but he was  bishop of the see of Cordova, Spain, for some sixty years. He was a particular favorite of the emperor Constantine, who is said to have been converted to Christianity under the instrumentality of Hosius, by offering him, as an inducement, the remission of his sins, a satisfaction which the heathen priests were unable to grant. He was present at the Council held at Eliberi or Elvira (q.v.), near Granada (305 or 306), and suffered for his faith (confessus sum, as he says in his letter to Constantine) during the persecutions of Diocletian and Maximianus. In 324 Constantine sent him to Alexandria, to settle the dispute between Alexander and Arius, also the troubles which had arisen concerning the observance of the Easter festival. He failed in this mission, but still remained in favor with the emperor. He took part in the Council of Nice (325), where Baronius claims that. Hosius attended as legate of the pope; but this is not generally conceded even by Roman Catholic historians. Hosius's signature is the first amongst the subscriptions to the acts of this council. He pronounced (ἐξέδετο) or drew up (according to Tillemont) the symbol or confession of faith of Nice. In 347 he presided at the Council of Sardica, called by order of the emperors Constantius and Constans at the request of Athanasius. In 355 Constantius desired him to take part in the condemnation of Athanasius, but Hosius replied by a letter, recalling all he had suffered on behalf of the faith, and closing with an earnest defense of Athanasius. A second attempt of Constantius, who called him to Milan, met with the same opposition, and likewise a third, Hosius, who was then nearly a hundred years old, still refusing to condemn Athanasius. This decided stand in favor of Athanasius finally caused Hosius's banishment in 355. At length, worn out by imprisonment, he consented to give countenance to Arianism in a formula which was presented to-the Synod of Sirmium (357). He was permitted to return again to his see, where he died in 359. Athanasius and Augustine praise his virtues and excuse his weakness. See Athanasius, Hist. Arian. ad Monach. c. 42, 44; Augustine, Cont. Epistolam Perneniani, 1, 7; Eusebius, De Vit. Constantini, 2:63; 3:7; Socrates, Hist. Eccl. 1:7, 8; 2:20, 29, 31; Sozomen, 1, 10, 16,17; 3. 11; Tillemont., Memoires pour servir A1'Hist. Eccl. 7, 300; Baronius, Ann. Eccl.; Galland, Biblioth. Patrum, vol. 5 Proleg. c. 8; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25:209; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 6, 275 sq.; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. 1, 245; Hefele, Conciliengesch. 1, 33 sq.; Neander, Church Hist. 2:154, 371, 398, 404; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 3, 627, 635 sq.; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 5, 343 sq., 349, 354 sq., 364; 6, 83, 140; Stanley, Eastern Ch. (see Index); Milman, Latin Christianity, 1, 99, 101; Baur, Dogmengesch. 1, 146; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, 1, 127 sq.,  135,140; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 5, 336 sq.; Aschbach, Kirchen Lex. 3, 331 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Hosius, Stanislaus[[@Headword:Hosius, Stanislaus]]

             A distinguished Romish theologian of Poland, of Germans origin, was born at Cracow May 5,1504. He studied at Padua and Bologna, and obtained, on his return to Poland in 1538, a canonry. He was afterwards made secretary to the king, and, in 1549, bishop of Culm. He was entrusted by the king with important missions to the emperors Charles V and Ferdinand I; and as a reward for his services was made also bishop of Ermeland. Hosius was an ardent opponent of Luther, and having written the Confessio catholicae fidei (Mayence, 1551, etc.) in opposition to the Augsburg Confession, he was rewarded with a cardinal's hat. He attended the Council of Trent as legate, and afterwards returned to Poland, where he used his influence in favor of the Jesuits, and in 1564, to prevent the spread of Lutheranism, he established the College of Braunsberg, called after him Collegium Hosianum, and still existing with the two faculties of theology and philosophy. He afterwards made a journey to Rome for the purpose of settling some questions of importance to the Polish Church, but was detained by pope Gregory XIII, who received him with the highest honors. He died at Caprarola Aug. 15, 1579. ‘A collection of his works has been published under the title Opera omnia(Col. 1584, 2 vols. folio). It contains De Conmmn7ione sub utraque Specie; De Sacerdotum conjugio; De Alissa vulgari lingual celebranda, etc. See Father Paul, History of the Council. of Trent; Krasinski, Ref. in Poland (London, 1840, 2 vols.); Ch. Hist. 13th Cent. p. 243; Ranke, Hist. of the Popes, 2, 82; Mosheim, Church Hist. 3, 98; Bayle, Hist. Dict. 3, 499 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 5, 339 sq.; Aschbach, Kirche. — Lex. 3, 333 sq.; Schröckh, Kirchengesch sd. Reform. 2, 695; Palavicini, Hist. Concilii Trident. lib. 2 Chronicles 4; Ersch u. Gruber, A1g. Encyklop.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 210; Eichhorn, Der Bischof Stan. rosius (Mainz, 1844-55, 2 vols.).

## Hosmann, Gustav Christoph[[@Headword:Hosmann, Gustav Christoph]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born May 16, 1695. He studied at Leipsic and Kiel, was deacon in 1721, and professor of theology at Kiel in 1730. In 1734 he was appointed first court-preacher, in 1749 general superintendent, and died July 10, 1766. He wrote, Disp. Exeget. ad Gal 3:19 (Kiel, 1720):-Hypotyposis Chronologiae Sacrae (Hamburg, 1727): — Annotationes ad Hypotyposin Chronologiae Sacrae (1729): — De Resurrectione Mortuorum a Christo Demonstrata Luk 2:37-38 : — De Baptisno Apostoloruns hoc de Mysterio Sententiam Evolvens (1732): — Principia Theologiae Comparativae (eod.): —  Chronologia Sacra Librorum V. Test. Observationibus Exegeticis Illustrata (1734): — Exercitationum Exegeticarum ad SS. Evangelia Fasciculi III (1746-50): — Chronologia Jeremiae, Ezechielis, Haggae, Zacharice, Esrae et Nehemiae (1751): — Historia Samuelis, Sauli et Davidis (1752): — Disquisitio de Era Seleucidarum et Regum Syriae Successione (eod.): — Semicenturia-Observationum Sacrarum (1753). See Moser, Jetztlebende Theologen; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:901; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hospice[[@Headword:Hospice]]

             The name by which are known the pious establishments kept up by monks on some of the Alpine passes, to afford assistance and shelter to travelers. The first of these established was that situated on the Great St. Bernard, of which the priests of the canton of Valais obtained possession in 1825. Another hospice existed on St. Gothard as early as the 13th century. This  establishment the monks have left, and it is now occupied by a “hospitaller,” who entertains travelers gratis. Hospices are also found on Mount Cenis, the Simplon, and the Little St. Bernard. — Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 432. SEE HOSPITALS.

## Hospinian, Rudolph[[@Headword:Hospinian, Rudolph]]

             A Swiss Protestant theologian, was born at Altdorf, near Zurich, Nov. 7, 1547, of a family several members of which had been martyrs of the Reformation. Rudolph was brought up by his uncle, and studied theology at the universities of Marburg and Heidelberg. After his return to Zurich in 1568 he began to preach, and became successively rector in 1576, archdeacon in 1588, and pastor of the church of the Abbey in 1594. He died March 11, 1626. Hospinian is especially distinguished as a writer, and most of his works are of a polemic character, against the Romish Church, inquiring into the cultus and constitution of that Church. The first of them was his De origine et progressu Rituum et Ceremoniaruzm Ecclesiasticarum (1585). Two years after he published De Templis hoc est de origine, progressu, usu et abusu templorum, ac omnino rerum omnium ad templa pertinentium (Zur. 1587, fol.; enlarged edition, 1602, fol.). His De Monachis, seu de origine et progressu Monachatus ac Ordinum Monasticorum, Equitum militarium tam sacrorum quam scecularium omnium was published at Zurich (1588), and reprinted, with additions, as an answer to Bellarmine's De Monachis (Zurich, 1609, folio) — De Festis Chris. tianorum, hoc est de origine, progressu, caerimoniis et ritibus festorum dierum Christianorum Liber unus, etc. (Zur. 1592-3, 2 vols. fol.; augmented, ib. 1612, fol.); the additions to the second edition are in answer to the objections of cardinal Bellarmine and of the Jesuit Gretser: De Festis Judeorum, et Ethnicorum, Libri tres (Zurich, 1592, fol.; 2nd edit., augmented, Zurich, 1611, fol.) — De Origine et Progressu Controversice Sacramenltariae de Caena Domini inter Lutheranos, Ubiquistas et Orthodoxos quos Zuinglianos seu Calvinistas vacant (Zur. 1602, fol.): the Lutherans are strongly attacked by Hospinian in the work — Sacrae Scripturce, orthodoxis symbolis, toti antiquitati puriori, et ipsi etiam Augustance Confessioni repugnantia, etc. (Zurich, 1609, folio). This work gave rise to great controversy. Frederick IV, elector of the Palatinate, blamed Hospinian strongly, and Leonard Hutter answered this and the preceding work in his Concordia Concors (Wittemb. 1614, folio). Hospinian intended to answer Hutter, but gave up the idea lest he should displease the Protestant princes and embitter the controversy, which was  very agreeable to the Roman Catholic party — Historia Jesuitica (Zurich, 1619, fol.), a very valuable work — An Anima sit in toto corpore sinul? De Immortalitate ejus (Zurich, 1586, 4to). A complete edition of Hospinian's works was published by J. H. Heidegger at Geneva (1669-81, 7 vols. fol.), containing a full memoir. See Fabricius, Historia Bibl. pt. 1, p. 349, 350; pt. 2, p. 510, 511; pt. 3, p. 87, 88; Dupin, Bibl. des Auteurs separes de la communion Romaine, etc. (Paris, 1718); Pierer, Universal- Lexikon, s.v. Herzog Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25 211; Bayle, Historical Dict. 3:502; Darling, Encyclop. Bibliog. vol. 1. SEE HUTTER. (J. N. P.)

## Hospital Sisters[[@Headword:Hospital Sisters]]

             Also called “Daughters of God,” are communities of nuns and lay sisters founded for the same purpose originally as the Hospitallers (q.v.). Their organization spread even more rapidly than the latter, but they soon abandoned their original purpose, and turned their attention to the education of young girls, especially orphans, and also to the redeeming of lost women. They are to be found to this day in France, the Netherlands, and in Italy, and are especially useful in taking care of the sick. Among their many branches we find the following:

(1.) Hospital Sisters of Notre Dame of Refuge, founded in 1624 by Elizabeth of the Cross at Nancy, confirmed in 1634 by pope Urban VIII. They received in their houses three classes of women: virtuous girls, who by vows bound themselves to works of charity; fallen women, who, after their reformation, were likewise admitted to taking the vows; finally, voluntary penitents, and women who were sent to these institutions against their will for correction.

(2.) Hospital Sisters of Loches (in Touraine), founded in 1630 by the priest Pasquier Bouray. They had a very strict rule.

(3.) Hospital Sisters of the Mercy of Jesus, established in 1630 according to the rule of St. Augustine; confirmed in 1638 by patent letters, and in 1664 and 1667 by papal bulls.

(4.) Hospital Sisters of St. Joseph or of Providence; SEE PROVIDENCE, ORDERS OF.

(5.) Hospital Sisters of St. Thomas of Villeneuve, established in 1660 by Angelus le Proust and Louis Chaboisseau, according to the third rule of St. Augustine; received in 1661 the royal sanction, and still exist in France.

(6.) Hospital Sisters of St. Augustine of Notre Danme of Christian Love, who originated in 1679 at Grenoble.

(7.) Hospital Sisters of Besangon, established in 1685,revived in 1807, have (1870) about eighteen houses.

(8.) Hospital Sisters of' St. Martha of Pontarlier, established in 1687.

(9.) Hospital Sisters of the Holy Ghost; SEE HOLY GHOST, ORDERS OF. To the class of Hospital Sisters, in the wider sense of the word, may also be counted the Elizabethines, the Sisters of Charity, and many other congregations. — Herzog, Real-Encyclop. 6, 285; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 5:345 sq.; Helyot, Geschichte d. Klöster- u. Ritterorden, 2, 362; 4, 404,437,475, 482; 7, 342 sq.; Theol. Univ. Lex. 2, 370 sq. (A. J. S.)

## Hospital, Michael De L[[@Headword:Hospital, Michael De L]]

             SEE HOPITAL.

## Hospitality[[@Headword:Hospitality]]

             (φιλοξενία). The practice of receiving strangers into one's house and giving them suitable entertainment may be traced back to the early origin of human society. It was practiced, as it still is, among the least cultivated nations (Diod. Sic. 5:28, 34; Caesar, Bell. Gall. 6, 23; Tacit. Germ. 21). It was not less observed, in the early periods of their history, among the (greeks and Romans. With the Greeks, hospitality (ξενια) was under the immediate protection of religion. Jupiter bore a name (ξένιος) signifying that its rights were under his guardianship. In the Odyssey (6, 206) we are told expressly that all guests and poor people are special objects of care to the gods. There were, both in Greece and Italy, two kinds of hospitality, the one private, the other public (see Smith's Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v. Hospitium). The first existed between individual, the second was cultivated by one state towards another. Hence arose a new kind of social relation: between those who had exercised and partaken of the rites of hospitality an intimate friendship ensued, which was called into play whenever the individuals might afterwards chance to meet, and the right, duties, and advantages of which passed from father to son, and were deservedly held in the highest estimation (Potter's. Greek Antiquities, 2, 722 sq.).

But, though not peculiarly Oriental, hospitality has nowhere been earlier or more fully practiced than in the East. It is still honorably observed among the Arabs, especially at the present day. (See Niebuhr, Arabia, p. 46; Burckhardt, 1, 331, 459; 2:651, 739; Jaubert, Trav. p. 43; Russel's Aleppo, 1, 328; Buckingham's Mesopot. p. 23; Robinson's Researches, 2, 331,  335, 603; Prokesch, Ermin. 2:245; Harmer, 2, 114; Schultens, Excerpt. p. 408, 424, 454, 462; Layard's Nineveh, 2nd ser. p. 317 sq.; Hackett's Ill. of Script. p. 64 sq.) An Arab, on arriving at a village, dismounts at the house of some one who is known to him, saying to the master, “I am your guest.” On this the host receives the traveler, and performs his duties, that is, he sets before his guest his supper, consisting of bread, milk, and borgul, and if he is rich and generous, he also takes the necessary care of his horse or beast of burden. Should the traveler be unacquainted with any person, he alights at any house, as it may happen, fastens his horse to the same, and proceeds to smoke his pipe until the master bids him welcome, and offers him his evening meal. In the morning the traveler pursues his journey, making no other return than “God be with you” (good-by) (Niebuhr, Reis. 2:431,462; D'Arvieux, 3:152; Burckhardt 1, 69; Rosenmüller, Morgenl. 6, 82, 257). The early existence and long continuance of this amiable practice in Oriental countries are owing to the fact of their presenting that condition of things which necessitates and calls forth hospitality. When population is thinly scattered over a great extent of country, and traveling is comparatively infrequent, inns or places of public accommodation are not found; yet the traveler needs shelter, perhaps succor and support. Pity prompts the dweller in a house or tent to open his door to the tired wayfarer, the rather because its master has had, and is likely again to have, need of similar kindness. The duty has its immediate pleasures and advantages, for the traveler comes full of news-false, true, wonderful; and it is by no means onerous, since visits from wayfarers are not very frequent, nor are the needful hospitalities costly. In later periods, when population had greatly increased, the establishment of inns (caravanserais) diminished, but did by no means abolish the practice (Josephus, Ant. 5:1, 2; Luk 10:34).

Accordingly, we find hospitality practiced and held in the highest estimation at the earliest periods in which the Bible speaks of human society (Gen 18:3; Gen 19:2; Gen 24:25; Exo 2:20; Jdg 19:16). Express provision for its exercise is made in the Mosaic law. (Lev 19:33; Dent. 14:29). In the New Testament also its observance is enjoined, though in the period to which its books refer the nature and extent of hospitality would be changed with the change that society had undergone (1Pe 4:9; 1Ti 3:2; Titus 1, 8; 1Ti 5:10; Rom 12:13; Heb 13:2). The reason assigned in this last passage (see Pfaff, Diss. de Hospitalitate, ad loc., Tübing. 1752), “for thereby some  have entertained angels unawares,” is illustrated in the instances of Abraham and Lot (Gen 18:1-16; Gen 19:1-3); nor is it without a parallel in classical literature; for the religious feeling which in Greece was connected with the exercise of hospitality was strengthened by the belief that the traveler might be some god in disguise (Homer, Odyss. 17, 484). The disposition which generally prevailed in favor of the practice was enhanced by the fear lest those who neglected its rites should, after the example of impious men, be subjected by the divine wrath to frightful punishments (Lelian, Animalia, 11, 19). Even the Jews, in “the latter days,” laid very great stress on the obligation: the rewards of Paradise, their doctors declared, were his who spontaneously exercised hospitality (Schöttgen, Hor. Heb. 1, 220; Kype, Observ. Sacr. 1, 129).

The guest, whoever he might be, was, on his appearing, invited into the house or tent (Gen 19:2; Exo 2:20; Jdg 13:15; Jdg 19:21). Courtesy dictated that no improper questions should be put to him, and some days elapsed before the name of the stranger was asked, or what object he had in view in his journey (Gen 24:33; Odyss. 1, 123; 3, 69; Iliad, 6, 175; 9, 222; Diod. Sic. 5, 28). As soon as he arrived he was furnished with water to wash his feet (Gen 18:4; Gen 19:2; 1Ti 5:10; Odyss. 4, 49; 17, 88; 6, 215); received a supply of needful food for himself and his beast (Gen 18:5; Gen 19:3; Gen 24:25; Exo 2:20; Jdg 19:20; Odyss. 3, 464), and enjoyed courtesy and protection from his host (Gen 19:5; Jos 2:2; Jdg 19:23). SEE SALT, COVENANT OF.

The case of Sisera, decoyed and slain by Jael (Jdg 4:18 sq.), was a gross infraction of the rights and duties of hospitality. On his departure the traveler was not allowed to go alone or empty-handed (Jdg 19:5; Waginseil, ad Sot. p. 1020, 1030; Zorn, ad Hecat. Abder. 22; Iliad, 6, 217). This courtesy to guests even in some Arab tribes goes the length (comp. Gen 21:8; Jdg 19:24) of sacrificing the chastity of the females of the family for their gratification (Lane, Modern Eg. 1, 443; Burckhardt, Notes on the Bedouins, 1, 179). As the free practice of hospitality was held right and honorable, so the neglect of it was considered discreditable (Job 31:32; Odyss. 14, 56); and any interference with the comfort and protection which the host afforded was treated as a wicked outrage (Gen 19:4 sq.). Though the practice of hospitality was general, and its rites rarely violated, yet national or local enmities did not fail sometimes to interfere; and accordingly travelers avoided those places in which they had reason to expect an unfriendly  reception (compare Jdg 19:12). The quarrel which arose between the Jews and Samaritans after the Babylonian captivity destroyed the relations of hospitality between them.

Regarding each other as heretics, they sacrificed every better feeling (see Joh 4:9). It was only in the greatest extremity that the Jews would partake of Samaritan food (Lightfoot, p. 993); and they were accustomed, in consequence of their religious and political hatred, to avoid passing through Samaria in journeying from one extremity of the land to the other. The animosity of the Samaritans towards the Jews appears to have been somewhat less bitter; but they showed an adverse feeling towards those persons who, in going up to the annual feast at Jerusalem, had to pass through their country (Luk 9:53). At the great national festivals, hospitality was liberally practiced as long as the state retained its identity. On these festive occasions no inhabitant of Jerusalem considered his house his own; every home swarmed with strangers; yet this unbounded hospitality could not find accommodation in the houses for all who stood in need of it, and a large proportion of visitors had to be content with such shelter as tents could afford (Helon, Pilgrim. 1, 228 sq.). The primitive Christians considered one principal part of their duty to consist in showing hospitality to strangers (1Pe 4:9; 1Ti 3:2;. Tit 1:8; compare Acts 2:44; 6:32, 35). They were, in fact, so ready in discharging this duty that the very heathen admired them for it. They were hospitable to all strangers, but especially to those of the household of faith (see Ambrose, De Abrahamo, 5; De Offic. 2, 21; 3:7; Augustine, Epist. 38, n. 2; Tertullian, Apologet. 39). Even Lucian praises them in this respect (De morte peregrin. 2, p. 766). Believers scarcely ever traveled without letters of communion, which testified the purity of their faith, and procured for them a favorable reception wherever the name of Jesus Christ was known. Calmet is of opinion that the two minor epistles of John may be such letters of communion and recommendation. (On the general subject, see Unger, De ξενοδοκί5 ejusque ritu untiquo, in his Annal. de Cingulis, p. 311 sq.; Stuck, Antiq. Conviv. 1, 27; De Wette, Lehrbuch der Archäologie; Scholz, Handb. der Bibl. Archäologie; Deyling, Observ. 1, 118 sq.; Jahn, Archäologie, I, 2:227 sq.; Küster, Erläuterung, § 202 sq.; Laurent, in Gronov. Thesaurus, 9, 194 sq.; Otho, Lex. Rabb. 283.) SEE CARAVAN; SEE ENTERTAINMENT; SEE GUEST.

## Hospitallers[[@Headword:Hospitallers]]

             Is the name generally given to charitable brotherhoods, consisting of laymen, monks, choristers, and knights of religious orders, who, while continuing under the rules and exercises of conventual life (chiefly after the rule of St. Augustine), devoted themselves to the care of the poor and the sick in the hospitals. These brotherhoods were founded at various times arid in different countries. They added to the ordinary vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, the special vow that they would devote themselves to this work of mercy. The hospitals (q.v.), in the age when these were instituted, were mostly connected with monasteries, and were subject to the bishops. Oftentimes the care of them was so great that a special officer was appointed, with the appellation of general, and the officer under him as intendant, superior, or major. Some of the Hospitaller brotherhoods, however, were not subject to the bishops, but only to the pope, as the Hospitallers' of St. John of God, also called the Brethren of Love, etc. As an order of spiritual knights, they were divided into knights, priests, and serving brethren. Among them we find

(1.) The Hospitallers of St. Anthony, SEE ANTHONY, ORDERS OF, founded by Gaston in consequence' of an epidemic known as St. Anthony's fire.

(2.) The Brethren of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem. SEE MALTA, KNIGHTS OF.

(3.) The Order of Teutonic Knights (q.v.).

(4.) The Brethren of the Hospital of the Order of the Holy Ghost, SEE HOLY GHOST, ORDERS OF, founded by Guido at Montpellier.

(5.) The Hospitallers of Burgos, founded in 1212.

(6.) The Hospitallers of our Lady of Christian Charity were founded near Chalons in the end of the 13th century by Guy de Joinville; a like order was founded at Paris in 1294.

(7.) The Hospitallers of our Lady Della Scala, which, according to some authorities, dates as far back as the 9th century, is said by others to have been founded about this time at Sienna, in Italy.

(8.) The Hospitallers of the Order of St. John of God (de Dieu), also called “Brothers of Charity,” etc. SEE CHARITY, BROTHERS OF.

(9.) Of the Congregation of penitent Brethren, founded in Flanders in 1615; the Hospitallers of the Order of Bethlehemites (q.v.), in 1655; and a number of congregations of the third order of St. Francis, which arose in the 14th century, some are still in existence. The dress of the hospitallers was a black robe or cloak, on the breast of which was worn a white cross, with eight points, which, according to their statutes, is the true symbol of the virtues. See Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 6, 285; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 5, 345; Helyot, Gesch. d. Klosteru. Ritterorden. 2, 200 sq.; 3, 86 sq., 463 sq.; Vertot, Hist. des Chevaliers de St. Jean de Jerusalem (Amst. 1732, 5 vols. 8vo); Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 25, 93 sq.; Hardwick, Hist. of the Middle Ages, p. 255 sq.; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, 2, 276; Milman's Gibbon, Roman Empire, 5, 598 sq.; Lea, Histor. Sacerdot. Celib. p. 365 sq., 475; New Englander, Aug. 1851, p. 388 sq. SEE JERUSALEM; SEE KNIGHTHOOD; SEE TEMPLARS; etc.

## Hospitals[[@Headword:Hospitals]]

             So called from the mediaeval hospitia, are now generally understood to be establishments intended for the reception of the poor the sick, or the infirm, where their spiritual and temporal wants are gratuitously ministered to. Though various provisions were made for the poor among the Greeks and Romans, and public largesses were distributed in many ways, hospitals were unknown. The true spirit of Christian charity, however, considers the most useless and abandoned characters as most in need of assistance, and imitates Christ in bestowing it upon them. The early Christians fed, not only their own poor, but also those of the heathen. Even Julian the Apostate praised their example in this respect. As soon as the early Christians were free to practice their religion openly, they commenced building charitable institutions, to which they gave various names, according to the character of their inmates: thus they had the Brephotrophium, or infant asylum; the Orpihanotrothium, or orphan asylum; the Nosocomium, or sick hospital; the Xenodochliun, or retreat for strangers, more particularly pilgrims. The latter was properly the hospital, or house of hospitality and in monasteries, that part of them which was reserved for the accommodation of visitors, and was divided into sections according to the classes of society to which the visitors belonged, was also so called (Du Cange, Gloss. s.v. Hospitale). These hospitals were soon found in all the large cities.

Epiphanius says (Haeres. 75, No. 1): “The bishops, in their charity towards strangers, are in the habit of establishing institutions wherein they receive the maimed and the sick, providing them  with such accommodations as their means will allow.” They ‘were generally in charge of the clergy (Constit. Apostol. I, 3:c. 19), though rich laymen would occasionally erect hospitals also, and wait on their inmates themselves, as did Pammachius of Porto, and Gallican of Ostia. The bishops were careful to have the poor properly buried, ransomed the prisoners of war, and often emancipated slaves. They often went so far as to sell the communion service, or the altar ornaments, to raise the means of accomplishing these charitable objects (Maurs des Chretiens, § 51). One of the most famous of these institutions was founded at Caesarea in the latter half of the 4th century. The next notable institution was that of St. Chrysostom, built at his own expense at Constantinople. There was also a very fine hospital at Rome, which was built by Fabiola, a Roman lady and friend of St. Jerome, who himself likewise built one at Bethlehem. The inmates of the hospitals in the early Church, very much like the practice of our own day, were divided according to sex. The male portion was placed under the charge of a deacon, and the women under the care of the deaconesses, who, according to Epiphanius (Exposit. fid. c. 17), rendered to persons of their sex whatever services their infirmity required. It was a rule for the deacons and deaconesses to seek for the unfortunate day by day, and to inform the bishops, who in turn, accompanied by a priest, visited the sick and needy of all classes (Augustine, De civit. Dei, I, 22 c. 8).

The hospitals known as Nosocomia were really first instituted under Constantine. They were under the direct care of the bishop himself, and were, until the Middle Ages, oftentimes placed near or incorporated with their dwellings. But they must not be understood to have been, like the hospitals of our own day, one immense building. They consisted of a number of small cottages (dormunculke), each intended for a certain malady. Procopius (De aedif: Justinian. I, 1, c. 2; Hist. Byzant. 3), in speaking of an ancient valetudinarium which was re-established and enlarged by Justinian, says that the enlargement consisted in the addition of a certain number of small houses (“numero dormuncularum”), and of additional annual revenues (“annuo censu”). These numberless small houses, spread over a large area, gave to a hospital the appearance and extent of a village by itself. The nosocomia were also established in the West, but, unlike those of the East, they were confined to the houses of the bishops. Thus Augustine dined at the same table with the sick and poor to whom he afforded relief (Posidius, In ejus Vita, c. 23). After the downfall of the Roman Empire, we find no mention made of hospitals in Europe for several centuries.

During that period the bishops generally took the whole  care of the poor and the sick. The bishops' house was the refuge of the poor, the widows, the orphans, the sick, and the strangers; the care of receiving and entertaining them was, as we have already stated, always considered one of the chief duties of the clergy. Daring the troubled times which followed the downfall of the Carlovingian dynasty the poor were almost forsaken; gaunt famine stalked over Europe, and the clergy were hardly able to keep off starvation from their own doors. But in the 13th and 14th centuries, when contagious diseases were rife in Europe, hospitals were generally established in nearly all parts of the continent. Some were the fruit of private charity, others were established by the Church, and others by the state. They were usually under the direction of priests and monks, and in the course of time many abuses arose. In the progress of civilization both the condition and the management of such institutions were greatly improved. At the present day, no civilized country is without its hospitals, either endowed and supported by the government or by private charity. The Protestant Church of Germany has institutions of deaconesses, who especially devote themselves to the care of the sick in hospitals, and from Germany these institutions have spread to many other countries. There are also in many countries special schools for the training of nurses in hospitals. Among those who, in modern times, have exerted themselves for the improvement of the hospital service, Florence Nightingale is prominent. See Bergier, Dictionnaire de Theologie, s.v.; Martigny, Dict. des Antiquites Chret. p. 289 sq.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 3, 336 sq.; Leckey, History of Rationalism, 2, 263 sq.; Gosselin, Power of the Pope, 1, 120,222; Church of England Review, July, 1855; Low, The Charities of London (London 1850,12mo); Nightingale, Notes on Nursi., l (London 1859); Dieffenbach, Anleit. zur Krankenwartung (Berl.1832). SEE ALMIONER; SEE ALMS; SEE DEACONESSES; SEE FOUNDLING HOSPITALS; SEE ORPHAN ASYLUMS. (J. H.W.)

## Hospitium[[@Headword:Hospitium]]

             a place sometimes attached to monasteries in former times, with the view of affording temporary relief to travellers, and in which a certain number of the poor were relieved by a daily alms. It was also called a Xenodochium.

## Hossbach, Peter Wilhelm, S.T.D[[@Headword:Hossbach, Peter Wilhelm, S.T.D]]

             A distinguished German theologian, born in Wusterhausen, Prussia, Feb. 20, 1784, was educated at the universities of Halle and Frankfort on the Oder. He was a regular attendant at the lectures of Knapp and Niemeyer.  After his graduation he studied with great interest the works of Schleiermacher, with whom he was intimately associated the greater part of his life, and through whose influence he obtained the position of preacher to the Prussian military school for officers (Kadettenhaus) at Berlin. In 1819, while in this position, he published Das Leben Joh. Val. Andreas, which was highly commented upon by Tholuck (comp. the article Andcre:1 in Herzog. Real-Encyklop. 1, and Supplem. 1), and which at once assigned him an eminent position in the ranks of the Church historians. In 1821 he became pastor of the New Jerusalem Church. His opening sermon, which he published, led to the publication of an entire volume of his sermons (1822), which he dedicated to his friend Schleiermacher. Other collections of his sermons were published in 1824, 1827, 1831, 1837, 1843, and after his death another collection, with an introduction by Pischon, in 1848. Hossbach published his most important work in 1828: Spener u. s. Zeit (2 vols. 8vo). The second edition, which was published in 1853, contains also, as an addendum, an introduction to the history of the Evangelical Church and theology of the 18th century, a portion of a work on which he was engaged the latter part of his life, and which was left uncompleted. He died April 7, 1846. Hossbach was a popular preacher, but his published sermons enjoyed even greater popularity, and established his reputation as an able divine. He held a midway position between the strictly orthodox and the liberal theologians of Germany, ‘and his great endeavor was to effect a compromise between these two antagonistic elements. A very fine autobiography as a minister Hossbach has furnished in his last sermon of the sixth collection, delivered to his congregation February 5, 1843, after a successful treatment of his eyes, one of which the physician was obliged to remove. See Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 19, 655 sq.; Theol. Univ. Lex. 2, 371. (J. H. W.)

## Hossein[[@Headword:Hossein]]

             the second son of Ali and Fatima, and the third of the twelve Imams, was born A.D. 625. He endeavored to dissuade his brother Hassan (q.v.) from resigning the caliphate in favor of Moawiyah, but on finding his remonstrances unavailing, he entered heartily into the support of the new caliph, and even served in his army when the Saracens first attacked Constantinople. On the death of Moawiyah, in 679, his son Yezid succeeded, but Hossein contested the caliphate with him, having been deceived by the promise of powerful support from the professed adherents of the house of Ali. Overpowered by numbers, and deserted by many of his followers, he fell by the hand of one of Yezid's soldiers, on the 10th of the Mohammedan month Mohanem, A.D. 680. A splendid mosque was erected over the place of his burial. The place, which was named Meshed Hossein (the place of Hossein's martyrdom), is a favorite resort of pilgrims to this day.

## Hossein Ben-Mansour, Aboul Moghits[[@Headword:Hossein Ben-Mansour, Aboul Moghits]]

             A Persian Mohammedan Mystic surnamed Al-Hellaj, was born at Khorassan or Beidah (Fars) in the second half of the 9th century. He was a descendant of a Guebre who had embraced Islamism. After studying under the most distinguished sofis, one of whom prescribed for him solitude and silence for two years, he traveled through the East as far as China, preaching on his way. Some believed in him, others considered him al impostor. He uttered new opinions in religion and morals, which did not very well harmonize with each other, nor with his mode of living: thus sometimes he was a strict observer of all the practices of Islamism, while  he taught that good works were more meritorious than devotional practices. His morals, however, were unimpeachable, and his life one of the utmost simplicity. He professed Pantheism, which he symbolized in these words: “I am God and all is God.” The imams and sheiks of Baghdad condemned him to death, and handed him over to the secular power. After remaining one year and a half in prison, by order of the vizir, Ali ben-Assa, he was taken out to undergo torture. Instead of cursing his persecutors, he prayed for them, and died thus, the 23rd dzou'lcadeh, 309 (March, 922). His body was burnt, and his ashes thrown into the Tigris. His theological and mystical works are some thirty in number. See Ibn Khallikan, Biograph. Dict. 1, 423; and Fragments translated by Tholuck, Blithensamml. aus d. morgenlmandischen Mystik (Berlin, 1825, 8vo), p. 310, 327; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25:215; D'Herbelot, Biblioth. Orientale, p. 392 (Hallage). (J. N. P.)

Host occurs in the A.V. of the Bible in two very different senses, the latter and most frequent now nearly obsolete.

1. Socially (ξένος, lit. a stranger, as usually; hence a guest, and by inference an entertainer, Rom 16:23; πανδοχεύς, one who receives all comers, i.e. a tavern keeper, e.g. the custodian of a caravanserai [q.v.], Luk 10:35). SEE HOSPITALITY; SEE INN.

2. Military (prop. and usually צָבָא, tsaba', warfare, hence an army, στρατία; also מִחֲנֶר, machaneh', an encampment, host; sometimes גְּדוּד, gedud', a troop; הִיַל, cha'yil, or חֵיל, cheyl, aforce; מֲִרָבָה, maarabah', Amilitary station; Gr. στράτευμα or στρατόπεδον), the usual designation of the standing army among the Israelites. This consisted originally of infantry (compare Num 11:21; 1Sa 4:10; 1Sa 15:4), not simply because the country of Palestine prevented the use of cavalry, since already the Canaanites and Philistines had iron (iron-armed) chariots, which they knew how to use to advantage in the plains and open land (Jos 17:16; Jdg 1:19; Jdg 4:3; Jdg 4:13; Jdg 5:22; 1Sa 13:5; comp. Wichmausen, De currib. bellic. in oriente usitatis, Viteb. 1722; SEE CHARIOT ), and the same was true of horsemen (2Sa 1:6); moreover, the neighboring nations (Syrians and Egyptians) employed these military instruments in their campaigns against the Israelites (Jos 11:9; Jdg 4:3; 2Sa 10:18, etc.). This last circumstance (which appears to have had no influence over David, 2Sa 8:4), especially when the theatre of war was removed into foreign countries, may naturally have induced Solomon  (contrary to the command, Deu 17:16; comp. Gesenius, Con72mment. zu Jesa. 1, 186 sq.) to add cavalry to his army (1Ki 4:26; 1Ki 10:26), which he distributed among the cities (1Ki 9:19; 1Ki 10:26); also under the later kings we find this description of troops mentioned (1Ki 16:9; 2Ki 13:7), although they were eager to avail themselves of the assistance of the Egyptian cavalry (Isa 31:1; Isa 36:9; 2Ki 18:24).

The Mosaic laws obliged every male Israelite from 20 years of age (Num 1:3; Num 26:2; 2Ch 25:5) to 50 (Joseph. Ant. 3, 12, 4; comp. Macrob. Sat. 1, 6; Seneca, Vit. brev. 20) to bear arms (see in Mishna, Sofa, 8:7), yet there were many causes of exemption (Deu 20:5; compare 1Ma 3:55). Whenever an occasion of hostilities occurred, the young men assembled, and the requisite enumeration of the soldiers (by means of a סֹפֵר, sopher, “scribe” or registrar, Jer 52:25; Isa 33:18) was made according to the several tribes (Num 31:2 sq.; Jos 7:3; Jdg 20:10). On sudden incursions of enemies, the able-bodied Israelites were summoned by special messengers (Jdg 6:35), or by the sound of trumpets, or by beacons (נֵס, nes) placed upon the hilltops (Jdg 3:27; Jdg 6:34; Jdg 7:24; Jer 4:5 sq.; Jer 6:1; Eze 7:14; comp. Isa 13:2; Isa 49:22; 2Ki 3:21; Jer 1:2; 1Ma 7:45; Diod. Sic. 19:97). The entire army, thus raised by levy, was divided, according to the various kinds of weapons (2Ch 14:8), into troops (officers and soldiers together being called שָׂרַים ֲִבָדַים, captains and servants) of 1000, 100, and 50 men (Num 31:14; Num 31:48; Jdg 20:10; 1Sa 8:12; 2Ki 1:9; 2Ki 11:15), each having its own leader (שִׂר הָאֲלָפַים, captain of the thousands; הִמֵּאוֹת שִׂר, captain of the hundreds; שִׂר חֲמַשַּׁים, captain of fifty; 2Ki 1:9; 2Ki 11:4; 2Ch 25:5; for later times, comp. 1Ma 3:55): larger divisions are also referred to (1Ch 27:1 sq.; 2Ch 17:14 sq.). The commander-in-chief of the entire army (called הִחִיַל שֵׂר., captain o ‘the host, or שִׂר הִצָּבָא, captain of the army, or שִׂר לִ הִצָּבָא, captain over the army, 2Sa 2:8; 2Sa 24:2; 1Ki 1:19) formed a council of war (general's staff) with the commanders of the chiliads and centuries (1Ch 13:1 sq.), and in time of peace had the direction of the military enrolment (2Sa 24:2 sq.). But the king generally led the army in person in battle. The national militia of the Hebrews wore no uniform. and at first each soldier was at his own expense, although commissaries of provisions are occasionally mentioned (Jdg 20:10). On military  weapons, SEE ARMOR.

The strength of the Israelitish armies is sometimes stated in very high figures (1Sa 11:8; 1Sa 15:4; 1Ch 27:1 sq.), which is not so surprising, as they were gathered in mass by messengers (at a later day, Josephus got together in Galilee alone 100,000 men of the Jewish soldiery, War, 2:20, 6); but the numbers are probably often corrupt (2Sa 24:9 sq.; 1Ch 21:5 sq.; 2Ch 13:3; 2Ch 14:8; 2Ch 17:14; 2Ch 26:12 sq.) or (in the Chronicles, see Gramberg, p. 117) exaggerated. SEE NUMBER.

The organization of a standing army was begun by Saul (1Sa 13:2 sq.; 1Sa 24:3) in the establishment (by voluntary enlistment) of a picked corps of 3000 strong from the whole mass of the people subject to military duty (1Sa 14:52). David followed his example, but, besides the bodyguard ( SEE CHERETHITET and SEE PELETHITE ), he likewise instituted a national army, to serve in turn in monthly divisions (1Ch 27:1 sq.). Solomon did the same (1Ki 4:26); and even princes of the royal stock, before they came to the throne invested themselves with a lifeguard of troops (2Sa 15:1; 1 Kings 1, 5). Likewise under Jehoshaphat (2Ch 17:14 sq.), Athaliah (2Ki 11:4), Amaziah (2Ch 25:5), and Uzziah (2Ch 26:11), as also under Ahaziah of Israel (2 Kings 1, 9 sq.), standing troops are mentioned in time of peace, but they were probably not in constant service. Their pay probably consisted in agricultural produce. Foreigners were not excluded from the honors of war (as may be seen in the case of Uriah the Hittite, and other warriors of David, q.v.); and Amaziah, king of Judah (although with the disapprobation of the prophet), even hired a whole troop of Ephraimitish soldiers (2Ch 25:6 sq.). (See generally J. F. Zacharime, De re militari yet. Hebr. Kil. 1735, a work of no great merit.) In post-exilian times a fresh organization of Jewish military force was instituted under the Maccabees. Judas early established his military companies (1Ma 3:55) in divisions of 1000 100, 50, and 10; and Simon, as prince, first paid a standing army out of his own resources (1Ma 14:32). His successors commanded a still larger number of troops, and John Hyrcanus was the first who enlisted also foreigners (Joseph. Ant. 13, 8, 4), probably Arabians, who served in mercenary armies (1Ma 5:39). On the other hand, the Jews likewise engaged in foreign warfare, for instance, as auxiliaries of the Egyptians (1Ma 10:36; Joseph. Ant. 13:10, 4), and individuals even attained the rank of commanders (Joseph. Ant. 13:10, 4; 13, 1; Apion, 2:5), although they generally abstained from  serving in foreign armies. on account of being obliged to violate the Sabbath (Joseph. Ant. 14:10,11 sq., 14). The discontent and party jealousies of the Jews rendered necessary the employment of foreign mercenaries by king Alexander and queen Alexandra (Joseph. Ant. 13:13, 5; 14, 1; 16, 2), called heavy-armed (ἑκατονταμάχοι, Joseph. Ant. 13:12, 5). Herod the Great had in his army, no doubt, many foreigners, even Germans (Joseph. Ant. 17:8, 3; War, 2:1, 2); Kandler (in Act. Acad. Erfbrd. Mogunat. 1, 415 sq.) understands also a special chosen corps as a body-guard (τωματοφύλακες, Joseph. Ant. 15:9, 3; comp. War, 2, 1, 3). He, as also his successor (Joseph. Ant. 17, 10, 3; War, 2, 20, 1), suffered his troops in certain cases to unite with the Roman legions (Josephus, War, 2, 18, 9; 3, 4, 2; Ant. 17, 10, ), and these Herodian soldiers, like the Roman, were employed to guard prisoners (Act 12:4 sq.). Respecting the discipline of these Herodian troops we know nothing positive, but they were certainly organized on Roman principles, as also Josephus himself' armed and disciplined the Jewish militia who were under his command, after the Roman custom (War, 2, 20, 7). In the times of the direct Roman government of Judea, in order to maintain tranquility, there were Roman military bodies in the country, who were regularly stationed at the head- quarters of the procurator at Caesarea (Act 10:1); but during the great festival, namely, the Passover, they were in part detailed to Jerusalem (Act 21:31; Joseph. War, 2, 12, 1). SEE ROMAN EMPIRE. (See generally Danz, De breor. re milit. Jense, 1690; J. Lydii Syntagma de re milit. cum notis S. van Til, Dordrac. 1698; both also in Ugolini Thesaur. 27.) SEE ARMY; SEE WAR.

## Hosseins Martyrdom, Anniversary Of[[@Headword:Hosseins Martyrdom, Anniversary Of]]

             a religious solemnity observed both in Persia and India with extraordinary splendor. It lasts for ten days, during which the Shiites keep up continual mourning for the martyr's fate, giving themselves up to sighs and groans, fastings and tears. They abstain from shaving their heads, from bathing, and even from changing their clothes. The observances consist of a series of representations of the successive scenes in the life of Hossein, from the date of his flight from Medina to his martyrdom on the plains of Kerbela;  and the exhibition of each day is preceded by the reading in a plaintive tone a portion of the history of Hossein.

## Host[[@Headword:Host]]

             (oblation, from hostia, victim, sacrifice), the name given in- the Romish Church to the bread or wafers used in the celebration of the Eucharist. It is unleavened, thin, flat, and of circular form, and has certain emblematic devices, as the crucifixion, the Lamb, or some words, or initials of words, having reference to the sacrifice, impressed on it. The Greek and other Oriental churches, as well as the various Protestant churches, celebrate the Eucharist by using leavened bread only differing from ordinary bread in being of a finer quality; and one of the grounds of separation from the West alleged by Michael Cerularius was the Western practice of using unleavened bread. “The Greek and Protestant controversialists allege that in the early Church ordinary or leavened bread was always used, and that our Lord himself, at the Last Supper, employed the same.

Even the learned cardinal Bona and the Jesuit Sirmond are of the same opinion; but most Roman divines, with the great Mabillon at their head, contend for the antiquity of the use of the unleavened bread, and especially for its conformity with the institution of our Lord, inasmuch as at the paschal supper, at which ‘he took bread, and blessed, and brake it,' none other than the unleavened was admissible (Exo 12:8; Exo 12:15; Lev 23:5). (See Klee, Dogmatik, 3, 190.)” — Chambers. At the Council of Florence it was left at the option of the churches to use leavened or unleavened bread. “Romanists worship the host under a false presumption that they are no longer bread and wine, but transubstantiated into the real body and blood of Christ, who is, on each occasion of the celebration of that sacrament, offered up anew as a victim (hostia) by the so-called ‘priests.' Against this error the 31st Article of Religion is expressly directed, and also these words in the consecration prayer of the Communion Service of the Protestant Episcopal Church, ‘By his one oblation of himself once offered,' etc., that Church pointedly declaring in both those places that the minister,  ‘so far from offering any sacrifice himself, refers' the people ‘to the sacrifice already made by another' (Eden). After the Council of Trent had determined that, upon consecration, the bread and wine in the sacrament are changed into the Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, and that though the Savior always sits at the right hand of God in heaven, he is, notwithstanding, in many other places sacramentally present, this decision follows: “There is, therefore, no room to doubt that all the faithful in Christ are bound to venerate this most holy sacrament, and to render thereto the worship of latria, which is due to the true God, according to the constant usage of the Catholic Church. Nor is it the less to be thus adored that it was instituted by Christ the Lord.”

We learn that, in conformity with this instruction, as the Missal directs, the priest, in every mass, as soon as he has consecrated the bread and wine, with bended knees adores the sacrament. He worships what is before him on the paten and in the chalice, and gives to it the supreme worship, both of mind and body, that he would pay to' Christ himself. With his head bowing towards it, and his eyes and thoughts fixed on it and directed towards it, he prays to it as to Christ: “Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us. Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us. Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, give us peace.” The following is a translation from the rubric of the Missal: “Having uttered the words of consecration, the priest, immediately falling on his knees, adores the consecrated host; he rises, shows it to the people, places it on the corporale, and again adores it.” When the wine is consecrated, the priest, in like manner, ‘falling on his knees, adores it, rises, shows it to the people, puts the cup in its place, covers it over, and again adores it.”

The priest, rising up after he has adored it himself, lifts it up as high as he can conveniently, and, with his eyes fixed upon it shows it, to be devoutly adored by the people; who, having notice also, by ringing the mass-bell, as soon as they see it, fall down in the humblest adoration to it, as if it were God himself. If Christ were visibly present, they could not bestow on him more acts of homage than they do on the host. They pray to it, and use the same acts of invocation as they do to Christ himself. The host is also worshipped when it is carried through the street in solemn procession, either before the pope, or when taken to some sick person, or on the feast of Corpus Christi. The person who, in great churches, conveys the sacrament to the numerous communicants, is called bajulus Dei, the porter or carrier of God. This idolatrous custom of the Church of Rome was not known till the year 1216; for it was in 1215 that transubstantiation, by the  Council of Lateran, under pope Innocent III, was made an article of faith; and we also find in the Roman canon' law that it was pope Honorius who ordered, in the following year, that the priests, at a certain part of the mass service, shout elevate the host, and cause the people to prostrate themselves in worshipping it. See Augulsti, Denkwiu-digkeiten aus der christl. Archaeol. 8:275 sq.; Elliott, Delineation of Romanism, bk. 2:ch. 4:5; Brown, Expos. of the 39 Articles, p. 606, 731, n.; Neale, Introduction East. Church, 2, 516; Siegel, Christ. AIterth. 1, 30; Bingham, Christ. Antiq. 2:819; Farrar, s.v. Adoration; Schröckh, Kirchengesch 28, p. 73; and the articles SEE AZYMITES; SEE LORD'S SUPPER; SEE MASS; SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION. (J.H.W.)

## Host of Heaven[[@Headword:Host of Heaven]]

             (צְבָא הִשָּׁמִיַם, tseba' hashssama'yim, army of the skies), in Gen 2:1, refers to the sun, moon, and stars, as the host of heaven under the symbol of an army, in which the sun is considered as the king, the moon as his vicegerent, the stars and planets as their attendants, and the constellations as the battalions and squadrons of the army drawn up in order, that they may come with their leaders to execute the designs and commands of the sovereign. According to this notion, it is said in the song of Deborah, “The stars in their courses fought against Sisera” (Jdg 5:20). The worship of the host of heaven was one of the earliest forms of idolatry (q.v.), and, from finding it frequently reprobated in the Scriptures, we may conclude that it was very common among the Jews in the days of  their declension from the pure service of God (Deu 4:19; 2Ki 17:16; 2Ki 21:3; 2Ki 21:5; 2Ki 23:5; Jer 19:13; Zep 1:5; Act 7:42). SEE HEAVEN.

In the book of Daniel it is said, “And it (the little horn) waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them” (Dan 8:10-11). This doubtless points to the aspiring nature and usurping power of Antiochus Epiphanes, who in 2Ma 9:10 is described as the man who thought he could reach to the stars of heaven; which, from Isa 14:13; Isa 24:21, may be understood to signify the rulers, both civil and ecclesiastical, among the Jews. The priests and Levites, like the angels, were continually Waiting on the service of the King of heaven in the Temple, as of old in the tabernacle (Num 8:24), and these were that part of the host, or the holy people, that were thrown down and trampled upon; for Antiochus overthrew some of the most celebrated luminaries among the leaders of the Jewish people, and reduced them to the lowest degradation. Spencer, in his treatise De Legibus Heb. bk. 1, ch. 4 p. 202, takes notice that the Scripture often borrows expressions from military affairs to accommodate itself to the use of the tabernacle, and hence is the frequent use of the term “host.” The host of heaven and the prince of the host he thinks must refer to the body of the priests, who exercised the offices of their warfare under the standards of the Deity. SEE LITTLE HORN.

A very frequent epithet of Jehovah is “Jehovah God of hosts,” i.e. of the celestial armies; generally rendered “Lord God of hosts” (Jer 5:14; Jer 38:17; Jer 44:7; Hos 12:5; Amo 3:13; Psa 59:5; Psa 80:4; Psa 80:7; Psa 80:14). This is a very usual appellation of the Most High God in some of the prophetical and other books, especially in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Zechariah, and Malachi; but does not occur in the Pentateuch, in the books of Joshua and Judges, nor in Ezekiel, Job, and the writings of Solomon. The Hebrew word “Sabaoth,” i.e. hosts, is used by the apostles Paul and James (Rom 9:29; Jam 5:4), and is retained untranslated in the English Version. As to the grammatical construction of Jehovah of hosts, some suppose it to be by ellipsis for Jehovah God of hosts; Gesenias says this is not necessary, and the Arabs, too, subjoin in like manner a genitive of attribute to the proper names of persons, as Antara, of the horse, q. d. Antara, chief of the horse. So, too, in the construction God of-hosts, the word hosts may be taken as an attribute, which could be put in apposition with the names of God. The hosts thus signified in Jehovah of hosts can  hardly be doubtful if we compare the expressions host and hosts of Jehovah (Jos 5:14-15; Psa 103:21; Psa 148:2), which, again, do not differ from host of heaven, embracing both angels, and the sun, moon, and stars (Gen 32:1-2; Deu 4:19). The phrase Jehovah of hosts, therefore, differs little from the latter form, God of heaven, and Jehovah God of heaven (Gen 24:7; 2Ch 36:23; Job 15:15; Ezr 1:2; Ezr 5:11-12; Ezr 6:9-10; Neh 1:4-5; Neh 2:4; Neh 2:20; Psa 136:26; Joh 1:9; Dan 2:18; Dan 2:37; Rev 11:13). SEE SABAOTH.

## Hostage[[@Headword:Hostage]]

             (תֲִּרוּבָה, taarubah', suretyship), a person delivered into the hands of another as a security for the performance of some engagement. SEE PLEDGE. Conquered kings or nations often gave hostages for the payment of their tribute, or for the continuance of their subjection; thus Jehoash, king of Israel, exacted hostages from Amaziah, king of Judah (2Ki 14:14; 2Ch 25:24). SEE WAR.

## Hostia[[@Headword:Hostia]]

             an animal among the ancient Romans which was destined for sacrifice. Sometimes the whole victim was consumed upon the altar, and at other times only the legs and intestines were burned. It was the smoke ascending from the sacrifice that was considered pleasing to the gods, hence the more numerous the animals the more pleasing the sacrifice. This was, no doubt, the reason for offering a hecatomb. The animal selected for sacrifice must be free from all blemishes and diseases. ' If it was of the larger sort of beasts the horns were marked with gold; if of the smaller sort it was crowned with the leaves of that tree which the deity for whom the sacrifice was designed was thought most to delight in.

## Hot Cross-Buns[[@Headword:Hot Cross-Buns]]

             A kind of muffin or biscuit, with the figure of the cross impressed upon them, quite generally used in England by the adherents of the Church of England for breakfast on Good Friday. These biscuits are said to be derived from the Ecclesiastical Eulogiae (q.v.), formerly given as a token of friendship, or sent to the houses of those who were hindered from receiving the host. — See Staunton, Ecclesiastical Dictionary, p. 377.

## Hotchkin, Ebenezer[[@Headword:Hotchkin, Ebenezer]]

             A Presbyterian missionary to the Indians, was born at Richmond, Mass., March 19, 1803. He was sent as an assistant missionary to the Choetaw nation in 1828, and spent the rest of his life laboring among them. He died at the residence of his brother, the late Rev. John Hotchkin, at Lenox, Mass., Oct. 28, 1867. Hotchkin was not only a minister, but also an instructor and was active in the management of boarding and other schools. — Wilson, Presbyterian Historical Almanac, 1868, p. 334 sq.

## Hotchkiss, Velona R., D.D[[@Headword:Hotchkiss, Velona R., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Spafford, Onondaga County, N.Y., June 5, 1815, and graduated from Madison University in 1838. His pastorates were in Poultney, Vermont (1839); Rochester, N.Y.; Buffalo (1849-54), also, subsequently, from 1865 until his death, and in Fall River, Massachusetts. From 1854 to 1865 he was a professor in Rochester Theological Seminary. Dr. Hotchkiss ranked very high as a scholar and an able preacher, and was regarded as one of the strongest men in his denomination. He died in Buffalo, January 4, 1882. (J.C.S.)

## Hotham[[@Headword:Hotham]]

             (Heb. Chotham', חוֹתָם, a seal or signet ring, as in Exo 28:12, etc.; Sept. Χωθάμ, Vulg. Hothanz), the name of two men.

1. One of the sons of Heber, the grandson of Asher (1Ch 7:32). B.C. cir. 1658. He is probably the same with HELEM, whose sons are enumerated in 1Ch 7:35, and grandsons in 1Ch 7:36-37.

2. An Axoerite, and father of Shama and Jehiel, two of David's champions (1Ch 11:44, where the name is Anglicized “Hothan,” after the Sept. Χωθάν). B.C. 1046.

## Hothan[[@Headword:Hothan]]

             (1Ch 11:44). SEE HOTIHAMI 2. Ho'thir (Heb. Hothir', הוֹתַיר, preserver; Sept. Ι᾿ωεθιρί, Ι᾿εθιρί), the thirteenth son of Heman (q.v.), who, with eleven of his kinsmen, had charge of the twenty-first division of Levitical singers (1Ch 25:4; 1Ch 25:28). B.C. 1014. SEE GIDDALTI.

## Hothum, William De, D.D[[@Headword:Hothum, William De, D.D]]

             an Irish prelate, was born in England, but educated at Paris. In 1280 he became a Dominican friar and was twice provincial of that order in England. He was appointed to the see of Dublin, December 8, 1297; consecrated at Rome in 1298 by the pope, and died on his return, at Dijon, August 27 of the same year. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 110.

## Hottentots[[@Headword:Hottentots]]

             The aboriginal inhabitants of Cape Colony, in Southern Africa. They are divided into three large tribes: 1. the Nama, or Namaqua; 2. the Kora (Korana, Koraqua); and, 3. the Saab, or Bushmen (Bosjesmans). In modern times they have been pushed northwards, partly by European immigrants, partly by the Betchuanas and Kaffres. The Nama, or Namaqua, live as nomads along the Orange River, in Great Namaqualand, which is an independent country, with about 100.000 square miles, and only 40,000 inhabitants, and Little Namaqualand, which is a part of Cape Colony. The Kora, or Korana, were about fifty years ago very numerous in the vicinity of the Vaal and Hart rivers; now they dwell as nomads on both sides of the Upper Orange River, both in Cape Colony and in the Orange Free State (q.v.). The Saab, or Bushmen, live scattered, partly in the northern districts of Cape Colony, partly in the desert Kalahary. In Cape Colony there were, according to the census of 1865, 81,598 Hottentots, by the side of 181,592 Europeans, and 100,536 Kaffres, in a total population of 496,381. Little is known of the Hottentots' religion further than that they believe in a good and an evil spirit, hold festivals on the occasion of the new and full moon, and look upon certain spots as the abode of departed spirits. They have no  regular priest, nor anything like an established worship, although they render especial homage to a small, shining bug. They have magicians for whom they have great respect. The Bastards, or Griquas, resulting from the amalgamation of Hottentots and Europeans, appear much more susceptible of mental and intellectual culture; they also form a distinct race, and a colony of 6000 of them, established at the Cat River in 1826, has been quite successful and numbered in 1870 about 20,000, nearly all Christians. They are partly nomads, partly agriculturists. The Hottentots in Cape Colony and the Griquas no longer speak the Hottentot language, but a Dutch dialect, strongly mixed with Hottentot and Kaffre words. The Hottentot language is not related to any other, and is especially different from the large South African family of languages.

The words are mostly monosyllabic, and usually end in a vowel or nasal sound. Among the consonants, l, f, and v are wanting. There are many diphthongs. Non- Africans find it impossible to imitate the gutturals which the Hottentots breathe with a hoarse voice from a hollow chest, as well as the four clicking sounds which are produced by a lashing of the tongue against the palate, and which in- writing are represented by lines and points (I = dental;! = palatal; ± = cerebral; ||, lateral). Modern linguists enumerate four dialects: 1. that of the Nama; 2. that of the Kora; 3. that of the eastern Hottentots, or Gonaquas; 4. the dead dialects of the colonial Hottentots. The substantives have three genders, masculine, feminine, and common; and three numbers, singular, dual, and plural. There are no cases; the adjective and verb are not inflected. The prepositions are usually placed after the words which they govern. The language of the Bushmen differs from that of the other Hottentots. By the Dutch conquerors of the country of the Hottentots the poor inhabitants were considered unworthy of Christianity, and even many members of the colonial churches discountenanced and prevented all missionary enterprises. The first missionary among the Hottentots began his operations in 1709, but he ceased them after a few weeks. In 1737, the Moravian missionary, G. Schmidt, gained an attentive hearing; but when, after a few years, the fruit of his labors appeared, he was compelled by the colonial government to leave. During the next fifty years no missionary was allowed to visit the Hottentots. In 1792 the Moravians succeeded in re-establishing their mission, but not until the country passed into the hands of the English did the missionaries find the necessary protection, under which their station at Baviaanskloof (at present called Genadendal) became very flourishing. The work grew steadily, and (since 1818) has extended from the Hottentots to  the Kaffres.

The Moravians, even as early as 1798, were joined by the London Missionary Society. The missionary Von der Kemp established in the eastern part of the colony a mission among the Hottentots, and the latter labored among the Bushmen. In Little Namaqualand the mission was likewise begun by the London Society, and continued by the Rhenish Missionary Society, which, after the emancipation of the Hottentots, established a number of stations in the eastern districts. Several thousands of Griquas settled on the Cat River, where the station Philipton, with several out stations, arose. Among the Koras, missions have been established (since 1834) by the Berlin Missionary Society. More recently, a number of other missionary societies, of almost all the churches represented in Cape Colony, have taken part in the missions among the Hottentots. Beyond the limits of Cape Colony, the London Mission Society was the first to establish (1805) missions in Great Namaqualand. Subsequently the field was occupied by the Wesleyan Metholists and the Rhenish Missionary Society. Several stations established by the former in the northern parts of the country were again abandoned (Concordiaville and Wesleyvale, 1845-53), but in 1869 they still had three districts in the south-Nisbethbath, Hoole's Fountain, and Jerusalem-all of which were occupied by native helpers, and occasionally visited by a Wesleyan missionary from Little Namaqualand. More extensive is the work of the Rhenish Society, which in 1842 established its first out-station at Bethania, and gradually advanced northwards as far as the Zwachaub. Their labors, especially at Bethania, have been very successful, and Great Namaqualand may now be regarded as a Christianized country. See Tyndall (Wesleyan missionary), Two Lectures on Great Namaqualand and its Inhabitants; Moo(lie, The Record, or a Series official Papers relative to the Condition and Treatment of the native Tribes in South Africa (Capetown, 1838 sq., 5 vols.). A Grammar of the Hottentot language has been prepared by Tyndall (Capetown, 1857), and a work on etymology by Wallmann (Berlin, 1857). On the history of the missions among the Hottentots, see Grundemann, Missionsatlas (Gotha, 1867). (A. J. S.)

## Hottinger, Johann Heinrich, 1[[@Headword:Hottinger, Johann Heinrich, 1]]

             A celebrated Swiss theologian and scholar, born at Zurich March 10, 1620. He studied theology and-the Oriental languages at Zurich, Geneva, Groningen, and Leyden. In 1642 he became professor of Church History at Zurich, and in 1643 added to it a professorship at the Carolinum. In 1655 he became professor of Oriental languages at Heidelberg, but in 1661 he  returned to Zurich. In 1666, after the decease of Hoornbeck (q.v.), the University of Leyden urged Hottinger to come as his successor. He finally consented, by advice of the Swiss government, to serve that university a few years. While making his arrangements preparatory to his journey, he was drowned in the Limmat, June 5, 1667. Hottinger occupies a distinguished place among the philologists of the 17th century, who labored to promote the knowledge of the Shemitic languages. He was one of the first to bring to public notice a number of Syriac and Arabic works by giving extracts from them and biographies of their authors. He also gave a powerful impulse to the study of Oriental languages by establishing at his own expense an Arabic printing office at Heidelberg while professor in that city. The great aim of his writings was to establish the interpretation of Scripture on a more thoroughly historical and grammatical foundation; yet he rather furnished the means for such a system than established it himself. His works consist chiefly of compilations, and were valuable from the fact that they were from sources previously not generally known. He seldom gives an exegesis, but when he does it is based on grammatical and historical considerations rather than on dogmatical. His principal works are, Exercitationes Antinzorinicnae de Pentateucho Sanarit. (1644) — Erotemata linguae sanetae (1647; 2nd edition, 1667) — Grammatica Chaldeao-Syriaca (1658) — Hist. orientalis de Muhammedismo, Saracenismo, Chaldaisno (Zur. 1650) — Historia ecclesiast. Novi Test. (1651-67, 9 vols.), of which Schaff (Ch. Hist. 1, 21) says that it is a counterpart of the Magdeburg Centuries. “It is less original and vigorous, but more sober and moderate:” Jus Ilebrceorum (1655) — Smegma orientale oppositum sordibus barbarisimi (1657) — Bibliotheca orientalis (Heidelb. 1658) — Thesaurus philol. (Zur. 1649) — Wegweiser, dadurch man versichert werden moag, wo heut zu Tage der wahre katholische Glaube zufinden sei (1647-49, 3 vols.) — Cursus theologicus (1660). Pierer, Universal Lexikon, s.v.; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. 2, 331; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 25, 236 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 287 sq.; Hirzel, J. It. Hottinger der Orientalist d. 17 Jahrhunderts; Bayle, Hist. Dict. 2, 525 sq.; Bibliotheca Sacra, 7, 63.

## Hottinger, Johann Heinrich, 2[[@Headword:Hottinger, Johann Heinrich, 2]]

             A Swiss Protestant theologian, grandson of the preceding, was born at Zurich Dec. 5,1681. He studied theology at the universities of Zurich, Geneva, and Amsterdam, and in 1704 was appointed professor of philosophy at Marburg. In 1705 he became professor of Hebrew  antiquities, and in 1710 professor of theology. To strictly Calvinistic views he added most of Cocceius's principles, and from this mixture resulted a system of his own, which he set forth in a treatise on dogmatics, entitled Typus Doctrince Christiatnce (Francf. ad Main, 1714, 8vo). This work created great excitement; the author was accused of inculcating mystical doctrines, and was obliged to resign his position in 1717. Hottinger retired to Frankenthal, where he became pastor of the Reformed Church. In 1721 he was appointed professor of theology at Heidelberg, where he died April 7, 1750. The most important of his later writings are Disquisitio de Revelationibus extraordinariis in genere et de quibusdam hodiernis vulgo dictis inspiratis in specie (1717, 8vo), in which he treats of the prophets of the Cevenlnes, who were just then attracting great attention in Germany. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25:239; Hilgenfeld, Zeitfschrift f. wissenschaftl. Theol. 1868, p. 31. (J. N. P.)

## Hottinger, Johann Jakob, 1[[@Headword:Hottinger, Johann Jakob, 1]]

             Son of Johann Heinrich, No. 1, was born at Zurich Dec. 1, 1652. He studied theology at Zurich and Basle, and became, in 1680, pastor of Stallikon, near Zurich. In 1686 he was appointed dean of the cathedral of Zurich, and in 1698 professor of theology in the university of that place. He died Dec. 18, 1735. Hottinger labored earnestly to establish a union of the Protestant churches, and with that view published his Diss. irenica de veritatis et charitatis in ecclesice Protestantium connubio (1721). He was an ardent opponent of the Roman Church, and wrote against it his Dissertatio saecularis de necessaria majorum ab ecclesia Romana secessione (1719). His principal other works are, Helvetische Kirsch engeschichte (16981729, 4 vols. 4to) — Ueber d. Zustand der Seele auch dem Tode (1715) — Die christlichen 'Lehre v.d. heilsamen Gnade Göttes (1716) — Historia formulae consensus (1723): Fatadoctrina depraedestinatione et gratia Dei (1727), etc. — Pierer, Universal- Lexikon, s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 290 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé. 25 238 sq.; Walch, Biblioth. Theolog. (see Index); Fuhrmann's Handwörterbuch d. Kirchengesch. 2, 354; Gass, Dogmen geschichte, 3, 78 sq.

## Hottinger, Johann Jakob, 2[[@Headword:Hottinger, Johann Jakob, 2]]

             Nephew of a grandson of the foregoing, and also a distinguished theologian, was born at Zurich May 18, 1783. He was appointed professor  of history at the university of his native place in 1844, and died there May 18, 1859. His principal works are Gesch. d. Schweizer. Kirchentrennung (Zür. 1825-27,2 vols. 8vo) — Huldreich Zwingli u. s. Zeit (ibid. 1841, 8vo). He also edited, in connection with Vigeli, Bullinger's Reformationsgesch. (vol. 1-3, Frauenf. 1840, 8vo). See Pierer. Univ. Lexikon, 8, 358; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 239; Brockhaus, Conv. Lex. 8, 108.

## Houames[[@Headword:Houames]]

             Is the name of a Mohammedan sect of roving licentious Arabians, who dwell in tents, as is the custom of the Arabians. “They have a particular law, by which they are commanded to perform their ceremonies and prayers under a pavilion, without an light, after which they lie with the first woman they can meet.” Some followers of this sect are living concealed at Alexandria and other places. They are not tolerated by their fellow- countrymen, and are burnt alive if discovered. The name given them signifies in Arabic wicked, lascivious, or abominable persons. See Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sac. 1, 495. (J. H. W.)

## Houbigant, Charles Francois[[@Headword:Houbigant, Charles Francois]]

             A French priest of the Oratory, and an eminent Biblical scholar, was born at Paris in 1686. He joined his order in 1704, and soon became distinguished for his great attainments. He lectured successively on belles- letters at Jeuilly, on rhetoric at Marseilles, and on philosophy at Soissons, and was called to Paris in 1722 to conduct the conferences of St. Magloire. His devotion to the duties required by these new offices produced a serious illness, which terminated in total deafness. Being thus incapacitated for public duty, he devoted all his time to study, applying himself especially to the Oriental languages. Towards the close of his long career, his intellectual faculties became impaired in consequence of a fall. He died at Paris October 31, 1783. In 1772 he founded a school for girls at Avilly, where he had a country residence, and at his death he left an annual income of 175 francs to that institution. His principal amusement was to set in type and print his works himself, and for that purpose he established a printing room in his country house. He wrote Racines de la Lungue Hebraique (Paris, 1732, 8vo) in verse, in imitation of the Racines-Grecques of Rort- Roval. In the preface Houbigant defends Masclefs system, and attempts to prove the uselessness and danger of vowel points in the study of Hebrew  — — Prolegomena in Scripturam Sacrum (Paris, 1746, 4to). In this work he follows Cappel, seeking to prove that the original text of the O.T. has undergone alterations which, without touching on points of dogma or of morals, tend to obscure the sense; and he gives rules by which these faults, due mostly to the carelessness of copyists, may be discovered and corrected — Conferences de Metz. In this work, published without name of place or date, he gives a popular expose of the principles of criticism developed in the preceding work — Psalmi Hebraici mendis quam plurimis expurgati (Leyden, 1748. 16mo), the text corrected according to the principles laid down by the author in his Prolegomena — Biblia Hebraica cunz notis criticis et versione Latina ad notas criticasfacta; accedunt libri Graeci qui deutero-canonici vocantur, in fres classes dis. tributi (Paris, 1753 and 1754, 4 vols. fol.).

This work, which cost its author twenty years' labor, was published by the Congregation of the Oratory at an expense of e 40,000 francs. It is very carefully executed, and is printed in two columns, one containing the text and the other the translation. The text, printed without vowel points, is but a reprint of Van der Hooght's edition of 1705. The corrections proposed by Houbigant (who makes no account of the Keri and Kethlib of the Masorites), are placed either in the margin or in the form of tables at the end of each volume. The corrections of the Pentateuch are taken from the Samaritan Codex, to which Houbigant, as well as Morin, attached undue importance; others are taken from various MSS. belonging to the Congregation of the Oratory, or to the Imperial Library of Paris, but are not fully indicated by him; a large number, finally, are merely conjectural, and derived from the application of his principles of criticism contained in the Prolegomena. These corrections have not received the approbation of competent judges. Houbigant appears not to have had a very clear idea of the relative value of his authorities, and he has been accused of want of thoroughness in his knowledge of Hebrew, as well as of arbitrariness in his corrections. The Latin translation was published separately, under the title Veteris Testamenti versio nova (Paris, 1753, 5 vols. 8vo); the critical notes and Prolegomena have also been printed separately, under the title Notao Criticae in universos Veteris Testamenti libros, cum laebraiae tum Graeae scriptos, cum integris Prolegomenis, ad exemplar Parisiense denuo recensce (Francf. ad Main, 1777, 2 vols. 4to). Houbigant translated bishop Sherlock's Sermons and Leslie's Meeting with the Deist into French. He left a large number of MSS. which were never published. See Cadry, Notice sur la Vie et les Ouvrages du P. Houbigant (in the Magasin  Encyclopedique, May, 1806) ( G. W. Meyer, Gesch. d. Schrifterklar. 4, 154-156, 264-270, 465, 466; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Geschl, 25, 20, 241 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 2, 158; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref. 7, 168; 8, 50.

## Houdayer, Julien[[@Headword:Houdayer, Julien]]

             A French theologian, was born at Noyen in 1562. In 1595 he was appointed rector of the Sorbonne, and later filled several positions of distinction in the Roman Catholic Church of France. He died Nov. 28, 1619. His only theological work is Du Devoir des Cures (Le Mans, 1612,12mo). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 247.

## Houdry, Vincent[[@Headword:Houdry, Vincent]]

             A French Jesuit preacher and religious writer, was born at Tours January 22, 1631. He entered the order in 1644, preached some thirty years, and then devoted his time to writing only. He died March 29, 1729. His principal works are Sermons sur tons les sujets de la. Morale Chretienne (Paris. 1696, etc., 20 vols. 12mo) — Traite de la maniere d'imlifer les bons predicatemurs (Par. 1702, 12mo); and most especially Bibliotheque des Predicateurs: contemat les principals sujets de la morale Chret. (Par. 1712, etc., 23 vols. 4to).Hoefer, Nou. Biog. Géneralé, 10 15, 258; Chandon and Delandine, Nouv. Dict. Hist. 16, 313.

## Houel, Nicolas[[@Headword:Houel, Nicolas]]

             A French philanthropist of the 16th century. He founded at Paris the laoison de la Charite Chretienne in 1578. Two years later he published his Avertissement et declaration de I' institution de la Charift Chretienne (Par. 1580, 8vo). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 258 sq.

## Hough[[@Headword:Hough]]

             (ִֵקּר, akker', Piel of עָקִר, to extirpatee), a method employed by the ancient Israelites to render useless the captured horses of an enemy (Jos 11:6; comp. Gen 49:6), as they were not allowed or able to use that animal (so also 2Sa 8:4; 1Ch 18:4). It consisted in hamstringing, i.e. severing “the tendon Achilles” of the hinder legs (Sept. νευροκοπεῖν; compare ‘akar; Syr. the same, Barhebr. p. 220). The practice is still common in Arab warfare (Rosenmüller, Instituturis Moham. circa bellum, § 17). SEE HORSE.

## Hough, John, D.D., 1[[@Headword:Hough, John, D.D., 1]]

             A distinguished English divine, born in Middlesex in 1651, and educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, of which lie was elected president in 1687, in spite of the mandamus of king James II, who endeavored to procure the election to the headship of the college first of Anthony Farmer, and then of Dr. Samuel Parker (q.v.), bishop of Oxford, both Roman Catholics in belief, and neither of them fellows of the college, as the statute required. Lord-commissioners having been sent to enforce the royal mandates on the students, Hough, together with twenty-six out of the twenty eight fellows of the college, courageously protested against their arbitrary proceedings, and refused to deliver the keys of the college. Finally, in Oct. 1687, Dr. Parker was by main force installed in Hough's place. “The nation, as well as the university, looked on all this proceeding with just indignation. It was thought an open piece of robbery and burglary, when men authorized by legal commission came forcibly and turned men out of their possession and freeholds” (bishop Burnet). “The protest of Hough was everywhere applauded; the forcing of his door was everywhere mentioned with abhorrence.” Less than a year after, James II, under the pressure of political events, thought it prudent, however, to retrace his steps, and to conciliate Hough and his adherents. The former was restored to his position as president. After the Revolution, Hough became successively bishop of Oxford in 1690; of Lichfield and Coventry in 1699; and finally, after refusing the archbishopric of Canterbury, bishop of Worcester in 1717. I-le died in 1743. Hough wrote Sermons and Charges, published with a Memoir of his Life, by William Russell, B.D. etc. (Oxford 1821); and other occasional sermons. — Darling, Encyclopedia Bibliograethica, 1, 1554; Macaulay, History of England, vol. 2; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 897; McMasters, Biog. Ind. to flume's History of England, p. 363 sq.; Stoughton (John), Eccl. Hist. of England (London 1870), 2, 133 sq.

## Hough, John, D.D., 2[[@Headword:Hough, John, D.D., 2]]

             A Congregational minister, was born in Stamford, Conn., August 17, 1783. He graduated at Yale in 1802, then studied divinity, and was' sent in 1806 as missionary to Vermont, where he was ordained pastor at Vergennes in 1807. This pastorate he resigned in 1812, and became professor of languages in Middlebury College, Vt. Here he remained twenty-seven years, occupying several chairs in turn. He left in.]839, and was some time  in the service of the Colonization Society. In 1841 he was installed pastor at Windham, Ohio. He obtained a dismission in 1850 on account of failing eyesight, which finally became blindness. He died at Fort Wayne, Indiana, July 17, 1861. Hough was eminently successful and popular as an instructor. He published three sermons, preached at ordinations (1810,1823,1826), and was one of the editors of “The Adviser, or Vermont Evangelical Magazine.” Congreg. Quart. 3, 378.; Wilson, Presbyt. Historical A1zanac, 1862, p. 186.

## Houghtaling, J. B[[@Headword:Houghtaling, J. B]]

             A Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Northeast, Dutchess Co., N.Y., Oct. 9, 1797; studied law for five years, from 1813; was converted about 1817, and entered the itinerant ministry in 1828. He was appointed agent of the Troy Conference Academy in 1835, and, on account of poor health, took a supernumerary relation in 1847, which he retained until his death in 1856 or 7. He was a very useful preacher and an excellent pastor. His business abilities were fine, and he was for many years secretary of the Troy Conference, and twice assistant secretary of the General Conference. Minutes of Conferences, 6, 353. (G. L. T.)

## Houghton, Daniel Clay, D.D[[@Headword:Houghton, Daniel Clay, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister (N.S.), was born at Lynton, Vermont, in 1814. He graduated at the University of Vermont in 1840, subsequently taught a few years in Western New York, and then entered the ministry in the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was one of the founders of Genesee College, in  Lima, N.Y.; was for some years professor of moral and intellectual philosophy in the college, and at the same time acted as financial agent. In 1853 he joined the Presbyterian Church, and in 1854 was appointed editor of the Genesee Evangelist. He died July 8, 1860. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, page 160.

## Hour[[@Headword:Hour]]

             (Chald. שָׁעָה, shal, saotrh', a monent, prop. a look, 1. q. “the wink of an eye” [Germ. Augenblick]; Greek éρα), a term first found in Dan 3:6; Dan 4:19; Dan 4:33; Dan 5:5; and occurring several times in the Apocrypha (Judith 19:8; 2Es 9:44). It seems to be a vague expression for a short period, and the frequent phrase “in the same hour” means “immediately:” hence we find בְּשָׁעָהsubstituted in the Targum for בְּרֶצ,ִ “in a moment' (Num 16:21, etc.). The corresponding Gr. term is frequently used in the same way by the N.T. writers (Mat 8:13; Luk 12:39, etc.). The word hour is sometimes used in Scripture to denote some determinate season, as “mine hour is not yet come,” “this is your hour, and the power of darkness,” “the hour is coming,” etc. It occurs in the Sept. as a rendering for various words meaning time, just as it does in Greek writers long before it acquired the specific meaning of our word “hour.” Saah is still used in Arabic both for an hour and a moment.

The ancient Hebrews were probably unacquainted with the division of the natural day into twenty-four parts. The general distinctions of “morning,  evening, and noonday” (comp. Gen 15:12; Gen 18:1; Gen 19:1; Gen 19:15; Gen 19:23) were sufficient for them at first, as they were for the early Greeks (Homer, II. 21:3, 111); afterwards the Greeks adopted five marked periods of the day (Jul. Pollux, Oom? — 1, 68; Dio Chrysost. Orat. in De Glor.), and the Hebrews parceled out the period between sunrise and sunset into a series of minute divisions distinguished by the sun's course, as is still done by the Arabs, who have stated forms of prayers for each period (Lane's Mood. Eg. vol. 1, ch. 3). SEE DAY.

The early Jews appear to have divided the day into four parts (Neh 9:3), and even in the N.T. we find a trace of this division in Mat 20:1-5. There is, however, no proof of the assertion sometimes made, that éρα in the Gospels may occasionally mean a space of three hours. It h'as been thought by some interpreters (see Wolfii Curae in N.T. ad Joh 19:14) that the evangelist John always computes the hours of the day after the Roman reckoning, i.e. from midnight to midnight (see Pliny, Hist. Noct. 2, 79; Aul Gell. Noct. Att. 3, 2); but this is without support from Hebrew analogy, and obliges the gratuitous supposition of a reckoning also from midday (against Joh 11:9).

The Greeks adopted the division of the day into twelve hours from the Babylonians (Herodotus, 2:109; comp. Rawlinson, Herod. 2:334). At what period the Jews became first acquainted with this way of reckoning time is unknown, but it is generally supposed that they, too, learned it from the Babylonians during the Captivity (Wiahner, Ant. Hebr. § 5:1, 8, 9). They may have had some such division at a much earlier period, as has been inferred from the fact that Ahaz erected a sun-dial in Jerusalem, the use of which had probably been learned from Babylon. There is, however, the greatest uncertainty as to the meaning of the word מֲִלוֹת (A.V. “degrees,” Isa 38:8). SEE DIAL. It is strange that the Jews were not acquainted with this method of reckoning even earlier, for, although a purely conventional one, it is naturally suggested by the months in a year. Sir G. Wilkinson thinks that it arose from. a less obvious cause (Rawlinson, Herod. 2, 334). In whatever way it originated, it was known to the Egyptians at a very early period. They had twelve hours of the day and of the night (called Nau=hour), each of which had its own genius, drawn with a star on its head. The word is said by Lepsius to be found as far back as the fifth dynasty (Rawlinson, Herod. 2, 135). The night was divided into twelve equal portions or hours, in precisely the same manner as the day. The most ancient division, however, was into three watches (Ant. 63, 6,  90, 4) the first, or beginning of the watches, as it is called (Lam 2:19); the middle watch (Jdg 7:19); and the morning watch (Exo 14:24). SEE WATCH. When Judaea became a province of Rome, the Roman distribution of the night into four watches was introduced; to which division frequent allusions occur in the New Testament (Luk 12:38; Mat 14:25; Mat 13:35), as well as to that of hours (Mat 25:13; Mat 26:40; Mar 14:37; Luke 17:59; Act 23:23; Rev 3:3). SEE COCK-CROWING. There are two kinds of hours, viz. (1.) the astronomical or equinoctial hour, i.e. the twenty-fourth part of a civil day, which, although “known to astronomers, was not used in the affairs of common life till towards the end of the 4th century of the Christian sera” (Smith, Dict. of Classical Antiq. s.v. Hora); and

(2.) the natural hour (such the Rabbis called זמניות, καιρικαί, or temporales), i.e. the twelfth part of the natural day, or of the time between sunrise and sunset. These are the hours meant in the New Test., Josephus, and the Rabbis (Joh 11:9; Act 5:7; Act 19:31; Josephus, Ant.14, 4, 3), and it must be remembered that they perpetually vary in length, so as to be very different at different times of the year. Besides this, an hour of the day would always mean a different length of time from an hour of the night, except at the equinox. From the consequent uncertainty of the term there arose the proverbial expression “not all hours are equal” (R. Joshua up. Carpzov, App. Crit. p. 345). At the equinoxes the third hour would correspond to nine o'clock; the sixth would always be at noon. To find the exact time meant at other seasons of the year, we must know when the sun rises in Palestine, and reduce \the hours to our reckoning accordingly (Jahn, Biblio. Arch. § 101). In ancient times the only way of reckoning the progress of the day was by the length of the shadow-a mode of reckoning which was both contingent on the sunshine, and served only for the guidance of individuals. SEE SHADOW. By what means the Jews calculated the length of their hours-whether by dialing, by the clepsydra or water-clock, or by some horological contrivance, like what was used anciently in Persia (Josephus, Ant. 11 6), and by the Romans (Martial, 8 Epig. 67; Juv. Sat. 10, 214), and which is still used in India (A siat. Researches, 5, 88), a servant notifying the intervals-it is now impossible to discover (see Buttinghausen, Specimen horarum Ieb. et Arab. Tr. ad Rh. 1758). Mention is also made of a curious invention called צְרוֹר שָׁעָה: by  which a figure was constructed so as to drop a stone into a brazen basin every hour, the sound of which was heard for a great distance, and announced the time (Otho, Lex. Rab. s.v. Hora).

For the purposes of prayer, the old division of the day into four portions was continued in the Temple service, as we see from Act 2:15; Act 3:1; Act 10:9. The stated periods of prayer were the third, sixth, and ninth hours of the day (Psalms 45, 17; Josephus, Anf. 4, 4, 3). The Jews supposed that the third hour had been consecrated by Abraham, the sixth by Isaac, and the ninth by Jacob (Kimchi; Schöttgen, Hor. Hebr. ad Act 3:1). It is probable that the canonical hours observed by the Romanists (of which there are eight in the twenty-four) are derived from these Temple hours (Goodwill Moses and Aaron, 3, 9). SEE HOURS, CANONICAL.

The Rabbis pretend that the hours were divided into 1080 חלקים(minutes), and 56,848 רצעים(seconds), which numbers were chosen because they are so easily divisible (Gem. Hier. Berachoth, 2, 4; in Reland, Ant. Heb 4:1, § 19). SEE TIME.

## Hour-glass Stand[[@Headword:Hour-glass Stand]]

             A frame of iron for the hourglass, often placed near the pulpit after the Reformation in England. They were almost: universally introduced in churches during the 16th century and continued in use until about fifty years ago, to regulate the length of sermons. Some of them are yet to be seen, as at Wolvercot and Beckley, in Oxfordshire, and Leigh Church, in Kent. One was recently set up in the Savoy Chapel. — Parker, Glossary of Architecture, p. 127; Walcott, Sac. Archaeol. D. 317.

## Houris[[@Headword:Houris]]

             A designation by Europeans of those imaginary beings whose company in paradise, according to the Mohammedans' belief, is to form the principal felicity of the believers. The name, derived from hour al oyun, signifies black-eyed. They are represented in the Koran as most beautiful virgins, not created of clay, like mortal women, but of pure musk, and endowed with immortal youth, and immunity from all disease. See the Koran, chap. 55, 56 (Sale's translation); and the Prel. Disc. s. 4; Brande and Cox, Dict. of Science, Liter. and Art, 2:153.

## Hours of our Lady[[@Headword:Hours of our Lady]]

             the title of a devotion instituted by pope Urban II at the Council of Clermont in 1095. — Walcott, Sac. Archaeol. p. 318.

## Hours, Canonical[[@Headword:Hours, Canonical]]

             signifies, in ecclesiastical usage, the daily round of prayers and praise in some churches, both ancient and modern. The ancient order of these “hours” is as follows:

1. Nocturns or [Matins, a service performed before daybreak (properly a night service), called vigils by the Council of Carthage (398), but afterwards the first hour after dawn; mentioned by Cyprian as midnight and matins, and by Athanasius as nocturns and midnight (Psa 119:62-147; Act 16:25). Cassian and Isidore say this season was first observed in the 5th century, in the monastery of Bethlehem, in memory of the nativity.

2. Lauds, a service performed at daybreak, following the matin shortly, if not actually joined on to it, mentioned by Basil and the Apostolical Constitutions.

3. Prime, a service performed at about six o'clock A.M., “the first hour,” mentioned by Athanasius — (Psa 92:2; Psa 5:3; Psa 59:16).

4. Tierce or Terce, a service performed at 9 A.M., “the third hour;” mentioned by Tertullian with Sexts and Nones (see below), as commemorating the time when the disciples were assembled at Pentecost (Act 2:15).

5. Sext, a service performed at noonday, “the sixth hour,” commemorating Peter's praying (Act 10:19).

6. Nones, a service performed at 3 P.M., “the ninth hour,” commemorating the time when Peter and John went up to the Temple (Act 3:1).

7. Vespers, a service performed in the early evening; mentioned by Basil, Ambrose, and Jerome, and by the Apostolical Constitutions (which we cite below), to commemorate the time when Christ instituted the Eucharist, showing it was the eventide of the world. “This hour is called from evening, according to St. Augustine, or the evening star, says St. Isidore.” It was also known as the office and the hour of lights as, until the 8th or 9th century, was usual in the East and at Milan; also when the lamps were lighted (Zec 14:7). “The Roman custom of saying Vesper after Nones then came into use in the West” (Walcott, Sac. Archaeol. p. 316).

8. Compline, the last evening or “bedtime service” (Psa 132:3); first separated from Vespers by Benedict.

The office of Lauds was, however, very rarely separated from that of Matins, and these eight hours of prayer were therefore practically only seven, founded on David's habit (Psalm 4:17; 119:62).

The Apostolical Constitutions (8, 34) mention the hours as follows: “Ye shall make prayer in the moranieg, giving thanks, because the Lord hath enlightened you, removing the night, and bringing the day; at the third hour, because the Lord then received sentence from Pilate; at the sixth, because he was crucified; at the ninth, because all things were shaken when the Lord was crucified, trembling at the audacity of the impious Jews, not enduring that the Lord should be insulted; at evening giving thanks, because he hath given the night for rest from labor; at cock-crowing, because that hour gives glad tidings that the day is dawning in which to work the works of light.” Cassian likewise mentions the observation of Tierce, Sext, and Nones in monasteries. Tertullian and Pliny speak of Christian services before daylight. Jerome names Tierce, Sext, Nones, Vespers, and Lauds; also Augustine-for the two latter hours, however, substituting “Early Vigil.” Archdeacon Freeman, of the Church of England, gives (Principles of Div. Serv. 1, 219 sq.) the following explanation, viz. that these offices, “though neither of apostolic nor early post-apostolic date as Church services, had, nevertheless, probably existed in a rudimentary form, as private or household devotions, from a very early period, and had been received into the number of recognized public formularies previous to the reorganization of the Western ritual after the Eastern model.” “Various reasons have been assigned for a deeper meaning in the hours; one is, that they are the thanksgiving for the completion of creation on the seventh day. Another theory beautifully connects them with the acts of our Lord in his passion: Evensong with his institution of the Eucharist, and washing the disciples' feet, and the going out to Gethsemane; Compline with his agony and bloody sweat; Matins with his appearance before Caiaphas; Prime and Tierce with that in the presence of Pilate; Tierce also with his scourging, crown of thorns, and presentation to the people; Sext with his bearing the cross, the seven words, and crucifixion; Nones with his dismission of his Spirit, descent into hell, and rout of tire devil; Vespers with his deposition from the cross ‘nd entombment; Compline with the setting of the watch; Matins with his resurrection” (Walcott, Sacred Archaeol. p. 317).

Of the origin of these  “hours,” Bingham (Antiquities of the Christ. Church, bk. 13:ch. 9:p. 661 sq.) says that “they who have made the most exact inquiries can find no footsteps of them in the first three ages, but conclude that they came first into the Church with the monastic life” (compare also Pearson, Praelect. in Act. Apost. mum. 3, 4). It is observable further, that most of the “writers of the fourth age, who speak of six or seven hours of prayer, speak of the observances of the monks only, and not of the whole body of the Church. Thus Jerome, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Cassian, Cassiodorus, and most other writers of the early Christian Church, speak but of three hours of prayers; thus, also, even Chrysostom himself, who, however, when “speaking of the monks and their institutions (Fomil. 14 in I Timothy p. 1599), gives about the same number of canonical hours as others do.” Yet it is very likely even that in some Eastern churches these hours of prayers might have been practiced in the 4th century, and quite certain that the different churches observing the hours varied greatly both as to the number of the hours and the service in their first original. “At the time of the Reformation, the canonical hours were reduced in the Lutheran Church to two, morning and evening; the Reformed Church never observed them” (Brande and Cox, Dict. of Science, Literat. and Art, 2, 152). In the Church of England these services were, at the time of the English Reformation, used as distinct offices only by stricter religious persons and the clergy. At the revision of the liturgy of that Church under Edward VI, it was decided to have “only two solemn services of public worship in the day, viz.

Matins, composed of matins, lauds, and prime; and Evensong, consisting of vespers and compline.” In the Greek Church, Neale (Essays on Liturgiology and Church Hist., Essay 1, p. 6 sq.) says, “There are eight canonical hours; prayers are actually, for the most part, said three times daily-matins, lauds, and prime, by aggregation early in the morning; tierce, sexts, and the liturgy (communion) later; nones, vespers, and compline, by aggregation in the evening.” So, also, is it in the West. “Except in monastic bodies,” says the same writer (p. 46 sq.), “the breviary as a church office is scarcely ever used as a whole. You may go, we do not say from church to church, but from cathedral to cathedral of Central Europe, and never hear matins save at high festivals. In Spain and Portugal it is somewhat more frequent, but there, as everywhere, it is a clerical devotion exclusively Then the lesser hours are not often publicly said except in cathedrals, and then principally by aggregation, and in connection with mass… In no national Church under the sun are so many matin services said as in our own.” It may not be out of place here to add that seven hours formed the  basis of the “Primers” (q.v.). “English editions of these, set forth by authority in the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward V, and of queen Elizabeth, show that the English reformers did not wish to discourage the observance of the ancient hours of prayer. As late as 1627, by command of Charles I, bishop Cosin published a ‘Collection of Private Devotions in the practice of the ancient Church, called the Hours of Prayer, as they were after this manner published by authority of queen Elizabeth, 1560,' etc.” See, besides the authorities already referred to, Procter, Prayer Book, chap. 1; Blunt (the Rev. J. H.), Dict. of Doctrinal and Hist. Theol. (London 1870), 1, 315; Siegel, Christl. — Kirche. Alterthümer, 1, 270 sq.; 4, 65 sq. SEE CANONICAL; SEE BREVIARY. (J. H. W.)

## House[[@Headword:House]]

             (בִּיַת, ba'yith, which is used with much latitude, and in the “construct” form בֵּית, beyth, Anglicized “Beth,” [q.v.] enters into the composition of many proper names; Gr. οικος, or some derivative of it), a dwelling in general, whether literally, as house, tent, palace, citadel, tomb, derivatively as tabernacle, temple, heaven, or metaphorically as family. SEE PALACE.

I. History and Sources of Comparison. — Although, in Oriental language, every tent (see Gesen. Thes. p. 32) may be regarded as a house (Harmer, Obs. 1, 194), yet the distinction between the permanent dwelling-house and the tent must have taken rise from the moment of the division of mankind into dwellers in tents and builders of cities, i.e. of permanent habitations (Gen 4:17; Gen 4:20; Isa 38:2). The agricultural and pastoral forms of life are described in Scripture as of equally ancient origin. Cain was a husbandman, and Abel a keeper of sheep. The former is a settled, the latter an unsettled mode of life. Hence we find that Cain, when the murder of his brother constrained him to wander abroad, built a town in the land where he settled. At the same time, doubtless, those who followed the same mode of life as Abel, dwelt in tents, capable of being taken from one place to another, when the want of fresh pastures constrained those removals which are so frequent among people of pastoral  habits. We are not required to suppose that Cain's town was more than a collection of huts. SEE CITY.

Our information respecting the abodes of men in the ages before the Deluge is however, too scanty to afford much ground for notice. The enterprise at Babel, to say nothing of Egypt, shows that the constructive arts had made considerable progress during that obscure but interesting period; for we are bound in reason to conclude that the arts possessed by man in the ages immediately following the Deluge existed before that great catastrophe. SEE ANTEDILUVIANS.

The observations offered under ARCHITECTURE will preclude the expectation of finding among this Eastern people that accomplished style of building which Vitruvius requires, or that refined taste by which the Greeks and Romans excited the admiration of foreign nations. The tents in which the Arabs now dwell are in all probability the same as those in which the Hebrew patriarchs spent their lives. It is not likely that what the Hebrews observed in Egypt, during their long sojourn in that country, had in this respect any direct influence upon their own subsequent practice in Palestine. SEE TENT.

Nevertheless, the information which may be derived from the figures of houses and parts of houses in the Egyptian tombs is not to be overlooked or slighted. We have in them the only representations of ancient houses in that part of the world which now exist; and however different may have been the state architecture of Egypt and Palestine, we have every reason to conclude that there was considerable resemblance in the private dwellings of these neighboring countries. The few representations of buildings on the Assyrian monuments may likewise be of some assistance in completing our ideas of Hebrew dwellings. The Hebrews did not become dwellers in cities till the sojourn in Egypt and after the conquest of Canaan (Genesis 47, 3; Exo 12:7; Heb 11:9), while the Canaanites, as well as the Assyrians, were from an earlier period builders and inhabitants of cities, and it was into the houses and cities built by the former that the Hebrews entered to take possession after the conquest (Gen 10:11; Gen 10:19; Gen 19:1; Gen 23:10; Gen 34:20; Num 11:27; Deu 6:10-11). The private dwellings of the Assyrians and Babylonians have altogether perished, but the solid material of the houses of Syria, east of the Jordan, may perhaps have preserved entire specimens of the ancient dwellings, even of the original inhabitants of that region (Porter, Damascus, 2:195, 196; C. C. Graham in “Camb. Essays,” 1859, p. 160, etc.; comp. Buckingham Arab Tribes, p. 171,172).

II. Materials and general Character. — There is no reason to suppose that many houses in' Palestine were constructed with wood. A great part of that country was always very poor in timber, and some parts of it had scarcely any wood at all. But of stone there was no want, and it was consequently much used in the building of houses. The law of Moses respecting leprosy in houses (Lev 14:33-40) seems to prove this, as the characteristics there enumerated could only occur in the case of stone walls. Still, when the Hebrews intended to build a house in the most splendid style and in accordance with the taste of the age, as much wood as possible was used. Houses in the East were frequently built of burnt or merely dried clay bricks, which were not very durable (Job 4:19; Mat 7:26). Such were very liable to the attacks of burglars (Job 24:16; Mat 6:19; Mat 24:16. See Hackett's Illust. of Script. p. 94). The better class of houses were built of stone, the palaces of squared stone (1Ki 7:9; Isa 9:10), and some were of marble (1Ch 29:2). Lime or gypsum (probably with ashes or chopped straw) was used for mortar (Isa 33:12; Jer 43:9); perhaps also asphaltum (Gen 11:3). A plastering or whitewashing is often mentioned (Lev 14:41-42; Eze 13:10; Mat 23:27); a wash of colored lime was chosen for palaces (Jer 22:14). The beams consisted chiefly of the wood of the sycamore from its extreme durability (Isa 9:10); the acacia and the palm were employed for columns and transverse beams, and the cypress for flooring-planks (1Ki 6:15; 2Ch 3:5).

The fir, the olive-tree, and cedars were greatly esteemed (1Ki 7:2; Jer 22:14); but the most precious of all was the almug-tree: this wood seems to have been brought through Arabia from India (1Ki 10:11-12). Wood was used in the construction of doors and gates, of the folds and lattices of windows, of the flat roofs, and of the wainscoting with which the walls were ornamented. Beams were inlaid in the walls to which the wainscoting was fastened by nails to render it more secure (Ezr 6:4). Houses finished in this manner were called ceiled houses and ceiled chambers (Jer 22:14; Hag 1:4). The lower part of the walls was adorned with rich hangings of velvet or damask dyed of the liveliest colors, suspended on hooks, and taken down at pleasure (Est 1:6). The upper part of the walls was adorned with figures in stucco, with gold, silver, gems, and ivory; hence the expressions “ivory houses,” “ivory palaces,” and “chambers ornamented with ivory” (1Ki 22:39; 2Ch 3:6; Psa 45:8; Amo 3:15). Metals were also employed to some  extent, as lead, iron, and copper are mentioned among building materials; but especially gold and silver for various kinds of solid, plated, and inlaid work (Exo 36:34; Exo 36:38).

The ceiling, generally of wainscot, was- painted with great art. In the days of Jeremiah these chambers were ceiled with costly and fragrant wood, and painted with the richest colors (Jer 22:14). (See each of these parts and materials in their alphabetical place.) The splendor and magnificence of an edifice seems to have been estimated in a measure by the size of the square stones of which it was constructed (1Ki 7:9-12). In some cases these were of brilliant and variegated hues (1Ch 29:2). The foundation stone, which was probably placed at the corner, and thence called the corner stone, was an object of peculiar regard, and was selected with great care from among the others (Psa 118:22; Isa 28:16; Mat 21:42; Act 4:11; 1Pe 2:6). The square stones in buildings, as far as we can ascertain from the ruins which yet remain, were held together, not by mortar or cement of any kind, except a very small quantity indeed might have been used, but by cramp ions. Walls in some cases appear to have been covered with a composition of chalk and gypsum (Deu 27:2; comp. Dan 5:5; Act 23:3. See Chardin's Voyages, ed. Langles, vol. 4). The tiles dried in the sun were at first united by mud placed between them, afterwards by lime mixed with sand to form mortar. The latter was used with burnt tiles (Lev 14:41-42; Jer 43:9). For the external decoration of large buildings marble columns were employed (Son 5:15). The Persians also took great delight in marble. To this not only the ruins of Persepolis testify, but the Book of Esther, where mention is made of white, red, and black marble, and likewise of veined marble. The Scriptural allusions to houses receive no illustration from the recently discovered monuments of the Mesopotamian mounds, as no private houses, either of Assyria or Babylonia, have been preserved; owing doubtless to their having been constructed of perishable mud walls, at most enclosed only with thin slabs of alabaster (Layard's Nineveh, 2, 214). SEE TEMPLE.

The Hebrews at a very ancient date, like the Orientals, had not only summer and winter rooms (Jeremiah 36, 22; see Chardin. 4:119), but palaces (Jdg 3:20; 1Ki 7:2-6; Amo 3:15). The houses, or palaces so called, made for summer residence, were very spacious. The lower stories were frequently under ground. The front of these buildings faced the north, so as to secure the advantage of the breezes, which in  summer blow from that direction. They were supplied with a current of fresh air by means of ventilators, which consisted of perforations made through the upper part of the northern wall, of considerable diameter externally, but diminishing in size as they approached the inside of the wall. SEE DWELLING.

Houses for jewels and armor were built and furnished under the kings (2Ki 20:13). The draught-house (מִחֲרָאוֹת; κοπρών latrinae) was doubtless a public latrine, such as exists in modern Eastern cities (2Ki 10:27; Russell, 1, 34).

Leprosy in the house was probably a nitrous efflorescence on the walls, which was injurious to the salubrity of the house, and whose removal was therefore strictly enjoined by the law (Lev 14:34; Lev 14:55; Kitto, Phys. Geogr. of Pal. p. 112).

III. Details of Hebrew Dwellings. — In inferring the plan and arrangement of ancient Jewish or Oriental houses, as alluded to in Scripture, from existing dwellings in Syria, Egypt, and the East in general, allowance must be made for the difference in climate between Egypt, Persia, and Palestine, a cause from which would proceed differences in certain cases of material and construction, as well as of domestic arrangement.

1. The houses of the rural poor in Egypt, as well as in most parts of Syria, Arabia, and Persia, are for the most part mere huts of mud, or sun burnt bricks. In some parts of Palestine and Arabia stone is used, and in certain districts caves in the rock are used as dwellings (Amo 5:11; Bartlett, Walks, p. 117). SEE CAVE. The houses are usually of one story only, viz. the ground floor, and sometimes contain only one apartment. Sometimes a small court for the cattle is attached; and in some cases the cattle are housed in the same building, or the people live on a raised platform, and the cattle round them on the ground (1Sa 28:24; Irby and Mangles, p. 70; Jolliffe, Letters, 1, 43; Buckingham, Arab Tribes, p. 170; Burckhardt, Travels, 2, 119). In Lower Egypt the oxen occupy the width of the chamber farthest from the entrance: it is built of brick or mud, about  four feet high, and the top is often used as a sleeping place in winter. The windows are small apertures high up in the walls, sometimes grated with wood (Burckhardt, Travels, 1, 241; 2:101, 119, 301, 329; Lane, Mod. Egyptians, 1, 44). The roofs are commonly, but not always, flat, and are usually formed of a plaster of mud and straw laid upon boughs or rafters; and upon the flat roofs, tents or “booths” of boughs or rushes are often raised to be mused as sleeping-places in summer (Irby and Mangles, p. 71; Niebuhr, Descr. p. 49, 53; Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 112; Nineveh, 1. 176; Burckhardt, Syria, p. 280; Travels, 1, 190; Van Egmont, 2:32; Malan, Magdala and Bethany, p. 15). To this description the houses of ancient Egypt, and also of Assyria, as represented in the monuments, in great measure correspond (Layard Mon. of Nin. p. 2, p. 49,50; Wilkinson, Ancient Eg.1, 13; Martiineau, East. Life, 1, 19, 97). In the towns the houses of the inferior kind do not differ much from the above description, but they are sometimes of more than one story, and the roof terraces are more carefully constructed. In Palestine they are often of stone (Jolliffe, 1, 26). In the inferior kinds of Oriental dwellings, such as are met with in villages and very small towns, there is no central court, but there is generally a shaded platform in front. The village cabins and abodes of the peasantry are, of course, of a still inferior description; and, being the abodes of people who live much in the open air, will not bear comparison with the houses of the same class in Northern Europe, where the cottage is the home of the owner. (See Jahn, Bibl. Archaeol. translated by Prof. Upham, pt. 1, ch. 2.)

2. The difference between the poorest houses and those of the class next above them is greater than between these and the houses of the first rank. The prevailing plan of Eastern houses of this class presents, as was the case in ancient Egypt, a front of wall, whose blank and mean appearance is usually relieved only by the door and a few latticed and projecting windows (Views in Syria, 2, 25). The privacy of Oriental domestic habits would render our plan of throwing the front of the house towards the street most repulsive. The doorway or door bears an inscription from the Koran as the ancient Egyptian houses lad inscriptions over their doors, and as the Israelites were directed to write sentences from the Law over their gates. SEE MEZUZAH.

Over the door is usually the kiosk (sometimes projecting  like a bay-window), or screened balcony, probably the “summer parlor” in which Ehud smote the king of Moab (Jdg 3:20), and the “chamber on the wall,” which the Shunammite prepared for the prophet (2Ki 4:10). Besides this, there may be a small latticed window or two high up in the wall, giving light and air to upper chambers, which, except in times of public celebrations, is usually closed (2Ki 9:30; Shaw, Travels, p. 207; Lane, Mod. Eg. 1, 27). The entrance is usually guarded within from sight by a wall or some arrangement of the passages. In the passage is a stone seat for the porter and other servants (Lane, Mod. Eg.1 32; Chardin, Voy. 4, 111). SEE DOOR.

The buildings which form the house front towards an inner square or court. Small houses have one of these courts, but superior houses have two, and first-rate houses three, communicating with each other; for the Orientals dislike ascending stairs or steps. It is only when the building-ground is confined by nature or by fortifications that they build high houses, but, from the loftiness of the rooms, buildings of one story are often as high as houses of three stories among ourselves. If there are three or more courts, all except the outer one are much alike in size and appearance; but the outer one, being devoted to the more public life of the occupant, and to his intercourse with society, is materially different from all the others. If there are more than two, the second is devoted chiefly to the use of the master, who is there attended only by-his eunuchs, children, and females, and sees only such persons as he calls from the third or interior court, in which they reside. In the history of Esther, she incurs danger by going from her interior court to that of the king, to invite him to visit her part of the palace; but she would not, on any account have gone to the outermost court, in which the king held his public audiences. Some of the finest houses in the East are to be found at Damascus, where in some of them are seven such courts. When there are only two courts, the innermost is the harem, in which the women and children live, and which is the true domicile of the master, to which he withdraws when the claims of business, of society, and of friends have been satisfied, and where no man but himself ever enters, or could be induced to enter, even by strong persuasions (Burckhardt, Travels, 1, 188; Van Egmont, 2 246, 253; Shaw, p. 207; Porter, Damascus, 1, 34, 37, 60; Chardin, Voyages, 6, 6; Lane, Modern Eg. 1 179, 207). See below.

Entering at the street door, the above-named passage, usually sloping downwards, conducts to the outer court; the opening from the passage to  this, as before observed, is not opposite the gate of entrance, but by a side turn, to preclude any view from the street into the court when the gate is opened. This open court corresponds to the Romali impluvium, and is often paved with marble. Into this the principal apartments look, and are either open to it in front, or are entered from it by doors. An awning is sometimes drawn over the court and the floor strewed with carpets on festive occasions (Shaw, p. 208). Around part, if not the whole, of the court is a veranda, often nine or ten feet deep, over which, when there is more than one floor, runs a second gallery of like depth, with a balustrade (Shaw, p. 208). The stairs to the upper apartments or to the roof are often shaded by vines or creeping-plants, and the courts, especially the inner ones — planted with trees. The court has often a well or tank in it (Psa 128:3; 2Sa 17:18; Russell, Aleppo, 1, 24, 32; Wilkinson, 1, 6, 8; Lane; Mod. Eg. 1, 32; Views in Syria, 1, 56). SEE COURT.

On entering the outer court through this passage we find opposite to us the public room, in which the master receives and gives audience to his friends and clients. This is entirely open in front, and, being richly fitted up, has a splendid appearance when the first view of it is obtained. A refreshing coolness is sometimes given to this apartment by a fountain throwing up a jet of water in front of it. This is' the κατάλυμα, or guest-chamber, of Luk 22:11; not necessarily an ἀνάγαιον, or upper chamber, as in Luk 22:12. A large portion of the other side of the court is occupied with a frontage of lattice-work filled with colored glass, belonging to a room as large as the guest-chamber, and which in winter is used for the same purpose or serves as the apartment of any visitor of distinction, who cannot, of course, be admitted into the interior parts of the house. The other apartments in this outer court are comparatively small, and are used for the accommodation of visitors, retainers, and servants. SEE GUEST- CHAMBER.

In the better class of houses in modern Egypt, the above ground-floor room is generally the apartment for male visitors, called mandarah, having a portion of the floor sunk below the rest, called durka'ah. This is often paved with marble or colored tiles, and has in the center a fountain. The rest of the floor is a raised platform called liwan, with a mattress and cushions at the back on each of the three sides. This seat or sofa is called  diwan. Every person, on entrance, takes off his shoes on the durka'ah before stepping on the liwan (Exo 3:5; Jos 5:15; Luk 7:38). The ceilings over the λι2ωΧδν and durka'ah are often richly paneled and ornamented (Jer 22:14). SEE DIVAN.

Bearing in mind that the reception-room is raised above the level of the court (Chardin, 4:118: Views in Samaria, 1, 56), we may, in explaining the circumstances of the miracle of the paralytic (Mar 2:3; Luk 5:18), suppose,

1. either that our Lord was standing under the veranda, and the people in front in the court. The bearers of the sick man ascended the stairs to the roof of the house, and, taking off a portion of the boarded covering of the veranda, or removing the awning over the impluvium, τὸ μέσον, ill the former case let down the bed through the veranda roof, or in the latter, down by Unay of the roof, διὰ τῶν κεράμων, and deposited it before the Savior (Shaw, p. 212).

2. Another explanation presents itself in considering the room where the company were assembled as the ὑπερῷον, and the roof opened for the bed to be the true roof of the house (Crench, Miracles, p. 199 Lane, Modern Eg. 1, 39).

3. And one still more simple is found in regarding the house as one of the rude dwellings now to be seen near the Sea of Galilee, a mere room “ten or twelve feet high, and as many or more square,” with no opening except the door. The roof, used as a sleeping-place, is reached by a ladder from the outside, and the bearers of the paralytic, unable to approach the door, would thus have ascended the roof, and, having uncovered it (ἐξορύξαντες), let him down into the room where our Lord was (Malan, 1. c.). See below.

Besides the mandarah some houses in Cairo have an apartment called mak'ad, open in front to the court, with two or more arches, and a railing; and a pillar to-support the wall above (Lane, 1, 38). It was in a chamber of this kind, probably one of the largest size to be found in a palace, that our Lord was arraigned before the high-priest at the time when the denial of him by Peter took place. He “turned and looked” on Peter as he stood by the fire in tile court (Luk 22:56; Luk 22:61; Joh 18:24), while he himself  was in the “hall of judgment,” the mak'ad. Such was the “porch of judgment” built by Solomon (1Ki 7:7), which finds a parallel in the golden alcove of Mohammed Uzbek (Ibn Batuta, Travels, p. 76, ed. Lee). SEE PRAETORIUM. The circumstance of Samson's pulling down the house by means of the pillars, may be explained by the fact of the company being assembled on tiers of balconies above each other, supported by central pillars on the basement; when these were pulled down, the whole of the upper floors would fall also (Jdg 16:26; see Shaw, p. 211). SEE PILLAR.

When there is no second floor, but more than one court, the women's apartments (Arabic harem or hamran, secluded or prohibited, with which maybe compared the Hebrew Armon, אִרְמוֹן, Stanley, S. and P. App. § 82), are usually in the second court; otherwise they form a separate building within the general enclosure, or are above on the first floor (Views in Syria, 1, 56). The entrance to the harem, as observed above, is crossed by no one but the master of the house and the domestics belonging to the female establishment. Though this remark would not apply in the same degree to Jewish habits, the privacy of the women's apartments may possibly be indicated by the “inner chamber” (חֶדֶר, ταμιεῖον; cubiculum), resorted to as a hiding-place (1Ki 20:30; 1Ki 22:25; see Jdg 15:1). Solomon, in his marriage with a foreigner, introduced also foreign usage in this respect, which was carried further in subsequent times (1Ki 7:8; 2Ki 24:15). The harem, of the Persian monarch (בֵּית נָשַׁים; ὅ γυναικών; domus feminarum) is noticed in the book of Esther (Est 2:3) SEE WOMAN.

Sometimes the diwan is raised sufficiently to allow of cellars underneath for stores of all kinds (ταμιεῖα, Mat 24:26; Russell, 1, 32). This basement is occupied by various offices, stores of corn and fuel, places for the water-jars to stand in, places for grinding corn, baths, kitchens, etc. In Turkish Arabia most of the houses have underground cellars or vaults, to which the inhabitants retreat during the midday heat of summer, and there - enjoy a refreshing coolness. We do not discover any notice of this usage in Scripture. But at Acre the substructions of very ancient houses were some years ago discovered, having such cellars, which were very probably subservient to this use. In the rest of the year, these cellars, or serdaubs, as  they are called, are abandoned to the bats, which swarm in them in scarcely credible numbers (Isa 2:20).

The kitchens are always in this inner court, as the cooking is performed by women; and the ladies of the family superintend or actually assist in the process. The kitchen, open in front, is on the same side as the entrance from the outer court; and the top of it forms a terrace, which affords a communication between the first floor of both courts by a private door, seldom used but by the master of the house and attendant eunuchs. There are usually no fireplaces except in the kitchen, the furniture of which consists of a sort of raised platform of brick, with receptacles in it for fire, answering to the “boiling-places” (מְבִשְּׁלוֹת; μαγειρεῖα; culinae of Ezekiel (Eze 46:23; see Lane, 1, 41; Gesenius, Thes. p. 249). In these different compartments the various dishes of an Eastern feast may be at once prepared at charcoal fires. This place being wholly open in front, the half-tame doves, which have their nests in the trees of the court, often visit it, in the absence of the servants, in search of crumbs, etc. As they sometimes blacken themselves, this perhaps explains the obscure passage in Psa 68:13, “Though ye have lien among the pots [but Gesenius renders “sheepfolds”], ye shall be as the wings of a dove covered with silver,” etc.

Besides the mandarah, there is sometimes a second room, either on the ground or the upper floor, called ka'ah, fitted with diwans, and at the corners of these rooms portions taken off and enclosed form retiring rooms (Lane, 1, 21; Russell, 1, 31, 33). While speaking of the interior of the house we may observe, that on the diwan, the corner is the place of honor, which is never quitted by the master of the house in receiving strangers (Russell, 1, 27; Malan, Tyre and Sidon, p. 38). When there is an upper story, the ka'ah forms the most important apartment, and thus probably answers to the ὑπερῷον, which was often the “guest-chamber” (Luk 22:12; Act 1:13; Act 9:37; Act 20:8; Burckhardt, Travels, 1, 154). The windows of the upper rooms often project one or two feet, and form a kiosk or latticed chamber, the ceilings of which are elaborately ornamented (Lane, 1, 27; Russell, 1, 102; Burckhardt, Trat. 1, 190). Such may have been the “chamber in the wall” (לֲַיָּה, ὑπερῷον, conaculum, Gesen. p. 1030) made, or rather set apart for Elisha by the Shunammite woman (2Ki 4:10-11). So, also, the “summer parlor” of Eglon (Jdg 3:20; Jdg 3:23; but see Wilkinson, 1, 11), the “loft” of the widow of Zarephath (1Ki 17:19). The “lattice” (שְׂבָכָה, δικτυωτός, cancelli) through which Ahaziah fell perhaps belonged to an upper chamber of this kind (2Ki 1:2), as also the “third loft” (τρίστεγον) from which Eutychus fell (Act 20:9; compare Jer 22:13). SEE UPPER ROOM.

The inner court is entered by a passage and door similar to those on the street, and usually situated at one of the innermost corners of the outer court. The inner court is generally much larger than the former. It is for the most part paved, excepting a portion in the middle, which is planted with trees (usually two) and shrubs, with a basin of water in the midst. That the Jews had the like arrangement of trees in the courts of their houses, and that the birds nested in them, appears from Psa 84:2-3. They had also the basin of water in the inner court or harem, and among them it was used for bathing as is shown by David's discovering Bathsheba bathing as he walked on the roof of his palace. The arrangement of the inner court is very similar to that of the outer, but the whole is more open and airy. The buildings usually occupy two sides of the square, of which the one opposite the entrance contains the principal apartments. They are upon what we should call the first floor, and open into a wide gallery or veranda which in good houses is nine or ten feet deep, and covered by a wooden penthouse supported by a row. of wooden columns. This terrace or gallery is furnished with a strong wooden balustrade, and is usually paved with squared stones, or else floored with boards. In the center of the principal front is the usual open drawing room, on which the best art of the Eastern decorator is expended. Much of one of the sides of the court front- is usually occupied by the large sitting room, with the latticed front covered with colored glass, similar to that in the outer court. The other rooms, of smaller size, are the more private apartments of the mansion.

No ancient houses had chimneys. The word so translated in Hos 13:3, means a hole through which the smoke escaped; and this existed only in the lower class of dwellings, where raw wood was employed for fuel or cooking, and where there was an opening immediately over the hearth to let out the smoke. In the better sort of houses the rooms were warmed in winter by charcoal in braziers (Jeremiah 36, 22; Mar 14:54; Joh 18:18), as is still the practice (Russell, 1; 21; Lane, 1, 41; Chardin, 4:120), or a fire of wood might be kindled in the open court of the house (Luk 22:55). SEE FIRE.  There are usually (no doors to the sitting or drawing rooms of Eastern houses: they are closed by curtains, at least in summer, the opening and shutting of doors being odious to most Orientals. The same seems to have been the case among the Hebrews, as far as we may judge from the curtains which served instead of doors to the tabernacle, and which separated the inner and outer chambers of the Temple. The outer doors are closed with a wooden lock (Lane, 1, 42; Chardin, 4:123; Russell, 1, 21). SEE LOCK; SEE CURTAIN.

The windows had no glass; they were only latticed, and thus gave free passage to the air and admitted light, while birds and bats were excluded. In winter the cold air was kept out by veils over the windows, or by shutters with holes in them sufficient to admit light (1Ki 7:17; Son 2:9). The apertures of the windows in Egyptian and Eastern houses generally are small, in order to exclude heat (Wilkinson, Anc e.g. 2, 124). They are closed with folding valves, secured with a bolt or bar. The windows often project considerably beyond the lower part of the building, so as to overhang the street. The windows of the courts within also project (Jowett, Christian Res. p. 66, 67). The lattice is generally kept closed, but can be opened at pleasure, and is opened on great public occasions (Lane, Mod. Egypt. 1, 27). Those within can look through the lattices, without opening them or being seen themselves; and in some rooms, especially the large upper room, there are several: windows. From the allusions in Scripture we gather, that while there was usually but one window in each room, in which invariably there was a lattice (Jdg 5:28, where “a window” is in Heb. “the window;” Jos 2:15; 2Sa 6:16, in Hebrews the window;” 2Ki 9:30, do.; Act 20:9, do.), there were sometimes several windows (2Ki 13:17). The room here spoken of was probably such an upper room as Robinson describes above with many windows (Res. 3, 417). Daniel's room had several windows, and his lattices were opened when his enemies found him in prayer (Dan 6:10). The projecting nature of the window, and the fact that a divan, or raised seat, encircles the interior of each, so that usually persons sitting in the window are seated close to the aperture, easily explains how Ahaziah may have fallen through the lattice of his upper chamber, and Eutychus from his window-seat, especially if the lattices were open at the time (2Ki 1:2; Act 20:9). SEE WINDOW.  There are usually no special bedrooms in Eastern houses, and thus the room in which Ishbosheth was murdered was probably an ordinary room with a diwan, on which he was sleeping during the heat of the day (2Sa 4:5-6; Lane, 1, 41). SEE BEDCHAMBER.

The stairs to the upper apartments are in Syria usually in a corner of the court (Robinson, 3:302). When there is no upper story the lower rooms are usually loftier. In Persia they are open from top to bottom, and only divided from the court by a low partition (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 1, 10; Chardin, 4:119; Burckhardt, Travels, 1, 18, 19; Views in Syria, 1, 6). This flight of stone steps conducts to the gallery, from which a plainer stair leads to the housetop. If the house be large, there are two or three sets of steps to the different sides of the quadrangle, but seldom more than one flight from the terrace to the house-top of any one court. There is, however, a separate stair from the outer court to the roof, and it is usually near the entrance. This will bring to mind the case of the paralytic, noticed above, whose friends, finding they could not get access to Jesus through the people who crowded the court of the house in which he was preaching, took him up to the roof, and let him down in his bed through the tiling to the place where Jesus stood (Luk 5:17-26). If the house in which our Lord then was had more than one court, he and the auditors were certainly in the outer one; and it is reasonable to conclude that he stood in the veranda addressing the crowd below. The men bearing the paralytic, therefore, perhaps went up the steps near the door; and finding they could not even then get near the person of Jesus, the gallery being also crowded, continued their course to the roof of the house, and, removing the boards over the covering of the gallery, at the place where Jesus stood, lowered the sick man to his feet. But if they could not get access to the steps near the door, as is likely, from the door being much crowded, their alternative was to take him to the roof of the next house, and there hoist him over the parapet to the roof of the house which they desired to enter. (See Strong's Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels, p. 64.) SEE STAIRS.

The roof of the house is, of course, flat. It is formed by layers of branches, twigs, matting, and earth, laid over the rafters, and trodden down; after which it is covered with a compost that acquires considerable hardness when dry. Such roofs would not, however, endure the heavy and continuous rains of our climate; and in those parts of Asia where the  climate is more than usually moist, a stone roller is usually kept on every root, and after a shower a great part of the population is engaged in drawing these rollers over the roofs. It is now very common, in countries where timber is scarce, to have domed roofs; but in that case the flat roof, which is indispensable to Eastern habits, is obtained by filling up the hollow intervals between the several domes, so as to form a flat surface at the top. These flat roofs are often alluded to in Scripture, and the allusions show that they were made to serve the same uses as at present. In fine weather the inhabitants resorted much to them to breathe the fresh air, to enjoy a fine prospect, or to witness any event that occurred in the neighborhood (2Sa 11:2; Isa 22:1; Mat 24:17; Mar 13:15). The dry air of the summer atmosphere enabled them, without injury to health, to enjoy the bracing coolness of the night-air by sleeping on the housetops; and in order to have the benefit of the air and prospect in the daytime, without inconvenience from the sun, sheds, booths, and tents were sometimes erected on the housetops (2Sa 16:22). SEE HOUSETOP.

The roofs of the houses are well protected by walls and parapets. Towards the street and neighboring houses is a high wall, and towards the interior courtyard usually a parapet or wooden rail.; Battlements” of this kind, for the prevention of accidents, are strictly enjoined in the law (Deu 22:8); and the form of the battlements of Egyptian houses suggest some interesting analogies, if we consider how recently the Israelites had quitted Egypt when that law was delivered. SEE BATTLEMENT.

In the East, where the climate allows the people to spend so much of their time out of doors, the articles of furniture and the domestic utensils have always been few and simple. SEE BED; SEE LAMP; SEE POTTERY; SEE SEAT; SEE TABLE. The rooms, however, although comparatively vacant of movables, are far from having a naked or unfurnished appearance. This is owing to the high degree of ornament given to the walls and ceilings. The walls are broken up into various recesses, and the ceiling into compartments. The ceiling, if of wood and flat, is of curious and complicated joinery; or, if vaulted, is wrought into numerous coves and enriched with fretwork in stucco; and the walls are adorned with arabesques, mosaics, mirrors, painting, and gold, which, as set off by the marble-like whiteness of the stucco, has a truly brilliant and rich effect.  There is much in this to remind one of such descriptions of splendid interiors as that in Isa 54:11-12.Smith; Kitto; Fairbairn. SEE CEILING.

IV. Metaphori: ally. — The word house has some figurative applications in Scripture. Heaven- is considered as the house of God (Joh 14:2): “In my Father's house are many mansions.” Here is an evident allusion to the Temple (q.v.), with its many rooms, which is emphatically styled in the Old Testament “the House of the Lord.” The grave is the house appointed for all the living (Job 30:23; Isa 14:18). House is taken for the body (2Co 5:1): “If our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved;” if our bodies were taken to pieces by death. The comparison of the body to a house is used by Mr. Harmer to explain the similes, Ecclesiastes 12 :and is illustrated by a passage in Plautus (Mostell. 1, 2). The Church of God is his house (1Ti 3:15): “How thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, that is, the Church of the living God.” In the same sense, Moses was faithful in all the house of God as a servant, but Christ as a son over his own house; whose house are we (Christians). But this sense may include that of household, persons composing the attendants or retainers to a prince, etc. This intimate reference of house or dwelling to the adherents, intimates, or partisans of the householder, is probably the foundation of the simile used by the apostle Peter (1Pe 2:5): “Ye (Christians), as living stones, are built up into a spiritual house.” Gen 43:16 : “Joseph said to the ruler of his house;” i.e. to the manager of his domestic concerns. Isa 36:3 : “Eliakim, who was over the house, or household;” i.e. his steward. Gen 30:30 : “When shall I provide for mine own house also?” i.e. get wealth to provide for my family (see 1Ti 5:8). Gen 7:1 : “Enter thou and all thy house (family) into the ark.” Exo 1:21 : “And it came to pass, because the midwives feared God, that he made them houses;” i.e. he prospered their families. So also in 1Sa 2:35; 2Sa 7:27; 1Ki 11:38. Thus the Lord plagued Pharaoh and his house (Gen 12:17). “What is my house, that thou hast brought me hitherto?” (2Sa 7:18). So Joseph (Luk 1:27; Luk 2:4) was of the house of David, but more especially he was of his royal lineage, or family; and, as we conceive, in the direct line or eldest branch of the family, so that he was next of kin to the throne, if the government had still continued in possession of the descendants of David (see also 1Ti 5:8). 2Sa 7:11 : “Also the Lord telleth thee that he will make thee a house;”  i.e. he will give thee offspring, who may receive and may preserve the royal dignity. Psa 49:12 : “Their inward thought is that their houses shall continue forever;” i.e. that their posterity shall always flourish. — Calmet; Wemyss. SEE HOUSEHOLD.

## House of Bishops[[@Headword:House of Bishops]]

             SEE CONVOCATION.

## House of Clerical and Lay Deputies[[@Headword:House of Clerical and Lay Deputies]]

             SEE CONVOCATION.

## House of Exposition [[@Headword:House of Exposition ]]

             SEE BETH-HANMMIDRASH.

## House of God[[@Headword:House of God]]

             A name frequently given to the edifice in which Christians assemble for the worship of God, not because God dwells there by any visible or special presence, as of old he “dwelt between the cherubims,” but because it is dedicated to God, and set apart for his service. It is thus synonymous with the word “church” in that modern use of it by which it signifies a building (Eden). SEE BETHEL; SEE HOUSE; SEE TEMPLE.

## House of Judgment [[@Headword:House of Judgment ]]

             SEE BETH-DIN.

## House of Prayer[[@Headword:House of Prayer]]

             Places where persons assemble to pray, and to receive religious instruction, but where the sacraments are not administered. It is the general name of the Protestant churches in Hungary, and was such in Silesia under the Austrian rule, to distinguish them from the Roman Catholic places of worship. It is also used in Germany to designate the churches of such sects as are not officially recognized, as the Moravians, etc. The synagogues are also called houses of prayer (Isa 46:7). — Pierer, Unic. Lex. s.v. SEE PROSEUCHAE.

## House of Reading[[@Headword:House of Reading]]

             SEE BETH-HAMMIKRA.

## House of the Living[[@Headword:House of the Living]]

             SEE BETH-HAIM.

## House, Erwin[[@Headword:House, Erwin]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Worthington, Ohio, February 17, 1824. He was converted at the age of thirteen; graduated at Woodward College, Cincinnati, in 1846; received license to preach in 1849, and in 1865 entered the Cincinnati Conference, of which he continued a member till his death, May 20, 1875. Mr. House commenced contributing to the press as early as 1837; in 1847 was employed as assistant editor of the Ladies' Repository, and from March 1851, to December 1852, had sole editorial charge of the magazine. He published, Sketches for the Young (1847): — The Missionary in Many Lands: — The Homilist: — Scripture Cabinet: — The Sunday-school Handbook. He was a hearty advocate of temperance. As a speaker to children he had very few equals. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1875, page 115; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## House-top[[@Headword:House-top]]

             (גָּג, gag, δῶμα), the flat roof of an Oriental house, for such is usually their form, though there are sometimes domes over some of the rooms. The flat portions are plastered with a composition of mortar, tar, ashes, and sand, which in time becomes very hard, but when not laid on at the proper season is apt to crack in winter, and the rain is thus admitted. In order to prevent this, every roof is provided with a roller, which is set at work after rain. In many cases the terrace roof is little better than earth rolled hard. On ill-compacted roofs grass is often found springing into a short-lived existence (Pro 19:13; Pro 27:15; Psa 129:6-7; Isa 37:27; Shaw, p. 210; Lane, 1, 27, Robinson, 3, 39,44,60). SEE GRASS.

In no point do Oriental domestic habits differ more from European than in the use of the roof (Hackett, Illustra. of Scripture, p. 71 sq.). Its flat surface is made useful for various household purposes (Jos 2:6), as drying corn, hanging up linen, and preparing figs and raisins (Shaw, p. 211; Burckhardt, Trav. 1, 191; Bartlett, Footsteps of our Lord, p. 199). The  roofs are used almost universally as places of recreation in the evening, and often as sleeping-places at night (2Sa 11:2; 2Sa 16:22; Dan 4:29; 1Sa 9:25-26; Job 27:18; Pro 21:9; Shaw. p. 211; Russell, 1, 35; Chardin, 4:116; Layard, Nineveh, 1, 177). They were also used as places for devotion, and even idolatrous worship (Jer 32:29; Jer 19:13; 2Ki 23:12; Zep 1:5; Act 10:9). At the time of the Feast of Tabernacles booths were erected by the Jews on the tops of their houses, as in the present day huts of boughs are sometimes erected on the housetops as sleeping-places, or places of retirement from the heat in summer time (Neh 8:16; Burckhardt, Syria, p. 280). As among the Jews the seclusion of women was not carried to the extent of Mohammedan usage, it is probable that the house-top was made, as it is among Christian inhabitants, more a place of public meeting both for men and women, than is the case among Mohammedans, who carefully seclude their roofs from inspection by partitions (Burckhardt, Trav. 1, 191, compare Wilkinson, 1, 23). The Christians at Aleppo, in Russell's time, lived contiguous, and made their house-tops a means of mutual communication to avoid passing through the streets in time of plague (Russell, 1, 35). In the same manner, the housetop might be made a means of escape by the stairs by which it was reached without entering any of the apartments of the house (Mat 24:17; Mat 10:27; Luk 12:3). Both Jews and heathens were in the habit of wailing publicly on the housetops (Isa 15:3; Isa 22:1; Jer 48:38). The expression used by Solomon, “dwelling upon the housetop” (Pro 21:9), is illustrated by the frequent custom of building chambers and rooms along the side and at the corners of the open space or terrace which often constitutes a kind of upper story (Hackett, ut sup. p. 74). Or it may refer to the fact that booths are sometimes constructed of branches and leaves upon the roof which, although of cramped dimensions, furnish a cool and quiet retreat, not unsuitable as a relief from a clamorous wife (Pococke, Travels, 2, 69). It is obvious that such a place would be convenient for observation (Isa 22:1), and for the proclamation of news (Luk 12:3; comp. Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 51). SEE ROOF.

Protection of the roof by parapets was enjoined by the law (Dent. 22:8). The parapets thus constructed, of which the types may be seen in ancient Egyptian houses, were sometimes of open work, and it is to a fall through or over one of these that the injury by which Ahaziah suffered is sometimes  ascribed (Shaw, p. 211). To pass over roofs for plundering purposes, as well as for safety, would be no difficult matter (Joe 2:9). In ancient Egyptian, and also in Assyrian houses, a sort of raised story was sometimes built above the roof, and in the former an open chamber, roofed or covered with awning, was sometimes erected on the house-top (Wilkinson, 1, 9; Layard, Mon. of Nin. 2, pl. 49, 50). — Smith. SEE HOUSE.

## Household[[@Headword:Household]]

             (usually same in the orig. as “house”), the members of a family residing in the same abode, including servants and dependants, although in Job 1, 3 a distinction (not observed in the A.V.) is intimated by the term בֲֻדָּה, abuddah,' lit. service (“servants,” Gen 26:24), between the domestics and the בִּיַת, bay'ith, or proper family of the master of the house; and some have thought a like difference to be denoted between the Greek term οἰκία (lit. residence) and οϊvκος of the N.T., which are both  indiscriminately rendered “‘house” and “household” in the English. Version. This latter view is confirmed by the improbability that any of the immediate imperial family (Nero's) should have been included in the converts to Christianity expressed in the phrase they of Caesar's household (οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καισαρος οἰκίας, Php 4:22). SEE CAESAR.

## Householder[[@Headword:Householder]]

             (οἱκοδεσπότης, master of the house, as rendered Mat 10:25; Luk 13:25; Luk 14:21), the male head of a family (Mat 13:27; Mat 13:52; Mat 20:1; Mat 21:23). There are monographs on the parable Matthew 20 by Feuerlein, De scriba proferente e thesauro nova et vetera (Alt. 1730); Bagewitz, De scriba docto (Rost. 1720). SEE GOODMAN OF THE HOUSE.

## Housel[[@Headword:Housel]]

             “the old Saxon name for the Eucharist, supposed by some to be from the Gothic ‘hunsa,' a victim.” — Eadie, Ecclesiastes Dictionary, p. 315.

## Houssay, Brother Jean Du[[@Headword:Houssay, Brother Jean Du]]

             A distinguished member of an order of hermits who lived on Mount Valerian, near Paris, was born at Chaillot in 1539. These pious men formed a community of their own, distinct from the outer world, and took the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Houssay died Aug. 3, 1609. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 271 SEE VALERIAN MONKS. (J. H. W.)

## Housta, Baudoin de[[@Headword:Housta, Baudoin de]]

             An Augustine monk, was born at Toubise in the early part of the 18th century, and distinguished himself greatly by his piety and erudition. He is especially celebrated as the would-be critic of Fleury's work on ecclesiastical history, which he attacked in a work entitled Mauvaise foi de M. Fleury, prouvee par plusieurs passages des Saints Peres, des conciles et d'auteurs ecclesiastiques qu'il Aomis, tronques ou infidlement traduits dans son histoire (Malines, 1733, 8vo). Of course the monk, from his narrow and biased standpoint, was unable to comprehend the greatness of Fleury and the liberality of his views, and he endeavored to ridicule Fleury, and stamp him as an infidel. Housta died at Enguien in 1760. — Chaudon and Delandine, Nouv. Dict. Hist. 6, 315 sq.; Fuller, Dict. Hist. 9, 45. (J. H.W.)

## Houteville, Alexandre Claude Francois[[@Headword:Houteville, Alexandre Claude Francois]]

             A French theologian, was born at Paris in. 1688, became a member of the Congregation of the Oratory in 1704, and remained such for some eighteen years. He was then appointed secretary to cardinal Dubois. In 1722 he published La Verite de la religion Chretienne prouvee par les faits (Paris, 4to; new ed. Paris, 1749, 4 vols. 12mo), “which had a ‘wonderful though scarcely deserved popularity at one time” (Hook, Ecclesiastes Biog. 6:198), and provoked considerable controversy. In 1723 he was made abbé of St. Vincent du Bourg-sur-Mer, in the diocese of Bordeaux. In 1728 he  published Essai philosophique sur la Providence. In 1740 he published a second edition of his Vérité de la religion Chretienne (Paris, 3 vols. 4to). This edition, greatly enlarged, contains a historical and critical discourse upon the method of the principal authors who wrote for and against Christianity from its beginning (which was translated and published separately, with a Dissertation on the Life of Apollonius Tyanceus, and some Observations on the Platonists of the latter School, London 1739, 8vo). “It contains little information concerning the authors or the events, but a clearly and correctly, written analysis of their works and thoughts” (Farrar, Crit. History of Free Thought, p. 15). In 1742 he was honored with the appointment of “perpetual secretary” to the French Academy. He died Nov. 8, 1742. — Biographie Univ. 20:620 sq.; Chaudon and Delandine, Nouv. — Dict. Hist. 6, 316; Dict. Hist. 9:45 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Hovel or Housing[[@Headword:Hovel or Housing]]

             is a term applied to a canopy or niche. — Wallcot, Sac. Archaeol. p. 318.

## Hoven, Jan Daniel Van[[@Headword:Hoven, Jan Daniel Van]]

             a Dutch theologian, was born August 20, 1705, at Hanau. He studied at Marburg and Utrecht, was in 1728 professor at Lingen, in Westphalia, in 1739 member of consistory, in 1758 professor at Campen, and died in  1793. He wrote, Specimen Historiae Analyticae (Lingen, 1732; Amsterdam, 1734): — Historie Ecclesiasticae Pragmaticae Specimen 1- 21 (1747-52): — Disp. de Vera AEtate Legationis Athenagora pro Christianis (1752): — Antiquitates Evangelicae (1758): — Antiquitates Romanae (1759): — De Vera State, Dignitate et Patria Minucii Felicis (1762), etc. See Meusel, Gelehrtes Deutschland; Winer. Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:609, 884, 910; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hovey, Edmund Otis, D.D[[@Headword:Hovey, Edmund Otis, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in East Hanover, N.H., July 15, 1801. At twenty-one years of age he began his preparation for preaching the gospel, at Thetford Academy; in 1828 graduated from Dartmouth College, and in 1831 from Andover Theological Seminary. He was ordained by the Presbytery of Newburyport the same year, and sent as a missionary to Wabash, Iowa. His great work was in founding and building up Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Indiana, of which, in 1834, he was appointed financial agent and professor of rhetoric. Subsequently he was made professor of chemistry, mineralogy, and geology. He was also treasurer and librarian. He died there, March 10, 1877. See (N.Y.) Evangelist, March 29, 1877. (W.P.S.)

## Hovey, Jonathan Parsons, D.D[[@Headword:Hovey, Jonathan Parsons, D.D]]

             A Presbyterian minister, was born in Waybridge, Vt., Oct. 10,1810. He received a collegiate education at Jacksonville, Ill., and South Hanover, Ind. He studied theology at Auburn Seminary, and was ordained for the ministry March 1837. He was settled four times: first at Gaines, N. Y.; then at Burdette, N. Y.; then at Richmond, Va.; and from September, 1850, for thirteen years, in New York City. “His church occupied a difficult field. It was surrounded by German Catholics, and by those who valued little, though they greatly needed, the institutions of the Gospel. Here he labored with signal fidelity and usefulness. Several revivals were enjoyed during his ministry, and many additions were made to the Church.” During our late civil war Dr. Hovey served as chaplain of the 71st Regiment New York State Volunteers, and continued with them during their entire period of service, at the expiration of which he returned again to his charge in New York City. He died there Dec. 16, 1863. — Wilson's Presb. Hist. Alm. 1864, p. 305 sq.; Rev. Dr. Field, in the Christian Intelligencer, Dec. 24, 1863.

## How, Samuel B., D.D[[@Headword:How, Samuel B., D.D]]

             was born in 1788, graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1710, and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1813. He was settled successively in  Presbyterian churches at Salisbury, Pa., 1813-15; Trenton, N. J., 1815-21; and New Brunswick. N. J., 1821-23. From 1823 to 1827 he was pastor of the Independent Church at Savannah, Ga., then for a year in New York, whence he was called to the presidency of Dickinson College, Pa., 1830- 31. In 1832 he accepted the charge of the First Reformed Dutch Church in New Brunswick, N. J., but resigned on account of ill health in 1861. In all these positions his fine classical scholarship and solid and extensive theological learning were studiously maintained and conspicuously displayed. Devout, conscientious, a Christian gentleman in the best sense of the term, a most faithful preacher and pastor, fearless and independent, zealous and successful, as a minister he was remarkable for scriptural instruction and pious fervor. His ideal of the ministry was lofty, and his life was the best commentary upon it. In 1855 he published an elaborate pamphlet entitled Slaveholding not sinful, which grew out of the request of the North Carolina Classis of the German Reformed Church to be united with the Reformed Dutch Church. The important and excited discussion which followed in the General Synod of the latter body ended in a decided refusal to comply with the application. Dr. How's pamphlet was answered in the same form by the Rev. Hervey D. Ganse and others, and it was long before the interest produced by it died away. Dr. How published also several occasional sermons of eminent ability. He was a frequent contributor to religious periodicals, especially in relation to the pending theological controversies of his time. The last seven years of his life were spent in retirement from public service. He preached when his health would permit. He dwelt among his own people, a model of Christian virtues and of ministerial excellence. He died in 1868. — Corwin's Manual Ref. Church, p. 118; Christian Intelligencer; Rev. R. H. Steele, D.D., Hist. of Ref. D. Ch. New Brunswick (1869). (WV. J. R. T.)

## Howard, Bezaleel, D.D[[@Headword:Howard, Bezaleel, D.D]]

             a Unitarian minister, was born at Bridgewater, Massachusetts, November 22, 1753. He graduated from Harvard College in 1781; immediately engaged in teaching at Hingham, and at the same time pursued a course of theology under the direction of Dr. Gay. He preached his first sermon in 1783; was appointed to a tutorship at Cambridge, and during this time filled vacant pulpits in the neighborhood on the Sabbath. He accepted a call to the First Church in Springfield in November 1784, and was ordained April 27, 1785. He resigned this charge on account of ill health, January 25, 1809. In 1819 he became pastor of a new Unitarian Church in the first parish of Springfield. He remained there until his death, January 23, 1837. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8:181.

## Howard, Bezaleel, D.D.[[@Headword:Howard, Bezaleel, D.D.]]

             a Unitarian Congregational minister, was born at Bridgewater, Mass., Nov. 22, 1753. He entered Harvard College in 1777, and, after graduation in 1781, engaged in teaching, pursuing at the same time a course of theological study. In 1783 he was appointed tutor at Harvard. In November 1784, he was called as minister to the First Church and Society in Springfield, Mass., and was ordained April 27, 1785. He continued in this position until September 1803, when impaired health obliged him to discontinue his work; but his resignation was not accepted by the Church until Jan. 25, 1809, when his successor was ordained. In 1819 he  associated himself with a new Unitarian Church which had been formed from members of his old congregation, and he continued with them till his death, Jan. 20, 1837. In 1824 Harvard College conferred the degree of D.D. upon him. The Rev. Daniel Waldo, in a sketch of Dr. Howard (in Sprague's Annals of the Am. Pulpit, 8, 181 sq.), says that the theological views of Dr. Howard had been Armenian until his latest years, when he came to believe “the sole supremacy of the Father. He, however, held to the doctrine of the atonement, in the sense of propitiation or expiation, with the utmost tenacity; and he regarded the rejection of it as a rejection of Christianity. His views of the character of the Savior were not, perhaps, very accurately defined; he seemed to regard him as a sort of eternal emanation from Deity; not a creature in the strict sense, on the one hand, nor yet the supreme God on the other.” He published a sermon delivered at the ordination of the Rev. Antipas Steward (1793). (J. H. W.)

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

             One of the most eminent of modern Christian philanthropists, was born at Hackney in 1726. His father apprenticed him to a wholesale grocer, but died when his son was about nineteen years of age, leaving him in possession of a handsome fortune, and young Howard, who was in weak health, determined to make a tour in France and Italy. On his return he took lodgings in Stoke Newington, where his landlady, a widow named Loidore, having nursed him carefully through a severe illness, he, out of gratitude, married her, though she was twenty-seven years his senior. She, however, died about three years after the marriage, and he now conceived a desire to visit Lisbon, with a view to alleviate the miseries caused by the great earthquake in 1756. On his voyage he was captured by a French privateer, carried a prisoner to Brest, and subsequently removed into the interior, but was finally permitted to return to England on the promise of inducing the government to make a suitable exchange for him. This was affected, and Howard retired to a small estate he possessed at Cardington, near Bedford, and there, in April 1758, he married Miss Henrietta Leeds. It is mentioned as a characteristic trait that he stipulated before marriage “that, in all matters in which there should be a difference of opinion between them, his voice should rule.” For seven years he was chiefly engaged in the task of raising the physical and moral condition of the peasantry of Cardington and its neighborhood by erecting on his own estate better cottages, establishing schools, and visiting and relieving the sick and the destitute; in his benevolent exertions he was assisted by his  wife. She died March 1765, and Howard from that time lost his interest in his home and its occupations. He lived some years at Cardington in seclusion, then made another Continental tour, and in 1773 was nominated sheriff of Bedford. The sufferings, which he had endured and witnessed during his own brief confinement as a prisoner of war struck-deep into his mind, and, shocked by the misery and abuses, which prevailed in the prisons under his charge, he attempted to induce the magistrates to remedy the more obvious of them.

The reply was a demand for a precedent, and Howard at once set out on a tour of inspection. But he soon found that the evil was general, and he set himself diligently to work to inquire into the extent and precise nature of the mischief, and, if possible, to discover the true remedy for the evil. He visited, in two journeys, most of the town and county jails of England, and accumulated a large mass of information, which, in March 1774, he laid before the House of Commons. This was the commencement of prison reform in England. Once actively engaged, he became more and more devoted to this benevolent pursuit. He traveled repeatedly over the United Kingdom, and at different periods to almost every part of Europe, visiting the most offensive places, relieving personally the wants of the most wretched objects, and noting all that seemed to him important either for warning or example. The first fruit of these labors was The State of the Prisons in England and Wales, with an Account of some Foreign Prisons (1777). “As soon as it appeared, the world was astonished at the mass of valuable materials accumulated by a private unaided individual, through a course of prodigious labor, and at the constant hazard of life, in consequence of the infectious diseases prevalent in the scenes of his inquiries. The cool good sense and moderation of his narrative, contrasted with that enthusiastic ardor which must have impelled him to his undertaking, were not less admired, and he was immediately regarded as one of the extraordinary characters of die age, and as the leader in all plans for ameliorating the condition of that wretched part of the community for whom he interested himself” (Aikin). In 1778 he undertook another tour, revisited the celebrated Rasp-houses of Holland, and continued his route through Belgium and Germany into Italy, whence he returned through Switzerland and France in 1779. In the same year he made another survey of Great Britain and Ireland. In these tours he extended his views to the investigation of hospitals. The results were published in 1780, in an Appendix to “The State o' the Prisons in England and Wales,” etc.

Having traveled over nearly all the south of Europe, in 1781 he visited Denmark, Sweden, Russia, and Poland, and in 1783 he  went through Spain and Portugal, continuing at intervals his home inquiries, and published in 1784 a second appendix, together with a new edition of the original work, in which the additional matter was comprised. The importance, both in prisons and hospitals, of preventing the occurrence or spread of infectious diseases, produced in Mr. Howard a desire to witness the working and success of the Lazaretto system in the south of Europe, more especially as. a safeguard against the plague. Danger or disgust never turned him from his-path, but on this occasion he went without even a servant, not thinking it right, for convenience sake, to expose another person to such a risk. Quitting England in 1785, he traveled through the south of France and Italy to Malta, Zante, and Constantinople, whence he returned to Smyrna, while the plague was raging, for the purpose of sailing from an infected port to Venice, where he might undergo the utmost rigor of the quarantine system. He returned to England in 1787, resumed his home tours, and in 1789 published the result of his late inquiries in another important volume, entitled An Account of the principal Lazarettos in Europe, etc., with additional Remarks on the present State of the Prisons in Great Britain and Ireland. The same summer he renewed his course of foreign travels, meaning to go into Turkey and the East through Russia, He had, however, proceeded no farther than the Crimea when a rapid illness, which he himself believed to be an infectious fever, caught in prescribing for a lady-, put an end to his life on the 20th of January, 1790. He requested that no other inscription should be put upon his grave than simply this, “Christ is my hope.” He was buried at Dauphiny, near Cherson, and the utmost respect was paid to his memory by the Russian government. The intelligence of his death caused a profound feeling of regret in his native country, and men of all classes and parties vied in paying their tribute of reverence to his memory. A marble statue by Bacon of “the philanthropist” was erected in St. Paul's Cathedral by a public subscription.

Mr. Howard's piety was deep and fervent, and his moral character most pure and simple. His-literary acquirements were small, neither were his talents brilliant; but he was fearless, single-minded, untiring, and did great things by devoting his whole energies to one good object. The influence of disinterestedness and integrity is remarkably displayed in the ready access granted to him even by the most absolute and most suspicious governments, in the respect invariably paid to his person, and the weight attached to his opinion and authority. He was strictly economical in his  personal expenses, abstemious in his habits, and capable of going through' great fatigue; both his fortune and his constitution were freely spent in the cause to which his life was devoted. The only blemish which has ever been suggested as resting upon his memory is in connection with his conduct to his son. Mr. Howard was a strict — and has not escaped the charge of being a severe — parent. The son, unhappily, in youth fell into dissolute habits, which being carefully concealed from the father, and consequently unchecked, brought on a disease which terminated in insanity. He survived his father nine years, dying on the 24th of April 1799; but he remained till his death a hopeless lunatic. The question of Howard's alleged harshness to his son has been thoroughly investigated and effectually disproved. (See Dixon's Life of Howard.) That his devotion to the great philanthropic object to which he gave up his life may not have interfered with his paternal duties, it is, of course, impossible to affirm; but that John Howard was an affectionate and kind-hearted father, as well as a single-minded benefactor to his species there can now be no reasonable doubt. See English Cyclopedia; Aiken, Character and Services of John Howard (London, 1792, 8vo); Brown, Memoirs of John Howard (London 1818, 4to); Dixon, Johns Howard and the Prison World of Europe (London, 1850, 12mo; reprinted, with an introduction, by the Rev. R. W. Dickinson, D.D., N. Y. 1854, 18mo); Field, Life of John Howard (London 1850. 8vo); Skeats, History of the Free Churches of England, p. 479.

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

             A Methodist Episcopal minister, was born of Roman Catholic ancestry in Onslow County, North Carolina in 1792. His early education was limited, as his father died shortly after the birth of John, and he was placed in a store at the age of twelve. He was converted in 1808 and entered the ministry in 1818 at Georgetown. In 1819 he joined the South Carolina Conference, and was stationed at Sandy River Circuit. In 1820 he was appointed to Georgetown 1821 to Savannah, 1822 to Augusta, and 1823 and 1824 to Charleston. He located from 1825 till 1828, when he was appointed to the Washington and Greensborough Circuits. In 1829 and 1830 he labored on the Appalachee Circuit. In 1831 he joined the Georgia Conference, then forming, and for three years became presiding elder of the Milledgeville District. From 1834 to the time of his death in 1836, he was agent for the “Manual Labor School” of the Conference. “Mr. Howard's ministry, especially in Savannah, Augusta, and Charleston, was attended with marked success. He labored with great fidelity, not only in  the pulpit, but with penitents at the altar being alike fervent in his prayers and appropriate in his counsels. As a pastor, too, he was always on the alert to promote the best interests of his people. Whenever there was darkness to be dissipated, or grief to be assuaged, or sinking hope to be encouraged, or evil of any kind to be removed, there he was sure to be present as an angel of mercy.” — Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 7, 614 sq.

## Howard, Leland, A.M[[@Headword:Howard, Leland, A.M]]

             a leading Baptist minister, was born at Jamaica, Windham County, Vermont, October 13, 1793. He was converted about 1810, and  commenced to preach in 1812. He was a "born preacher," but placed himself under the tuition of Reverend Joshua Bradley, of the Baptist Church in Windsor, for one year, and then pursued his studies under the direction of Reverend James M. Winchell, of the First Baptist Church in Boston, Massachusetts. He was ordained pastor in Windsor, Vermont, November 16, 1817, where he remained seven years, and then of the. First Baptist Church in Troy, N.Y., five years, when he returned to his former pastorate in Windsor, Vermont, and had charge five years. His other pastorates were Brooklyn, N.Y., Newport, R.I., Norwich, N.Y., Fifth Street Church, Troy, N.Y., Hartford, Connecticut, and, in 1852, he went to Rutland, Vt., and was pastor ten years. He died there, May 5,1870. He was chaplain of the House, in the legislature of Vermont, in 1831, and of the Senate in 1861. (J.C.S.)

## Howard, Leonard, D.D[[@Headword:Howard, Leonard, D.D]]

             an English clergyman, was rector of St. George's, Southwark, London. He died in 1767, leaving a number of Sermons (1736-61), and a collection of Letters and State Papers (1753-56). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

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

             an Irish Catholic prelate, was born in 1661, became bishop of Killala in 1726, of Elplun in 1729, and died about 1740. He published some Sermons (1738). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Howard, Roger S., D.D[[@Headword:Howard, Roger S., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was employed, in 1857, as a teacher in Baingor, Maine, and remained there until 1859, when he became rector of St. Stephen's Church, Portland. In 1861 he removed to Vermont; in 1862 became rector of Trinity Church, Rutland; in 1867 of St. James's Church, Woodstock; in 1870 president of Norwich University; and rector of St. Mary's Church, Northfield; in 1872, was called to the rectorship of the Church of the Reconciliation, Webster, Massachusetts; in 1879 he removed to Greenfield where he died, April 16, 1880, aged seventy-two years. See Whittaker, Almanac and Directory, 1881, page 173.

## Howard, Simeon, D.D[[@Headword:Howard, Simeon, D.D]]

             A Unitarian Congregational minister, was born at Bridgewater, Maine, April 29, 1733, and educated at Harvard College, where he graduated with distinguished honor in 1758. After a course of theological study, pursued while himself engaged in teaching, he accepted a call to a church at Cumberland, Nova Scotia. In 1765 he returned to Cambridge as a resident graduate student, and was elected tutor the year following. In 1767 he accepted the pastorate of West Church, Boston, and was ordained May 6, 1768. During the Revolution his congregation suffered greatly, and having made many friends during his residence in Nova Scotia, he proposed that his congregation should emigrate with him thither, which they did. After about one year and a half he returned to Boston, and again served his congregation there, receiving only such compensation for his services, as he was fully satisfied they could afford to give in their destitute circumstances. He died in the midst of his labors among them, August 13! 1804. The degree of D.D. was conferred on him by Edinburgh University. He was an overseer and fellow of Harvard, and a member of most of the American societies for the promotion of literary, charitable, and religious objects, and an officer of several of them. Dr. Howard was “bland and gentle in his manner, calm and equable in his temper, cheerful without levity, and serious without gloom His parishioners loved him as a brother, and honored him as a father; his brethren in the ministry always met him with a grateful and cordial welcome; and the community at large reverenced him for his simplicity, integrity, and benevolence.” Dr. Howard published Sermons (1773, 1777, 1778, 1780) — Christians have no Cause to be ashamed of their Religion (sermon, 1779) — Ordination Sermon (1791). — Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 8, 65.

## Howard, Solomon, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Howard, Solomon, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born November 14, 1811. He joined the Church in 1828, graduated from Augusta College, Kentucky, in 1833, and entered the Ohio Conference in 1835. After eight years of successful work in the pastorate, he was for two years principal of the Ohio Wesleyan University. From 1845 to 1852 he was in educational work in Springfield, Ohio. In 1852 he was elected president of the Ohio University, at Athens, where he remained for twenty years. He died August 11, 1873, at San Jose, California. He was a delegate to the General Conference of 1856. He was emphatically an educator, and many a poor young man will remember his sympathy for him in his struggles for an education. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1873.

## Howarda, William D., D.D[[@Headword:Howarda, William D., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, July 28, 1814. He was among the early graduates of Lafayette College, and in 1833 became a student of theology with Dr. William Neill. He was licensed to preach in 1837, and the next year ordained pastor of the Frankford Church, now in the bounds of Philadelphia. In 1849 he removed to Pittsburgh, to take charge of the Second Presbyterian Church, where he continued to labor faithfully until his death, September 22, 1876. He published occasional Sermons. See Presbyterian, September 30, 1876. (W.P.S.)

## Howe, Bezaleel[[@Headword:Howe, Bezaleel]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Tower Hill, Dutchess County, N. Y., July 14, 1781. In early life he was a student of Paine and Rousseau, and for several years a professed infidel; but the unhappy death of a notorious infidel of his acquaintance was the means of his conversion, and in 1823 he entered the New York Conference, in which he labored with great zeal and success until his death, June 25, 1854. He was fond of study, and his piety and abilities honored and edified the Church. — Min. of Conferences, 5, 533. (G. L. T.)

## Howe, Charles[[@Headword:Howe, Charles]]

             a distinguished English diplomatist under Charles II, was born in Gloucestershire in 1661. Being of a strong religious turn, he finally forsook public life, and retired into the country, where he wrote his Devout Meditations (8vo: 2nd ed. Edinb. 1752 12mo; London 1824, 12mo, and often), of which the poet, Dr. Edward Young, says, “I shall never lay it far out of my reach, for a greater demonstration of a sound head and sincere heart I never saw.” Howe died in 1745. London Gentl. Mag. vol. 64; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 902; Gorton, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Howe, George, D.D[[@Headword:Howe, George, D.D]]

             a distinguished minister of the Southern Presbyterian Church, was born in 1802. In 1833 he was elected by the General Assembly a professor in the theological seminary at Charleston, S.C., and subsequently became president of that institution, which position he retained until his sudden death, April 15, 1883. For half a century his life had been devoted to the great work of training young men for the ministry, and though dead he yet speaks through the living lips of hundreds who went out from this school of the prophets. See (N.Y.) Observer, April 19, 1883. (W.P.S.)

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

             a Nonconformist divine, and one of the greatest of English theologians, who is often called the “Platonic Puritan,” was born May 17, 1630, at Loughborough, in Leicestershire, where his father was the incumbent of the parish church; but, having become a Nonconformist, he was ejected from his living, and retired to Ireland. He soon, however, returned to England, and settled in the town of Lancaster, where John received his rudimentary instruction from his father. He was afterwards educated at Christ College, Cambridge, but removed to Brazenose College, Oxford; of which he became the bible-clerk in 1648, and where he for the second time took his degree of B.A. in 1649. He was made a demy of Magdalen College by the parliamentary visitors, and was afterwards chosen a fellow. In July, 1652, he took the degree of AM.A. After having been ordained by a Nonconformist divine, assisted by others, he became a minister at Great Torrington, in Devonshire. In 1654 Cromwell appointed him his domestic chaplain. He gave some offence to the protector by one of his sermons, in which he censured certain opinions about divine impulses and special impressions in answer to prayer, but retained his situation till Cromwell's  death, and afterwards till the deposition of Richard Cromwell. He then resumed and continued his ministry at Great Torrington till the Act of Uniformity, August 1662, obliged him to restrict his preaching to private houses. He went to Ireland in 1671, where he resided as chaplain to the family of lord Massarene, enjoying there the friendship of the bishop of that diocese. Howe was granted liberty to preach in all the churches under the jurisdiction of this bishop. He wrote at this time his Vanity of Man as Mortal, and began his greatest work, The Living Temple, below referred to.

In 1675 he accepted an invitation to become the minister of a congregation in London. During the year 1680 he engaged in a controversy with Drs. Stillingfleet and Tillotson on the question of nonconformity, and it is said that Dr. Stillingfleet, who had provoked the controversy by a discourse which he preached before the lord mayor and aldermen of London on “The Mischief of Separation,” was subdued when he read Howe's reply, and confessed that he discoursed “more like a gentleman than a divine, without any mixture of rancor, or any sharp reflections, and sometimes with a great degree of kindness towards him, for which, and his prayers for him, he heartily thanked him” (Rogers's Life of Howe, p. 183). In August 1685, he went to the Continent with lord Wharton, and in 1686 became one of the preachers to the English church at Utrecht. When James II published his “declaration for liberty of conscience,” Howe returned to London, and at the Revolution, the year following, he headed the deputation of dissenting ministers who presented their petition to the throne. In 1689 he again pleaded the cause of the Nonconformists in an anonymous pamphlet entitled The Case of the Protestant Dissenters represented and argued. In 1691 he became involved in the Antinomian controversy by a recommendation, which he gave to the works of Dr. Crisp. He soon, however, cleared his reputation by a strong recommendation of Flavel's Blow at the Root, a work against Antinomianism, then in the course of publication. In 1701 he became entangled in a controversy with the Puritan De Foe (q.v.) on account of one of Howe's members, who had been elected lord mayor, and who, in order to qualify himself for that office, had taken the Lord's Supper in an Established church. The manner in which Howe answered (Some Considerations of a Preface to an Inquiry, etc.) the objections of De Foe, who opposed communion in the Established Church by Nonconformists, is to be regretted by all who venerate the name of John Howe.

He died April 2, 1705. Among the Puritans, John Howe ranks as one of the most eminent. He was also unquestionably a man of great general learning. “The  originality and compass of Howe's mind, and the calmness and moderation of his temper, must ever inspire sympathy and awaken admiration in reflective readers: his Platonic and Alexandrian culture commends him to the philosophical student, and the practical tendency of his religious thinking endears him to all Christians” (Stoughton [John], Ecclesiastes Hist. of Engl. 2, 422, 423). “Perhaps it may be considered as no unfair test of intellectual and spiritual excellence that a person can relish the writings of John Howe; if he does not, he may have reason to suspect that something in his head or heart is wrong. A young minister who wishes to attain eminence in his profession, if he has not the works of John Howe, and can procure them in no other way, should sell his coat and buy them; and, if that will not suffice, let him sell his bed and lie on the floor; and' if he spends his days in reading them, he will not complain that he lies hard at night” (Bogue and Bennett, Hist. of Dissenters, 1, 437). “Howe seems to have understood the Gospel as well as any uninspired writer, and to have imbibed as much of its spirit. There is the truest sublimity to be found in his writings, and some of the strongest pathos; yet, often obscure, generally harsh, he has imitated the worst' parts of Boyle's style. He has a vast number and variety of uncommon thoughts, and is, on the whole, one of the most valuable writers in our language, or, I believe, in the world” (Dr. Doddridge). “I have learned more from John Howe than from any other author I ever read. There is an astonishing magnificence in his conceptions” (Robert Hall). “This great man was one of the few who have been venerated as much by their contemporaries as by their successors.

Time, which commonly adds increased luster to the memory of the good, has not been able to magnify any of the qualities: for which Howe was so conspicuous. His strong and capacious intellect, his sublime elevation of thought, his flowing eloquence, the holiness of his life, the dignity and courtesy of his manners, the humor of, his conversation, won for him from the men of his own time the title of ‘the great Howe”‘(Skeats, Hist. of the Free Churches of England, p. 169). Howe's most important works are, The Living Temple (many editions; first in 1676), in which he proves the existence of God and his conversableness with men, and which occupies one of the highest places in Puritan theology — The Redeemer's Tears over lost Souls [Luk 19:41-42], with an Appendix on the Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost (London 1684; often reprinted), in which Howe does not, unlike many high Calvinistic theologians, enter at all into the predestination controversy, but confines himself to a solution of the question of God's omniscience and man's responsibility: — Inquiry  concerning the Trinity, etc. — Office and Work of the Holy Spirit. These, with his Sermons and other writings, are to be found in his Collected Works, with Life by Dr. Calamy (1724, 2 vols. folio); and in The whole Works of the Rev. John Howe,. M.A., edited by Hunt (London, 1810-22, 7 vols. 8vo, with an eighth vol., containing a Memoir and additional works), and again in The Works of the Rev. John Howe, M.A., as published during his life, comprising the whole of the two folio volumes, ed. 1724, with A Life of the Author, by the Rev. J. P. Hewlett (London, 1848, 3 vols. 8vo). There is also an edition of his Works in 1 vol. imp. 8vo (London, 1838), and an American edition (Philadelphia. 2 vols. imp. 8vo). See also Wilson, Selections from Howe, with his Life (London 1827, 2 vols.12mo); Taylor, Select Treatises of John Howe (1835, 12mo);. Rogers, Life of John Howe, with an Analysis o ‘his Writings (London 1836, 12mo); Dunn, Howe's Christian Theology (London 1836,12mo); English Cyclopedia; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 902; Quarterly Review (London), 36, 167; Literary and Theological Review, 4, 538; Meth. Quart. Rev. Oct. 1862, p. 676; Hook, Eccl. Biog. 6, 198 sq. (J.H.W.)

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

             a Congregational minister, born at Killingly, Connecticut, January 14, 1747 was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1765, the first in his class. By recommendation of the president of his college he was appointed principal of a public school at Hartford, at that time the most important institution of that class in the colony. He was licensed to preach in 1769, and was appointed tutor at Yale in the same year. He held this position, preaching quite frequently, until called to the New South Church, Boston, in 1772, where he was ordained May 19, 1773. At the outbreak of the Revolution (1775) he fled to Norwich, where he remained only a short time, as his health had become enfeebled. He went to New Haven, and on his return stopped at Hartford, where he died, Aug. 25, 1775. — Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 1, 707 sq.

## Howe, Josiah[[@Headword:Howe, Josiah]]

             an English divine of the 17th century, born at Crendon, Bucks County, was educated at Oxford, and obtained a fellowship at Trinity College, of that University, in 1637. He found great favor with Charles I, at whose command he was admitted to the degree of bachelor of divinity in 1646. After the ruin of the royal house he was ejected from his fellowship, but  was restored to his preferment after the restoration of the monarchy. He died in 1701. See Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. 3; Gorton, Biog. Dict. 2, s.v.

## Howe, Nathaniel[[@Headword:Howe, Nathaniel]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Ipswich, Mass., Oct. 6,1764. He graduated at Harvard College in 1786, and was ordained pastor at Hopkinton Oct.5, 1791, where he labored until his death, Feb. 15, 1837. He published An Attempt to prove that John's Baptism was not Gospel Baptism, being A Reply to Dr. Baldwin's Essay on the same Subject (1820) — A Catechism with miscellaneous Questions, and A Chapter of Proverbs for the Children under his parochial Care. See Sprague, Annals, 2, 307; North American Review, 4, 93-97.

## Howe, Obadiah, D.D[[@Headword:Howe, Obadiah, D.D]]

             an English clergyman, was vicar of Boston, Lincolnshire. He died in 1682, leaving The Universalist Examined, and Criticised (1648): — Sermons (1664). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Howell, Horatio S[[@Headword:Howell, Horatio S]]

             a Presbyterian minister, born near Trenton, N. J., in 1820, was educated at Princeton College, and the Union Theological Seminary, N. Y. In 1846 he was ordained pastor of East Whiteland Church, Pa. He subsequently became pastor of the Church at Elkton, Md., and at the Delaware Water Gap, Pa. While he was laboring at this latter place the Rebellion broke out. He at once entered the army as chaplain of the 90th Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers. His reputation as chaplain was pre-eminent for arduous, zealous, and judicious devotion. He was killed at the battle of Gettysburg, Pa., July 1, 1863. — Wilson Pres. Hist. Almanac, 1864.

## Howell, Lawrence[[@Headword:Howell, Lawrence]]

             a distinguished Nonjuror, was born soon after the Restoration, about 1660. He studied at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1684, and M.A. in 1688. Having entered the Church, he was ordained in 1712 by the nonjuring bishop, Dr. Hickes, who had taken the title of suffragan bishop of Thetford. He soon after published a pamphlet entitled The Case of Schism in the Church of England truly stated, for which he was committed to Newgate, convicted, and condemned to three years' imprisonment, besides whipping, a fine of £500, and degradation. This latter part was remitted him, however, by the king. He died in Newgate in 1720. Whatever his errors, the punishment appears to have been disproportionate to his offence. He was a man of extensive learning and great capacity. He wrote Synopsis Canonum S.S. Apostolorum et Conciliorum AEcumenicorum et Provincialium ab Ecclesia Graeca  receptorum (1708, fol.): — Synops. Canon. Eccles. Lat. (1710-1715, fol.) — A View of the Pontificate from its supposed beginning to the end of the Council of Trent, etc. (London 1716, 8vo) — Desiderius, or the original Pilgrim; A divine Dialogue (from the Spanish) (London 1717,12mo) — A complete History of the Holy Bible, with additions by Rev. Geo. Burder (London 1806,3 vols. 8vo) — Certain Queries proposed by Roman Catholics, etc. (London 1716); etc. — Darling, Cyclopedia Bibliographica, 1, 1563; Hook, Eccl. Biog. 6, 199; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 25, 313 sq. (J. N. P.)

## Howell, Robert Boyte Crawford, D.D[[@Headword:Howell, Robert Boyte Crawford, D.D]]

             a prominent Baptist preacher in Tennessee, was born in Wayne County, North Carolina, March 10, 1801. He pursued his literary and theological studies in Columbian College, also the study of medicine, but without intending its practice. With this preparation, he entered upon the duties of the ministry in the Episcopal Church, of which his family were communicants; but, quite unexpectedly to his friends, he soon joined the Baptists, traveling fourteen miles to reach the nearest Baptist church for this purpose, Feb. 6,1821. Five days afterwards he received license to preach the doctrines of the Baptist Church. At Washington he performed, in connection with his theological studies, the duties of a city missionary, and for a year after the completion of his course he was a missionary in Virginia. He then accepted a call to the pastorate of the Cumberland Street Baptist Church in Norfolk. He was ordained Jan. 27,1827. A revival immediately followed, as the fruits of which he baptized about 200 within a few months. His labors continued here for eight years. In 1834 he removed to Nashville, Tenn.

The First Baptist Church had been dispersed by the Rev. Alexander Campbell and his disciples, but under Mr. Howell's labors it was revived and built up. He established, and for some time edited a religious newspaper. He exerted more influence in the support of missions than any other minister of the denomination in Tennessee. After the organization of the Southern Baptist Convention, he was elected and re- elected its president. In 1850 he removed to Richmond, Va., where, in addition to the charge of a church, he was a trustee of Richmond College, and of the Richmond Female Institute, a member of the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission, Publication, and Sunday- school Boards, and of the Virginia Baptist Mission and Educational Board. In 1857 he yielded to an urgent call to reoccupy his former field of labor in Nashville. There, besides efficiently promoting all the State Baptist organizations, he was, by  appointment of the Legislature, a trustee of the Institution for the Blind, and in other educational trusts. His labors were arduous; in addition to which, he performed a considerable amount of literary work, including some of his most useful books. He died April 5,1868, greatly honored and lamented. Dr. Howell was a man of commanding presence and dignified address, warm and genial in his manners. His labors as a preacher of the Gospel were abundant and successful, and some of his published works had a wide circulation in this country, and were republished in England. He was the author of Evils of Infant Baptism — The Cross: — The Covenants — The Early Baptists of Virginia On Communion — The Deaconship — The Way of Salvation. He left several works in manuscript, among them, “The Christology of the Pentateuch,” an enlargement of “The Covenants,” and “The Family.” He was also a frequent contributor to the periodicals of his Church. (L. E. S.)

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

             an English prelate, was born at Naugamarch, Brecknockshire, educated a fellow of Jesus College, Oxford, was made canon of Windsor in 1636, bishop of Bristol in 1644, and died in 1646. He was a meek man and a most excellent preacher. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 3:515.

## Howgill, Francis[[@Headword:Howgill, Francis]]

             a noted preacher of “the Friends,” was born about 1638 in Westmoreland, England. He was brought up and educated in the Church of England, but withdrew from the national Church after graduation in the university, and joined the Independents, among whom he held an eminent position as minister. In 1652 he became an adherent to the doctrines of George Fox, the Quaker. Two years later, he set out with two others of the Society of Friends to preach their doctrines for the first time at London. He even went before the protector Cromwell, to seek his influence in aid of the Quakers, who were then greatly persecuted, both in the country and at London; but he does not seem to have been successful in his effort. He escaped, however, after this interview, all personal molestation as long as he continued preaching in London. He and his friends next went to Bristol, where they met with much better success. “Multitudes flocked to hear them, and many embraced their doctrine.” The clergy became alarmed, and Howgill and his co laborers were summoned before the magistrates, and commanded to leave the city immediately. Considering themselves entitled to remain, as “free-born Englishmen,” they tarried in the city, and continued to meet with success. In 1663 we find Howgill at Kendal, again summoned before the justices of the place, who tendered him the oath of allegiance, and on his conscientious refusal of it committed him to prison, in which he remained until his death, Jan. 20,1688. Howgill wrote a copious treatise against oaths while in prison. He also published The Dawnings of the Gospel Day, and its Light and Glory discovered (London  1676, fol.). See Neale, History of the Puritans (Harper's edit.), 2, 413 420; Gough, Hist. of the Quakers, 1, 112, 126, 144, etc.; 2:31, 96 sq., 236 sq. (J. H. W.)

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

             a Scotch Presbyterian, was born at Lochgoin Nov. 14, 1735. His father died when John was only one year old, and he was removed to his grandparents' at Blackhill, where he received a limited education. In 1766 he returned to the farm of Lochgoin, to pursue the study of Church history and religious biography, to which he had devoted much of his time for several years. In 1767 his early religious impressions assumed the form of decided piety, and he determined to serve the Church by preparing the book for which he is celebrated, The Scotch Worthies. “It is a work of no inconsiderable labor; for, though the biographical information he had procured, and with which his powerful memory was richly stored, must have greatly facilitated the task, yet, living remote from cities, and almost shut out from the abodes of civilized life, the difficulty of correspondence and the want of books must have tended not a little to render his task both painful and irksome. Under all these disadvantages, however, did Mr. Howie, in the seclusion of Lochgoin, bring the work to a successful termination. The first edition appeared in 1774 and a second, greatly enlarged, in 1785 (new edition, revised, corrected, and enlarged, with a preface and notes by Wm. McGavin, Edinb. and N. Y., 1853, 8vo). Like the ‘Pilgrim's Progress,' it has been long so extensively popular with all classes of the community, that it has secured for itself a position from which it will never be dislodged, as long as Presbyterianism, and a religious attachment to the covenanted work of Reformation, continue to engage the attention of the natives of Scotland.” Besides this work, Mr. Howie published,

1. a collection of Lectures and Sermons, by some of the most eminent ministers, preached during the stormiest days of the Persecution: —

2. An Alarm to a secure Generation —

3. Faithful Contendings displayed; an account of the suffering remnant of the Church of Scotland from 1681-1691 —

4. Faithful Witness-bearing exemplified

5. Patronage Anatomized, a work which, next to the “Scots' Worthies,” must be regarded as superior to all his other writings —

6. Vindication of the Modes of handling the Elements in the Lord's Supper before giving Thanks; written during the controversy on this subject among the Antiburgher seceders —

7. Clarkson's plain Reasons for Dissenting, with a preface and notes, and an abstract of the principles of the Reformed presbytery regarding civil government —

8. Preface to Mr. Brown of Wamphray's Looking glass of the Law and the Gospel. Howie died in Sept. 1791. “He was, indeed, a marked character, whether at home, in the public market, or at church; and wherever he went, the fame of his piety and varied acquirements contributed greatly to his influence” (Biogr. Sketch prefixed to the Amer. edition of his “Scotch Worthies”). — Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 905. (J.1I. W.)

## Howley, William, D.D[[@Headword:Howley, William, D.D]]

             an English prelate, was born at Ropley, Hampshire, in 1765. He was educated at Winchester school, and in 1783 went to New College, Oxford. He was elected fellow in 1785, became canon of Christ Church in 1804, regius professor of divinity in 1809 bishop of London in 1813 and, finally, archbishop of Canterbury in 1828. He died in 1848. His principal works are Sermon [on Isa 54:13] (London, 1814, 8vo) — Sermon [on Psa 20:7-8] (Thanksgiving, when the eagles taken at Waterloo were deposited in the Chapel Royal, Whitehall) (London 1816, 4to) — A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London the Visitation of 1818 (London 1818, 8vo) — A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London in July, 1826 (London 1826, 4to). — Darling, Cyclopedia Bibliographica, 1. 1564.

## Howley, William, D.D (2)[[@Headword:Howley, William, D.D (2)]]

             an English prelate, son of William Howley, D.D., was born February 12, 1765. In his youth he attended the Winchester School, from which he went to the University of Oxford, obtaining a fellowship at New College. In 1794 he was elected fellow of Winchester College; in 1809 was appointed regius professor of divinity; and in September, 1813, succeeded Dr. Randolph as bishop of London. On the decease of Dr. Manners Sutton, in 1828, he became archbishop of Canterbury. He died February 11, 1848. Besides being president of many charitable institutions, he was a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, and a member of the Royal Society of Literature. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1848, page 149.

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

             an English Catholic divine, was born at Feckenham, Worcestershire, about 1516, of poor parentage. He was educated by the Benedictines of Evesham, and afterwards at Gloucester College, Oxford; became chaplain to the bishop of Worcester, afterwards to Bonner, and vigorously opposed the Reformation in England. In 1549 he was imprisoned in the Tower, but was released on the accession of Mary, who made him dean of Westminster. Elizabeth offered him the archbishopric of Canterbury on condition of becoming a Protestant, but he refused, and was again imprisoned in 1560. Being released in 1563, he finally retired to the isle of Ely, and died at Wisbeach in 1585, leaving an account of his Conference with Jane Grey (Lond. 1554, 1626), besides some Sermons and a few controversial pieces.

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

             an English divine, born in London in 1556, was educated at Christ Church, Oxford. He filled successively the vicarate of Bampton, in Oxfordshire, the rectorate at Brightwell, in Berkshire, and then became fellow of Chelsea College, and canon of Hereford. In 1619 he was appointed bishop of Oxford, and was transferred to the bishopric of Durham in 1628. He was also at one time vice-chancellor of Oxford. While in this position “he exerted himself against those Puritans who opposed the discipline and  ceremonies, but was afterwards a more distinguished writer and preacher against popery.” He died in 1631. Howson was the author of a number of sermons (published 1597-1661); and four of his polemical discourses against the supremacy of St. Peter were published by order of king James I, “to clear the aspersions laid upon him (Howson) of favoring popery” (1622, 4to). See Hook, Ecclesiastes Biogr. 6, 202; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 908.

## Howson, John Saul, D.D[[@Headword:Howson, John Saul, D.D]]

             an Anglican divine, was born in 1816. He graduated with honor from Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1837; was ordained in 1845, becoming the same year senior classical master, and in 1849 principal of the Liverpool College; in 1866 vicar of Wisbech, afterwards chaplain to the bishop of Ely; in 1867 dean of Chester, and died December 15, 1885. Besides contributions to the religious periodical press and to Smith's Dict. of the Bible, he wrote various lectures and sermons, and was the joint author, with Dr. Conybeare, of the well-known work on the Life and Epistles of St. Paul.

## Howson, John Saul, D.D (2)[[@Headword:Howson, John Saul, D.D (2)]]

             an English prelate, "was born at Giggleswick, May 5, 1816. He graduated from Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1837; obtained the members prize in 1837 and 1838, and the Norrisian prize in 1840. In 1845 he became senior classical master, and in 1849 principal of the Liverpool College, which post he held till the close of 1865. He was appointed vicar of Wisbeck in 1866; from 1867 to 1873 was examining chaplain to the bishop of Ely; in 1867 became dean of Chester, in which position he died, December 15, 1885. He was the author of various works: the Hulsean lectures on the Character of St. Paul: — and, in connection with the Reverend W.J. Conybeare, the Life and Epistles of St. Paul.

## Hoyer, Anna[[@Headword:Hoyer, Anna]]

             a German enthusiast, was born at Goldenbüttel, near Eiderstadt (Schleswig), in 1584. Her maiden name was OWEN. In 1599 she married a nobleman called Hoyer, and when he died she retired to one of her estates, where she devoted herself to belles-lettres and poetry. Becoming acquainted with an alchemist named Teting, who attended her during a sickness, she was soon fascinated by the views of the mystic, whom she took into her house, and considered as a prophet. She afterwards joined the Anabaptists, and thought herself inspired. Her ardor in making proselytes caused her to lose nearly her whole fortune, and, leaving her country, she went to Sweden, where she found a protector in queen Eleonora Maria, who presented her with an estate on which she resided until her death in 1656. Her views, derived from Paracletus, David Joris, Schwenckfeld, Weigel, and other mystics, are expressed in indifferent verses in her Works (Amsterd. 1650). Some of her writings were directed against the Lutherans. See J. G. Feuclitking, Gynecaeum haeret. fanat. p. 356 sq.; Arnold, Kirchen-u. Ketzerhist. 3, 10, 14; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. 25, 319.

## Hoyer, Franz Heinrich[[@Headword:Hoyer, Franz Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in Holstein, July 20, 1639. He studied at Helmstadt and Giessen, was in 1665 third preacher at Norden, East Frisia, in 1683 pastor primarius, and died May 20, 1699, leaving De  Usu Logices in Theologia (Giessen, 1660): — De Usu Metaphysicae in Theologia (eod.): — De Principio Theologiae (eod.):De Deo (eod): — De Questione Ubinam Ecclesia Lutheri Fuerit ante Lutherum (1664), besides writing numerous ascetical works. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hoyt, Nathan, D.D[[@Headword:Hoyt, Nathan, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Gilmanton, Belknap County, N.H., February 27, 1793. He was educated at Cambridge, Massachusetts, but did not enter college on account of ill-health. He was licensed by Albany Presbytery in 1823, and ordained by the same presbytery in 1826. He first labored in Troy, N.Y., as a city missionary, and on his removal to South Carolina became pastor of the Beech Island Church. His next pastorate was in Washington, Georgia, and his third and last was in Athens, where he labored with much zeal and efficiency, for nearly thirty-six years. He died July 12, 1866. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, page 437.

## Hoyt, Ova Phelps, D.D[[@Headword:Hoyt, Ova Phelps, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at New Haven, Vermont, May 26, 1800. He graduated from Middlebury College in 1821, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1824. Soon after he was ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Potsdam, N.Y., where he remained until 1830, then took the agency of the American Home Missionary Society, and resided in Utica. While there he was editor of the Western Recorder for a year and a half. He was stated supply at Cambridge in 1835; at Detroit, Michigan, in 1839; at Kalamazoo, in 1840; district secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, in 1852; supply at Elkhart, Iowa, in 1860; and from 1863 resided in Kalamazoo, Michigan, until his death, February 11, 1866. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, page 299.

## Hozai[[@Headword:Hozai]]

             (Heb. Chozay', חוֹזִי, seer; Sept. οἱ ὁρῶντες, Vulg. Hozai, Auth. Vers. the seers,” marg. “Hosai”), a prophet or seer, the historiographer of Manasseh, king of Judah (2 Chronicles 33, 19). B.C. p. 642. The Jews are of opinion that Hosai and Isaiah are the same person; the Sept. takes Hosai in a general sense for prophets and seers: the Syriac calls him Hanan, the Arabic Sapcha. — Calmet, s.v. Bertheau (Chronik. Einleit. p. 35) conjectures that חוזי is here a corrupt rendering for חוזים, as in 2Ch 33:19; 2Ch 33:18; but for this there is only the authority of a single Codex and the Sept. (Davidson, Revision of Heb. Text, p. 221, b). SEE CHRONICLES.

## Hrabanus[[@Headword:Hrabanus]]

             SEE RABANUS.

## Hreidmar[[@Headword:Hreidmar]]

             in Norse mythology. When the Asas journeyed through the world, Odin, Halner, and Loke came to a river with a waterfall. There they found a viper, devouring a salmon. Loke killed the viper, and it was brought to the village, where they sought a night's lodging of the rustic Hreidmar, who was a powerful sorcerer. Hardly had he seen the viper, when he called his two sons, Tofner and Reigen, and told them that the strangers had killed Otter (viper), their brother. Hreidmar immediately went to the Asas, who  promised to pay him as much money in reparation as he desired. The sorcerer tore off the skin from the killed viper, and ordered it to be filled with red gold. Odin sent Loke into the land of the black elves to seek gold. There he found the dwarf Andwari, who gave him all the money he had in his possession. But the elf still had a small ring on his hand, which Loke ordered him to deliver with the gold. Andwari obeyed, saying, "The ring will be the death of its possessor."

The hide was filled, and the ring laid on top, and thus the Asas were free from all debt. Hreidmar's sons wanted a share of the gold, but he refused them. They consulted with each other and slew their father. Now Reigen thought he might take one half, but Tofinir forbid him, ordering him to go off, or the same fate should befall him which came upon his father. Reigen fled to king Hialfrek, and became his smith. Tofnur changed himself into a snake, and guarded the gold. The smith found an avenger in Sigurd. He told the latter where Tofnur was Sigurd dug a ditch near by where Tofnur was accustomed to get water, and waited there for him, and finally slew him. Sigurd then went to Reigen and killed him. Next he rode to Tofnur's dwelling, and took all the gold along with him.

Sigurd then came to the Hinderalps; there he found a beautiful woman, who called herself Hildur, but whose real name was Brynhildur. He married her and rode to king Giuki, who had two sons, Gunnar and Hogni, and one daughter, Gudrun; the latter he married, and entirely forgot Hildur. She incited Gunnar and Hogni to murder Sigurd; but they, being bound together by an oath, could not become traitors to him; so the third brother, Guttorm, killed him while asleep, with a sword. King Atli, the brother of Brynhildur, married Gudrun, the widow of Sigurd. He invited Gunnar and Hogni, but was anxious for their money. They hid it, whereupon he made war upon them, caught them, and killed both. Shortly after, Gudrun, to avenge the murder of her brothers, killed two of Atli's children, and gave the. king some nectar to drink from the skulls of his own children. Thus eventually the whole generation of Niflungar was annihilated.

## Hroswitha[[@Headword:Hroswitha]]

             SEE ROSWITHA.

## Hrugner[[@Headword:Hrugner]]

             in Norse mythology. Thor, the mightiest of the Asas, had gone on a journey to kill magicians and giants. Odin rode on his wonderful horse Sleipnerto Jotunheim, and thus came to the mightiest and most frightful of giants, Hrugner. Odin began to boast of his horse, and Hrugner, to punish him, pursued him on his own horse, Guldfaxi. Odin, however, had such a start of Hrugner that the latter could not overtake him, although he  followed him to the walls of Asgard. Here the gods invited him to their drinking-bout, which invitation he accepted. He became drunk, and began to tell what wondrous things he intended to do. The Asas, tired of his boasting, mentioned Thor's name, and suddenly the mighty hero appeared, raised his frightful miolner, and inquired who had invited the boasting giant. Hrugner argued with Thor that it would be small honor to him to kill him unarmed, and challenged Thor to a duel on the boundary of Griotunagarder. This Thor accepted.

The giants in Jotunheim. now made a monstrous man of clay, and not finding a heart strong enough, they took out that of a horse, and called him Mokkurkalfi. Hrugner also armed himself. His head, heart, and club were all of stone. Thus armed, he waited for Thor. Thor came with thunder and lightning, and threw his hammer at the giant. The latter threw his club at Thor. The two frightful weapons struck each other in the air. The stone club burst, a part falling on the earth, the other striking Thor on his head and stunning him. The hammer of Thor shattered the head of Hrugner so that he fell, his monstrous foot resting on Thor's neck. The huge man of clay fell at Thialfi's hand. None of the Asas could remove Hrugner's foot from Thor's neck until Magni, a son of Thor, came and lifted off the foot without any exertion. Thor presented him with the giant's horse, Guldfaxi.

## Hu[[@Headword:Hu]]

             the most eminent god of the Celtic religion, originally the founder of the religion of the Druids. See vol. 2, p. 180.

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

             in the mythology of the Celts, was the supreme god in Britain. He seems to have been thought very noble, for the attributes given him point to a being such as can be represented only by a pure religion. Then Celts have a myth that, at the flood, he pulled the monster who caused the flood out of the water, and thus dried the earth.

## Huarte, Juan[[@Headword:Huarte, Juan]]

             the representative of Spanish philosophy in the Middle Ages, was a Frenchman by birth, and born about 1530. He was educated at the University of Huesca, and afterwards devoted himself to the study of medicine and philosophy. The work to which he owes his great reputation is entitled Examen de Ingenios, para las sciencias donde de nuestra la differencia de habilidades que hay en los hombres, y el genero de letras quecada uno responde en particular offcina plantiniana (1593; sm. 8vo, Pamplon. 1575, and often). This work aims to show, “by marvelous and useful secrets, drawn from true philosophy, both natural and divine, the gifts and different abilities found in man, and for what kind of study the genius of every man is adapted, in such a manner that whoever shall read this book attentively will discover the properties of his own genius, and be able to make choice of that science in which he will make the greatest improvement.” It has been translated into English by Carew and Bellamy, under the title Trial of the Wits; into German by Lessing (Priüfung der Köpfe), and into many other languages. Huarte has been severely reproached for having published as genuine a spurious letter of Lentulus, the proconsul, from Jerusalem, in which a description of the Savior's person is given. He died near the close of the 16th century. See Antonio, Biblioth. Hispana nova, 1, 543; Bayle, Histor. Dict. 3, 528; Ticknor, History of Spanish Lit. 3, 189; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 333 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Hubald[[@Headword:Hubald]]

             SEE HUCBALD.

## Hubbard, Austin Osgood[[@Headword:Hubbard, Austin Osgood]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Sunderland, Mass., Aug. 9, 1800. He was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1824. He pursued his theological studies under the direction of the Presbytery of Baltimore, teaching at the same time in the academy at Franklin, Md. He was licensed to preach in 1826, and labored as a missionary some two years in Frederick County, Md. From 1831 to 1833 he was at Princeton Theological Seminary in further theological studies, and preaching to vacant churches in the vicinity. In 1833, during Dr. Alexander's absence in Europe, Mr. Hubbard was appointed assistant professor of Biblical Literature. In 1835 he went to Melbourne, C. E., and labored as a missionary. In 1840 he removed to Hardwick, Vt., and was installed pastor of the Congregational Church in that place July 7th, 1841. In 1845 he was called to Barnet, Vt., and preached there until 1851. In 1855 he accepted a call to Craftesbury, Vt., where he remained until the death of his wife in the fall of 1857, when he became mentally and physically prostrated, and he was removed to the Vermont Insane Asylum in March, 1858, where he died Aug. 24th, 1858. He published Five Discourses on the moral Obligation and the particular Duties of the Sabbath (Harm., N. H., 1843, 16mo). “Fervent piety and thorough scholarship combined to render him a faithful and able minister of the New Testament. His views of divine truth were clear and strong, his manner of presenting them forcible and impressive. His sermons were logical, and weighty with matter.” — Congregational Quarterly, 1, 412 sq.

## Hubbard, Benjamin H., D.D[[@Headword:Hubbard, Benjamin H., D.D]]

             a minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in 1811. He was converted in early youth, licensed to preach in 1835, and shortly afterwards entered the Memphis Conference. His appointments were, Hatchie Circuit, Gallat in and Cairo, Huntsville, Alabama; Columbia, Tennessee; Trenton, Jackson, Somerville, and Athens, Alabama. At the last-mentioned place he was connected with the Tennessee Conference Female Institute as president till 1852, when he was transferred to Jackson, Tennessee, in connection with the Jackson Female Institute, where he died, May 2, 1853. He was a fine scholar and excellent preacher. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1853, page 462.

## Hubbard, Isaac G., D.D[[@Headword:Hubbard, Isaac G., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, for many years was rector of the church in Manchester (St. Michael's), Connecticut, until 1866, when he removed to Claremont, N.H., and subsequently became rector of Trinity Church in that town. At the time of his death, March 30, 1879, he had in charge Union Church, West Claremont. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1880, page 171.

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

             an English divine and adherent of the “Independents,” was born about 1692. He was at first assistant at a church in Stepney, and after the decease of Dr. Taylor succeeded him as pastor of a congregation at Deptford. This position he held for twenty-two years with distinguished skill, fidelity, and diligence. In 1740 he was appointed to the divinity chair of the academy of the Independents at London. “He applied himself to the duties of this office with exemplary diligence, and the most pleasing hopes were entertained of many years of usefulness; but they were extinguished by his decease in July, 1743.” He published Two Sermons at Coward's Lecture (London, 1729, 8vo). Nine of his sermons are in the Berry Street (Coward's Lecture) Sermons (2nd ed. 2 vols. 8vo, 1739). Bogue and Bennett, Hist. of Dissenters (2nd edit.), 2, 219 sq.; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 909.

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

             a Congregational minister, was born in England in 1621, and came to this country with his parents in 1630. He was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1642, a member of the first class. He is said to have pursued a course of theological studies with the Rev. Mr. Cobbet, of Ipswich, whom he also assisted in the pulpit. He was ordained about 1656. In 1685 Mr. Cobbet died, and Hubbard became his successor. In 1686 he served as assistant to the Rev. John Dennison, grandson of Major General Dennison, who was also a graduate of Harvard (1684). In 1689 Dennison died, and, about three years after, the Rev. John Rogers, son of the president of Harvard, became Hubbard's colleague. In 1703, enfeebled by age, Hubbard was obliged to resign his charge, and the people voted him sixty pounds as a gratuity. He died Sept. 14, 1704. His writings were mainly on the history of New England, and he left a work in MS. which has been of service to American historians. He published a Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians from 1607-1677, with a Discourse (Boston 1677, 4to) — Sermons (1676, 1682, 1684) — and, in connection with the Rev. John Higginson, of Salem, Testimony to the Order of the Gospel in the Churches (1701). Hubbard is represented by his contemporaries to have been “for many years the most eminent minister in the county of Essex, equal to any in the province for learning and candor, and superior to all his contemporaries as a writer.” — Sprague, Annals Amer. Pulpit, 1, 148 sq.; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 909.

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

             a celebrated Quaker of the 17th century, was at first a preacher in the Parliament's army, but he afterwards joined the Quakers, and, in accordance with their principles of peace, quitted the army. After preaching some nine years, he was imprisoned on account of his religious belief, and died from the effects at Newgate, June 17. 1662. Hubberthorn was one of the Quakers liberated by king Charles upon his marriage with Catharine of Braganza, who ordered “the release of Quakers and others in jail in London and Middlesex for being present at unlawful assemblies, who yet profess all obedience and allegiance, provided they are not indicted for refusing the oath of allegiance, nor have been ringleaders nor preachers at their assemblies, hoping thereby to reduce them to a better conformity.” Just before this event, Hubberthorn, together with George Fox, had addressed the king and demanded the liberation of their suffering brethren.  — Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, 2, 418; Stoughton, Ecclesiastes Hist. of England, 1, 275.

## Huber, Fortunatus[[@Headword:Huber, Fortunatus]]

             general definitor of the order of the Franciscans and provincial in Bavaria, who died at Munich, February 12, 1706, is the author of, Menologium Franciscanun (Munich, 1698, 2 volumes fol.): — Chronicon Triplex Triumn Ordinium S. Francisci per Germaniam. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:718; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Huber, Johann Ludwig[[@Headword:Huber, Johann Ludwig]]

             a German author who at first studied theology, but afterwards devoted his time mainly to the study of jurisprudence deserves our notice on account of his Versuche mit Gött zu reden (sacred songs) (Reusl. 1775; Tübing. 1787). He died at Stuttgaredt in 1800.

## Huber, Johann Nepomuk[[@Headword:Huber, Johann Nepomuk]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian and philosopher of Germany, was born August 18, 1830, at Mufuch, where he also studied theology and philosophy. In 1859 he was appointed professor in extraordinary and in 1864 ordinary professor of philosophy and psdagogics. His first important theological work, Philosophie der Kirchenvdter (Munich, 1859), was placed on the Index, and as he did not recant, and occasionally spoke for. the right of free investigation, the ultramontane party prevented his influence among the students of theology. He now betook himself to speak and to write against ultramontanism. The famous work against infallibility, Janus, der Papst und der Concil (Leipsic, 1869), Engl. transl. Janus, the Pope and the Council (Boston, 1869), is as much his work as that of Doi.inger. Under the name of Quirinus, he published, from 1869, in the Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung, bis Romische Briefe vom Concil. Against Hergenrother's Antijanus, he wrote Das Papstthum und der Staat. The most important work of this period is his Darstellung des Jesuite nordens nach sein er erfssung und Doctrin, Wilrksankeit u. Geschichte (Berlin, 1873). He also defended the principles of Christianity against materialism and the destructive tendencies related to it. Thus he wrote in 1870 a criticism on Darwin's theory, and in 1875 against Hickel, in his Zur Kritik nmoderner Schopfungslehren. The Alte und Neue Glube of Strauss found in him a severe philosophical critic in 1873, as did Hartmann the philosopher, Des Unbewussten, against whom he wrote Die religiose Frage (1875), and Der Pessimsismus (1876). Huber died March 19, 1879, at Munich, to the great sorrow of the Old Catholics, whose most gifted leader he'was. Besides the writings already mentioned, he published, Die cartesischesn Beweise voin Dasein Gottes (Augsburg, 1854): — Johannes Scotus Erigena (Munich, 1861). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:590: Lichtenberger, Enscyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v.; Zierngiebl, Johannes Huber (Gotha, 1881). (B.P.)

## Huber, Kaspar[[@Headword:Huber, Kaspar]]

             SEE HUBERINUS.

## Huber, Maria[[@Headword:Huber, Maria]]

             a celebrated mystic, was born at Geneva in 1694. She retired into solitude in 1712, to indulge in contemplation and mysticism. She afterwards returned to live in Geneva, joined the Roman Church, and died at Lyons in 1759. She is generally named as a deist, yet her opinions partook rather of extreme mysticism than of infidelity her principal works are Lettres sur la religion essentielle à l'homme (Amsterd. 1738; London 1739, 2 vols.) in which “she traces all religion to the moral necessities of the heart, and considers revelation a mere auxiliary to natural theology, a means of interpreting it to our own consciousness” (Hagenbach, Germ. Rationalism, p. 55 sq.) — Recueil de diverse pieces servant de supplement aox Lettres sur la religion, etc. (Berl. 1754, 2 evol.; London 1756) — Le mondefou prefere au monde sage, divise en trois parties, fisant 24 promenades (whence the work is sometimes styled Promenades) (Amst. 1731 and 1744) — Le Systeme des theologiens anciens et modernes, sur l'etat des âmes separees des corps (Amst. 1731, 1733.1739) — Reduction du Spectateur Anglais a ce qu'il referme de meilleur, etc. (Par. 1753 12mo). Senebier considers her as the author of the Histoire d'Abassay (1753, 8vo), which is generally attributed to Miss Fauque. See Senebier, Hist. litter. de Geneve, 3, 84; Haag, La France Protestante; Pierer; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 344.

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

             a German theologian, was born at Berne in 1547. He studied theology in Germany, and became pastor at Burgdorf. He was much given to controversy, especially in behalf of the Lutheran doctrine on the Lord's  Supper. Censured for a speech he made on the 15th of April, 1588, he nevertheless continued to attack the doctrines of the Reformed Church, and was, in consequence, first imprisoned, and then exiled. In July 1588, he went to Tübingen, where he joined the Lutheran Church. He became pastor of Doredingen, and in 1592 professor at Wittenberg. His belief in free grace, and in the universality of the atonement, brought him into antagonism with Huminus, Leyser, and Gesner (1592); the breach between them was not healed by public discussions held at Wittenberg and Regensburg in i594. Huber has been wrongly charged with teaching the doctrine of universal salvation. He was a determined opponent of the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, and held that the words “decree” and “election” were equivalent to “gracious invitation,” which God extends to all men without distinction. “But, to make their calling and election, they must repent and believe.” Driven out of Hesse-Cassel in 1594, he resided for some time at Jena, Helmstadt, and Goslar. He died March 25,1624. The most important among his numerous works are Christum esse mortuum pro peccatis ominum hominum (Tübing. 1590) — Beständiges Bekenntniss (1597) — Amnti-Bellarminus (Gosl. 1607, 6 vols.). See Acta Huberiana (Tüb. 1597; Lüb. 1598); (Götze, Acta Hub. (Lüb. 1707); Schmid, Lebensbeschreibung (Helmst. 1708); Pfaff, Introd. in Hist. Liter. Theol. pt. 2, bk. 3, p. 431; Arnold, Ketzerhistorie, 1, 952; Moshelm, Ch. History, 3, 158.

## Huberinus (Huber), Kaspar[[@Headword:Huberinus (Huber), Kaspar]]

             a Bavarian monk, afterwards a convert to Protestantism, was born near the close of the 15th century. He became a Protestant preacher in 1525 at Augsburg, and was appointed to a church at that place in 1527. He was a zealous opponent of the Anabaptists, who were quite numerous at Augsburg about that time, and he also engaged in the Berne disputations on the ministration of the sacrament. He was in favor of the Lutheran doctrine on this point, and in 1535 he went to Wittenberg, to consult with Luther personally, and to regain for Augsburg the celebrated Urbanus Rhegius (q.v.). Huberinus was also actively engaged in introducing the Reformation in the Pfalz, and in the territory of Hohenlohe. In 1551 he returned to Augsburg as preacher, but as he alone of the Protestant preachers at Augsburg had accepted the Interim (q.v.), he was obliged to leave the city in 1552, and died of grief at Oehringen Oct. 6,1553. Huberinus wrote quite extensively; among other worls, we have from his pen Tröstlicher Sermon — v.d. Urstende Christi (1525) — Schlussreden  v.d. rechten Hand Gottes u. 1. Gewalt Christi (1529) etc. See Keim, Schwseb. Ref. Gesch, p. 273,278; Döllinger, Reformation, 2, 576; Herzog, Real Encyklopadie 6, 296; Theol. Univ. Lex. p. 372; Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8, 569. (J. H. W.)

## Hubert (Hubertus), St[[@Headword:Hubert (Hubertus), St]]

             Son of Bertrand, duke of Guienne was high in office under Theoderic, king of the Franks having been a great sportsman, and, according to tradition, converted by a stag which bore a shining cross between his antlers, and which spoke, entreating him to turn from his gay life and serve the Church. He at once entered the Church, succeeded his religious instructor, Lambert (Lamprecht), as bishop of Lüttich in 708, and died in 727. His body was in 827 transferred to the Benedictine convent of Andain, in the Ardennes, which thence received the name of St. Hubertus, and it is here he is said to have had the abovementioned vision. Tradition also holds that his relics, by virtue of the golden key of St. Hubert, which he received from St. Peter, can cure hydrophobia, etc. The 3rd of November (St. Hubert's day) marks the end of the hunting season, and was celebrated by great hunts (St. Hubert's chase). — Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8, 570; Theolog. Univ. Lex. 1, 372.

## Hubert, Leonard[[@Headword:Hubert, Leonard]]

             a Belgian theologian, flourished about the year 1490. He was at first a Carmelite monk, afterwards he became bishop of Darie, then suffragan of the bishop of Liege, and finally “inquisitor” of Liege. He wrote quite extensively. His most celebrated works are De Immunitate Ecclesiastica Sermons. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 25, 35-1.

## Hubert, Order of St[[@Headword:Hubert, Order of St]]

             the oldest and highest order of Bavaria, was founded in 1444, and often reformed, the last time in 1808. The sign of the order is a golden cross on a  shield, in the middle of which is the picture of St. Hubertus (q.v.). It is borne on a golden chain.

## Hubert; Mathieu[[@Headword:Hubert; Mathieu]]

             a distinguished French Roman Catholic, born at Chatillon in 1640, was a priest of the Congregation of the Oratory, and one of the most brilliant preachers of his country and Church. He died at Paris in 1717. He published Sermons (Paris, 1725, 6 vols. 12mo). — Feller, Dict. Hist. 9, 49 sq.; Hook, Ecclesiastes Biog. 6, 202; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé. 25, 355. (J. H.W.)

## Hubertine Annalist[[@Headword:Hubertine Annalist]]

             an anonymous writer of the chronicles of St. Hubert's monastery, flourished about the middle of the 11th century. In his Chronicles St. Hub. Andaginensis the style of Sallust is imitated. Bethmann (L. C.) and Wattenbach (W.) issued a new edition of it in Pertz, Script. 8, 565-630, and the following opinion of the author is expressed by them: “Satis habeamus nosse, auctorem operis fuisse virum inter medias res versatum, acrem judicio, veritatis studiosum: hoc enim totum ejus dicendi genus, hoc simplex et sincera rerum narratio suadent.” — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 296 sq.

## Hubmayer or Hubmeyer (Hubmor), Balthasar[[@Headword:Hubmayer or Hubmeyer (Hubmor), Balthasar]]

             one of the most learned of the Anabaptists, was born at Friedberg, near Augsburg, Bavaria, in 1480. He studied theology and philosophy at Freiburg with Eck, and in 1512 went with his teacher to Ingolstadt, where he became preacher and professor. In 1516 he went to Regensburg, where his ministrations led to the expulsion of the Jews; but, having openly expressed sentiments favorable to the Reformation, he was himself obliged to leave Regensburg, and taught school for some time in Schaffhausen. In 1522 lie was appointed pastor to Waldshut, where he came under the influence of Münzer, and embraced the Anabaptist views. He wrote several works in support of his new views, more particularly upon baptism and the sacraments; but the ground which he took against his early coadjutor and intimate friend Zwingle provoked a violent reply from the latter, and caused the estrangement of the two friends. Driven to Zurich in 1525 by the Austrian persecution at Waldshut, he was branded as a heretic by Zwingle, and, after suffering imprisonment, finally fled from the Austrian territory (1526). He preached a short time at Constance, and then journeyed to Moravia. In 1528 he was arrested, probably at Brünn, by the Austrian authorities, and was burned at the stake in Vienna (March 10). His wife, who steadfastly adhered to Hübmayer's views, was imprisoned with him, and suffered martyrdom by drowning. Hübmayer is now conceded by all historians to have been a man of very exalted character, and, although a fanatic in religion, it is certain that he never favored the extreme views of some of the Anabaptists. See Brown, Memorials of  Baptist Martyrs, p. 106 sq.; Baptist Quarterly Review, 1869 (July), p. 333: Mosheim, Ch. Hist. 3, 203; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 298 sq.; Theol. Univ. Lex. 1, 372. (J. H. W.)

## Hubner, Johannes[[@Headword:Hubner, Johannes]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born March 17, 1668, at Tyrgau, Upper Lusatia. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1694 rector at Merseburg, in 1711 at Hamburg, and died May 21, 1731. He is best known as the author of Zweimal 52 auserlesene biblische Historien, which were published in more than one hundred editions, and were translated into other languages.  This biblical history is also largely used in German parochial and Sabbath schools. (B.P.)

## Huby, Vincent[[@Headword:Huby, Vincent]]

             a French Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Hennebon, in the Bretagne, May 15. 1608. He entered the order of the Jesuits in 1643, and contributed greatly to the growth of this order. He died March 24, 1693. He wrote a number of ascetic works, which have been edited by abbé Lenoir Duparc, and published under the title AEuvres spirituelles (Paris, 1753, 1761,1769; Lyons and Paris, 1827,12mo); also by the abbé Baudrand (Paris, 1767, 12mo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. 25, 361.

## Huc, Evariste Regis[[@Headword:Huc, Evariste Regis]]

             a French Roman Catholic missionary, was born at Toulouse Aug. 1, 1813. He was educated in his native city, and entered the order of St. Lazarus, and in 1839 was sent as missionary to China. After about three years of missionary labor in the northern districts of China, he started with father Gabet, in the fall of 1844, to explore the wilds of Tartary and Christianize Tibet, according to the directions of the apostolic vicar of Mongolia. Accompanied by a single Chinese convert, a young lama, they reached the lama convent of Kounboun, where they acquired the dialect of Tibet. Towards the end of September 1845, they joined a caravan from China, with which they went to Lhassa, the capital of Tibet. Here they were permitted to remain on their declaration that they had come only for the purpose of preaching the religion of Christ. But they had barely settled when the Chinese ambassador commanded them to leave the country. They were put in charge of a Chinese escort. and carried back a journey of nearly 2000 miles to the extreme south, and arrived in October, 1846, at Macao. Here they were subjected to a trial by the Chinese tribunals, and were finally permitted to return to the station from which they had originally started on this journey. Hue, whose health completely failed him, returned to Toulouse in 1849, and gave an account of this journey in his Souvenirs d'un Voyage dens la Tartarie, le Thibet et la Chine, pendant les annees 1844, 1845, et 1846 (Paris 1850, 2 vols. 8vo). This book met with great success, and was translated into various languages (English by Hazlitt, London 1851, 2 vols. and New York, 1853). It owed its great success partly to its description of a country heretofore unknown, and also  to its lively style. In this work the abbé also pointed out the similarities between the Buddhist and Roman Catholic ceremonials and for it was punished by seeing his book placed on the “Index” (comp. Miller, Chips from a German Workshop, 1, 187, note). By order of the emperor, he then published L'Empire Chinois, felisant suite a l'ouvrage intitule “Souvenir d'un Voyage dans la Tartarie et le Thibet” (Par. 1854, 2 vols. 8vo). This work was crowned by the Academy. There are several editions of it and it was also translated into English (N. York, 1855, 2 vols. 12mo). His last work, Le Christianisme en Chine. en Tartarie, et au Thibet (Paris, 1857, 3 vols. 8vo, with map), contains a vast amount of historical information; but its chief topic is the propagation of Romanism in China. Hue thinks that “the Gospel will soon take in Asia the place now occupied by the philosophy of Confucius, the traditions of the Buddhists, and the endless legends of the Vedas; finally, that Brahma, Buddha, and Mohammed will disappear to make room for the true God,” etc. Hue died in Paris March 31, 1860. See Chambers, Cyclopaedia, 5, 445; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Gen. 25, 361; Methodist Quarterly Review, Oct. 1855; Christian Examiner, January to May, 1858. (J. H. W.)

## Hucarius[[@Headword:Hucarius]]

             an English deacon who flourished in the 11th century. He wrote one hundred and eight homilies, “which were extant in Leland's time in Canterbury College (now Christ Church), Oxford, but which appear to be no longer in existence. In the prologue to this book, Hucarius stated his name and country, but nothing more is known of him.” He is said to have made an extract from the penitential work of archbishop Egbert of York, of the 8th century, as an introduction to the homilies. See Wright, Biog. Brit. Lit. (Anglo-Sax. Period), p. 426; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 21, 604; Theol. Univ. Lex. 1, 372. (J. H. W.)

## Hucbald[[@Headword:Hucbald]]

             also called HUCBOLD, HUGBALD, UBALD, and HUBALD, a celebrated monk, was probably born about 850, and was educated by his learned relative Milo (q.v.) in the monastery of St. Amandus in Flandern. After Milo's death, Hucbald succeeded him as teacher and presiding officer of the school of this monastery. About 893, archbishop Fulco, of Rheims, called Hucbald to that city, to preside over the cathedral school there lie died in 930. He distinguished himself greatly in music, and was the first to  establish the laws of harmony (diaphonia). His lives of some of the saints are considered valuable, especially Vita S. Lebuini, Vita Aldegundis, Vita Rictrudis. See Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 3, 342; Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, 6, 297 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Huddesford, William, D.D[[@Headword:Huddesford, William, D.D]]

             an English diviner who died in 1772, was principal of Triuity College, Oxford. He published Catalogus Liborum Manuscriptorum Viri Clarissimi Antonio a Wood (1761). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

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

             an English philologist and theologian, was born at Widehope in 1662, and was educated at Queen's College, Oxford. He obtained the degree of Master of Arts in 1684, and shortly afterwards that of Doctor of Divinity. In 1701 he was appointed librarian of the Bodleian library at Oxford, and died Nov. 27, 17.19. He is chiefly known on account of his Geographie Veteris Scriptores Graeci minores. etc. (Oxford, 1698, 1703, 1712, 3 vols. 8vo), and his edition of Josephus, entitled Flavii Josephi Opera (Oxford 1720,2 vols. fol.), which appeared shortly after his death. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 372 sq.

## Hueiteoquixqui[[@Headword:Hueiteoquixqui]]

             in Mexican mythology, was the high-priest. His word was not only advisory, but decisive. He also crowned the king. He opened the breast of the sacrifice, and tore out its heart.

## Hueitequilhuitl[[@Headword:Hueitequilhuitl]]

             in Mexican religion, was one of the three great festivals, celebrated by human sacrifices, in honor of the great mother of the earth, Centeotl. It took place on the last day of the eighth month.

## Huel, Joseph Nicolas[[@Headword:Huel, Joseph Nicolas]]

             a French philosopher, was born at Mattaincourt June 17, 1690. After the completion of his studies at Paris he took orders, and was made curate of Rameux. He is said (Barbier Dict. des Anonymes) to be the author of Essai philosophique sur la crainte de la Mort, and of Moyen de rendre nos religielses utiles et de nous exempter des dots qu'elles exigent (1750), in which important reforms of the religious houses of the Roman Catholic Church are advocated. His special aim was the employment of the inmates of convents in instructing the youth of the land, instead of spending a life of idleness, partly, if not wholly, at the expense of the state. The book was suppressed, but reprinted eleven years after, without, however, awakening any general interest in this reformatory movement. Huel died at Romeux Sept. 3,1769. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Geneir. 25, 377 sq.; Classe, Remarques bibliographiques sur Huel, in the Memoires de I'Academie de Nancy (1856): p. 251. (J. H. W.)

## Huematsin[[@Headword:Huematsin]]

             a Mexican sage, lived at Tezcuco in the 7th century, and was considered a doctor by excellence of that Atbens of the New World. To him has been attributed the composition of Teonaxtli (the divine book), a sort of encyclopedia, which gave information, it is said, of the emigrations of the race of the Aztecs after their departure from the borders of Asia until their arrival upon the plateau of Anahuac, specifying the various halts which the invading nation was obliged to male on the borders of the Rio Giba. It has been affirmed that the Teomaxtli was among the Aztec books that were condemned to the fire, without being examined, by the bishop of Mexico, Zumarraga. It is possible that, in point of mythology and history, the  importance of these hieroglyphic collections has been exaggerated, and so it is hardly possible now to estimate the extent of the literary losses which Mexico suffered. If the work of Huematsin had been preserved to our time, we might have some information to establish the real signification of the Mexican hieroglyphics. When we remember that the palace of Tezcuco embraced certain departments intended only for the doctors who occupied themselves with special studies, and recall what has been told of the great treasures which were stored up both at Mexico and at Tezcuco, and consecrated exclusively to the study of the kingdom of nature, it is difficult to limit the office of Huematsin to that of a simple theorist, who developed barbarian traditions and fantastic ideas. This learned Aztec seems to have derived his learning from close observation. See Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Huesca, Council of (Concilium Oscense)[[@Headword:Huesca, Council of (Concilium Oscense)]]

             a council held at Huesca, in Spain, in 598, of which only two canons are extant. One orders that the diocesan synods, composed of the abbots, priests, and deacons of the diocese, be held annually, in which the bishop shall exhort his clergy upon the duties of frugality and continence: the other that the bishop shall inform himself whether the priests, deacons, and  subdeacons observe the law of continence (tom. 5:Cone. 1604). — Landon, Manual of Councils, p. 266.

## Huesca, Duando de[[@Headword:Huesca, Duando de]]

             a celebrated member of the Albigenses (q.v.), flourished in the first half of the 13th century. He at length yielded to Romish influences, and returned to that Church, in which he founded a religious community under the name of ‘Poor Catholics.” In 1207 he went to Rome, and obtained the remission of his heresy from Innocent III, and was by this pope declared the superior of his fraternity. The members of this community lived o(n alms, applied themselves to study and teaching, kept Lent twice a year, and wore a habit of white or gray, with shoes open at the top, but distinguished by some particular mark from those of the Poor Men of Lyons (Insabatati). “The new order spread so rapidly that in a few years it had numerous convents both south and north of the Pyrenees. But, although they professed to devote themselves to the conversion of heretics, and Huesca wrote some books with that view they soon incurred the suspicion of the bishops, who accused them of favoring the Vaudois (q.v.), and concealing their heretical tenets under the monastic garb. They had sufficient influence to maintain themselves for some time, and even to procure letters from his holiness, exhorting the bishops to endeavor to gain them by kindness instead of alienating their minds from the Church by severe treatment; but their enemies at last prevailed, and within a short time no trace of their establishments was to be found.” — McCrie, Reformation in Spain, p. 36 sq.; list. Gie. de Languedoc, 3, 147 sq. (3. H, W.)

## Huet (Huetius), Pierre Daniel[[@Headword:Huet (Huetius), Pierre Daniel]]

             a French scholar, and ecclesiastic, was born at Caen Feb. 8,1630. He was educated at the Jesuit school of Caen, and was originally intended for the profession of the law; but the perusal of the “Principles” of Des Cartes and Bochart's “Sacred Geography' turned his attention to general literature, and he became a zealous pupil of these distinguished men. In 1652 he accompanied Bochart to Sweden. Here he discovered and transcribed the MS. of Origen, which subsequently became the basis of his celebrated edition of that Church father. He was solicited by the queen to settle in her dominions, but he refused the offer, and returned to France. In 166-1l he published an essay De Interpretatione, and in 1668 his edition of Origen's Commentaria in Sac. Script. (Rouen, 2 vols. fol.; Cologne, 1685, 3 vols. fol.), with a learned introduction, entitled Origeniana, since reprinted in the Benedictine edition of Origen. He thus acquired so great a reputation that he was honored with the degree of doctor of law, and shortly after was appointed subtutor to the dauphin. He also took a leading part in editing the Delphini edition of the Latin classics. In 1674 he was elected a member of the French Academy; and having taken orders in 1676, he was appointed in 1678 to the abbey of Aunay, near Caen. In 1685 he was made bishop of Soissons, but he never entered on this position and was transferred to the see of Avranches in 1692. Desirous of devoting his time to study, he resigned his bishopric in 1699, and obtained the abbey of Fontelnay near Caen. In 1701 he removed to Paris, and resided at the Jesuits' house. He died Jan. 26,1721. His other principal works are Demonstratio Evangelica (Paris, 1679, often reprinted). “This work, which is the great monument of Huet's literary reputation, was the result of various conversations with the eminent Rabbi Manassehl ben-Israel at Amsterdam. It begins with a set. of definitions on the genuineness of books, history, prophecy, the Messiah, and the Christian religion. Then follow two postulates and four axioms. — The propositions occupy the rest of the book, and in the discussion of these the demonstration consists” (Kitto) — De la situation du Pardlis Terrestre (Par. 1691, 12mo) — Commentarius de rebus ad auctoren pertinentibus (Amst. 1718, 12mo), “his autobiographical memoirs-a model of pure Latinity, as well as the most interesting record of the history of his  time.” It was translated by John Aikin, M.D. (London, 1810,2 vols. 8vo) — Censura Philosophiae Cartesianae (Par. 1689, 1694,12mo) — Questiones Alnetance de Concordia Rationis et Fidei (Caen, 1690). The two last- named works are aimed at the Cartesian philosophy, to which Huet had adhered in his earlier days, and against which he appears in these works as one of the most formidable opponents — Traite philosophique de la faiblesse de l'Eprit humain (Amsterd. 1723, 8vo), “which, according to Voltaire, was regarded by many as a refutation of his Demonstratio Evangelica, and has caused him to he classed among skeptics.” All the works of Huet were published in a collected form in 1712, and An additional volume, entitled Huetiana, in the year following his death (1722). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé. 25:387 sq.; English Cyclopedia, s.v.; Quarterly Rev. (London), 4:103 sq.; Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 449 sq.; Morell, list. of Mod. Philosophy, p. 195 sq., 523. (J.H.W.)

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

             a distinguished French philosopher, was born Dec. 26, 1814, at Villeau, France. He was for a time professor at the University of Ghent, and distinguished himself greatly by his efforts to reform modern philosophy upon the principles of Bordas-Dermoulin, who aimed to conciliate all the political and social influences of the Revolution with the religious traditions of ancient Gallicanism. His last years were spent in educating the young prince of Servia. He died suddenly, while on a visit at Paris, July 1, 1869. His principal works are Recherches sur la vie, les outrages et les doctrines de Henri de Gand (1838, 8vo) Le Cartisianisme ou la veritable renovation des sciences (1843, 2 vols. 8vo), crowned by the French Academy — Le Regne social du Christianisme (1853, 8vo):Essais sur la Reformé  Catolique (1856, 8vo), written in connection with Bordas-Demoulin — La science de l'esprit, principes de philosophie pure et appliquée (2 vols. 8vo, 1864). — Vapereau, Dict. des Contemporains, p. 907; Brockhaus, Unsere Zeit, 5th year, vol. 2 (1869), 237.

## Huffel, Johann Jakob Ludwig[[@Headword:Huffel, Johann Jakob Ludwig]]

             a German divine, was born May 6,1784 at Gladenbach, in Hesse, and educated at the universities of Giessen and Marburg. In 1817 he was appointed' minister at Friedberg, in 1825 senior professor in the theological seminary at Herborn, and in 1829 prelate of Baden and religious counselor of the duke of Baden. He died July 26,1856. Besides a collection of sermons (Giessen, 1817-29), Hüffel published Wesen u. Berzf d. evang. Geistlichen (ibid. 1821, 4th edit. 1843) — Studen christl. Andacht (1844 ) — Briefe ü. d. Unsterblichkeit (2nd edit. Karlsruhe, 1832). The same subject is still further treated in a later work, entitled Die Unsterblichkeit avf's neue beleuchtet (2nd edit. 1838): — Der Pietismus geschichtlich beleuchtet (Heidelb. 1849). — Theol. Univers. Lex. 1, 372; Pireer, Univers. Lex. 8, 581.

## Hufnagel,Wilhelm Friedrich[[@Headword:Hufnagel,Wilhelm Friedrich]]

             a German theologian, was born at Hall, Swabia, June 15, 1754, and educated at the universities of Altorf and Erlangen. In 1779 he was appointed professor extraordinary of philosophy at Erlangen, and in 1782 he was transferred to the chair of theology as regular professor. In 1788 he received the pastorate of the university church, and was made overseer of the seminary for preachers. In 1791 he removed to Frankfort-on-the-Main as preacher of one of the oldest churches of that city. He died Feb. 7 1830. Hufnagel was distinguished both as a preacher and as a theologian, but he  was especially at home in the Shemitic languages. His publications, aside from his Sermons (1791-96), are Variarum lectiouum e Bibliis a Nisselio curatis excerptarum specimen (1777) — Salmos hohes Lied geprüft, überset u. erlautert (1784) — Nov. Biblioth. theol. (1, 1782-3) — Bearbeit. d. Schriften d. A. T. nach ihrem Inhalt u. Zweck (1784), in which he took a rationalistic position — Iiob neu übers. n. Annm. (1781): — Dissertatio de Psalinis prophetias Messian. continentibus (2 pts. 1, 784). — Biographie Universelle, 27, 428; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. 2, 339 sq.; Doring, Gelehrt. Theol. Deutschl. 1, 767 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Hug, Johann Leonhard[[@Headword:Hug, Johann Leonhard]]

             an eminent German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Constance June , 1765, and educated at Freiburg University. In 1789 he took priest's orders, and in 1791 was appointed professor of Old-Testament exegesis at his alma mater. In 1792 the New-Testament exegesis was added to the duties of his chair. To fit himself more thoroughly for his professional duties, he visited the great libraries and universities of Central Europe. Though a Roman Catholic, he was too well acquainted with sacred criticism, and, like the celebrated Dr. Jahn, too impartial to be very greatly influenced in his views as a Biblical scholar and critic by his ecclesiastical connections. He wrote Erfindung d. Buchstabenschrift (Ulm, 1801) — Einleitung in d. Schriften d. Neuen Testaments (Stuttg. 1808, 2 vols.; 4th ed. 1847). This work, in which he attempts to vindicate and sustain the genuineness of all the-books commonly regarded as canonical, has been translated into French and English (Introduction to the New Testament, by Wait, London 1827,2 vols. 8vo; far better by Fosdick, Andover, Mass., 8vo), and is considered one of the ablest works of the kind. Untersuchungen über den Mythus d. berühmtesten Völker d. alten Welt (Freib. 1812) — Ueber d. Hohe Lied (ibid. 1813-1818) — De conjugii Christiani vinculo indissolubili comment. exeget. (ib. 1816), in which he took ground against civil marriages — Katechismus (ib. 1836) — De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina comment. (ib. 1818) — Gutachten über d. Leben Jesu von D. F. Strauss (ib. 1840-1844, 2 vols.). Hug was also one of the editors, with Hirscher (q.v.) and others, of the Freiburger Zeitschrift für Theologie (Bonn, 1839-42). See Maier, Gedächtnissrede auf Hug (Freiburg, 1847); Real Encyklop. d. Kathol. Deutschland, 5:518 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 19, 658; Chambers, Cyclopedia, 5:449 sq.; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. 2, 340; Haag, Hist. d. Dogmas Chret. 1, § 112;  Werner, Geschichte d. Katholischen Theol. p. 527 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé. 25, 400. (J. H. W.)

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

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Gloucester, now Camden County, New Jersey, about 1814. But little is known of his early life. He was converted in 1841, licensed to preach about 1844, and joined the New Jersey Conference in 1845. Thenceforward he filled with zeal and efficiency the several positions assigned him, being in many places eminently useful. On Rome and Wantage Circuit, on Cedarville charge and elsewhere, he had extensive and powerful revivals of religion, and founded the first Methodist society at the village of Cranberry, N. J., consisting at first of seven members, which, before the year closed, increased to fifty. About 1855, while laboring on Vernon Circuit, he had his hip dislocated by a fall from his carriage, which caused him a great deal of suffering, and in the spring of 1864, being pressed by increasing affliction, he was obliged to take a superannuated relation, and settled at Pointville, in Burlington County. Here he labored as he had ability, being greatly beloved by the people. He died suddenly, while preparing to re-enter the active work of the ministry, April 5, 1866. “Hugg was emphatically a good man: the poor knew well how to prize him, and the children everywhere loved him. He was a good preacher, and, when health permitted, a faithful pastor.” — New Jersey Conf. Minutes, 1867.

## Hugh[[@Headword:Hugh]]

             SEE HUGO.

## Hughes, George, B.D[[@Headword:Hughes, George, B.D]]

             an English Nonconformist, was born in Southwark in 16)3, and educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. He became fellow of Pembroke College, then lecturer at Allhallows, London, and afterwards minister of Tavistock. During the Rebellion he obtained the living of St. Andrew's. Plymouth, but was ejected for nonconformity in 1662. — He died in 1667. Hughes was a divine of good natural capacity and learning, and an exact critic for his time. His principal works are: An Analytical Exposition of the whole Book of Genesis, and of the first twenty-three Chapters of' Exodus, wherein the various readings are observed, etc. (1672, fol.) — Aphorisms, or Select  Propositions of the Scriptures, shortly determining the Doctrine of the Sabbath (1670, sm. 8vo). — Darling, Cyclopedia Bibliographica, 1, 1568.

## Hughes, Jabez[[@Headword:Hughes, Jabez]]

             an English divine, born in 1685, was educated at Cambridge University, and afterwards became fellow of Jesus College. He is chiefly known as the editor of Chrysostom's treatise περὶ ἱερωσύνης or On the Priesthood (Cambr. 1710, 8vo; 2nd edit. in Greek and Latin, with notes and a preliminary dissertation against the pretended Rights of the Church etc., 1712, 8vo). He died in 1731. — New Gen. Biog. Dict. 7, 276; London Gent. Mag. 48, 583,673.

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

             an English divine, was born in 1682, educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, and afterwards became a fellow of the university. But little is known of his life. He died in 1710. Among his works we find Dissertationes in quibus Auctoritas Ecclesiastica, quatenus civili sit distincta, defenditur contra Erastianos (Cambridge, 1710, 8vo; and in English by Hilk. Bedford, London 1711, 8vo) — St. Chrysostom's Treat. on the Priesthood (Cambr. 1710, 8vo; 2nd edit., with notes, etc., 1712, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 911; Lowndes, Brit. Liter. p. 535 sq.

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

             an American Roman Catholic prelate, was born in Ireland in 1798, and emigrated to this country in 1817, his father having preceded him about two years. At first he went to a florist to learn the art of gardening, but a few years later he entered the Theological Seminary of St. Mary's at Emmittsburgh, Md., teaching also at the same time. In 1825 he was ordained priest in Philadelphia, and settled over a parish of that city. In 1837 he was appointed coadjutor of bishop Dubois, of New York. and immediately after his consecration in 1838, he assumed the virtual administration of the diocese, but he was not made bishop until 1842. In 1850 New York was raised to the dignity of an archiepiscopal see, and archbishop Hughes went to Rome to receive the pallium at the hands of the pope. He died January 3, 1864. Even before his elevation to the episcopacy he had gained among his coreligionists some distinction as a champion of his Church by a controversy, in 1830 and 1834, with Dr. John  Breckinridge, on the question, “Is the Protestant religion the religion of Christ?” Some years later he had another celebrated controversy with Dr. Nicholas Murray, of Elizabeth, who, under the name of “Kinran,” published a series of able and interesting articles against the Roman Catholic Church. “Both controversies increased his reputation among his coreligionists; but non-Catholics were not struck by his arguments in favor of Roman Catholicism, and he failed to attract anything like the attention, or produce anything like the impression, which writings of real ability, such as those of Mohler in Germany, and of Brownson and Hecker, are always sure to command.” As archbishop, in the administration of the property of the Church, and the use, which he made of it for the spreading of his Church, he displayed a talent rarely found. An immense property gradually accumulated in his hands, which enabled him to increase largely the number of Roman Catholic churches, schools, and other denominational institutions.

Thus, in 1841, he opened the Roman Catholic St. John's College, at Fordham, New York, to which he afterwards added the Theological Seminary of St. Joseph. The archbishop sustained a celebrated controversy on this subject with Erastus Brooks, editor of the New York Express, and at that time a state senator, who had stated in an address in the senate chamber that the archbishop owned property in New York to the amount of $5,000,000. A long discussion took place, and this time the ability with which the archbishop defended his statements and his position, was acknowledged alike by Protestants and Romanists. But he opened a breach between the Romanists and Protestants by his unauthorized demands in the School Question, to the effect that the Common Council of New York City should designate seven of the public schools as Catholic schools, and when this was denied both by the Common Council and the Legislature, bishop Hughes advised the Catholics to run, at the next political campaign, an independent ticket. He defended his cause with great ability, but failed to convince Protestants generally of the fairness of the demand to grant to the Roman Catholic community an exceptional prerogative, which was neither possessed nor claimed by any Protestant, body. He also opposed the reading of the Protestant version of the Bible in the common school, in which he was not quite so successful as in his other efforts in behalf of Romanism. Archbishop Hughes's political influence in the United States was very great, and he was honored by all sects in a manner unknown in any other Protestant country. Thus, in 1847, he was invited by both houses of Congress to deliver a lecture in the hall of the House of Representatives in Washington, and after the outbreak of the  Rebellion (1862) he was even entrusted with a semi-official mission to France. As a writer archbishop Hughes has done but little, except by the discussions above alluded to. These were all published in book form (Philadelphia 1836, 8vo). He also published a number of his sermons and addresses. Since his decease his “works” have been collected by Lawrence Kehoe (N.Y. 2 vols. 8vo; 2nd ed. 1865). — N. Tablet, Jan. 1864; Methodist, Jan. 9,1864; An Amer. Cyclop. 1868, p. 429. (J. H..)

## Hughes, John (3)[[@Headword:Hughes, John (3)]]

             a Wesleyan Methodist minister, nephew of John Thomas, vicar of Caerleon, Monmouthshire, was born at Brecon, County Brecon, May 18, 1776. He was educated at the grammar-school at Brecon, under the care of Reverend David Griffiths. Dr. Coke and other distinguished persons received their education at the same place and under the same master. In 1790 Hughes was converted under a sermon by John M'Kersey, and joined the Methodist Society. His parents designed him for the Established Church, but young Hughes could not conscientiously enter its ministry. In 1793 he became a resident with his uncle at Caerleon. In 1796 he was appointed by the Conference to the Cardiff Circuit. In 1800 he and Owen Davies were appointed the first missionaries in North Wales. In 1805 he was superintendent of the Welsh Mission in Liverpool. His remaining circuits were, Swansea, Bristoli Glasgow, Northwich and Warrington, Macclesfield, Newcastle-under-Lyne, etc.

In 1832 he became a supernumerary at Knutsford, Cheshire. He died May 15, 1843. Hughes deliberately declined a life of ease and honor, and, contrary to the wishes of his friends, chose the toils and privations of the Methodist ministry. From this course he never swerved. He was a most diligent worker, producing, amid the pressing duties of his itinerancy, works of great and lasting value. In 1803 he published a new edition of the Welsh Hymn-Book; he translated part of Dr. Coke's Commentary on the New Testament (1809); while at Macclesfield, 1813, he wrote A Plea for Religious Liberty, a reply to Joseph Cook's ("Civis") The Danger of Schism, pamphlets which were the result of a controversy respecting the Sunday-schools originated by David Simpson, and which were now carried on by the Methodists; Hor  Britannicae, or Studies in Early British History (Lond. 1818, 2 volumes 8vo), a work which received the encomiums of Dr. Thomas Burgess, bishop of Salisbury, then bishop of St. Davids, of Sharon Turner, in a letter to the author, of Price, of David M'Nicoll, and of the Eclectic Review. It embodied the results of many years' antiquarian research and is a work of great value. Hughes also wrote, but did not publish, a work entitled Historical Triads; Consisting of Memorials of Remarkable Persons and Occurrences among the Cymry, translated from the Welsh, with notes and illustrations. The manuscript has been deposited in the British Museum. He received several prizes, premiums, and medals from the Cambrian Society for his literary productions. His last work was the Memoir and Remains of Fussell, which he finished in 1839. See Robert Jackson, Memoir in Wesleyan Methodist Magazine, March 1847, page 209 sq.; Minutes of the British Conference, 1843; Wesl. Meth. Magazine, September 1834, page 669; Smith, Hist. of Wesl. Methodism, 2:359, 361, 393 sq.

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

             an eminent Baptist divine, was born in London Jan. 1, 1769. In 1784 he became a member of the Baptist Church, and entered the Baptist College at Bristol, where he remained as a student till 1787. He studied also three years at Aberdeen, where he passed M.A. in 1790. In 1791 he became classical tutor in the Baptist College; 1792 to 1796 he was assistant minister at Broadmead Chapel, Bristol; and in 1796 he became pastor of the Baptist Chapel, Battersea. When the “Religious Tract Society” was formed' in 1799, he was chosen its first secretary, and he retained this office until his death, Oct. 12, 1833. His industry in official work was enormous, and a great part of the success of the Tract Society is due to his labors. He also took a large part in the formation of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and was its first secretary, retaining the office until his death. His personal history is largely that of this great organization. See Leifchild, Memoirs of the Rev. J. Hughes (London 1834, 12mo); Jubilee Volume of the Religious Tract Society; Owen, History of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Timpson Bible Triumphs (1853, 12mo).

## Hughes, Obadiah, D.D[[@Headword:Hughes, Obadiah, D.D]]

             an English Presbyterian clergyman, descended from a distinguished Puritan family, was born at Canterbury in 1695. He completed a liberal education in Scotland. He was first assistant minister, then co-pastor at Maid Lane, Southwarkl, and lecturer at Old Jewry. In 1721 he married the sister of the lord mayor of London, and used the riches she brought him in doing good. He was one of the preachers at Salters' Hall in 1734 against popery. He preached the funeral sermon on the death of Reverend Samuel Say, in 1743, at Westminster, and the church there called him to succeed Mr. Say in the pastorate. He suffered much from the death of friends, and himself died December 10, 1751. See Wilson, Dissenting Churches, 4:96.

## Hugo[[@Headword:Hugo]]

             a friar of the order of the Minimi, and a doctor of theology, was born at Prato, near Florence, in the latter half of the 13th century. He was a man of remarkable austerity, and imposed upon himself the most severe mortifications. He died in Tartary after the year 1312. Among his works, which remain in MS., are a letter to the Minimi of Prato, a treatise De Vita Contenmplatica, and De Perfectione Statuum. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 25, 451.

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

             a cardinal, bishop OF OSTIA was born in France, and probably, as the authors of the Histoire Litteraire assert, in the diocese of Beauvais. He became at first a Cistercian monk, then abbot of Trois Fontaines, in the  diocese of Chalons. Pope Eugenius made him cardinal about 1151, in spite of the opposition of St. Bernard, who was sorry to lose such a man. Hugo died in 1158. To him are attributed some commentaries on the Old and New Tests., also a book on the miracles of pope Eugenius. But these indications seem to be conjectural, and it may even be supposed that they are erroneous. However, there is one of his letters which has been written on occasion of the death of Eugenius. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Hugo (St.) of Grenoble[[@Headword:Hugo (St.) of Grenoble]]

             was born at Chateauneuf in the Dauphiny, and became a priest at Valence. In 1080 he was appointed bishop of Grenoble, but he only accepted the position after considerable hesitancy, and even left the bishopric some time after, and retired to the abbey of Chaise-Dieu, in Clermont, as a Benedictine monk. By order of pope Gregory VII, however, he returned again to Grenoble. He died there April 1,1139. He was declared saint two years after by pope Innocent II. Hugo was a very pious man, and especially rigid in the enforcement of the vow of celibacy. During fifty three years, spent in the active duties of his bishopric, it is said he never saw the face of a woman except that of one aged mendicant. See Real-Encyklop. f. d. Kathol. Deutschl. 5, 530 sq.; Lea, History of Sacerdotal Celibacy, p. 238.

## Hugo (or Hew)[[@Headword:Hugo (or Hew)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was a monk of Arbroath, and bishop of Dunkeld in the tenth year of king Alexander II. He was witness to a charter by king William, dated at Forfar. He died in January 1214. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 78.

## Hugo Aicelin de Billom, or Hugo Sequin[[@Headword:Hugo Aicelin de Billom, or Hugo Sequin]]

             was born at Billom, in Auvergne, about 1230, was educated at the college of the Church of St. Sirene, and afterwards entered the monastery at Clermont. He preached at various places with great success, and was awarded, on account of his superior scholarship, the doctorship of divinity by the University of Paris, where he was afterwards professor of theology. In 1285 Hugo went to Rome, and was appointed by pope Honorius IV master of his palace. Nicolas IV made him cardinal, May 15, 1288. He died at Rome Dec. 29, 1297. He is said to have written works on the beatific vision, an apologetical work against the corrupters of the doctrines of St. Thomas, On Jeremiah, a volume of Sermons, etc. See Echard, Scriptores ordinis Praedicatorum, 1, 450 sq.; Encyclop. Theolog. 31, 1091 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 450.

## Hugo Grotius[[@Headword:Hugo Grotius]]

             SEE GROTIUS.

## Hugo Of Clugny[[@Headword:Hugo Of Clugny]]

             SEE CLUGNY.

## Hugo de Fleury or de St. Marie[[@Headword:Hugo de Fleury or de St. Marie]]

             (oftentimes called St. Benoit sur Loire), a celebrated Benedictine monk of the abbey of Fleury, on the Loire, flourished about the middle of the 11th century. His Chronicon, a history of religion and of the Church, prepared after the manner of his day, viz. consisting of notices of popes, martyrs, and other saints, Church fathers, persecutions, heresies, etc., a work of great celebrity, was probably never brought down by him later than 855, and the continuation from that date to 1034 was in all likelihood prepared by other Benedictine monks (Minster, 1638, 4to). He wrote also De la Puissance Royale, et de la Digniti Sacerdotale (found in the Miscellanea  of Baluze). — Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 24, 501 sq.; Hook, Eccl. Biog. 1, 206. (J. H. W.)

## Hugo de Fouilloi[[@Headword:Hugo de Fouilloi]]

             a distinguished French theologian, canon of St. Augustine, was born in the early part of the 12th century. In 1149 he was chosen abbé by the regular canons of St. Denis of Rheims, but he declined this high office. On the decease of the person selected in his stead in 1153, however, he consented to accept the honor. He abdicated in 1174, and his death is supposed to have occurred shortly after. He is said to be the author of a number of works, but as they were not written under his own name, and as some were even printed as the productions of others, it is difficult now to determine them. He is generally believed to be the author of De Claustro Animce, a work often attributed to Hugo St. Victor — De Arca Noe mystica Descriptio — De Arca Noe moralis interpretatio — De vanitate rerum mundanarum, etc. — Oudin, Script. Eccl.; Histoire Litt. de la France, 13, 492 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 2, 442 sq.

## Hugo de Paganis[[@Headword:Hugo de Paganis]]

             SEE KNIGHT TEMPLARS.

## Hugo of Amiens, or of Rouen[[@Headword:Hugo of Amiens, or of Rouen]]

             a distinguished Roman Catholic divine, was born at Amiens, France, towards the close of the 11th century, and was educated at Laon under the  celebrated Anseim. He entered the Benedictine monastery of Clugny, and became prior of the monastery of Limoges in 1113. On account of his great learning and uncommon talent he was transferred as prior to the monastery at Lewes, in England, and in 1125 was appointed abbot of Reading Abbey by Henry I, the founder. In 1129 Hugo was elected archbishop of Rouen, over which see he presided until his death, Nov. 11, 1164. He was quite prominent in the history of celibacy during his day. While archbishop of Rouen, he sought to convert an obscure sect in Brittany, in all likelihood a branch of the Petrobrussians, whose doctrines were “a protest against the overwhelming sacerdotalism of the period, by an elaborate denunciation of their tenets, among which he enumerates promiscuous licentiousness and disregard of clerical celibacy.” Indeed, Hugo was distinguished among his contemporaries not only as a theologian, but also as a statesman. “It was he who, in 1139, at the Council of Winchester, saved king Stephen from excommunication by the English bishops.” He wrote Dialogi de Summo Bono Libri 7 (published by Martene in his Thesaur. Anecdotum, 5, 895), a work of especial interest both to the theologian and the philosopher on account of the views which it sets forth on moral philosophy — De Haeresibus, printed by D'Achery as an appendix to the works of Guibert de Nogent, is a work leveled against the heretics of his day, and affording valuable materials on the history of the Church in the 12th century — De Fide Catholicae, containing an explication of the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer, published by Martene and Durand in their Thesaurmus Anecdotum, vol. 5, and in their l'eterum Scriptorum Collectio, vol. 9. See Schröckh Kirchengesch. 27, 409 sq.; Lea, Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy, p. 372 sq.; Hoefer— Nouv. Biog. Géneralé. 25, 439 sq.; Gorton, Biog Dic. s.v. — (J. H. W.)

## Hugo of Angouleme[[@Headword:Hugo of Angouleme]]

             flourished in the 10th century. As soon as he had become the incumbent of the see of Angoulême (March 21, 973) he sought also to assume the temporal government over his diocese, and became entangled in controversies with count Arnold, the prince of that country, against whom he even waged war. It is thought that Hugo finally withdrew from the bishopric, retired to the abbey of St. Cibard, and died in obscurity in 990. He is said to have left several works, but they have not yet come to light. — Hist. Lift. de la France, vol. 8; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 428.

## Hugo of Besancon[[@Headword:Hugo of Besancon]]

             was born towards the close of the 10th century, and was appointed archbishop of Besançon, as successor of archbishop Gaucher of Salins, in 1031. Immediately on assuming the charge of the see he dismissed the canons of St. Anatole of Salins, and gave this church to the monks of St. Benigne of Dijon; but he afterwards repented of the change, and reinstated the chapter of St. Anatole in 1048. He is said to have been an industrious prelate, and to have enjoyed the confidence of his pope and of his emperor. Under the emperor Henry III he was arch-chancellor. He also assisted at the coronation of king Philip I of France. He died July 27, 1066. — Dunod de Carnage, Histoire de l'Eglise de Besançon 1, 29 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. biog. Gen. 25, 429.

## Hugo of Breteuil[[@Headword:Hugo of Breteuil]]

             was born near the opening of the 11th century, and was educated as a theologian at the school in Chartres. He was made bishop of Langres by king Robert some time in the first months of 1031. Conducting himself in a manner unworthy of his high position in the Church, he was finally accused of adultery and homicide, and other even more atrocious crimes, and was brought to trial before a council at Rheims. At first he braved the accusations, and sought to defend himself; but, finding that the proof against him was impossible of contradiction, he finally fled, and was punished with excommunication. To expiate his crimes he went on foot to Rome, where he procured an audience with pope Leo IX, and obtained pardon. On his return home he died at Biterne, France,. March 16, 1051. He is the author of an interesting letter On the Errors of Berenger (published as an appendix to the works of Lanfranc). — Hist. Litt. de la France, 7, 438; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. 25, 428 sq.

## Hugo of Castro-Novo (Newcastle)[[@Headword:Hugo of Castro-Novo (Newcastle)]]

             an English theologian, flourished, according to Wadding (Annall. Min. 3), about 1310. He belonged to the order of the Minimi, and was an ardent defender of the philosophy of Duns Scotus. He is said to have been the author of De Victoris Christi contra Antichristum (printed in 1471). But his most important work is De Laudibus B. Mariae (published 1697, 1698, 1704). It comprises twelve books, the first of which is a simple paraphrase of the angelical salutation (Luke 1, 26 sq.). The third book treats of the carnal prerogatives of Mary, the fourth of her virtues, the sixth of the  names by which she is known, the seventh and eighth of the celestial and terrestrial objects to which she is ordinarily compared, etc. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 450 sq.

## Hugo of Champfleuri[[@Headword:Hugo of Champfleuri]]

             a French prelate, was born in the early part of the 12th century. Of his early life but little is known. In 1151 he was appointed chancellor of France, and in 1159 he was elected bishop of Soissons, retaining, however, his position in the state, from both of which, for unknown reasons, he was deposed in 1171. He died Sept. 4, 1175. — Hist. Litt. de la France, 13 536; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 25, 445. Hugo OF CITEAUX, a French Roman Catholic theologian who flourished in the 12th century, was a disciple of St. Bernard and abbé of Trois Fontaines. In 1150 he was made bishop of Ostie and cardinal by pope Eugene III. He died in 1158. Hugo wrote a narrative of the death of pope Eugene III, and several other works. He was a prelate of great merit and piety. See Encyclop. Theologique (Dict. des Cardinaux), 31, 1083.

## Hugo of Falcandus[[@Headword:Hugo of Falcandus]]

             SEE FALCANDUS.

## Hugo of Farfa[[@Headword:Hugo of Farfa]]

             SEE FARFA.

## Hugo of Flavigny[[@Headword:Hugo of Flavigny]]

             a French Church historian, was born at Verdun about the year 1065. While yet a youth he entered the convent of St.Vitonius at Verdun, where he studied under the abbot Rodolph. In consequence of some persecutions, Hugo and the other members of his order removed to Flavigny. In 1097 he was elected abbot of his convent, and in 1111 he exchanged this abbey for that of St. Vannes. According to some, he died there as early as 1115, but according to others he left this convent for St. Dijon about 1115, and the time of his death is much later. Hugo wrote a chronicle extending from the birth of Christ to the year 1102 divided into two parts, under the title Chronicon Virdumense, Aquibusdam dictum Flaviniacense (in Ph. Labbei Bibliotheca Nova, tom. 1). The first part of this work, which closes with the 10th century, is trifling and erroneous, but the second part contains much important information on the ecclesiastical history of France in the 11th and 12th centuries. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 25, 433; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 6, 308.

## Hugo of Frazan or Trasan[[@Headword:Hugo of Frazan or Trasan]]

             tenth abbé of Clugny (q.v.), who flourished in the 12th century, became abbé in 1157 or 1158. Taking sides with the anti-pope Victor IV, he was  excommunicated by pope Alexander III, and driven from the abbey. He died after the year 1166. Several works are attributed to him, but without good reason. — Hist. litt. de la France, 13, 571 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 442.

## Hugo of Langres[[@Headword:Hugo of Langres]]

             SEE BERENGARIUS.

## Hugo of Lincoln[[@Headword:Hugo of Lincoln]]

             was born in 1140 at Gratianopolis, Burgundy, and was first a regular canon, and later a Carthusian monk. When Henry II founded the Carthusian monastery at Witham, in Somersetshire, he invited Hugo to accept the priorship of this new foundation. After many entreaties by Reginal, bishop of Bath, Hugo consented. He was also made bishop of Lincoln by Henry II. He died in Nov. 1200, and was canonized at Rome in 1221. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 25, 448; Wheatly, Book of Common Prayer, p. 75; Lea, Hist. of Sacerdot. Celib. p. 296. (J. H. W.)

## Hugo of Macon[[@Headword:Hugo of Macon]]

             a French ecclesiastic, was born about the close of the 11th century, and was educated by his cousin St. Bernard. He was appointed abbé of Pontigny, as the representative of which he appeared in 1128 at the Council of Troves. In August, 1136. he was elected bishop of Auxerre, and was consecrated the January following. He was an attendant at the Council of Sens, which condemned the doctrines of Abelard (q.v.); also in 1148 at the Council of Rheims, where he combated the opinions of Gilbert de la Porree. He stood high in the estimate of popes and princes. After his death, Oct. 10, 1151, the manner in which he disposed of the immense fortunes which he had amassed by great avariciousness, and which, instead of being bequeathed for distribution among the poor of his diocese, were given to his nephew, greatly annoyed his friends, and his cousin the pious St. Bernard, finally had the will annulled by pope Eugene III. He is said to have written several books, but there are no writings extant which can be definitely claimed as his. — Hist. Litt. de la France, 12, 408; Hoefer. — Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 438.

## Hugo of Monceaux[[@Headword:Hugo of Monceaux]]

             a distinguished French divine, was born in the early part of the 12th century. He was first monk at Vezelay, then abbé of St. Germain (1162). He was consecrated by pope Alexander III, April 21, 1163. The pretensions of bishop Maurice, of Paris, to assist in the ceremony were energetically opposed by Hugo, and this occasioned a controversy, of which a summary was published by Hugo. It forms a very interesting document of his time (printed in the collection of Andre Duchesne, vol. 4). In the same year (May 19) Hugo assisted at the Council of Tours, where he continued the controversy with Maurice, which was finally brought before the pope, who decided in favor of the monk. In 1165 (Aug. 22) Hugo was one of the abbes who presided at the baptism of the royal infant, later Philip Augustus. He was also about this time entrusted with various ecclesiastical offices, and in 1179 he attended the Council of Latran. He  died Mar. 27, 1182. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 25, 446; list. Litt. de la France, 13, 615; Gallia Christiana, 7 col. 442. (J. H.W.)

## Hugo of Nonant[[@Headword:Hugo of Nonant]]

             an English divine, was born at Nonant, in, Normandy, in the first half of the 12th century, and was educated at Oxford University. About 1173 he became archdeacon of Lisieux, and, towards 1185, bishop of Coventry. He was the Romish legate to England during the administration of the bishops of Durham and of Ely, in the absence of Richard to the East, and his influence caused the removal of these bishops in 1191. Only three years later he was himself driven from his see, but he was permitted in 1195 to return again, on paying a fine of 5000 marks silver to the royal treasury. He died in April 1198, during a voyage, or more probably, while in exile a second time. The recital of the disgrace of the bishop of Ely was written down by Hugo, and has been' published by Roger of Hoveden (Script. Rer. Ang. p. 702). It is a very violent pamphlet. — Hist. Litt. de la France, 15; — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 447.

## Hugo of Porto[[@Headword:Hugo of Porto]]

             was born about the middle of the 11th century. He was archdeacon of Compostelle until the bishopric of Porto was established in 1114, when Hugo was elected to this see. He was a member of several Church councils in 1122-25. He died about 1125. Of his writings, the History of the Church of Compostelle, which has never been printed, is of especial value for the history of his diocese. — Histoire Litt. de la France, 11, 115; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 435. (J. H. W.)

## Hugo of Potters[[@Headword:Hugo of Potters]]

             a monk of Vézelay, of whose life but little is known, flourished in the 12th century. He wrote a history of the monastery of Vézelay, which has been published by D'Achery in his Spicilegium, 3. He is also supposed by some to be the author of the Chronique des Colmtes de Nevers, inserted by Labbe in his Nouvelle Bibliothéque des Manuscrits. He died about 1 161. — fist. Litt. de la France, 7, 668 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 25, 439.

## Hugo of Rheims[[@Headword:Hugo of Rheims]]

             son of count Herbert of Vermandois, flourished in the 10th century. He was elected archbishop of Rheims when not quite five years old, and installed as head of the Church in that city by the power of his father; but only six years later Hugo was succeeded by the monk Artold or Artaud. Herbert, dissatisfied-with this appointment, made Artold prisoner, and called a synod at Soissons, which confirmed his son Hugo in the archbishopric. After Herbert's death Artold was liberated, and great contentions arose between the two incumbents of the same see. In 947 a synod was held at Verdun; but this, as well as another held at Mousson in 948, proved of no avail, as Hugo had secured for himself the intercession of the pope, who decreed that Hugo should hold the archbishopric. The friends of Artold finally resolved to hold a national synod, when Hugo was deposed and Artold installed. See Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 22, 252 sq.

## Hugo of Riremont[[@Headword:Hugo of Riremont]]

             a French theologian of the 12th century, of whose life but little is known, was the author of Epistola de Natura et Origine Aniace (in Martene, Anecdota, 1, 368), which is based on the real and supposed works of Augustine. Of Aristotle's treatise On the Soul he seems to have been unaware. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. 25, 447; Hist. Litt. de la France, 11, 113.

## Hugo of Sancto Caro[[@Headword:Hugo of Sancto Caro]]

             (Hugh of St. Cher), sometimes also called HUGO DE S.THEODORICO, an eminent French theologian, was born at St. Cher (whence his surname), a suburb of Vienne, France, about 1200. He studied theology and canon law at Paris, and in 1224 joined the Dominicans in the convent of St. Jacques (whence he is also called HUGO DE ST. JACABO), and in 1227 was made “provincial” of this order in France. He also taught theology in Paris, and was connected with several scientific undertakings. He was one of the commissioners who examined and condemned the Introdoctorius in Evang. aetern. of the Franciscan Gerhard, which developed the fanatical doctrines of Alb. Joachim of Flore (q.v.), and was active in the controversy of William de St. Amour with the mendicant orders. In 1245 he was made cardinal by Innocent IV, and died at Orvieto in 1263. The reputation of Hugo, however, rests chiefly upon his Biblical studies and writings. In 1236 he executed a revision of the text of the Latin Vulgate, an immense  labor for that age. A copy of this work preserved in the Nuremberg Library has this title: “Liber de correctionibus novis super Biblia, ad sciendum quae sit verior et communior litera, Reverendisimi patris et domini D. Hugonis, sacrae Rom. eccl. presbyteri cardinalis, sacrae theologiae professoris et de ordine praedicatorum.” His principal published works are Postillae in universa Biblia, a sort of brief commentary, prepared, however, without sufficient acquaintance with the original languages of the Bible (Basil. 1487, etc.) Speculum ecclesiae (Lyons, 1554). But his most important service to Biblical literature was his conception of the plan of a Concordance, which he executed, with the aid of many monks of his order, in his Sacroruma Bibl. Concordantiae (latest ed. Avignon, 1786, 2 vols. 4to). It is an alphabetical index of all the words in the Vulgate, and has formed the model of all Concordances to the Bible. It had the effect also of bringing the division into chapters and verses into general use. See Quétif et Echard, Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum, 1, 194 sq.; Hist. Litter. de la France, 19:38 sq.; Richard Simon, Nouvelles observations sur le texte et les versions du N. Test. 2, 128; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vol. 6; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 450; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. 2, 340.

## Hugo of St. Victor[[@Headword:Hugo of St. Victor]]

             said to have been count of Blankenburg, was born at Ein, near Ypres, about 1097, and educated in the convent of Hammersleben, near Halberstadt. When eighteen years of age he went to Paris, and joined the Augustines of St.Victor. He next became professor of theology, and his success as a teacher and writer was very brilliant. He died at Paris about 1141. Hugo was the most spiritual theologian of his time, and the precursor of the later Mystics. He recommended the use of the Bible for private devotion, and urged also its study on priests and teachers. He followed the theology of Augustine so strictly, and expounded it so successfully, that he was called Augustine the Second, and the Mouth of Augustine. “In Hugo we see the representative of a school distinguished in the 12th century for its hearty religious spirit, and its tendency to practical reform; a school which, though it united more or less the mystico contemplative with the speculative element, yet constantly kept up the contest with the predominant dialectic tendency of the times. If, in Abelard, we see those spiritual tendencies, which had been harmoniously united by Anselm, brought into conflict with each other, we see them once more reconciled in Hugo, but with this difference, that in him the dialectical element is not so strong as it was in Anselm. In his doctrinal investigations,  he often has reference to, and contends against Abelard, though without mentioning his name.

The empirical department of knowledge generally, and in theology the study of the older Church teachers, and of the Bible, was made specially prominent by Hugo, in opposition to one-sided speculation and innovating influences. Hs principle was, ‘Study everything; thou wilt afterwards see that nothing is superfluous.' Adopting the definition of faith in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he remarks, ‘Faith is called the substance of things invisible, because that which, as yet, is not an object of open vision, is by faith, in a certain sense, made present to the soul actually dwells in it. Nor is there anything else whereby the things of God could be demonstrated, since they are higher than all others; nothing resembles them which could serve us as a bridge to that higher knowledge.' Hence he declared that, in regard to the essence of true faith, much more depends on the degree of devotion than on the extent of knowledge; for divine grace does not look at the amount of knowledge united with faith, but at the degree of devotion with which that which constitutes the object of faith is loved” (compare Trench, Sac. Lat. Poetry, p. 54). In the struggle then raging between scholasticism (Bernhard) and mysticism (Abelard), Hugo inclined rather to mysticism; but, instead of favoring exclusively the one, he aimed rather at combining the two antagonistic doctrines, and giving birth to a new system, containing the better elements of both. It is for this reason that we oftentimes find one or the other of these doctrines quite promiscuously advocated in his writings. A tolerably accurate idea of Hugo's own doctrines, and of the peculiarities of his system, may be obtained by a study of his Summa sentfentiacrum. In man, says he, there is a threefold eye: the bodily eye, for visible things; the eye of reason, which enables man to see his own soul and its faculties; and the eye of contemplation, to view divine things. But by sin the eye of contemplation has become blinded, so that faith, which has the advantage of realizing without seeing, comes in its stead, and is the organ of the knowledge of the super terrestrial; while the eye of reason is not so greatly obscured as to excuse man's ignorance of divine things.

Thus he acutely distinguishes between what is possible to be known ex ratione, the “necessaria” (natural laws), and what secundum rationem, the “probabilia,” as well as what lies supra rationem, the “mirabilia” (divine things), and what must be acknowledged to be contra rationem, the “incredibilia.” Subject to knowledge are the necessaria, subject to faith the probabilia and mirabilia. Faith, he continues, is supported by reason, reason is perfected by faith. The certainty of faith is-  superior to opinion, but not to knowledge; still scire quod ipsum sit must precede faith; after faith comes intelligere quid ipsum sit. Purity of heart and prayer lead upon the steps of cogitatio, meditatio, and contemplatio, gradually to this higher intuition, which affords a real foretaste of heaven itself (compare Ebrard, Hdbuch. d. Kirch. u. Dogmen-Gesch. 2, 220). In his De sacramentis fidei, treating of redemption, he regards man as the end of creation, and God as the end of Iman. In the doctrine of the attributes of God, he considers, like Abelard, power, wisdom, and goodness as primary, but contradicts Abelard in his view that what God does is the limit of his omnipotence. With Anselm, he seeks to exhibit the doctrine of the Trinity by analogy with the human spirit. Spirit, wisdom, and love, says he, correspond to the three divine persons; but, while human wisdom and affection are liable to changes, the divine are not. On the doctrine of the will, he modified Augustine slightly. He distinguishes, in order to harmonize the freedom of man with the omnipotence of God, between willing per se, and the fixing of the will upon something definite; making the former free, and the latter bound by the moral government of God. God is consequently not auctor ruendi, but only ordinator incedendi.

Hugo was also the first to advance distinctly the idea of gratia superadita. Grace is both creatrix and salvatrix; of these, the creatrix involved the power to be free from sin, but positively to do good required gratia apposita. After the fall, gratia operats had to be added to gratia co- operans. The essence of original sin he holds to consist in ignorance and concupiscence. To the doctrine of the sacraments Hugo was the first of the scholastics to give definiteness. Unsatisfied with Augustine's definition of them as sacrae rei signum, he says, in his Summa, that the sacrament is visibilis borma invisibilis gratiae, in eo collatae. In his De sacramentis fidei he defines it still more distinctly as ‘a corporeal, actually perceptible element, which, by virtue of the divine institution, exhibits, and really contains, symbolically, invisible grace.” He also distinguishes three classes of sacraments: the first, those on which salvation especially depends (Baptism and the Lord's Supper); the second, those which are not necessary to salvation, but yet useful for sanctification-the number of these is indefinite; and, thirdly, that which serves to qualify for the administration of the other sacraments priestly ordination. To the first class, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, he gave not only especial prominence, but he laid particular stress on their careful observance. Of course he believed in transubstantiation, calling the mode of the change transitio, but he considered it a means of communion with Christ. The best edition of his  collected works is the first-Opera Omnia, stud. Badii Ascensii et J. Parvi (Paris, 1526, 3 vols. fol.). The later editions are Venice, 1588; Cologne, 1617; Rouen, 1648: all in 3 vols. See Neander, Ch. History 4, 401 sq.; Dupin, Eccl. Writers, 12th century; Oudin, Comment. de Script. Eccl. t. 2 p. 1138; Schmid, Mysticisimus di. Mittelalters (Jena, 1824); Liebner, Monographie über Hugo (Leips. 1832). A number of the writings attributed to Hugo are probably not his, and others of his real writings remain unedited. The task of selecting what are and what are not his genuine works has been undertaken by M. Haureau, of Paris, who will doubtless do it full justice. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 436 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 308 sq.; Maurice, Medieval Philos. p. 144 sq.; Tiedemann, Geist. der speculat. Philos. 4, 289 sq.; Tennemann, Gesch. d. Philos. 8, 206 sq.; Schröckh Kirchengesch. 24, p. 392 sq.; 29, 274 sq.; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines (see Index); Neander, Hist. of Christian Dogmas, 2, 467 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Hugo, Etherien[[@Headword:Hugo, Etherien]]

             a Tuscan theologian of the 12th century, contemporary of pope Alexander III, to whom he dedicated the principal of his works, lived some time at the court of Constantinople, and was highly esteemed by the emperor Comnenus. On the occasion of his conference with the Greek theologians he wrote his treatise De Haeresibus quas Graeci in Latinos devolvunt, also known under the title of le Imnmortali Deo, libri 3. It is published in the Lyons edition of the Library of the Fathers, vol. 22:col. 1198. The  same collection contains also a treatise of Hugo on the State of the Soul separated from the Body. — Dupin, Bibl. des Auteurs eccles. du douzieme siecle; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. 25, 448.

## Hugo, Herman[[@Headword:Hugo, Herman]]

             a distinguished Jesuit, born at Brussels in 1588, wrote several historical and theological works lie is celebrated on account of his Pia desideria emblematibus illustrata (1624, 8vo; 1629, 12mo; translated into English as Divine Addresses, by Edmund Arkwater. 3rd edit. corrected, London 1702, 8vo). He died of the plague at Rheinberg Sept. 10, 1629. See Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. 2, 1572; Nouv. Dict. Hist. p. 336.

## Hugo, archbishop of Lyons[[@Headword:Hugo, archbishop of Lyons]]

             was born about the middle of the 11th century, and was one of the most distinguished supporters of the Romish Church, in her efforts to exalt the papacy, during the last half of the 11th century, when Gregory VII and the emperor Henry were arrayed against each other. He was the papal legate (under pope Urban II) at the Council of Autun, A.D. 1094, who pronounced the ban on king Philip of France for the repudiation of his  lawful wife Bertha. Hugo died Oct. 7,1106. His only works are his letters, which, according to the Hist. Lit. de la France (9, p. 303), are very valuable to the historian of the 12th century. See Neander, Ch. Hist. 4, 123; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 429 sq.

## Hugociano, Fran?ois[[@Headword:Hugociano, Fran?ois]]

             a distinguished Roman Catholic prelate, according to some was an Englishman by birth, but according to others was born at Pisa in the first half of the 14th century. By an acquaintance which he formed with pope Boniface IX he was able to procure the archbishopric of Bordeaux in 1389, and some time after he was also made Boniface's legate to Gascogne, the kingdoms of Navarre, Castile, Leon, and Aragon.. In 1405 he was made cardinal by pope Innocent VII, and was employed by the papal chair in several theological controversies. He was especially prominent at the Council of Pisa in 1409. He died at Florence Aug. 14,1412. See Encyclop. Theol. 31, 1082 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Hugonet, Philibert[[@Headword:Hugonet, Philibert]]

             a distinguished Roman Catholic prelate who flourished in the 15th century was educated at the universities of Dijon, Turin, and Padua. and succeeded his uncle in the bishopric of Macon. He was made cardinal in 1473 by pope Sixtus IV, and died at Rome in 1484. See Encyclop. Theol. 31, 1083; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé. 25, 426.

## Huguceio of Pisa[[@Headword:Huguceio of Pisa]]

             SEE GLOSSATORES.

## Huguenots[[@Headword:Huguenots]]

             originally a nickname applied to the partisans of the Reformation in France. The origin of this word is rather obscure. Some derive it from Huguon, a word applied in Touraine to persons who walk at night in the street-the early French Protestants, like the early Christians, having chosen that time for their religious assemblies. Others derive it from a faulty pronunciation of the German Eidgenossen, signifying confederates, on account of the connection between the French Protestants and the Swiss confederates. who maintained themselves against the tyrannical attempts of Charles III, duke of Savoy, and were called Eignots. Others derive it from the part which the French Protestants took in sustaining Henry IV, the descendant of Hugues Capet, to the throne of France against the Guises. Another derivation is from the subterraneous vaults in which they held their assemblies, outside the walls of Tours, near a gate called Fourgon, an alteration from feu Hugon. This last derivation is strengthened by the fact that they were originally called “Huguenots of Tours.” Still others derive it from the name of a very small coin of the time of Hugues, to denote the vile condition of the Protestants. Thus the distinguished German philologist, Prof. Mahn, of Berlin, in his Etymologische Untersuchungen auf dem. Gebiete der Romanischen Sprachen, gives no less than fifteen supposed derivations, but inclines himself to the opinion that the word Huguenot was originally applied as a nickname to the early French Protestants, and that it was derived from Hughues, the name of some heretic or conspirator, and was formed from it by the addition of the French diminutive ending ot, like Jacot, Margot, Jeannot, etc.

At the very commencement of the Reformation in Germany, adherents of the cause of the Reformers sprang up in France, then under the government of Francis I. Under the powerful support which these French Reformers found in Margaret of Navarre, sister of the king, as early as 1523 Melchior Wolmar, a Swiss, preached the Gospel in the south of France, and Lutheran societies, at this time calling themselves Gospellers (q.v.), were organized by Gerhard Roussel and Jacob Lefevre. SEE FABER.

The circulation of Lefevre's New Testament by the thousand throughout France by peddlers from Switzerland, where copies were printed by Farel (q.v.), still further increased the number of the Reformers, and finally led to the promulgation of al ordinance by the Sorbonne, obtained from the king, for the suppression of printing (Feb. 26, 1535). In 1533, Calvin (q.v.), who had been invited to Paris by the rector of the University, began to  preach the new doctrines in that and other cities, and by his efforts greatly furthered the success of the French Protestants, who now began to be known by the name of Huguenots. Indeed, so numerous had they become, that to exterminate, if possible, by force, their doctrine before it should spread further, the Church resorted, by consent of the king, in 1545, to a massacre in the Vaudois of Province, which was accompanied by horrors impossible to describe. The new-view religion, however, made rapid progress in spite of all persecutions and men of rank; of learning, and of arms ranged themselves in its defense. “The heads of the house of Bourbon, Antoine, duke of Vendome, and Louis, prince of Conde, declared themselves in its favor. The former became the husband of the celebrated Jeanne d'Albret, queen of Navarre, daughter of the Protestant Margaret of Valois, and the latter became the recognized leader of the Huguenots. The head of the Coligny family took the same side. The Montmorencies were divided; the Constable halting between the two opinions, waiting to see which should prove the stronger, while others of the family openly sided with the Reformed. Indeed, it seemed at one time as if France were on the point of turning Protestant.” The Huguenots had become strong enough to hold a synod as early as 1559, and in 1561 cardinal De Sainte-Croix becoming alarmed, wrote the pope, “The kingdom is already half Huguenot,” while the Venetian ambassador Micheli reported to his government that no province in France was free from Protestants.

The Roman Catholic clergy, in influence at court, now decided to drive Henry II to a more determined opposition against the Huguenots by assuring him that his life was threatened. Cardinal de Lorraine, the head of the Church in France, declared to him that, “if the secular arm failed in its duty all the malcontents would throw themselves into this detestable sect. They would first destroy the ecclesiastical power, and the royal power would come next.” The immediate consequence was a royal edict, in 1559, declaring the crime of heresy punishable by death, and forbidding the judges to remit or mitigate the penalty. The fires of persecution, which had for a time been smoldering, again burst forth. The provincial Parliaments, at the instigation of the Guises, established Chambres ardentes for the punishment of Protestants; and executions, confiscations, and banishments became the order of the day throughout France. The death of Henry II, and the accession of Francis II, did not modify in the least the existing state of affairs. More violent measures, even were taken, none of which succeeded in eradicating the great eyesore of the adherents of the prevalent Church, whose office had now become that of the executioner and hangman. The  Protestants could endure these persecutions no longer, and resolved on open revolt. Protected by Antoine de Bourbon, king of Navarre, by the Condes, the Colignys, and also by such Romanists as were politically opposed to the Guises, the Huguenots formed a strong opposition. Having chosen Louis de Conde for their leader, they decided, Feb. 1, 1560, at Nantes, to address a petition to the king, and, in case it were rejected, to put down the Guises by force of arms, capture the king, and make the prince of Conde governor of the kingdom. The carrying out of this plan was entrusted to Georges de Barri de la Renaudie, a nobleman from Perigord. The conspiracy, however, was discovered through the treachery of count Louis de Sancerre, and the court was removed to Amboise. Some of the Huguenots followed it in arms, whence the whole affair became known as the conspiracy of Amboise. They were defeated, however, by the forces of the Guises, and 1200 of them, taken as prisoners, were executed. The Guises now aimed at the introduction of the Inquisition in France; but, at the instigation of the noble chancellor l'Hôpital [see Hôpital], the king gave to Parliament, by the edict of Romorantin, in May, 1560, the right of deciding in matters of faith, leaving, however, to the bishops the privilege of discovering and pointing out heretics.

During the minority of Charles IX, who ascended the throne Dec. 5, 1560, a boy only ten years old, the strife between the parties which divided the court became more violent, as the chancellor de l'Hôpital, on the assembling of Parliament in Dec. 1560, had exhorted men of all parties “to rally round the young king; and, while condemning the odious punishments which had recently been inflicted on persons of the Reformed faith, announced the intended holding of a national council, and expressed the desire that henceforward France should recognize neither Huguenots nor papists, but only Frenchmen.” Catharine de Medicis, the regent, who regarded it to her interest to balance the power of the two parties so as to govern both more easily, seconded the views of the chancellor. The two princes of Conde, who had been prisoners at Lyons after the affair of Amboise, were liberated. Antoine de Navarre was made constable of France, and a new edict was published in July 1561, which granted full forgiveness to the Huguenots, who, it was stated, were no longer to be designated by such nicknames. Finally, a conference was appointed (Sept. 3) for both parties to meet with a view to conciliation.

This conference is famous in history as the Conference of Poissy (q.v.). The Cardinal de Lorraine led the Roman Catholic theologians, but was signally defeated,  especially by the arguments of Theodore Beza. The Huguenots, emboldened by their success, now adopted the Calvinistic Confession, and, thus united Tose more strongly against Romanism, counting among their friends Catharine herself, who had been forced to their side by the machinations of the Guises. January 17, 1562, a royal edict was issued, guaranteeing to the Protestants liberty of worship. The Guises and their partisans now became exasperated. On Christmas day, 1562, about 3000 Protestants of Vassy, in Champagne, met for divine worship, and to celebrate the sacrament according to the practices of their Church. Vassy was one of the possessions of the Guises, and the bishop of Chalons complaining to Antoinette de Bourbon, an ardent Roman Catholic, she threatened the Huguenots, if they persisted in their proceedings, with the vengeance of her son, the duke of Guise. Undismayed by this threat, the Protestants of Vassy continued to meet publicly, and listen to their preachers, believing themselves to be under the protection of the law, according to the terms of the royal edict. On March 1, 1563, while the Huguenots of Vassy, to the number of about 1200, were again assembled for divine worship in a barn — as they had shortly before been deprived of their churches by Catharine who made this concession to Antoine de Navarre, in order to secure her support, still leaving them, however, free to assemble in the suburbs and in the country on the estates of noblemen — they were attacked by a band of armed men, led by the duke of Guise, and massacred. For an hour they fired, hacked, and stabbed amongst them, the duke coolly watching the carnage. Sixty persons of both sexes were left dead on the spot, more than two hundred were severely wounded, and the rest contrived to escape. After the massacre the duke sent for the local judge, and severely reprimanded him for having permitted the Huguenots of Vassy to meet. The judge entrenched himself behind the edict of the king.

The duke's eye flashed with rage, and, striking the hilt of his sword with his hand, he said, “The sharp edge of this will soon cut your edict to pieces” (Smiles, Huguenots, p. 48; comp. Davila, Histoire des Guerres civiles de France, 2, 379). This massacre was the match applied to the charge ready to explode. It was the signal to Catholic France to rise in mass against the heretics, and to Protestant France a warning for their lives. An army of Roman Catholics gathered, at the head of which were the duke of Guise, the constable of Montmorency, and marshal St. Andre, who seized the king and the regent under pretence of providing for their safety, proclaimed the Huguenots, who had at the same time been gathering at Orleans under Conde, rebels, and sent an army against them. Thus began  the first war of the Huguenots. September 11, 1562, the royal troops, after much bloodshed, took Rouen, and December 19 a battle was fought at Dreux, in which, after a terrible struggle, the Protestants yielded. One of the leaders of the Romanists, marshal St. André, fell in battle; another, the constable of Montmorency, was made prisoner by the Huguenots, and the leader of the latter in turn fell into the hands of the Guises. An exchange of prisoners, however, was immediately affected. The duke of Guise now marched against Orleans, but was assassinated in his own camp, Feb. 18, 1563, before he had been able to attack this great stronghold of the Protestants. The queen mother, realizing the loss which the Romanists, to whose side she had been forced by policy, had sustained in the death of the duke of Guise, and informed of a threatened invasion of the English on the coast of Normandy, concluded the peace of Amboise, March 19, by which the Protestants were again granted the privileges of the edict of 1562, with several additions. The armies now united, and made common cause against the English. As soon, however, as Catharine thought herself able to dispense with the aid of the Huguenots, whom she both feared and hated, and on whose destruction she was resolved, she again restricted the privileges conceded them in the edict of Amboise, formed a close alliance with Slain for the extirpation of heresy, and made attempts to secure the imprisonment, and death if possible, of Conde and of the admiral Coligny (q.v.). The Huguenots now became alarmed, and their leaders adopted the resolution, Sept. 29,1567, to secure, at the castle of Morceaux, the king's person, in whose name Catharine de Medicis was acting. The court, having received information of this decision, fled to Paris. Conde immediately followed, and, laying siege to the city, opened the second war of the Huguenots. After a siege of one month, Conde and the constable Montmorency met for battle, November 10, 1567, at St. Denis. Here 2700 Huguenots fought against no less than 20,000 royal troops. But so well did the Huguenots maintain their ground, that the victory was undecided.

The superior force of the royal troops led Conde to fall back into Lorraine, where he was re-enforced by 10,000 German warriors, under prince John Casimir. Conde with these forces now threatened Paris (Feb. 1568), and Catharine, in her fright, at once offered a treaty of peace, which was contracted at Longjumeau March 27, 1568, re-establishing the terms of the treaty of Amboise generally known as the petite paix (little peace) of Longjumeau. Notwithstanding this treaty, which both parties seem to have signed only because they felt under compulsion, Catharine continued all manner of persecutions against the Protestants. “The pulpits, encouraged  by the court, resounded with the horrid maxim that faith need not be kept with heretics, and that to massacre them was just, pious, and useful for salvation” (De Thou, Vie de Coligny, p. 350). In less than three months more than 3000 Protestants were either assassinated or executed. L'Hôpital, the friend of peace, and the upholder of the rights of all citizens without distinction of creed, who had become obnoxious to Rome and her adherents, was dismissed or forced to resign, and the seizure of Conde and Coligny resolved upon. Fortunately, however, for the Protestants, some of the royal officers were unwilling to be instruments in the massacre likely to ensue upon such an act, and Conde and Coligny received warning to flee for their lives. Rochelle, one of the strongholds of the Protestants, which had baffled all the attacks and plans of Catharine, was open to receive them, and thither they consequently directed their steps for safety, closely pursued by the royal blood-hunters. Measures had also been planned for entrapping the other leading Protestants, but they all failed in the execution. “The cardinal of Chatillon, an adherent to the Protestant cause, who was at his see (Beauvais), escaped into Normandy, took the disguise of a sailor, and crossed over to England in a small vessel, and there became of great service to the Protestant cause by his negotiations. The queen of Navarre, warned in time by Coligny, also hastened to Rochelle with her son and daughter, contributing some money and four thousand soldiers. The chiefs-in-general took the defensive, and immediately raised levies in their different provinces. The guerrillas maintained by these persons kept the Catholic army in full employment, and preserved Rochelle from a general attack till proper measures had been taken for its defense.” Catharine, outwitted in her diabolical attempts, now resolved to cajole the Huguenots into submission, and to this end published an edict declaring the willingness of the government to protect the Protestants in future, as well as to render them justice for the past. But so completely was this edict at variance with her conduct that it passed unnoticed. Enraged at this, she now promulgated several edicts against the Protestants, revoking every edict that had ever been published in their favor, and forbade, under the penalty of death, the exercise of any other religion than the Roman Catholic. This sudden revocation of all former edicts made her acts a public declaration that she was resolved on a war of religion, and the Huguenots, fortified in their strongholds, and with assistance, which they had obtained from Germany and England, now began the third religious war.

On March 13,1569, the two contending armies met in battle at Jarnac, near La Rochelle, in which the Catholics, headed by the duke of Anjou, later Henry III, defeated the  Protestants, making prince Conde a prisoner, whom they afterwards, on recognition in the camp, murdered in cold blood. The Protestants being thus left without a leader, the command was entrusted to Coligny. But the admiral, ever unselfish in his motives, finding that the army had become greatly dispirited by their recent reverses, urged Jeanne D'Albret, queen of Navarre, to give them her son as princely leader. She at once hastened to Cognac, where the army was encamped, and presented her son, prince Henry of Beam, afterwards Henry IV, then in his 16th year, and Henry, son of the lately fallen Conde, still younger, as the leaders of the cause, under the guidance of Coligny. Having obtained further re-enforcements from Germany, the Huguenots now laid siege to Poitiers, but on Oct. 3, 1569, were again defeated in a battle at Moncontour. Still sustained by means from England, Switzerland, and Germany, the Huguenots were enabled to take Nimes in 1569, to free prince Henry of Navarre and the eldest Henry of Conde in La Rochelle, to beat the royal army at Luqon and Arnay-le- Duc in 1570, to besiege Paris, and, finally, to dictate (Aug. 8, 1570) the terms of the peace of St. Germain-en-Laye, by which they were to hold La Rochelle, La Charitd, Montauban, and Cognac for two years, and were guaranteed liberty of worship outside of Paris, equality before the law, admission to the universities, and a general amnesty. “Under the terms of this treaty, France enjoyed a state of quiet for about two years, but it was only the quiet that preceded the outbreak of another storm.”

Having failed to crush the Protestants in the open field Catharine, now sought to accomplish her object by treachery and by a general massacre. In her artful wav she contrived a marriage between her own daughter Margaret of Valois, sister of the king, and Henry of Beam, king of Navarre, the proclaimed leader of the Huguenots. Jeanne d'Albret, the mother of Henry of Beam, and even the admiral Coligny, heartily concurred in the projected union, in the hope that it would be an important step towards a close of the old feud; but many of the Protestant leaders mistrusted Catharine's intentions, especially after her late attempt to assassinate Coligny, and they felt inclined to withdraw. None the less, as the preparations for the royal nuptials were in progress, the Reformers took courage, and resorted in. large numbers to Paris to celebrate the great, and to them so promising, event. Catharine now felt that her favorable moment had come. On the day after the marriage, which had been celebrated with great pomp, and was followed by a succession of feasts and gayeties, in which the principal members of the nobility,  Protestant as well as Romanist, were participating, and while the fears of the Huguenots were completely disarmed, a private council was held by Catharine and the king, in which it was decided that on a given night all the Protestants should be murdered, with the exception of Henry of Beam and the young prince of Conde. For the head of Coligny the king offered a special price of 50,000 crowns; but the attempt made upon his life failed to prove fatal to Coligny, and the hypocritical Charles even professed sorrow for the injury he sustained. SEE COLIGNY.

The night of August 24, 1572, was appointed for the massacre. About twilight in the morning of the 24th, as the great bell of the church of St. Germain was ringing for early prayers, to open the festival of St. Bartholomew's day, Charles, his mother, and the duke of Anjou sat in a chamber of the palace to give the signal for the massacre. A pistol-shot fired from one of the windows of the palace called out 300 of the royal guard, who, wearing, to distinguish themselves in the darkness, a white sash on the left arm and a white cross in their hats, rushed out into the streets, shouting “For God and the king!” and commenced the most perfidious butchery recorded in history. The houses of the Huguenots were broken in, and all who could be found murdered, the king himself firing from his windows on those who passed in the street. Some 5000 Huguenots, among them their great and noble leader, the admiral Coligny (q.v.), were thus killed in Paris; while many Roman Catholics met with the same fate at the hands of personal enemies, under the plea of their being inclined to Protestantism. The next day orders were sent to the governors of the provinces to follow the example of the capital. A few only had the manliness to resist this order, and in the space of sixty days some 70,000 persons were murdered in the provinces. SEE BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY.

Those who escaped took refuge in the mountains and at La Rochelle. Henry of Navarre was compelled to sign a recantation. The prince of Conde became a Roman Catholic, and Charles IX declared in Parliament that Protestantism was extinct in France. “Catharine de Medicis wrote in triumph to Alva (the ignominious commander of Philip's troops in the Netherlands), to Philip II of Spain, and to the pope, of the results of the three days' dreadful work at Paris. When Philip heard of the massacre, he is said to have laughed for the first and only time in his life. Rome was thrown into a delirium of joy at the news. The cannon were fired at St. Angelo; Gregory XIII and his cardinals went in procession from sanctuary to sanctuary to give God thanks for the massacre. The subject was ordered to be painted, and a medal was struck to celebrate the atrocious event, with the pope's head on one side, and on  the other an angel, with a cross in one hand and a sword in the other, pursuing and slaying a band of flying heretics. The legend it bears, ‘Ugonottorum Strages, 1572,' briefly epitomizes the terrible story.” The festival of St. Bartholomew was also ordered to be yearly celebrated in commemoration of the event. Not satisfied with these demonstrations at Rome, Gregory sent cardinal Orsini on a special mission to Paris to congratulate the king His passage was through Lyons, where 1800 persons had been killed, the bodies of many of whom had been thrown into the Rhone to horrify the dwellers near that river below the city (Smiles, Huguenots, p. 60).

Although deprived so suddenly of their leaders, and greatly weakened by the slaughter of great numbers of their best and bravest men, the Protestants gathered together in their strong places, and prepared to defend themselves by force against force. “In the Cevennes, Dauphiny, and other quarters, they betook themselves to the mountains for refuge. Ill the plains of the south fifty towns closed their gates against the royal troops. Wherever resistance was possible it showed itself.” Thus opened the fourth war of the Huguenots. The duke of Anjou, at the head of the Romanists, marched against the forts in the hands of the Huguenots. He attacked La Rochelle, but was repulsed, and obliged to retire from the siege, after losing nearly his whole army. The duke of Anjou becoming king of Poland, peace was concluded June 24, 1573, and the Protestants received as security the towns of Montauban, Nimes, and La Rochelle, besides enjoying freedom of conscience, though not of worship, throughout the kingdom. Charles IX falling ill, the so-called Conspiration des politiques was formed by the Huguenots, with a section of the Roman Catholic nobility, to depose the queen and the Guises, and to place on-the throne the chief of the Romanists, the duke of Alen9on, the youngest son of Catharine and of Francis II, who, from political motives, made common cause with the Huguenots. The leaders made arrangements with Henry of Navarre and the prince of Conde, Protestant princes, for the humiliation of Austria, and only a premature rising of the Protestants defeated the plan. Some of the conspirators were executed, D'Alenuon and Henry of Navarre were arrested, and Conde fled to Germany, where he returned to Protestantism, saying that his abjuration had been obtained from him by violence.

The fifth ‘war' of the Huguenots began under Henry II, the former duke of Alenlon, who became king of France in 1574. In this war the Roman  Catholics lost several strong towns, and were repeatedly defeated by the Huguenots. The prince of Conde returned to France with- a German army under the orders of John Casimir, and in March 1576, was joined by the duke of Alen9on, who was at enmity with the king. In the south, Henry:of Navarre was making rapid progress. The court became alarmed, and finally concluded the peace of Beaulieu, May 8, 1576, granting the Huguenots again a number of places of security, and freeing them from all restrictions in the exercise of their religion, also the promise to indemnify the German allies of the Huguenots for the war expenses. The Guises, thus frustrated in their political designs, instigated the inhabitants of Peronne, under the leadership of Humieres, to organize an association called the Holy League (q.v.), in 1576, for the defense of the interests of Romanism. The league rapidly increased, was supported by the king, by Spain, and the pope, and finally led to the sixth war of the Huguenots. The states, however, refusing to give the king money to carry it on, and the Roman Catholics being divided among themselves, the peace of Bergerac was signed in September, 1577. The conditions were the same as on the former occasions; but Catharine, in her anxiety to diminish the growing power of the Guises, entered into a private treaty with Henry of Navarre (at Nerac), and thus the Protestants were put in possession of a few more towns.

The seventh war of the Huguenots, called at court the Guerre des amoureux, was occasioned by the Guises, who instigated the king to demand back the towns given to the Protestants as securities, and to violate the treaty in various ways. Conde answered by taking Lafére in November 1579, and Henry by taking Cahors in April, 1580. The duke of Anjou intending to employ the royal forces in the Netherlands, and the Huguenots having met with several disastrous encounters with the Romanists, peace was concluded again at Flex, Sept. 12, 1580, and the Huguenots were permitted to retain their strongholds six years longer. A comparatively long interval of peace for France now followed.

But when the duke of Anjou (formerly of Alenaon) died in 1584, leaving Henry of Navarre, a Protestant, heir presumptive to the throne, the “Holy League” sprang again into existence under the influence of the adherents of the Guises, the strict Roman Catholic members of the Parliament, the fanatical clergy, and the ultra conservative party. The states, especially the sixteen districts of Paris (whence the association also took the name of Liguze des Seize), took an active part in it. Henry, duke of Guise, finally concluded a treaty with Spain, signed at the castle of Joinville January 3,  1585, creating a strong opposition to the succession of Henry of Navarre to the throne, and aimed even against Henry III, who seemed inclined to favor his brother-in-law. At the same time the Guises sought, though not altogether successfully, the approbation of pope Gregory XIII to the declaration of cardinal of Bourbon as heir to the throne, under the pretense that, as a faithful Catholic, he would aid his Church in extirpating heresy.

The real object of the duke of Guise, however, in proposing so old an incumbent for the throne, was to obtain for himself the crown of France, which seemed by no means a chimerical attempt, as he had received strong assurances of support from Spain. With the assistance of soldiers and funds sent him by his Spanish ally, the duke succeeded in taking several towns, not only from the Huguenots but also from the king. Henry III, hesitating to send an army against the duke of Guise promptly, was finally obliged to sign the edict of Nemours, July 7, 1585, by which all modes of worship except that of the Roman Catholic Church were forbidden throughout France. All Huguenot ministers were given one month, and the Huguenots six months, to leave the country, and all their privileges were declared forfeited. Though put under the ban as heretics by pope Sixtus V, Henry of Navarre and the prince of Conde prepared to resist the execution of the royal edict by force of arms. With the aid of money from England, and an army of 30,000 men sent from Germany, they took the field in 1587, and began the eighth war of the Huguenots, called also, from the names of the leaders, the war of the three Henrys. The Huguenots gained the battle of Contras, Oct. 8.1587, but were subsequently defeated, and their German allies were obliged to leave the country. The duke of Guise was left master of the field. He was not slow to grasp the power of the state, and obliged the king to sign the edict of reunion of Rouen, July 19, 1588, for the forcible submission of the Huguenots, and the exclusion of Henry of Navarre from the succession to the throne. The king, to whom it now became evident that the duke of Guise's aim was to secure the throne for himself, feigned acquiescence in the demand, called a Parliament at Blois in order to gain time, and there caused both of the Guises to be murdered (Dec. 23, 1588). Both Protestants and Roman Catholics were indignant at this act of treachery; the Parliament denounced the king as an assassin,' and Charles of Guise, duke of Mayenne, who had escaped the massacre, made himself master of several provinces, marched on Paris, and took the title of lieutenant general of the kingdom.

Catharine having died in 1589, Henry III made a treaty with Henry of Navarre, but was himself assassinated in the camp of St. Cloud by the monk Jacques Clement,  August 1, 1588. Henry of Navarre, a Protestant in belief, now succeeded to the throne under the title of Henry IV. His first step was to conquer for himself the possessions which had been wrested from his kingdom by the league and the Spaniards. But finding that he could obtain security of life and permanent possession of his dominion only by becoming a Roman Catholic, he abjured the faith of his fathers in the church of St. Denis, July 25, 1593. The duke of Mayenne, supported by Spain still continued the war against the king, but the latter having obtain I ed absolution from the pope in 1595, notwithstanding the efforts of the Jesuits, who had sold their influence to Spain, many forsook the league to join the royal standard, and the duke of Mayenne was finally obliged to make peace with the king. On April 15, 1598, Henry IV granted to the Protestants, for whom he ever cherished great affection, the celebrated Edict of Nantes (q.v.), consisting of ninety-one articles, by which the Huguenots were allowed to worship in their own way throughout the kingdom, with the exception of a few towns; their ministers were to be supported by the state; inability to hold offices was removed; their poor and sick were to be admitted to the hospitals; and, finally, the towns given them as security were to remain in their hands eight years longer. Pope Clement VIII became enraged at the concessions, and wrote Henry that “a decree which gave liberty of conscience to all was the most accursed that had ever been made.” His influence was also used to induce Parliament to refuse its approval to the edict, but it was finally registered in spite of Romish craftiness, Feb. 25, 1599.

After repeated attempts upon the life of the king, who had made himself especially obnoxious to the Jesuits, he was eventually assassinated by Ravaillac May 14, 1610. Henry's second wife, Mary of Medicis, and her son Louis XIII, still a minor, now assumed the government. The edicts of toleration were by them also ratified; but, notwithstanding this public declaration on their part, they were practically disregarded and violated. When prince Henry II of Conde rose against the king in Nov. 1615, the Protestants sided with him. By the treaty of London, May 4, 1616, their privileges were confirmed; but, at the instigation of the Jesuits, a new edict of 1620 restored Roman Catholicism as the official religion of Beam, and decided that the Huguenots should be deprived of their churches. The latter resisted, headed by the princes of Rohan and Soubise, and the war commenced anew (in 1621), but this time proved unfavorable to the Protestants; yet at the peace of Montpellier, Oct. 21,1622, the edict of Nantes was confirmed, and the Protestants only lost the right of holding  assemblies. In 1622, Louis XIII called Richelieu, whom the pope had lately created cardinal, to his councils. The power of the chancellor once firmly established, he determined to crush the Huguenots, whose destruction he considered essential to the unity and power of France, not so much on account of their religion, as on account of their political influence at home, and particularly abroad. He accordingly paid little attention to the stipulations of the treaty which the king had made with the Huguenots, and provoked them to rebellion by all possible means.

In 1625, while the government was involved in difficulties in Italy, the Protestants improved the opportunity and rose in arms. Their naval force, under Soubise, beat the royal marine in several engagements, and cardinal Richelieu found himself under the necessity of offering conditions of peace, which this time the Protestants very unwisely refused to accept. The cardinal now resolved to reduce La Rochelle, their stronghold. A powerful army was assembled and marched on the doomed place, Richelieu combining in himself the functions of bishop, prime minister, and commander-in-chief. The Huguenots of Rochelle defended themselves with great bravery for more than a year, during which they endured the greatest privations. But their resistance was in vain; even a fleet which the English had induced Charles I to send, under the command of the duke of Buckingham, to their assistance, was defeated off the Island of Rhé, Nov. 8, 1627. On the 28th of Oct. 1628, Richelieu rode into Rochelle by the king's side, in velvet and cuirass, at the head of the royal army, after which he proceeded to perform high mass in the church of St. Margaret, in celebration of his victory (compare Smiles, Hug. p. 118). The loss of La Rochelle was the deathblow to the Huguenots as a political power. As it was followed by the loss of all their other strongholds, Nismes, Montauban, Castres, etc., they were now left defenseless, and entirely dependent on the will of their conqueror. Richelieu, however, acting in a wise and tolerant spirit, refrained from pushing the advantages which he had gained to extremes, and advised the publication of an edict which should grant the Protestants freedom of worship, no doubt actuated to this course by considerations of state policy, as he had just entered into a league with the Swedes and Germans, and needed the good-will of his Protestant subjects as much as that of the Romanists. June 27, 1629, peace was concluded at Alais, and in the same year an edict followed, called “the Edict of Pardon,” granting to the Protestants the same privileges as the edict of Nantes, with exception of their strongholds, which were demolished, they ceasing to have political influence, and becoming distinguished as a party only by their religion. The  reign of Louis XIII closed in 1629, and his successor, Louis XIV, as well as cardinal Mazarin, the successor of Richelieu, who had died a short time before Louis, confirmed to the Protestants the rights and privileges granted them; and although they suffered from a gradual defection of nobles, who, finding them no longer available for purposes of faction, now rejoined the old Church, they nevertheless enjoyed comparative freedom from persecution.

The death of Mazarin in 1661 forms another epoch in the history of the Protestants. New edicts were published, intended to damage their financial interests, and to become impediments to the free exercise of their religion. Thus, in 1662, an edict forbade them to inter their dead except at daybreak or at nightfall. Another decree in 1663 excused new converts from payment of debts previously contracted with their fellow-religionists. In 1665 their children were allowed to declare themselves Roman Catholics-if boys, at fourteen; if girls, at twelve years of age; parents either to continue to provide for their apostate children, or to apportion to them a part of their possessions. In 1679 it was decreed that converts who- had relapsed into Protestantism should be banished, and their property confiscated. In 1680 Huguenot clerks and notaries were deprived of their employments, intermarriages of Protestants and Roman Catholics' were forbidden, and the issue of such marriages declared illegitimate, and incapable of succession. In 1681, to strike terror to the hearts of the Protestants, a royal declaration granted the right to Huguenot children to become converts at the age of seven years. “The kidnapping of Protestant children was actively set on foot by the agents of the Roman Catholic priests, and their parents were subjected to heavy penalties if they ventured to complain. Orders were issued to pull down Protestant places of worship, and as many as eighty were shortly destroyed in one diocese. The Huguenots offered no resistance. All that they did was to meet together and pray that the king's heart might yet be softened towards them. Blow upon blow followed. Protestants were forbidden to print books without the authority of magistrates of the Romish communion. Protestant teachers were interdicted from teaching anything more than reading, writing, and arithmetic. Such pastors as held meetings amid the ruins of the churches which had been pulled down, were compelled to do penance with a rope round their necks, after which they were to be banished the kingdom. Protestants were prohibited from singing psalms on land or water, in workshop or in dwellings. If a priestly procession passed one of their  churches while the psalms were sung, they must stop instantly, on pain of fine or imprisonment to the officiating minister.” In short, from the pettiest annoyance to the most exasperating cruelty, nothing was wanting on the part of the “most Christian king” and his abettors. The intention apparently was to provoke the Huguenots into open resistance, so as to find a pretext for a second massacre of St. Bartholomew.

In 1683, Colbert, who had been Louis's minister for several years, and who, convinced that the strength of states consisted in the number, the intelligence, and the industry of their citizens, had labored in all possible ways to prevent the hardships which Louis, led by his mistress, Madame de Maintenon, and his Jesuit confessor, Pere la Chaise, was inflicting on the Protestants, was removed by death. Military executions and depredations against the Protestants now began throughout the kingdom. “Pity, terror, and anguish had by turns agitated their minds, until at length they were reduced to a state of despair. Life was made almost intolerable to them. All careers were closed against them, and Protestants of the working class were under the necessity of abjuring or starving. The mob, observing that the Protestants were no longer within the pale of the law, took the opportunity of wreaking all manner of outrages on them. They broke into their churches, tore up the benches, and, placing the Bible and hymn-books in a pile, set the whole on fire; the authorities usually lending their sanction on the proceedings of the rioters by banishing the burned-out ministers, and interdicting the further celebration of worship in the destroyed churches” (Smiles, Huguenots, p. 135-6). Bodies of troops which had been quartered upon the Protestants to harass them, now made it a business to convert the Protestants.

Accompanied by Jesuits, they passed through the southern provinces, compelling the inhabitants to renounce their religion, demolishing the places of worship, and putting to death the preachers. Hundreds of thousands of Protestants, unwilling to renounce their religion, fled to Switzerland, the Netherlands, England, and Germany. In vain was it attempted to restrain this self-expatriation by cordons along the borders. Many Protestants also made an insincere profession of Roman Catholicism. These, on the slightest appearance of relapse, were put to death. On October 23, 1685, Loutis at last revoked the edict of Nantes. This revocation enacted the demolition of all the remaining Protestant temples throughout France; the entire proscription of the Protestant religion; the prohibition of even private worship under penalty of confiscation of body and property; the banishment of all Protestant pastors from the kingdom  within fifteen days; the closing of all Protestant schools; the prohibition of parents from instructing their children in the Protestant faith; the obligation, under penalty of a heavy fine, of having their children baptized by the parish priest, and educating them in the Roman Catholic religion; the confiscation of the property and goods of all Protestant refugees who failed to return to France within four months; the penalty of the galleys for life to all men, and of imprisonment for life to all women detected in the act of attempting to escape from France. “Such were a few of the dastardly and inhuman provisions of the edict of Revocation. It was a proclamation of war by the armed against the unarmed — a war against peaceable men, women, and children-a war against property, against family, against society, against public morality, and, more than all, against the right of conscience.” But when we take into consideration the private character of the king, how completely he was controlled by abandoned women and their friends, the Jesuits, who both feared and hated Protestantism, because, if successful, it would have been a death-blow to their own wicked association, we cannot wonder that great was the rejoicing of the Jesuits on the revocation of the edict of Nantes,” and that “Rome sprang up with a shout of joy to celebrate the event,” and that “Te Deums were sung, processions went from shrine to shrine, and the pope sent a brief to Louis, conveying to him the congratulations and praises of the Romish Church.”

The edict of Revocation was carried out with rigor; and but one feeling now possessed the minds of the Reformed, to make their escape from that devoted land. Disguised in every form which ingenuity could suggest, by every outlet that could anywhere be made available, through every hardship to which the majority were most unaccustomed, the crowd of fugitives pressed forward eagerly from their once dearly-loved country. It is impossible to estimate with accuracy the number of the refugees. Sismondi (Hist. de France) computed that the-total number of those who emigrated ranged front 300,000 to 400,000, and he was further of opinion that a like number perished in prison, on the scaffold, at the galleys, and in their attempts to escape; and Weiss (in his History of the French Protestant Refugees) thinks the number no less than 300,000 of those who departed the French kingdom. Vauban wrote, only a year after the Revocation, that France had lost 60,000,000 of francs in specie, 9000 sailors, 12,000 veterans, 600 officers, and her most flourishing manufactures; and Fénelon thus described the last years of the reign of Louis XIV: “The cultivation of the soil is almost abandoned; the towns and  the country are becoming depopulated. All industries languish, and fail to support the laborers. France has become as but a huge hospital without provisions.” The hospitable shores of England, which had long before this period furnished an asylum to the fugitive Huguenots, were now eagerly sought, and the Huguenots met with kindness and assistance from the English government. To Holland, also, and to Denmark, the best talent of the land, the most skilful artisans, directed their steps, and many great branches of industry of France, by the folly of a king who had taken his mistress as his first state counselor, received their deathblow. The industry of some places was for a time completely prostrated. Indeed, more than a century really passed before they were restored to their former prosperity, “and then only to suffer another equally staggering blow from the violence and outrage which accompanied the outbreak of the French Revolution.” In fact, this last terrible event may justly be considered not only as a providential retribution, but likewise a natural penalty for the civil wrongs inflicted upon the Protestants, since these cruel measures exiled from the country a large part of its piety and intelligence, by which alone that catastrophe might have been averted.

From the vicinity of Nismes, where the Huguenots had always been very numerous, thousands, unwilling either to abjure their faith or to leave their native country, betook themselves to the mountains of the Cevennes, and continued the exercise of their religion in secret. These, and the mountaineers of the Cevennes, among whom sprang up a sect which displayed a remarkable fanatical enthusiasm, under the name of Camisards (q.v.), finally commenced to wage war against the royal forces, which was called the War of the Cevennes, or the Camisard War. It was successfully carried on until 1706, when, in consequence of the war of succession with Spain, they were allowed a respite, the royal troops being otherwise employed. Their number now rapidly augmented, especially in Province and Dauphiny, and thus, notwithstanding all the persecutions which the Protestants had suffered, about two millions continued to adhere to their religion (Charles Coquerel, Hist. des Eylises du Desert, Par. 1841, 2 vols.).

A partial repose which the Huguenots now enjoyed for more than ten years greatly increased their numbers, especially in Province and Dauphiny; but in 1724, Louis XV, who had ascended the throne in 1715, at the instigation of the ever-conspiring Jesuits, issued a very severe ordinance against them. The spirit of the age, however, was too much opposed to persecution to suffer the edict to work the mischief intended. The governors of several  provinces tolerated the Protestants, and as early as 1743 they resumed their assemblies in the mountains and woods, and celebrated their Mariages du desert. In 1744 new edicts were issued against them, requiring upon those who had been baptized or married in the desert (as it was called) a repetition of the rite by the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church. Even the Roman Catholics themselves soon became loud in opposition against these violent measures, and the persecution gradually ceased. Men like Montesquieu and Voltaire successfully advocated mild treatment, and it must be conceded that the Protestants owed much of the toleration they afterwards met with to Voltaire's treatise on the subject, written in 1763, and to his procuring the release of John Calas (q.v.). Their position was still further improved on the accession of Louis XVI to the throne (1774). In 1787 an edict was issued (which the Parliament, however, registered only in 1789) by which the validity of Protestant baptisms and marriages was recognized, though subject to some purely civil regulations; they were given cemeteries for the burial of their dead, were allowed to follow their religion privately, and granted the rights of citizenship, with the exception of the right of holding any official position.

After the breaking out of the French Revolution in 1789, a motion was made in the General Assembly to admit the Protestants to equal rights with the Roman Catholics: this motion was at first rejected, but finally carried. A decree of 1790 restored the Protestants to the possession of all the rights and property they had lost subsequently to the revocation of the edict of Nantes. The “Code Napoleon” placed the-Protestants equal in their civil and political rights with the Roman Catholics, as, in fact, they had already been for more than fifteen years; and though, after the restoration of the Bourbons, especially in 1815 and 1816, the priests succeeded in exciting the populace of the department of the Gard to rise and murder the Protestants, the authorities conniving at the crime, still they remained equal to the Roman Catholics in the eye of the law. The spirit of persecution, however, continued, though in a somewhat weaker form, both among the people and the government of the Bourbons, even in that of the Orleans family, though, after the July Revolution of 1830, the reformed charter of France had proclaimed universal freedom of conscience and of worship, a principle which was reasserted in 1848. (For the present state of Protestantism in France, SEE FRANCE. )

The descendants of the Huguenots long kept themselves a distinct people in the countries to which their fathers had fled, and entertained hopes of a  return to their country; but as time passed on these hopes grew fainter, while by habit and interest they became more united to the nations among whom it fell to their lot to establish a new home. The great crash of the first Revolution finally severed all the ties that bound them to their native land. They either changed their names themselves by translating them, or they were changed by the people among whom they resided by mispronunciation. Thus, in England, “the Lemaltres called themselves Master; the Leroys, King; the Tonneliers, Cooper; the Lejeunes, Young; the Leblancs, White; the Lenoirs, Black; the Loiseaus, Bird. Thenceforward the French colony in London no longer existed. At the present day, the only vestige of it that remains is in the Spitalfields district, where a few thousand artisans, for the most part poor, still betray their origin, less by their language than by their costume, which bears some resemblance to that of the corresponding class in Louis XIV's time. The architecture of the houses they inhabit resembles that of the workmen of Lille, Amiens, and the other manufacturing towns of Picardy.

The custom of working in cellars, or in glazed garrets, is also borrowed from their original country” (Weiss, p. 283, 284). In our own country also, where the Huguenots settled at an early day, their descendants may be found, particularly in New York, Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas; and, as in England, they have become naturalized, and their names have been changed, until it has become difficult to recognize them. “Their sons and grandsons, little by little, have become mingled with the society which gave a home to their fathers, in the same way as in England, Holland, and Germany. As their Church disappeared in America, the members became attached to other evangelical denominations, especially the Episcopal, Reformed Dutch, Methodist, and Presbyterian. The French language, too, has long since disappeared with their Church service, which used to call to mind the country of their ancestors. French was preached in Boston until the close of the last century, and at New York the Huguenot services were celebrated both in French and English as late as 1772. Here, at the French Protestant church, which succeeded the Huguenot years since, the Gospel was preached in the same language in which the prince of French pulpit orators, Saurin, used to declare divine truth two centuries ago. The Huguenot church at Charleston, South Carolina, alone has retained in its primitive purity, in their public worship, the old Calvinistic liturgy of its forefathers. The greater part of the exiled French families have long since disappeared, and their scattered communities have been dissolved by amalgamation with the other races around them. These pious fugitives have  become public blessings throughout the world, aid have increased in Germany, Holland, and England the elements of power, prosperity, and Christian development. In our land, too, they helped to lay the firm corner- stones of the great republic whose glory they most justly share” (G. P. Disosway, The Huguenots in America, as Appendix to Harper's edition of Smiles's Huguenots, p. 442). See Beza, Hist. des Eglises reform mees en France (Antw. 1580, 3 vols); Thuane, Historia sui temporis (Paris, 1620, and often, 7 vols.); Davila, Storia delle guerre civili di Francia (Venice, 1630); St. Aignon, De el'tat des Protestants en France (Paris, 1808; 2nd ed. 1818); Lacretelle, Histoire de France pendant les guerres de la religion (Paris, 1814,1815,4 vols.); Benoit, Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes (Delft, 1693, 2 vols.); Rulhiere, Eclaircissements historiques sur les causes de la Revocation de l'Edit de Nantes (Par. 1788, 2 vols.); Court de Gebelin, Hist. des troubles des Cevennes (Villefranche, 1760, 2 vols.); Browning, Hist. of the Huguenots (London 1828, 2 vols.) Brockhaus, Conversations-Lexikon, 8. 129 sq.; Pierer, Universal Lexikon, 8:583 sq.; Weiss, History of the French Protestant Refugees; Coquerel, Histoire des Eglises du desert (Paris, 1857, 2 vols. 8vo) Felice, Histoire des Protestants de France; Peyrat, Histoire des Pasteurs du Desert (Paris, 2 vols. 8vo); Crowe, History of France (London, 1867,1869, 5 vols.); Smiles, The Huguenots (3rd edit. London, 1869); London Rev. July, 1855 Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 450 sq. For special biographies, Haag, La France Protestante (Par. 8 vols. 8vo)} Michelet. Louis XIV et la Revocation de l'Edit de Nantes (Paris, 1860, 8vo); Michelet, Guerres de Religion (Par. 1857, 8vo); Drion,. Histoire Chronol. de l'Eglise Protestante de France (2 vols. 12mo); Smedley, History of the Reformed Religion in France (London, 1827, 3 vols.); Athanase Coquerel fits, Les Forcats pour la obi (Paris, 1868). (J. H. W.)

## Hugues[[@Headword:Hugues]]

             SEE HUGO.

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

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, who died at Celle, July 22, 1878, doctor of theology, is the author of, Erbauliche und belehrende Betrachtungen uber das Gebet des Herrn (Celle, 1832): — Das Verfahren der reformirten Synode Niedersachsens, etc. (Hamburg, eod.): — Unionsgedanken (1843): — Entwurf einer vollstandigen gottesdienstlichen Ordnung zum Gebrauch fur evangelisch-reformirte Gemeinden (1846): — Die Confederation der reformirten Kirchen in Niedersachsen, Geschichte und Urkunden (1873). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:593. (B.P.)

## Huguet, Marc Antoine[[@Headword:Huguet, Marc Antoine]]

             a French prelate, was born at Moissac in 1757. He entered the sacred order in his youth, and became curate of a little village in Auvergne. In 1791 he was elected bishop of Creuse. During the French Revolution he was a member of the Legislature, and of the National Convention, and voted for the death of the king. Complicated in several popular disturbances, and  conspiring against the established government, he was arrested in 1795, and imprisoned at Ham for several months. Engaging in another conspiracy which failed to accomplish its object, he was again arrested, condemned to death, and executed Oct. 6, 1769. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. 25, 466.

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

             a learned English divine, who flourished in the 17th century, was fellow of Magdalen College, rector of Beckington and Hornblotton, Somersetshire. He published Lectures on the Lord's Prayer (London 1626, 4to). He was also a very superior scholar of exegesis, and a prominent assistant on Walton's Polyglot Bible. His services were highly commented upon by bishop Walton himself. See Wrangham, Proleg. 2, 203; Todd, Life of Walton, p. 269 sq.; Stoughton (John) Ecclesiastes Hist. of English. (London, 1870, 2 vols. 8vo), 2, 332; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 58.

## Huisseau, Jacques d1[[@Headword:Huisseau, Jacques d1]]

             a French theologian, was born in the latter half of the 16th century. He entered the monastery at Marmoutiers, and was made great prior of his order in 1594. Refusing in 1604 admission to Matthieu Renusson, visitor of the order of St. Benoit for the province of Tours, he was deposed from his position, deprived of all power, and excommunicated. He, however, succeeded in regaining his position. At the time of his death, Sept. 24,1626, he was provincial of the Benedictine congregation of exempts in France. He published, for the use of his abbey, a collection of prayers, entitled Enchiridion Precum (Tours, 1607) — Supplement a la Chronique des Abbés de Marmoutiers (1615) — Chronique des Prieurs (1625). This last-named work Huisseau translated himself into Latin. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 25, 468 sq.

## Huisseau, Jacques d2[[@Headword:Huisseau, Jacques d2]]

             another French minister and theologian, who flourished in the 17th century. But little is known of his early life. He was professor of theology at Saumur and rendered himself famous by his La disciple des Eglises Reformees de France, avec uen recueil des observations et questions sur la plupart des articles tiré des actes des synodes nationaux (1650,4to, probably published at Saumur; Geneva, 1666, 4to; Bionne, near Orleans, 1675, 12mo). The great success which followed this work estranged from him many of his acquaintances and associates in the Church, who envied  his prospects, and who even presented complaints against him in 1656, meeting, however, with no encouragement from the superiors of Huisseau. In 1670 he published La Reunion du Christianisme, ou la matiere de rejoindre les Chretiens dans une seule Confession de foi (Saumur, 12mo). It favored the union of all who believed in Christ as the God or man Savior, and was attacked by L. Bastide in his Remarques sur un livre intitule “La reunion,” etc. (1670, 12mo), and it was condemned by the Synod of Anjou. Huisseau endeavored to explain his views, but the synod declined to give him a hearing, and finally deposed him from the priesthood. He immigrated to England, and was reinstated as minister without being obliged to retract. He died there before 1690, about 70 years of age. — Biographie Universelle, 57, 441.

## Huit, Ephraim[[@Headword:Huit, Ephraim]]

             a dissenting English minister, of whose early life but little is known. He was minister for some time at Roxhall, Warwickshire, and finally immigrated to this country, and settled in New England. He became minister of a congregation at Windsor, Conn., and died in 1644. Huit published, in his mother country, Prophecie of Daniel explained (London 1643, 4to) Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 913.

## Huitzilopochtli[[@Headword:Huitzilopochtli]]

             (also Mexitli), in Mexican mythology, is the supreme deity of the nation, the bloodthirsty god of war. The two sons of a widow, Coatlicue, observing that their mother was pregnant, and being afraid of the disgrace of an, illegitimate birth, resolved to murder her. Just as they were in the act of doing so, Huitzilopochtli sprang out of her body, a god of war, carrying in his left hand a shield, and in his right a spear. He soon conquered his mother's murderer, and pillaged their houses. When the Aztecs left their dwelling-places, travelling for one hundred and sixty-five days, to find a more southern country, they were directed by this god, whose idol they carried before them, to the valley of Mexico. Here they built a wooden temple, which later became the site of one of stone. In this temple his image stood, frightful and terrible. The most horrible sacrifices were made in honor of this god. Hundreds of slaves and prisoners were offered to him. At the dedication of his temple, seventy thousand human beings were sacrificed, by opening the breast when yet alive, tearing out the heart, and offering it to the idol on a golden spoon. SEE MEXICAN RELIGION.

## Hujukhu[[@Headword:Hujukhu]]

             in the mythology of the Caribbeans, is the heaven which lies above the visible heaven. There are all earthly joys in tenfold greater measure. The trees bear better fruit, the fields flowers more beautiful. Fishing is easier and less dangerous. Every man has many wives who care for him. Sickness and death are not known there.

## Hukkok[[@Headword:Hukkok]]

             (Hebrew Chukkok', חֻקֹּק, incised; Sept. Ι᾿κώκ 5. r. Ι᾿ακανά,Vulg. Hucusa), a town on the border of Naphtali, near Zebulon, not far from Jordan, west of Aznoth-Tabor, and in the direction of Asher (Jos 19:34); elsewhere written HUKOK (חוּקֹק, Chukok', 1Ch 6:75; Sept. Ι᾿ακάκ,.Vulg. Hucac); but probably, in this latter passage, erroneously for HELKATH (Jos 21:35; comp. Jos 19:25). Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. Icoc), as well as Benj. of Tudela (2, 421), allude to it. It is doubtless identical with the modern small village Yakuk, between the plain of Genesareth and Safed (Robinson's Researches, 3 App. p. 133; Biblioth. Sac. 1843, p. 80), said to contain the grave of Habakkuk (see new edit. of Researches, 3, 81; and comp. Schwarz, Palestine, p. 182).

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

             Yakuk, the modern representation of this site, is laid down on the Ordnance Map three and three quarter miles north-west of the shore of the Sea of Galilee (from Khan Minveh), and is described in the accompanying Memoirs (1:364, 420) as a "stone-built village, containing about two hundred Moslems; surrounded by arable land, and situated at the foot of a hill. There is a good spring, and many cisterns are found in the village. Guerin says that, in 1875, the village was reduced to about twenty houses. There are traces of ancient remains at this village, and a rockcut birkeh [pool] with steps leading down to it, also cut out of the rock."

## Hukok[[@Headword:Hukok]]

             (1Ch 6:75). SEE HUKKOK.

## Hul[[@Headword:Hul]]

             (Heb. Chul, חוּל, a circle; Sept. Οὔλ), the name of the second son of Aram (B.C. cir. 2414), who appears to have given name to an Aramsean region settled by him (Gen 10:23; 1Ch 1:17). Josephus (Ant. 1, 6, 4) places it (Ουλον, as Havercamp corrects- for ῎Οτρος) in Armenia, comparing it with the district Cholobotene, according to the conjecture of Bochart (Phaleg, 2:9). Michaelis, taking the word in the sense of a hollow or valley (Spicileg. 2:135) understands Caele-Syris (comp, Josephus, Ant. 12, 7, 1; 1Ma 3:13); and Schultens (Parad. p. 282) refers it to the southern part of Mesopotamia, from the signification sand. More probable seems the identification proposed by Rosenmüller (Aterthum. 1, 2, p. 253) with the district now called Huleh, around the lake Merom, at the upper sources of the Jordan (Burckhardt, Tray. 1, 87), which, although a small tract and no proper part of Aramaea, seems to be supported by the rendering of Saadias (compare Schwarz, Palestine, p. 41, note), According to Dr. Robinson, the name el-Huleh, as used by the present inhabitants, belongs strictly to the northern part of the basin in which the lake lies, but is commonly extended to embrace the whole; its different quarters fall within various jurisdictions, and have special names (Researches, 3:342). A great portion of this northern tract near the lake is now an impassable marsh, probably in consequence of the choking up of the streams by rubbish (Bibliotheca Sacra, 1846, p. 200, 201). The remainder is a very fertile plain, forming a valley near Banias (Robinson's Researches, new ed. 3:396-398). Traces of the name Hul or Huleh appear in the district Ulatha Οὐλάθα around Paneas, mentioned by Josephus as originally belonging to Zenodorns, and bestowed by Augustus upon Herod (Ant. 15:10, 3, comp. Wars, 1, 20, 4) SEE MEROM.

## Hulda or Holda[[@Headword:Hulda or Holda]]

             (the friendly, or benignant), a German goddess, known in the old legends as “Frau Holle,” was originally the goddess of marriage and fecundity, worshipped and invoked by maids and wives; she sent bridegrooms to the former and children to the latter. She was represented as a beautiful white woman, surrounded by great numbers of children, in her favorite haunts in the depths of the sea or the hearts of hills. She was also the patroness of agriculture and domestic life, with its manifold employments. Later she appears in the fairy tales of Hesse and Thuringia probably written by Christian priests as an old and ugly woman, with a long nose, large teeth, coarse hair, and a companion of the wild and the roaming. But even in these last tales traces of kind and pleasant ways are left. — Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8, 480; Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 453. (J. H.W.)

## Huldah[[@Headword:Huldah]]

             (Hebrew Chuldah', חֻלְדָּה, weasel; Sept. ῎Ολδαν, Josephus Ο᾿λδά, Ant. 10, 4, 2), wife of Shallum, a prophetess, who, in the reign of Josiah, abode in that part of Jerusalem called the Mishneh, where the book of the law was discovered by the high-priest Hilkiah. B.C. 623. This prophetess was consulted respecting the denunciations which it contained. She then delivered an oracular response of mingled judgment and mercy; declaring the not remote destruction of Jerusalem, but promising Josiah that he should be taken from the world before these evil days came (2Ki 22:14-20; 2Ch 21:4). Huldah is only known for this circumstance. She was probably at this time the widow of Shallum, a name too common to suggest any information; he is said to have been “keeper of the wardrobe,” but whether the priestly or the royal wardrobe is uncertain. If the former, he must have been a Levite, if not a priest. SEE HARHAS. As to her residence בִּמַּשְׁנֶה, in the Mishneh, which the A.V. renders “in the college,” there is no ground to conclude that any school or college of the prophets is to be understood. The name means second or double; and many of the Jews themselves (as Jarchi states) understood it as the name of the suburb lying between the inner and outer wall of Jerusalem; perhaps 1. q. “the lower city,” or Acra (q.v.). It is safest to regard it as a proper name denoting some quarter of Jerusalem about which we are not certain, and, accordingly, to translate in the mishneh, for which we have the precedent of the Septuagint, which has ἑν τῇ Μασεν῝. The place of her residence is mentioned probably to show why she, being at hand, was resorted to on  this urgent occasion, and not Jeremiah, who was then probably away at his native town Anathoth, or at some more distant place. There were gates of the temple in the middle of the southern wall, called “the gates of Huldah” (Mishna, tit. Middoth, 1, 3), which, if they were so named from any connection with tile prophetess, may indicate her residence on Ophel. SEE SHALLUM; SEE JOSIAH.

## Huldericus, Augustensis Episcopus[[@Headword:Huldericus, Augustensis Episcopus]]

             who flourished in 860, was a scholar of Adalbert, and descended from the counts of Kilbury and Döllinger. He is known by his letter addressed to pope Nicholas against the celibacy of the clergy (Eistola de Cleri caelibatu). It was translated into English, and published about the time of the Reformation (in 16mo), without date. — Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica; Clarke, Succession of Sac. Literature, 2:531.

## Huldrer[[@Headword:Huldrer]]

             in Norse mythology, are the mild, womanly elves, or women of the woods, who are supposed to be seen in the mountains of snow in Norway. SEE HOLDA.

## Huldrich, Jean Jacques[[@Headword:Huldrich, Jean Jacques]]

             a Swiss theologian, born at Zurich in 1683, belonged to a family of which several members have distinguished themselves as theologians and philologists. SEE HULDERICUS.

He devoted much of his time to the acquisition of Hebrew, and went to the universities of Holland to pursue a course of study in the Oriental languages. On his return to his native place in 1706 he was made pastor of the House of Orphans. In 1710 he was appointed professor of moral science at the Gymnasium of Zurich. His scholarship was of a superior order, and he was frequently solicited to accept a professorship at the universities of Heidelberg and Groningen. He died at Zurich May 25, 1731. He published Historia Jeschua Nazareni, a Judeis blaspheme corrupta, ex manunscripto hactenus inedito Heb. et Lat., cum tiotis (Leyd. 1705, 8vo) — Gentilis Obtrectator, sive de calumniis gentilium in Judaeos Commentarius (Zurich, 1744,4to), a collection of sermons, etc. — Hoefer. Nouv. Biog. Gen. 25, 470 sq.

## Hull Hope[[@Headword:Hull Hope]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born March 13, 1763, in Worcester County, on the eastern shore of Maryland. His early education was rather neglected, and he was apprenticed to a carpenter at Baltimore. In this city he was converted, and entered the itinerancy in 1785. He was first appointed to Salisbury, North Carolina. With the exception of a brief period spent in New England, his time was given to the introduction of  Methodism in the Southern States. His last appointment was the Savannah Circuit, Georgia. In 1794 he traveled with bishop Asbury, and located in 1795. He died October 4,1818, at Athens, Ga. Hull possessed wonderful power over those who came within his influence, and was one of the most eloquent ministers in the Methodist Episcopal Church in his day. His piety was deep, and many were converted under his labors. During his active work in the ministry, he secured for himself a pretty good education, and was at one time able even to assume the duties of teacher of Latin. He was also one of the first and strongest supports of the University of Georgia, which was founded during his residence at Athens. — Stevens, Memorials of Methodism, chap. 9; Boehm, History Reminisc. p. 366; Sprague, Annals Azet. Pulpit, 7, 112 sq. (J. H.W.)

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

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born in 1812.1 He took holy orders in 1836, was sub-regent at Aschaffenburg in 1839, in 1865 cathedral-dean at Wurzburg, and died June 22, 1870. He published Die Idee des Gottlichen in der Wissenschaft und die sogenannte freie Wissenschaft (Wurzburg, 1867). After his death were published three volumes of his Volkspredigten, edited by Joseph Huller (Augsburg, 1871- 73). (B.P.)

## Huln[[@Headword:Huln]]

             (UILLAUME, a Roman cardinal, born at Étain. in the diocese of Verdun, in the latter half of the 14th century. He was at one time archdeacon of Verdun and later of Metz. He was an attendant at the Council of Basle in 1440, and was one of the supporters of the antipope (Amadeus of Savoy) Felix V, who gave him the cardinal's hat. Nicholas V confirmed the cardinal after the schism Dec. 19, 1449. He died at Rome Oct. 28,1455. — Migne, Dict. Theol. 31, 1092.

## Hulot, Henri Louis[[@Headword:Hulot, Henri Louis]]

             a French theologian, was born at Avenay March 1, 1757. He was professor first at the seminary, then at the University of Rouen, where he was obliged to resign at the outbreak of the Revolution, and to flee from persecution which threatened him. He went to Gand, where he was made grand vicar, until the entrance of the French into the Netherlands in 1794 forced him again to flee. He went successively to Minster, Erfurt, Dresden, and Augsburg. When he was permitted to return to his native land, h.1 was appointed curate of the parish of Avan9on, and later of Antigny. After twenty years of assiduous labor at this parish, he was made canon, and finally grand vicar and official at Rheims. He died Sept. 1, 1829. His principal writings are Lettre aux catholiques de Reims (in Latin and French, Gand, 1793, 8vo) — Lettre despretres Français Al'eveque de Gand — Collect. des brefs du pape Pie VI (Augsb. 1796) — lettres à M. Schrofenberg, eveque de Freysingue et de Ratisbonne, enfaveur des pretres Franf. (1796, 8vo) — Etat les Cathol. Angl. (1798, 8vo) —  Salisburgensis cujusdetm religiosi delecta castigfatio, seu vindicice cleri Gallicani exulis (1800, 8vo):Gallicanorum Episcoporumn dissensus innocuus (1801, 8vo) — Sedis apostolicae Triumphus, seu sedes apostolica, protectore deo, semper invicta (Laon, 1836, Svo). Several controversial works and sermons were left in MS. — Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Gen. 25, 479.

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

             was born at Middlewich in 1708. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge; obtained a small curacy in the country; and, upon the death of his father in 1753, withdrew to his paternal inheritance in Cheshire, where, owing to his delicate state of health, he lived in retirement until his death, Dec. 14, 1790. He bequeathed estates in order to found two divinity scholarships in St. John's College, the Hulsean Prize Essay, and to endow the offices of “Christian Advocate” and “Christian Preacher” in the University of Cambridge. The duties of the “Christian Preacher,” or Hulsean Lecturer according to this appointment, were to deliver and print twenty sermons every year, either upon the evidences of Christianity, or the difficulties of Holy Scripture.

The funds being inadequate, the lectures were not commenced until 1820, and in 1830 the number of sermons to be delivered in a year was reduced to eight. In 1860 the office of “Christian Advocate” was changed to a professorship, called the Hulsean Professorship of Divinity. Bishop Ellicot was the first incumbent in the new chair. At present the office of the Hulsean Lecturer or Preacher is annual, and the duty of the lecturer to preach not less than four, nor more than six sermons in the course of the year. Among the most important of the Hulsean sermons are the following: Blunt (J.J.), Principles for the proper Understanding of the Mosaic Writings, 1832 (London 1833, 8vo); Alford, The Consistency of the Divine Conduct in revealing the Doctrines of Redemption, 1841 (Cambridge, 1842, 8vo); Trench, The Fitness of the Holy Scripture for unfolding the Spiritual Life of Man, 1845 (Cambridge, 1845, 8vo); Trench, Christ the Desire of all Nations, 1846 (Cambridge, 1846, 8vo); Wordsworth, On the Canon of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and on the Apocrypha, 1847 (London 1848, 8vo); Wordsworth, Lectures on the Apocalypse, critical, expository, and practical, 1848 (London 1849, 8vo). — Darling, Cyclopedia Bibliographica, 1, 1573; Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 453; Farrar, Hist. of Free Thought, p. 207.

## Hulsean Lectures[[@Headword:Hulsean Lectures]]

             SEE HULSE, JOHN.

## Hulsemann, Johann[[@Headword:Hulsemann, Johann]]

             a German theologian, was born in Ostfriesland in 1602, and was educated at the universities of Wittenberg and Leipzig. In 1629 he was appointed professor of theology at the University of Wittenberg; he was also a member of the “Leipziger Convent” of 1630, and of the “Colloquium” at Thorn in 1645, where he performed the office of moderator theologorum Augustance confessionis. In 1646 he was called as professor of systematic theology to the University of Leipzig. He died in 1661. In connection with his son-in-law, Calovius (q.v.), he carried on the controversy against Calvinism as a strictly orthodox Lutheran. An able polemic and a thoroughly educated theologian, who in many respects may be compared to the scholastics of the 16th century, Hulsemann distinguished in his attacks against Calvinism (in his work Calvinismus irreconciliabilis, Witt. 1644, Lpz. 1646), incited by bishop Joseph Hall's Roma irreconciliabilis, the fundamental articles and the presuppositions from the possible inferences. His most celebrated work is Breviarum theolog. exhibens praecipuas fidei controversias (1640, and often), and in an enlarged form, Extensio breviarii theologici (1655, 1657). — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4, 304 sq.; Theol. Univ. Lex. 1, 372; Gass, Protest. Dogmat. 1, 318 sq.; 2, 38 sq.; Tholuck, Geist. d. luther. Theol. Wittenberg's, p. 164 sq.

## Hulsemann, Wilhelm[[@Headword:Hulsemann, Wilhelm]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born March 7, 1781, in Westphalia, and died at Iserlohn, February 1, 1865, superintendent and doctor of philosophy. He published, Die preussische Kirchenagende in Hinsicht auf die evangelische Kirche uberhaunpt (Essen, 1825): —  Evangelische Hauspostille (Dusseldorf, 1827, 2 volumes; 2d ed. 1844): — Die Geschichte der Auferweckung des Lazarus (Leipsic, 1835): —Christus und die Sunderin am Jacobsbrunnem (1837): — Predigten und Gesange uber die Epistebn der Sonn- und Festtage des Kirchenjahres (1838, 2 volumes). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:275, 333, 358; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:594; Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 7:66 sq. (B.P.)

## Hulsius, Anton[[@Headword:Hulsius, Anton]]

             a Dutch divine, was born in 1615, at Kilda, in the duchy of Bergen. In 1644 he was preacher and professor of Hebrew at Breda, afterwards professor of theology and of Hebrew at Leyden, and died February 27, 1685. He wrote, Disputatio Epistolica cum Jacobo Abendana super Haggaei 2:9 (Leyden, 1666): — Abrahamelis Comm. in LXX Hebdomadibus Danielis cum Confutatione (1653): — Authentia Codicis Ebraei Sacri Contra Criminationes Is. Voss Vindicata (1662): — Theologia Judaica (1653): — Nomenclator Biblicus Hebraeo-Latinus (1659): — Compendium Lexici Hebraici (1674): — Liber Psalmorum Haebr. cum Annotationibus (1650): — Oratio de Linguae Hebraicae Origine et Propagatione (1641). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:416 sq.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Steinschneider, Bibl. Handbuch, s.v. (B.P.)

## Hulsius, Heinrich[[@Headword:Hulsius, Heinrich]]

             a Reformed theologian of Holland, was born October 10, 1654. He studied at different universities, was in 1670 doctor of theology, in 1681 professor at Duisburg, and died March 29, 1723. He wrote, Summa Theologiae, seu Liber de Molitione et Opere et Sabbatho Dei (Leyden, 1683): — Vita Ithiel, Uchal et Samuel sive in Ultima Parsemiastae Salomonis Capita Commentarius Propheticus (1693): — De Vallibus Prophetarum Sacris (Amsterdam, 1701): — Comment. in Israelis Prisci Praerogativas ac bona sub V.T. Dissert. 15 Inclusus, etc. (1713). See Dunkel, Nachrichten, 3:320; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:417. (B.P.)

## Human Depravity[[@Headword:Human Depravity]]

             SEE DEPRAVITY.

## Human Sacrifices[[@Headword:Human Sacrifices]]

             SEE SACRIFICE.

## Human Soul[[@Headword:Human Soul]]

             SEE SOUL.

## Humanists[[@Headword:Humanists]]

             (from the Latin litrae humanores, polite letters) was the name assumed in the beginning of the 16th century by a party which, with Erasmus and Reuchlin at their head, was especially devoted to the cultivation of classical literature, and which, as not infrequently happens in the enthusiasm of a new pursuit, was arrayed in opposition to the received system of the schools, not alone in the study of the classical languages, but even in philosophy, and eventually in theology. See Chambers, Cyclop. vol. 5.; Gieseler, Ch. Hist. 3, 406 sq.; Kurtz, Ch. Hist. 2, 35, 127.

## Humanitarians[[@Headword:Humanitarians]]

             I. A name given to those several classes of anti-Trinitarians who believe that Christ was nothing more than a mere man, born according to the usual course of nature, and one who lived and died according to the ordinary circumstances of mankind. As such are generally regarded the early Judaizing sects of Ebion, Cerinthus, and Carpocrates; but this classification is by no means justified, especially as regards the Ebionites (q.v.), who taught that at the baptism in the Jordan the Messianic calling first arose in Jesus, and that at this time a higher spirit joined itself to him, investing him with miraculous powers, that left him only at the hour of his departure from this world. The earliest recorded author of the purely humanitarian theory is generally regarded as Theodotus (q.v.) of Byzantium (A.D. 196), surnamed the Tanner, who, having denied Christ in time of persecution, defended himself afterwards by declaring that, in so doing, “he had denied not God, but man.”

A contemporary of Theodotus, Artemon (q.v.), in like manner believed in God the creator, but held that Christ was a mere man, born of a virgin, however, and superior to the prophets, and asserted that such had been the universal belief of Christians till the time of Zephyrinus. 202 (comp. Liddon, Our Lord's Divinity [Bampton Lect. 1866], p. 425). These opinions must of course be distinguished from the doctrines of the Arian sects, even the lowest schools of which admit the pre-existence of Christ, and his pre-eminence among the creatures of God. SEE ALOGI: SEE ARIANS; SEE ARTEMONITES; SEE SOCINIANS; SEE UNITARIANS.

II. The name Humanitarian is also sometimes applied to the disciples of St. Simon (the successor of Baboeuf, who flourished under Napoleon I), and in general to those who look to the perfectibility of human nature as their great moral and social dogma, and ignore altogether the dependence of man upon supernatural aid, believing in the all-sufficiency of his own innate powers. A party of Communists who arose in France about 1839 also took the name from the newspaper L'humanitaire, their organ — Buck, Theol. Dict.; Pierer, Univers. Lex.; Chambers, Cyclop.; Shedd, History of Doctrines, 1, 259. SEE COMMUNIST.

## Humanity[[@Headword:Humanity]]

             the exercise of the social and benevolent virtues; a fellow-feeling for the distresses of another. It is properly called humanity because there is little or  nothing of it in brutes. The social affections are conceived by all to be more refined than the selfish. Sympathy and humanity are universally esteemed the finest temper of mind, and for that reason the prevalence of the social affections in the progress of society is held to be a refinement of our nature,

## Humanity and Christianity[[@Headword:Humanity and Christianity]]

             SEE CHRISTIANITY.

## Humanity of Christ[[@Headword:Humanity of Christ]]

             SEE CHRIST, PERSON OF; SEE CHRISTOLOGY; SEE INCARNATION.

## Humbert[[@Headword:Humbert]]

             (by some improperly called HUBERT), a French cardinal, was born probably towards the close of the 10th century. He entered the order of the Benedictines at Moyen-le-Moutier in 1015. In 1049 pope Leo IX, who had been bishop of Toul, the diocese in which the monastery of Moyen-le- Moutier was situated, called Humbert to Rome, and he was first created archbishop of Sicily, and in 1051 cardinal bishop of Silva Candida. Humbert is believed to be the first Frenchman who received the cardinal's hat. He was intimately associated with the pope, was admitted to all his councils, and was the Roman ambassador to Constantinople to effect a union with the Eastern or Greek Church. Under pope Victor III he was made chancellor and librarian at the Vatican, which offices he continued to hold under the pontifical successors Etienne III, Nicolas II, and Alexander II. He was at the head of the party opposed to Berenger, and obliged him to make a confession of faith at the synod at Rome in 1059. He died about 1063. He wrote a number of works, among others a treatise against the Simonians (published by Martene in his Anecdota), and a narrative of his embassy to Constantinople. This narrative and two other polemical works against the Greek Church have been printed several times, especially in the  Annales Ecclesiastici of Baronius. All his writings have been collected and printed by Migne, vol. 143 (1853), p. 929-1278. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 483; Migne, Encyclop. Theol. 31, 1092 sq.

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

             general of the order of Dominican monks, was born at Romans, France, about 1200. He was early sent to Paris to be educated as a clergyman, and soon became prominent as an assistant preacher to the celebrated Jourdan. He entered the order in 1224, and was made priest at Lyons. In 1242 he was elected “provincial” of Tuscany, in 1244 “provincial” of. France, and in 1254 general of his order. In 1263, however, he abdicated this high position, and retired as a simple monk, first to a monastery at Lyons, and later to a like institution at Valencia. The patriarchate of Jerusalem was offered him in 1264, but he declined it. He died July 14,1277. He wrote Officium Ecclesiasticum univetsum tam nocturnum quan diurnum, ad usum ordinis praedicatorum: — Expositio super regulam St. Augustini: — Expositio super Constitutiones ordinis fratrum praedicatorum, not quite complete: — Liber de instructione oficialium ordinis fratrum praedicatorum (printed several times; the best edition, Lyons, 1515): — De Eruditione Praedicatorum, also entitled De Arte praedicandi, has been inserted in the Collection of the Church Fathers, vol. 25: Liber de Praedicatione Crucis, an appeal to the Christians against infidels: — Liber de eis quae tractanda videbantur in Concilio generali Lugduni celebrando, of which extracts were published by Martene in his Thesaurus Anecdot. — vol. 7, etc. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 25, 483 sq.

## Humbert (3)[[@Headword:Humbert (3)]]

             a French theologian, was born at Gendrex, near Paris, about the middle of the 13th century. In July 1296, he was elected abbé of Prulli, in the diocese of Sens, and he died there March 14, 1298. He wrote several theological and philosophical works, all of which remain unprinted. His most important work is Sententice super libros Metaphysicae Aristotelis, a commentary on Aristotle's metaphysics. — Hoefer, Nouveau Biog. Géneralé, 25, 485; Hist. Litt. de la France, 21, 86.

Humble Access Prayer Of,

is a phrase in some churches for a divine supplication made by the priest kneeling at the altar before the consecration.

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

             the most notable man of letters and speculation in Scotland during the last century. He was almost equally eminent as a metaphysician, a historian, and a political essayist. He was born at Edinburgh April 26 (O. S.), 1711. On his father's side he was related to the earls of Home or Hume, and through his mother he was the grandson of Sir David Falconer, lord president of the court of justice. His father was not rich, but he was-an independent proprietor, owning the estate of Ninewells, in Berwickshire. But David was the younger son, and was entitled to only a small share of his father's substance. He was left an orphan in his infancy, and, with his brother and one sister, depended on the sole care of his excellent mother. He passed without special note through the University, and was designed for the Scotch bar, but he had no taste for the profession; and having spent seven years at home at Ninewells, after leaving college, ostensibly engaged in studying the sages of the law, he visited Bristol in 1733 with some mercantile aspirations.

Thence, after a few months of disgust, he passed over into France, and took up his abode first at Rheims, and afterwards at La Flechi. Here he devoted himself to philosophy for life, and composed his Treatise of Human Nature. It was in a discussion with one of the Jesuit fathers of La Flecchi that the celebrated argument against miracles flashed upon his mind. The Treatise of Human Nature was published in 1737, after his return to England. He says himself of it; “It fell dead-born from the press.” The family home at Ninewells was again his shelter, and here he renewed his studies and extended his speculations. In 1742 he published the first part of his Essays, Moral and Political, which, in his opinion, met with considerable favor. Still, he had obtained no assured provision in life. He was disappointed in an application for a professorship in the University of Edinburgh, and in 1745 he accepted the charge of the marquis of Annandale. With him he resided twelve unpleasant months, but he derived some emolument from the association. In 1746 he became secretary to general St. Clair, whom in 1747 he attended on his military embassy to Vienna and Turin. The Inquiry concerning the Human Understanding a recast of the first part of his first treatise-was published while he was at Turin in 1749 he resought his old refuge at Ninewells, and occupied himself with the composition of his Political Discourses, and his Inquiry into the principles of Morals. The former constituted the second part of his essays; the latter was a revision and modification of the second part of his Treatise of Human Nature, which has always been better known in  Germany than in England. In 1751, on the marriage of his brother, he abandoned the family seat, and, in company with his sister, made a new home in Edinburgh. He applied for a chair in the University of Glasgow, but again failed. In 1752 he accepted the post of librarian to the Advocates' Library in Edinburgh, but transferred nearly all his small salary to the blind poet, Blacklock.

He now engaged in the composition of his History of England, which had attracted his regards some years before. The partisan temper in which it is designed is revealed by the period which he first took up. He plunged in medias res, or, rather, he commenced nearly at the end, and worked backwards. From its publication Hume experienced such hostility and disappointment that he would have changed his name and retired to the Continent if he had not been prevented by the occurrence of the Seven Years' War. The first volume of the History of England appeared in 1754; the second in 1756 or 1757. Between the two was published the Natural History of Religion (8vo), which was answered by bishop Hurd. The History of the House of Tudor came out in two volumes in 1759; and in 1761, two volumes, containing the early history of England, completed the work, which, before its conclusion, was recognized as an English classic, and still is justly so regarded. If the work encountered various and violent opposition, it gradually achieved eminent popularity, and rendered the author “not only independent, but opulent.” Being now “turned of fifty,” he resolved to spend the remainder of his life in philosophical dignity and comfortable retirement. The resolve was of no long duration. The marquis of Hertford invited Hume, with whom he was personally unacquainted, to become his secretary of legation at the French court. The distinguished philosopher and historian was received with marked attentions and flatteries by the eminent persons assembled at Paris. It was the period when the union of infidel sentiments with literary renown had become the rage in the most brilliant salons. After two years lord Hertford was recalled, but Hume remained as charge d'affaires till 1766 and received a pension of £400 for his diplomatic services.

The “canny Scot” had become a rich old bachelor, and was able to extend his patronage and aid to Rousseau on his arrival in England, and even to procure for him the offer of a pension from the crown. These favors ended in a quarrel between the protected and the protector, of which an account was given by the latter in a pamphlet. About this time Hume became undersecretary of state, and held the office for two years, returning to Edinburgh in 1769. Here he passed the remaining years of his life, with the exception of a brief visit to Harrowgate and Bath, and it was shortly before  setting out on this journey, undertaken for the restoration of his declining health, that he wrote his Autobiography. He had been attacked with diarrhea in the spring of 1775, and succumbed to the disease on Sunday, Aug. 25, 1776. He was serene in life, he was equally serene in death. If Christianity had no consolations for an expiring foe, the grave presented no terrors to the man who had cavilled about all religion. Yet few persons will assent to the unmeasured eulogy of Adam Smith, who “considered him, both in his life, and since his death, as approaching as nearly to the idea of a perfectly wise and virtuous man as perhaps the nature of human frailty will permit.” But Smith, notwithstanding this testimony, refused to publish the Dialogues or, Natural Religion, though a special legacy of £200 was attached to such publication. They were not given to the world until 1779, and then by the agency of Hume's nephew. His Life, written by himself with a Letter from Adam Smith giving an Account of his Death, appeared in 1777 (Lond. 8vo). A better view of the life and the character of Hume than this edition of his autobiography is given in the Autobiography of Alexander Carlyle (Edinb. and N. Y. 1860).

The philosophy of Hume underwent three revisions with, however, scarcely any essential change. It has been customary to enlarge upon the acumen and logical precision of Hume, but these qualifications resolve themselves, on close scrutiny, into mere dialectical subtlety. If his artifices imposed upon others, he was often the victim of them himself, and he was crushed to the earth beneath the ruins of the systems which he overthrew. Hume's fundamental thesis is that all human knowledge (no pun is designed) consists of impressions and ideas. Impressions are the direct perceptions of sense: ideas are only the relics or signs of former impressions. Impressions are always particular, and incapable of variation: ideas are consequently the unalterable specters of former sensations. The theory of Locke is accepted and simplified by discarding the office of reflection. The theory of Berkeley is accepted and expanded by applying his argument against matter to mind, and denying all evidence of the existence of either.

The result is a thoroughly Pyrrhonistic doubt. The application of these postulates, for postulates they are, generated the whole philosophy of Hume. There are only two objects of knowledge-the relations of ideas, and the relations of impressions or facts. The former relations are concerned with unchanging signs, and are therefore simple, and readily discerned by the discussion of thought; but the latter always involve the principle of cause and effect, because due to some exciting  influence. The relation of cause and effect is nothing more than the habitual succession of events; because all our complex conceptions are linked together only by customary association, and it is impossible that particular objects should produce a general idea. General ideas are, indeed, in possibilities, for all abstractions are only vague images of particulars. Ideas may represent either realities or phenomena, but no investigations can reach beyond the phenomenon to the reality.

This reality is a pure delusion- a figment; it is only the name arbitrarily given to a system of connected impressions and ideas. There is neither reality nor substance, neither matter nor mind; at least, there is nothing to authorize the assertion of their existence except as factitious phenomena. The connection of phenomena, or of the conceptions corresponding with them, is accepted as truth in consequence of a primordial tendency of the mind, called belief. This belief, however, imports nothing more than the tenacity of certain notions in consequence of the vivacity of the impressions by which they are produced. The credibility of facts is thus resolved into their apprehensibility, and becomes merely a question of probabilities. This constitution of belief, and this complexion of knowledge, result from the mode in which the materials of thought are obtained. They are gathered by observation and experience, and are distinguished into two, and only two classes, according to their relative strength-impressions and ideas; the former being the primary and more forcible perceptions; the latter being the derivative and weaker, and being only copies of impressions. Further than this it is impossible to carry speculation. The mind, the instrument of thought, lies beyond; but its nature is discernible only in its operations, and these constitute its whole nature so far as any attainable knowledge is concerned. Thus the human mind is the mold and measure of all knowledge, and yet that mind is itself only a problematical phenomenon. A good-humored skepticism is accordingly the sole result of philosophy.

From this brief and imperfect synopsis of Hume's doctrine-so well summed up by Mackintosh: “He aimed at proving, not that nothing was known, but that nothing could be known” it is easy to recognize the mode in which he reached its most startling applications. He might assert the moral sense, but the assertion was nugatory, for there could be no foundation for morals, nor anything more valid than expediencies growing out of particular impressions and their observed sequences. He might admit the possibility, even the probability, of divine intelligence, but could not tell whether it was “ane or mair,” since revelation could not be substituted for sensible  perceptions. The scheme had no room for the admission of miracles, as they were unsupported by ordinary experience, and human testimony was fallacious. All this mischievous error is the appropriate fruit of the tree on which it hangs. Many refutations of these positions have been attempted, and a vigorous warfare has been waged on the principles supposed to form the foundation of this philosophy; but too little attention has been paid to the ambiguity of the terms employed, and to the vacillation with which they are used by the conjuror.

A strict definition of “miracles” and “experience,” and a rigid adherence to such definition, will reduce the celebrated argument against miracles to a bald petitio principii, or to a manifest absurdity. Hume endeavored to prove that “no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle,” and the reasoning employed for this purpose is, that ‘a miracle being a violation of the laws of nature, which a firm and unalterable experience has established, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can be; whereas our experience of human veracity, which (according to him) is the sole foundation of the evidence of testimony, is far from being uniform, and can, therefore, never preponderate against that experience which admits of no exception.” This boasted and plausible argument has, with equal candor and acuteness, been examined by Dr. Campbell, in his Dissertation on Miracles, who justly observes that, so far is experience from being the sole foundation of the evidence of testimony, that, on the contrary, testimony is the sole foundation of by far the greater part of what Mr. Hume calls firm and unalterable experience; and that if, in certain circumstances, we did not give an implicit faith to testimony, our knowledge of events would be confined to those which had fallen under the immediate observation of our own senses. Hume maintained that a miracle is contrary to experience; but, in reality, it is only different from ordinary experience. That diseases should generally be cured-by the application of medicine, and sometimes at the mere word of a prophet, are facts not inconsistent with each other in the nature of things themselves, nor irreconcilable according to our ideas. Each fact may arise from its own proper cause; each may exist independently of the other; and each is known by its own proper proof, whether of sense or testimony. To pronounce, therefore, a miracle to be false, because it is different from ordinary experience, is only to conclude against its existence from the very circumstance, which constitutes its specific character; for if it were not different from ordinary experience, where would be its singularity? or what  proof could be drawn from it in attestation of a divine message? SEE MIRACLES.

The importance and value of Hume's political essays have rarely been appreciated. They are the best of all his productions, but they have been almost disregarded in the estimation of his genius. They exercised a considerable but unacknowledged influence on the age nearest his own. It is impossible to ignore the obligations of the Constitution of the United States to the essay on the Idea of a Perfect Commonwealth. Lord Brougham does no more than justice to the author when he declares that “Mr. Hume is, beyond doubt, the author of the modern doctrines which now rule the world of science, which are to a great extent the guide of practical statesmen; for no one deserving the name of legislator pretends to doubt the soundness of the theory.” Many of the intellectual vices, as all the excellences of Hume-his speculative audacity, his regard for material comfort and independence, his want of enthusiasm, the restriction of his view to observation and experience, his acceptance of expediency as a principle, his acquaintance with courts and with affairs of state, his knowledge of history, his philosophic habits, his slow progress from pinched to easy circumstances, all favored proficiency in this branch of inquiry.

Many of these characteristics were, however, adverse to his career as an historian. True, in Hume's History of England, the vigorous, easy, and unaffected style, the vivacity of the delineations, the arrangement of the topics, the disposition of the personages, the variety and penetration of the reflections, are all admirable. The narrative is always fascinating, if the expression is rarely idiomatic, sometimes ungrammatical, and often provincial. But to the highest merits of history it possesses no claim. It is hastily, carelessly, and inaccurately composed; it is incurious of truth; it disregards authentic sources of information from indolence and indifference; it is equally partial and prejudiced. In form, it is a model of historical art, but not of the art in its highest conception; in substance and in spirit it displays easily every sin and corruption, which a historian should abhor. His writings called forth many antagonists, and, in fact, may be said to have given rise to the Scotch metaphysical school of Common Sense, so called, of which the best exposition, and, at the same time, the best answer to Hume's skepticism, is to be proved by Reid's Complete Works, with Notes by Sir William Hamilton (Edinburgh, 1846, 8vo). Beattie's Essay on Truth, and Oswald's Appeal to Common Sense (Edinb. 1772, 2 vols.), were also written in reply to Hume.  See The Philosophical Works of David Hume, including all the Essays, and exhibiting the more important Alterations and Corrections in the successive Editions published by the Author (Edinburgh and Boston, 1854, 4 vols. 8vo); Burton, Life and Letters of David Hume (Edinb. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo); Letters of eminent Persons addressed to David Hume (Edinb. and Lond. 1820, 4to); Brougham, Lives of Men of Letters and of Science (London, 1845, 8vo); Tennemann, Manual History of Philos. § 376; English Cyclop. s.v.; Morell, Hist. of Mod. Philosophy, pt. 1, ch. 3; Sir Wm. Hamilton, Lect. on Metaphysics; Mackintosh, Hist. of Ethical Philos. p. 146 sq.; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 914 sq.; Lewes, History of Philos. 2, 305 sq.; Tennemann, Gesch. d. Philos. 11, 425 sq.; Ritter, Christl. Philos. 8. 6, 7, ch. 2; Cousin, Hist. the la Philos. moderne, Leçon 11; Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, p. 148 sq.; Edinb. Rev. Jan. 1847; Quart. Review, 73, 292; 77, 40; 1844, p. 315 sq.; Blackwood's Magazine (on the argument against miracles), 46, 91 sq.; June, 1869; Brit. Review, Aug. 1847, p. 288; 1868, p. 77 sq.; New Englander, i, 169,172; 2, 212; 4, 405; 18, 168; North American Review, 79, 536 sq.; Christ. Remembrancer, Oct. 1868, p. 272; Brit. and For. Evang. Rev. Oct. 1865. p. 826 sq.; Contemp. Review, May, 1869, art. vi, reprinted in the Amer. Presbyt. Rev. July, 1869, art. 8. (G. F. H.)

## Humerale[[@Headword:Humerale]]

             SEE AMICE.

## Humes, Thomas William, D.D[[@Headword:Humes, Thomas William, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman and educator, was born at Knoxville, Tennessee, November 22, 1815. After graduating from the East Tennessee College in 1830, and studying theology for two years with Reverend Stephen Foster of Knoxville, he entered Princeton Seminary in 1832. In 1837 he joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, and was ordained in 1845. With the exception of two years, he preached until 1869. From 1865-83 he was president and professor of moral philosophy and Christian evidences; 1884-86 engaged in home mission work; 1886-92 librarian of the Lawson McGhee Library of Knoxville. He died January 16, 1892. See Necrological Report of Princeton Theol. Sent. 1893.

## Humiliati[[@Headword:Humiliati]]

             a monastic order founded about 1134 by some Italian noblemen whom the emperor Henry II had sent as hostages to Germany. In 1151 they were transformed into canons of St. Benedict, and as such received the sanction of pope Innocent III in 1200. A corresponding order of nuns was afterwards organized in Milan by a lady name(d Blassoni (whence they were also called Nuns of' Blassoni). Notwithstanding the numerous disorders they occasioned, these nuns did great good as nurses, etc.; their rule was adopted in some ninety-eight convents, but they were finally suppressed by Pius V in 1571. A few convents, without particular attention to dress and observances of the old order, still remain in Italy. The habit of the order consisted in a white dress and cloak, to which a white scapulary was afterwards added; also a small hood. The nuns' dress was white, with gray under-garments, or vice versa. — Pierer, Univers. Lexikon, 8, 609;  Fehr, Allgem. Gesch. der Mönchsorden (Tüb. 1845), p. 132 sq.; Helyot, Geschichte d. Klöster u. Ritterorden, 6; 179 sq.; Aschbach, Kirchen- Lexikon, 3, 347; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 5, 396 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Humiliation of Christ[[@Headword:Humiliation of Christ]]

             (in the language of the older Reformed theologians, the status humiliations sive exinanitionis), the “humbling of himself” (Philippians ii, 8) to which the son of God submitted in accomplishing the redemption of mankind. As to the question whether the Logos, at the incarnation, voluntarily divested himself of his divine self-consciousness in order to develop himself in purely human form, SEE KENOSIS. On the question of his descent into Hades, SEE HELL, DESCENT INTO. For monographs on this subject, see Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 34; Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 113.

The humiliation of Christ is generally set forth by theologians as shown in his birth, his circumstances, temptation, sufferings, and death.

1. In his birth: he was born of a woman — a sinful woman; though he was without sin (Gal 4:4); of a poor woman (Luk 2:7; Luk 2:24); in a poor country village (Joh 1:46); in a stable-an abject place; of a nature subject to infirmities (Heb 2:9), hunger, thirst, weariness, pain, etc.

2. In his circumstances: laid in a manger when he was born, lived in obscurity for a long time, probably worked at the trade of a carpenter, had not a place where to lay his head, and was oppressed with poverty while he went about preaching the Gospel.

3. It appeared in his reputation: he was loaded with the most abusive railing and calumny (Isaiah 53), the most false accusations (Mat 26:59; Mat 26:67), and the most ignominious ridicule (Psa 22:6; Matthew 22:68; Joh 7:35).

4. In his soul: he was often tempted (Mat 4:1, etc.; Heb 2:17-18; Heb 4:15); grieved with the reproaches cast on himself, and with the sins and miseries of others (Heb 12:3; Mat 11:19; Joh 11:35); was burdened with the hidings of his Father's face, and the fears and impressions of his wrath (Psa 21:1; Luk 22:43; Heb 5:7).

5. In his death: scourged, crowned with thorns, received gall and vinegar to drink, and was crucified between two thieves (Luke 23; John 19;  Mar 15:24-25). 6. In his burial: not only was he born in another man's house, but he was buried in another man's tomb; for he had no tomb of his own, or family vault to be interred in (Isa 53:10, etc.; Mat 13:46).

The humiliation of Christ was necessary,

1. To execute the purpose of God, and covenant engagements ‘of Christ (Act 2:23-24; Psa 40:6-8);

2. To fulfill the manifold types and predictions of the Old Testament;

3. To satisfy the broken law of God, and procure eternal redemption for us (Isaiah 53; Heb 9:12; Heb 9:15);

4. To leave us an unspotted pattern of holiness and patience under suffering. Buck, Theol. Dict. s.v. For a summary of the views of the Reformed theologians on the humiliation of Christ, see Heppe, Dogmatik deri Evang. — Reform. Kirche (Elberfeld, 1861), Locus 19. See also Hase, Evane. Prot. Dogmatik, § 155, 156; Gill, Body of Divinity, vol. 2; Robert Hall, Works, vol. 3; Knapp, Theology, § 9597. SEE JESUS CHRIST.

Humility (Lat. humilitas; from humus, the ground), as a Christian grace, is the opposite of “highmindedness.” It was unknown to the ancient heathen moralists; the word humilis, with them, indicated baseness of mind.

1. The believer is indeed “exalted” to a higher stage of manhood by his union with Christ, and becomes moreover, a “king and priest unto God.” But he never “exalts” himself. Whatever he has, he owes (and feels that he owes) not to himself, but to the love of God, his creator; to the grace of Christ, his redeemer; and to the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, his sanctifier. He perceives all his blessings only in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. If he looks upon himself, he finds that- all he is or has is but what has been mercifully vouchsafed to him; if he looks upon his individual ego, apart from these privileges, he finds only a weak, impotent personality, corrupted by sin and error, and unworthy of such great privileges. If he rejoices in the possession of Christian graces, he rejoices in them as having been given him (1Co 4:7), and considers at the same time the merits of others (Rom 12:3 : “For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith”). Conscious of the gifts he has received, he yet  praises the grace which has given them to him (Rom 15:17-18 : “I have therefore whereof I may glory through Jesus Christ, in those things which pertain to God. For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me.” Php 4:11-13 : “I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content. I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound: everywhere and in all things I am instructed both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need. I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.” 2Co 3:5 : “Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God.” 1Co 3:5-7 : “Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then, neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase”). The best Christians are but unprofitable servants, and unworthy instruments of the grace of God (Luk 17:10 : “So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all these things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do”). The feeling of obligation for all one is or has, and of shortcoming in the use of those gifts, which we cannot even praise ourselves for having well employed, is a mark of humility.

2. “To consider this grace a little more particularly, it may be observed,

1. That humility does not oblige a man to wrong the truth or himself by entertaining a meaner or worse opinion of himself than he deserves.

2. Nor does it oblige a man, right or wrong, to give everybody else the preference to himself. A wise man cannot believe himself inferior to the ignorant multitude, nor the virtuous man that he is not so good as those whose lives are vicious.

3. Nor does it oblige a man to treat himself with contempt in his words or actions: it looks more like affectation than humility when a man says such things in his own dispraise as others know, or he himself believes, to be false; and it is plain also that this is often done merely as a bait to catch the praises of others.

Humility consists,

1. In not attributing to ourselves any excellence or good which we have not.

2. In not overrating anything we do.

3. In not taking an immoderate delight in ourselves.

4. In not assuming more of the praise of a quality or action than belongs to us.

5. In an inward sense of our many imperfections and sins.

6. In ascribing all we have and are to the grace of God. True humility will express itself,

1. By the modesty of our appearance; the humble man will consider his age, abilities, character, function, etc., and act accordingly;

2. By the modesty of our pursuits: we shall not aim at anything above our strength, but prefer a good to a great name.

3. It will express itself by the modesty of our conversation and behavior: we shall not be loquacious, obstinate, forward, envious, discontented, or ambitious.

The advantages of humility are numerous:

1. It is well pleasing to God (1Pe 3:4).

2. It has great influence on us in the performance of all other duties, praying, hearing, converse, etc.

3. It indicates that more grace shall be given (Jam 4:6; Psa 25:9)

4. It preserves the soul in great tranquility and contentment (Psa 69:32-33).

5. It makes us patient and resigned under afflictions (Job 1:22).

6. It enables us to exercise moderation in everything. To obtain this excellent spirit, we should remember, 1. The example of Christ (Php 2:6-8);

2. That heaven is a place of humility (Rev 5:8);

3. That our sins are numerous, and deserve the greatest punishment (Lam 3:39);

4. That humility is the way to honor (Pro 16:18);

5. That the greatest promises of good are made to the humble (Isa 57:15; Isa 56:2; 1Pe 5:5; Psa 147:6; Mat 5:5)” (Buck, Theo. Dict. s.v.).

“It has been deemed a great paradox in Christianity that it makes humility the avenue to glory. Yet what other avenue is there to wisdom, or even to knowledge? Would you pick up precious truths, you must bend down and look for them. Everywhere the pearl of great price lies bedded in a shell, which has no form or comeliness. It is so in physical science. Bacon has declared it, Natura non nisi parendo vincitfu; and the triumphs of science since his days have proved how willing Nature is to be conquered by those who will obey her. It is so in moral speculation. Wordsworth has told us the law of his own mind, the fulfillment of which has enabled him to reveal a new world of poetry: Wisdom is ofttimes nearer when we stoop than when we soar. That it is so likewise in religion we are assured by those most comfortable words, Except ye become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Moreover, the whole intercourse between man and man may be seen, if we look at it closely, to be guided and regulated by the same pervading principle; and that it ought to be so is generally recognized, instinctively, at least, if not consciously. As I have often heard said by him, who, among all the persons I have conversed with to the edification of my understanding, had the keenest practical insight into human nature, and best knew the art of controlling and governing men, and winning them over to their good the moment anybody is satisfied with himself, everybody else becomes dissatisfied with him; whenever a person thinks much of himself, all other people give over thinking about him. Thus it is not alone in the parable that he who takes the highest room is turned down with shame to the lowest, while he who sits down in the lowest room is bid to go up higher.” See Hare, Guesses at Truth, 1, 242; Krehl, Handwörterbuch des 7. Test., s.v. Demuth; Grove, Moral Philosophy, 2, 286; Whately, Dangers to Christian Faith, p. 38; Conybeare, Sermons, p. 141.

## Humphrey, Edward Porter, D.D[[@Headword:Humphrey, Edward Porter, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister and educator, was born at Fairfield, Connecticut, January 28, 1809. He graduated from Amherst College in 1828, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1833. He was a pastor until 1853, when he became professor of church history in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Danville, Kentucky, remaining there until 1866, when he  became pastor at Louisville. He was made pastor emeritus in 1879. He died December 9, 1887. In 1861 he was associate editor of the Danville Review. See Appletons' Cyclop. of Amer. Biography.

## Humphrey, Heman, D.D[[@Headword:Humphrey, Heman, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Simsbury, Connecticut, March 26, 1779. He graduated from Yale College in 1805; was pastor of the  Congregational Church in Fairfield from 1807 to 1817; in Pittstield, Massachusetts, from 1817 to 1823; president of Amherst College from 1823 to 1845; and then retired to Pittsfield, where he died, April 13, 1861. Dr. Humphrey was the author of, Tour in France, etc. (2 volumes): — Domestic Education: — Letters of a Son in the Ministry: — Life and Writings of Professor W. Fiske: — Life of T.H. Gallaudet: — Sketches of the Hiistory of Revivals. See Appleton's Annual Cyclop. 1861, page 542.

## Humphrey, Lawrence[[@Headword:Humphrey, Lawrence]]

             an English Protestant divine and philologian, was born at Newport-Pagnell, Buckinghamshire, about 1527. He was educated at Cambridge, where lie applied himself especially to the classics. After becoming fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and professor of Greek in the university, he entered the Church. In 1555 he left England in consequence of the persecutions to which Protestants were subject, and remained a while in Zurich. After the death of queen Mary he returned home and resumed his professorship. He became successively professor of theology at Queen's College in 1560, president of Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1561, dean of Gloucester in 1570, and dean of Winchester in 1580. He died February 1, 1589. He was a man of conciliatory manners, and of great piety and learning; of great purity of character, moderate and conscientious, and to this he owed his last preferments lie was a good linguist, and a very skilful controvertist. He wrote Epistola de Graecis literis et Homeri lectione et imitatione (printed in the first part of Junius's Cornucopiae, Basle, 1558, fol.): — De religionis conservatione et reformatione, deque Primatu Regum (Basle, 1559, 8vo): — Obadias Propheta, Hebraice et Latine, et Philo “De Judice,” Graece et Latine, at the end of the preceding treatise: — Optimates, sive de nobilitate ejusque antiqua origine, natura, offciis, disciplina (Basle, 1561, 8vo, with a Latin translation of Philo's treatise De N'obilitate): — Joannis Juelli, episcopi Salisburiensis, Vita et Mors (London, 1573, 4to): — Jesuitismi pars prima, sive praxis Romance curice contra respublicas et principes (Lond. 1582, 8vo): — Jesuitisnzi pars secunda, Puritano Papismli seu doctrince Jesuiticae aliquot rationibus ab Edni. Campiatno comprehensce et a Johanne Durceo defenses Confutatio (London, 1584, 8vo), etc. See Wood, Athenoe Oxonienses (vol. 1); Chalmers, Genesis Biog. Dictionary; Chauffepid, Dict. Hist.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 543; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 918; Neal. History of the Puritans (see Index); Hook, Eccles. Biography, 6:207 sq. (J. N. P.)

## Humphrey, Zephaniah Moore, D.D[[@Headword:Humphrey, Zephaniah Moore, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, son of Reverend Heman Humphrey, D.D., was born at Amherst, Massachusetts, August 30, 1824. He graduated from Amherst College in 1843; studied at Union Theological Seminary in 1846 and 1847; graduated from Andover Theological Seminary in 1849; preached in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, one year thereafter; was ordained in October, 1850, pastor at Racine; became pastor of the Congregational Church in Milwaukee in 1856; of a Presbyterian Church in Chicago, Illinois, in 1859; of Calvary Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in 1868; professor in Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1875; and died there, November 13, 1881. He was moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in 1871. See Genesis Cat. of Union Theol. Sem. 1876, page 55; Trien. Cat. of Andover Theol. Sem. 1870, page 180.

## Humphreys, Hector, D.D[[@Headword:Humphreys, Hector, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Canton, Connecticut, June 8, 1797. He pursued his studies at the academy in Westfield, and graduated in 1818 from Yale College. His purpose was to enter the ministry of the Congregational Church; but, having abandoned this project, he joined the Protestant Episcopal communion, and was admitted, after due preparation, to the bar. When Washington College was established, he was elected its first professor of ancient languages. His predilection for the ministry led him to ordination, but he continued to discharge the duties of his professorship until 1831, when he was appointed president of St. John's College, Annapolis, Maryland. He died there, January 25, 1857. Although familiar with all branches of literature, he devoted himself particularly to natural science, and he published many articles urging the application of chemistry to agriculture. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1857, page 146.

## Humtah[[@Headword:Humtah]]

             (Heb. Chuntcah', חֻמְטָה, prob. from the Syr. fortress, otherwise place of lizards; Sept. Α᾿μματά v.r. Εὐμά and Χαμματά; Vulg. Athmatha), a town in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Aphekah and Hebron (Jos 15:54), apparently in the district lying immediately west of Hebron (Keil, Comment. ad loc.). It is not mentioned by any other ancient  writer (Reland, Palcest. p. 723) except Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v, Α᾿ματά, Ammatha). There is some resemblance between the name and that of Kimath (Κιμάθ), one of the places added in the Vat. text of the Sept. to the list in the Heb. text of 1Sa 30:27-31. It possibly corresponds with the ruined site marked as Sabzin (or Ramet el-Alineh) on Van de Velde's Map at 1l miles north of Hebron, just west of the Jerusalem road.

## Hundeiker, Johann Peter[[@Headword:Hundeiker, Johann Peter]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born in 1751, and died January 26, 1836. He published, Hausliche Gottesverehrug fur christliche Familien (Hildesheim, 1784, and later): — Strahlen des Lichts aus den heiligen Hallen des Temnpels der Wahrheit und Erkenntniss (Leipsic, 1824): — Hausliches Festbuch fur gebildete Genossen des heiligen Abendmahls (1821, 2 volumes): — Weihgeschenk. Erweckungen zur Andacht in den heiliqen Tagen der Einsegung und der ersten Abendmahlsfeier (1823; 2d ed. 1844). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:330, 332, 335, 367, 375; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:596. (B.P.)

## Hundeshagen, Karl Bernhard[[@Headword:Hundeshagen, Karl Bernhard]]

             a Reformed theologian of Germany, was born January 10, 1810, at Friedewald, Hesse. He studied at Giessen and Halle, commenced his academical career at the former place in 1830, and accepted a call in 1834 as professor in the newly founded university of Berne. In 1846 his anonymous work, Der deutsche Protestantismus, seine Vergangenheit und seine heutigen Lebensfragen, appeared, and fell like a flash of lightning in that troubled period. "This remarkable work," says Schaff (in his Germany, its Universities, Theology, and Religion, Philadelphia, 1857, page 401), "is a manly and bold, yet well-meant and patriotic exposure of the religious, political, and social diseases of modern Germany, and represents, almost prophetically, the peculiar crisis which preceded the outbreak of the political earthquake of 1848. The author develops, first, the nature and object of Protestantism in its original form, then he traces the rise and power of recent anti-Christianity in Germany, its causes and effects, following it out even to the moral destitution of German emigrants in foreign countries; and finally he discusses the movements and questions which agitated the country in the, last ten years before the revolution. He accounts for the development of modern infidelity in the bosom of German Protestantism, to a considerable extent, by the political reaction since the Congress of Vienna, which crippled the free motion of national life, violently suppressed all political discontent, and indirectly forced the bitter hostility to the existing order of things to vent itself intellectually upon the Church and Christianity. He thinks that, a healthy religious life of a nation can only unfold itself on the soil of rational political freedom, as the example of England and the United States prove better than all arguments." This work made Hundeshagen's reputation, and he was at once called to  Heidelberg as professor of New Testament exegesis and Church history, where he continued to labor for twenty years (1847-67). In 1867 he accepted a call to Bonn, where he spent his last years in peaceful and friendly relations with his colleagues, although a great sufferer in body. He rejoiced in the restoration of the German empire in 1870, and greeted the hour of his departure with Christian fortitude and joyfulness. He died June 2, 1873. Hundeshagen was one of the most prominent and original theologians which the Reformed Church of Germany has given in this century to the service of the Evangelical Church. His peculiar importance consisted in this, that in his own way he showed how certain features of the Reformed Church might be advantageously applied to the living Christianity of the day. He emphasized the ethical principle in Protestantism over against a mere dogmatic or critical intellectualism, and laid stress upon the social element in the Church, which was languishing by reason of its amalgamation with the State. Besides the work mentioned above, Hundeshagen published, De Agobardi Archiepiscopi Lugdunensis Vita et Scriptis (Giessen, 1831): — Epistolas Aliquot Ineditas Martini Buceri, Joannis Calvini, Theodori Bezae Aliorumque ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam Magnes Britanniae, Edidit (Berne, 1840): — Ueber den Einfuss des Calvinisus auf die Ideen von Staat und staatsburgerlicher Freiheit (1842): — Die Conflikte des Zwinglianismus, Lutherthums end Calvinismus in der bernischen Landeskirche von 1522-1558 (1843): — Die Bekenntniss-Grundlage der vereinigten evangelischen Kirche in Baden (1851): — Ueber die Natur und die geschichtliche Entwicklung ders Humanitdtsidee in ihren Veirhaltniss zu Stat und Kirche (1853): — Der Weg zu Christo (eod.). A collection of his essays and shorter writings was published by professor Christlieb (Gotha, 1874, 2 volumes). See Christlieb, K.B. Hundeshagen, eine Lebensskizze (Gotha, 1873); Riehm, in Theolog. Studien und Kritiken, 1874, part 1; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:569 sq. (B.P.)

## Hundred[[@Headword:Hundred]]

             (as a division of the Heb. people). SEE HOST.

## Hundt-Radowsky, Johann Hartwig Von[[@Headword:Hundt-Radowsky, Johann Hartwig Von]]

             a Protestant writer, was born in 1759, and died at Burgdorf, Switzerland, August 15, 1835. He wrote, Judenspiegel (Wurzburg, 1819): — Neuer Judenspiegel (1828): — Die Judenschule (1822) :-Der Christenspiegel (Stuttgart, 1830, 3 volumes). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:379; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:417; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:597. (B.P.).

## Huneric[[@Headword:Huneric]]

             SEE VANDALS.

## Hungari, Anton[[@Headword:Hungari, Anton]]

             a Roman Catholic priest and writer of Germany, was born at Mayence in 1809, and died December 17, 1881, at Rodelheim, near Frankfort-on- theMain. He published, Christliche Reden an Sonn- und Festtagen (Mayence, 1838): — Festtagspredigten (Frankfort, 1841): — Christodora (1840): — Gute Aussaat, Erzahlungen fur katholische Christen (1867): — MarienPreis, erbauliche Unterhaltungen (1866): — Tempel der Heiligen zur Ehre Gottes (7th ed. 1867): — Muster-Predigten der katholischen Kanzel-Beredsamkeit (1873-79, 12 parts). (B.P.)

## Hungarian Confession[[@Headword:Hungarian Confession]]

             (Confessio Hungaria), the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Church in Hungary. It- was drawn up in 1557 and 1558 by the Synod of Czenger (hence also called Confessio Czengeriana), and published in 1570 in Debreczin. It is strongly Calvinistic, especially in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and it was on that account not adopted by the Reformed churches of Poland. (A. J. S.)

## Hungarian Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Hungarian Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Benedictine missionaries, who, at the beginning of the 11th century, brought Christianity to the Magyars, transmitted to them also a translation of the Psalms, the gospels and epistles, as essential parts for the divine service. In the life of Margareth, daughter of king Bela IV, who died in 1271, we are told that she read the Psalms and the history of the passion of the Saviour in the Hungarian dialect-Hungarico idiomate (see Pray, Vita S. Elisabethae et B. Margar. 1770). In consequence of the many invasions made into Hungary, only fragments of a later time have been preserved. Thus we find parts of the Old Test., translated by the Franciscans Thomas and Valentinus, in a Vienna codex, written between 1336 and 1444 (according to Rdvany, Antiq. Lit. Hung. Pesth, 1803, in the year 1450).

 The translation is made from the Vulgate. The four gospels are preserved in a Munich codex. Both were edited by Dobrentei, Regi magyar nyelvemekek (1838), 1:3 sq.; (1842), 3:17 sq. Psalms, Song of Solomon, and the gospels are found in a codex of the episcopal library at Stuhlweissenburg (specimens in Toldy, Magyar N. Irodalom Tortenrete, Pesth, 1862, 1247). A second complete translation of the Bible was made by L. Bathory (died 1456); it is supposed that this translation is preserved in the codex Jordalszky at Grau. This codex was written in 1519, and contains Exodus 6 -Judges, and all of the New Test. with the exception of the Pauline epistles.

The first printed edition of the Pauline epistles, by B. Kornjathy, was published at Cracow in 1533; the gospels, by Gabriel Pannoilius Pesthinus, at Vienna in 1536; the complete New Test., by John Sylvester, was published in 1541; another in 1574. A translation of the entire Bible, from the original, which the Jesuit Stephen Szanto (Latin Arator) prepared towards the end of the 16th century, was never printed, whereas the translation from the Vulgate, made by the Jesuit George Kaldi  (Szent Biblia, az egesz Keresz-tyensegben bevott regi deak betubol, Vienna, 1626), is still in use among the Roman Catholics, and was often reprinted (Tyrnam, 1732; Buda, 1783; Erlau, 1862-65; the latter edition revised in accordance with modern orthography; see Danke, De S. Scriptura, Ejusq. Interpret. Comm. Vienna, 1867, page 243 sq.). A revision of Kaldi's New Test. was undertaken by a Reformed pastor in Hungary, in 1869, in behalf of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

The first Protestant edition of the whole Bible appeared at Visoly, near Guns, in 1589. This is the present authorized version of Hungary. The translation was made from the originals, compared with the Vulgate and several other Latin versions, by Gaspard Caroli, or Karoli, a Magyar by birth, pastor of the Church at Guns, and dean of the Brethren of the Valley of Kaschau. He had studied at Wittenberg, where he' had imbibed the principles of the Reformation. The printing was done at Visoly, where a printing-office was established for that purpose by count Stephen Bathory. The sheets, as they passed through the press, were corrected by Albert Molnar, subsequently regent of the college at Oppenheim. He afterwards subjected the whole to a careful revision, and published an improved edition at Hanau in 1608. under the title, Biblia, az-az: Istennek O es Ujj Testamentomaban foglaltatott egesz Szent iras, Magyar nyelore fordittatott Karoly Gaspar altal. Molnar subsequently published other editions of the Bible, and separate editions of the New Test. The edition of 1608 is the more interesting, since it is accompanied with a Magyar translation of the Heidelberg catechism, the liturgy of the Hungarian churches, and a metrical version of the Psalms.

When the different editions were exhausted, another revision of the Hungarian Bible was undertaken by count Stephen Bethlen D'Iktar, brother to prince Gabriel Bethlen. He assembled a number of learned men to prepare the work, and established a printing-press at Warasdin. In 1657 the revision was completed, and printing was commenced; but in 1660, when the city of Warasdin was taken by the Turks, almost half of the copies were lost or destroyed. The remaining copies were saved, and taken to Clauldiopolis, or Koloswar, in Transylvania, where the edition was completed in 1661. Another edition (the sixth) of the Bible was published at Amsterdam in 1684-85, by N.K.M. Totfalusi, by whom a separate edition of the New Test. and Psalms was printed during the same year. The seventh edition of the Bible was published at Cassel in 1704, edited by John Ingebrand. In 1730 an edition was published at Utrecht, Szent Biblic,  az-az: Istennek O es Ujj Testamentonmaban foglaltatott egesz Szent iras, Magyar nyelore fordittatott Karoli Gaspar, which was followed by others in 1737 and 1794. In Basle also an edition was published in 1751, and at Leipsic in 1776.

Another revision of the Hungarian Bible, which, perhaps, ought rather to be regarded as a new translation, was executed by Dr. Comarin, pastor of Debreczin, but he died before it could be committed to press, and the MS. was sent for publication to the celebrated Vitringa. Perhaps the edition published in Holland in 1716-17 was from this MS. The Jesuits prevented its circulation, and seized and destroyed 3000 copies.

In 1812 a Bible society was formed in Presburg, but with the exception of an edition of the Bible in 1823, no editions of the Hungarian Scriptures appear to have been published by that society. In 1814 Dr. Pinkerton found at Utrecht upwards of 2000 copies of the authorized Hungarian Bible, belonging to the above-mentioned edition of 1794. These copies were purchased by the British and Foreign Bible Society, and transmitted to Presburg for circulation.

When, in 1837, Hungary became accessible to the operations of the Bible Society, the publication of the Scriptures was commenced in Hungary itself, and the total number of Hungarian Bibles and Testaments printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society up to March 31, 1884, was 561,310.

As Caroly's Bible abounds in archaic expressions, some of which sound rude and coarse to modern ears, the British and Foreign Bible Society has of late made arrangements to secure a faithful revision. A small number of a revised New Test. was published in 1876 with the intention of eliciting the criticisms of Hungarian scholars, with a view to the settlement of the text. As the text has been fixed, the British and Foreign Bible Society published, in 1883, an edition of 10,000 New Tests. as revised by bishop Filo. See Bible of Every Land, page 325. (B.P.)

## Hungarian-Wendish Version[[@Headword:Hungarian-Wendish Version]]

             SEE WENDISH-HUNGARIAN VERSION s.v.; SLAVONIC VERSIONS. By way of supplement we add that an edition of the New Test. and Psalms has been published in 1882, with a slight revision, limited to orthographical and syntactical errors, made by pastor Berke. (B.P.)

## Hungary[[@Headword:Hungary]]

             a kingdom in Eastern Europe, which has for several centuries been united with the empire of Austria. It has 82,839 square miles, and its population was, according to the census of 1857, 9,900,785. Connected with it, as dependencies of the crown of Hungary, are Transylvania (q.v.), Croatia, and Slavonia. This whole division, which is sometimes called the Trans Leithanian division of the empire, sometimes simply Hungary, has 124,000 square miles, and, according to the official census of 1857, 13,768,813 inhabitants. According to the official census of Dec. 31,1869, the total population of the countries subject to the Hungarian crown amounted to 15,429,238, of which Hungary proper had about 11,109,000; Transylvania, 2,109,000; Croatia and Slavonia, 1,015,000; the Military Frontier, 1,195,000.

I. History. — The Hungarians, a Scythian tribe, were, as it seems, akin to and allies of the Chazari, who in the first century of the Christian era had  left their original seats, the plateaus of Central Asia, and had founded in the course of time a powerful empire on the Tauric peninsula. At the close of the 9th century the Hungarians (Magyars) were living on the northeastern frontier of this empire, which they defended under their own chiefs against the powerful neighboring nations. After the destruction of this empire, the Magyars, who were unable to resist singly the onset of other tribes, crossed the Dnieper, and settled (884) near the mouth of the Danube, between the Rivers Bugh and Szereth. The imperial throne of Constantinople was at that time occupied by Leo the Wise, who called the bravery of his new neighbors to his aid against Simeon, the chief of the Bulgarians. The call was cheerfully accepted by Arpad, the son of the Magyar duke Almos. Simeon was conquered, and his country laid waste. The renown of the Magyars soon induced king Arnold, of Germany, to ask them for aid against Szvatoplugk, the grand prince of Moravia. Again they accepted the invitation, entered Upper Pannonia, which then belonged to the Moravian empire, and obtained a complete victory; after that they returned to their homes. These, however, had in the meanwhile been invaded and terribly devastated by the Bulgarians, and the Magyars therefore concluded to settle permanently in Pannonia, from which they had just returned as victors. The occupation of the country began in 894; it was completed in 900. The country, distributed among seven tribes and 108 families, was converted into a military state. Their bravery and their renown caused many people of the districts, which they had traversed, and many soldiers of foreign countries, to join them. Thus strengthened, they were able to undertake expeditions as far as the North Sea, the South of France into Italy, and to the Black Sea. But repeated defeats by the kings and emperors of Germany put a stop to their conquests and gave a different direction to their energies. The frontiers of their new country were more definitely marked and fortified, and many more foreign colonists drawn into the country.

The large number of Christian slaves, the connection with the emperors of Constantinople, but in particular the efforts of duke Geysa (972-997), and of his Christian wife Sarolta (Caroline), gradually prepared the introduction of Christianity. Geysa made peace with all his neighbors, and at the diet which he assembled recommended a hospitable reception of foreign visitors and the introduction of Christianity. Geysa himself was baptized by bishop Pilgrin of Passau, who, even during the reign of Tacsony, the father of Geysa, had begun to show a warm interest in the conversion of Hungary.  Besides him, the emperor Otto I and bishop Adalbert of Prague showed a great zeal for the Christianization of the Magyars. Thus the Roman Catholic Church obtained the ascendancy over the few missions which under former chiefs had been established by missionaries of the Greek Church. Adalbert, in 994, baptized, at Gran,Voik, the son of Geysa, who received the name of Stephen. Immediately after his accession to the throne, Stephen made it the first object of his rule to secure the complete victory of Christianity; nor did he hesitate for this end to employ force. He issued at once an order that all Magyars must receive baptism, and that all Christian slaves must be set free.

This decree filled those Magyars who were opponents of. Christianity with the utmost indignation against the young king and against the Germans who surrounded him. Kuppa, a relative of Stephen and duke of the Sumegians, put himself at the head of the malcontents, but at Veszprim he was totally defeated and killed; and henceforth all serious opposition to the Christianization of Hungary ceased. Stephen himself traversed the country in every direction, encouraging the people to become Christians, and threatening with severe punishments all who would refuse to obey this order. He established schools in his residence, called many monks as teachers, established ten richly-endowed bishoprics, introduced the tithe, and made the prelates the first estate of the empire. For these labors Stephen received from pope Sylvester II a crown, which has since then constituted the upper part of the sacra regni Hungariae corona, while its lower part consists of a crown which the Greek emperor Manuel Dukas gave to Geysa. With this crown Stephen received from the pope a patriarchal cross and the title of apostolic king. Thus Hungary became a kingdom, the chief supports of which, according to the Constitution given by Stephen, were to be the clergy and the nobility. The following kings enlarged the privileges of the clergy, who thus, in the course of time, became richer than in any other European country. After the death of Stephen several more efforts were made by the native pagan party to displace both Christianity and the German party at the court, which was regarded as the chief support of Christianity. But all these attempts utterly failed, and paganism soon became extinct. The frontiers of the empire were enlarged by the conquest of Croatia and Slavonia in 1089, and that of Dalmatia in 1102; at home the clergy extorted from the weak Andrew I (1202-35) a favorable Concordat. In 1437 Hungary fell for the first time to the house of Hapsburg. In 1526 the line of independent kings of Hungary became extinct by the death of king Louis II. A large portion of Hungary was subjugated by the Turks, and remained  a Turkish province for more than a century; the remainder was long rent by civil wars, which ended in connecting the country permanently with the crown of Hapsburg.

When the first knowledge of the Reformation reached Hungary, the Diet of 1528 issued a cruel decree that the Lutherans and all favorers of Lutheranism should be captured and burned. But amidst the disorder which followed the death of Louis II the Reformation spread, and gained a firm footing in spite of the cruel prohibitory laws. Probably the first to preach in favor of the Reformation was Thomas Preussner, of Kaesmark, who is said to have publicly announced his concurrence in the views of Luther. A great impression was made by the Augsburg Confession, as the grandees who accompanied king Ferdinand to the Diet of Augsburg brought back a favorable account of the Lutheran Reformation. Several scholars went to Wittenberg to study under Luther, among whom were Devay, Quendel, Stockel, Andrew Fischer, Leutscher, Bogner, Transylvanus, Radan, Siklosy, and Kopaczy. The further progress of the Reformation was very quiet, only a few bishops and magnates trying to employ force. Prince Zapolya, who contested with king Ferdinand the possession of Hungary, issued a severe edict against the Protestants, and the parish priest of Libethen was in 1527 burned as a favorer of the Reformation; but as the majority of the towns, nearly the whole nobility, and many of the most powerful magnates were favorable to the Reformation, the persecution of Protestantism soon ceased. Many of the priests then joined the Reformation with their entire congregations; in other instances the congregations waited until the death of the Catholic pastor, and then called an evangelical successor.

The evangelical pastors continued for a long time to pay tribute to the bishops, and were protected by the latter in their rights and privileges, provided they would remain faithful to the Augsburg Confession, and not join the detested Sacramentarians (Calvinists). In i549 the royal free cities of Upper Hungary had their Confession. of Faith drawn up by Leonhard Stockel in the sense of the Augsburg Confession, and presented it to king Ferdinand. This Confession was approved and confirmed not only by the king, but also by the primate Nicholas Olah and the bishop Verantius, with several Catholic prelates, as bishop Kechdry of Veszprim, bishop Thurzo of Neutra, and bishop Dudich, who had attended the Council of Trent as representatives of Ferdinand. King Ferdinand himself appeared to be favorable to the Protestants, for he permitted the election of the foremost patron of the Reformation, Thomas Nadasdy, as  palatine of Hungary. Still more auspicious was the reign of the mild Maximilian, who tried to gain the Protestants by wise concessions. Thus they found time to develop their Church Constitution, to hold synods, and to regulate their Church and school affairs under the protection of the evangelical magnates. A large majority of the inhabitants belonged to the evangelical faith; only three magnates continued to be Roman Catholic, and probably Protestantism would have forever established its ascendancy had not the Protestants themselves been split into Lutherans and Calvinists, who seemed to hate each other more than other religious denominations.

Thus weakened by internal dissensions, the Protestants suffered greatly from the persecutions which began against them under the reign of Rudolphus. The Jesuits, who had come for a short time to Hungary in 1561, at the invitation of the primas Nicholas Olah, but had been unable to do any thing under the tolerant reign of Maximilian, returned, and began to display a great activity for the restoration of the old Church. Jacob Barbian of Belgioso took from the Protestants a number of churches, and the complaints of the people against these acts of violence remained without effect. Rudolphus, instead of redressing the grievances, made to the laws passed by the Hungarian Diet al addition, which declared the grievances of the Protestants to be unfounded and their conduct scandalous, and which confirmed all the former laws against them. Boczkai, the prince of Transylvania, rose against this law, and was joined everywhere by malcontents. Soon he was master of all Transylvania and of Northern Hungary. Basta, the imperial general, was defeated, and Rudolphus compelled to conclude, in 1606, the peace of Vienna, which assured the Protestants throughout the empire of religious liberty, and promised that the emperor would never allow any violation of this provision. To the provision was, however, added this clausula, “without any injury to the Catholic religion.” When the articles of the Vienna treaty of peace were, in 1608, read to the Diet at Pressburg, the bishop of Veszprim protested in the name of the clergy against the religious liberty granted to the Protestants; but the firmness of archduke Matthias overcame the opposition of all the Catholics, and the treaty of peace was unanimously ratified by all save cardinal Forgaez. Nevertheless, Rudolphus declared the resolutions of the Diet invalid. This breach of faith cost him the throne; his brother Matthias was crowned king of Hungary on November 8, 1608, two days after the evangelical count Illeshazy had been elected palatine by a large majority.

Through the liberality of Illeshazy, who was in possession of immense riches, the Protestants received a large number of churches and  schools. Illeshazy died the next year (May 6,1609); but his successor, count George Thurzo, was an equally zealous Protestant. Under his presidency, a synod was held in March, 1610, at Sillein, in the comitat of Trentshin, at which the Protestant churches were organized into three superintendentships, the duties of superintendents, seniors, and inspectors defined, and many rules adopted for the regulation of Church government and Church discipline. The resolutions of the synod, which were printed by order of the palatine, and circulated among all the Protestant congregations of the country, aroused the Catholic clergy to extraordinary efforts against the further spreading of Protestantism. Unfortunately, palatine Thurzo died soon, and the Catholics found a leader of rare ability in the Jesuit Pazmany, who succeeded in causing within a short time more than fifty of the first noble families to return to the Catholic Church. They, in turn, compelled hundreds of thousands of their subjects to leave the Protestant churches. At the diets the Roman Catholics again obtained the ascendency; the resolutions of 1608 were, it is true, several times confirmed, but the government did not respect the decrees of the diets, and the persecutions of Protestants continued. For a time the Reformed prince Bethlen, of Transylvania, extorted by his victories from king Ferdinand II promises of redress, but none of these promises were kept. At the Diet of 1637, the Protestants, under the name of the Evangelical Estates (Status et Ordines Evangelici), presented their grievances in writing; but the Diet contented itself with a new confirmation of former laws, and gave to the Jesuits the first landed property in the kingdom. The discontent of the Protestants was supported by Racoczy, prince of Transylvania, who invaded Hungary at the head of 10,000 men, and finally compelled Ferdinand III to conclude the peace of Linz, 1645, in which the Protestants again obtained the free exercise of their religion, the use of bells, and the permission to build towers and' to keep their own cemeteries. But the Catholic clergy refused to recognize the provisions of this treaty, and soon the reign of Leopold I brought on the sorest trials for Protestantism. The complaints of the Protestants regarding the constant violations of their rights were not listened to; they were ordered not to bring their grievances before the Diet, but before the courts. Several Protestant noblemen entered, therefore, into a conspiracy for the separation of Hungary from Austria, but the plot was discovered, and all who had taken part in it sentenced to death.

The Jesuits used this as a pretext for the most violent measures against Protestants. Archbishop Szelepczenyi summoned the evangelical ministers of the mountain towns before his court at Pressburg, where they were charged  with being accomplices of the Turks, with seditious sermons, revolutionary sympathies, abuse of the Catholic host, opening of the prisons, sale of Catholic priests to the Turks. The preachers were all sentenced to death; but the emperor pardoned them on the condition that they should renounce their titles of preachers and pastors, not discharge the duties connected with such a title, keep no schools, not preach either secretly or publicly, and sign a declaration acknowledging their guilt. Whosoever should refuse to sign this declaration must leave Hungary within thirty days. In the next year all the evangelical preachers, even those who lived under Turkish dominion, were summoned to Pressburg. The latter did not come; but those living under the scepter of Leopold made their appearance, 250 of the Confession of Augsburg and 57 of the Helvetic Confession. The majority signed the demanded declaration; those who refused were imprisoned; the most obstinate, about 29 in number, were sent to the galleys. The Swedish government, the dukes of Saxony, Brandenburg, and Luneburg, remonstrated with the emperor in favor of the prisoners, but not until about a year later did they recover their liberty. A great massacre of Protestants was soon after (1657) committed at Eperies by the imperial general Caraffa, who pretended to have discovered a wide-spread conspiracy, and caused the execution of a large number of prominent men, among whom were many of the leaders of the Protestants. The peace of Carlovics, in 1699, restored to Hungary all the districts, with the only exception of that of Temesvar, which for more than a hundred years had been under the rule of the Turks. At home, the continued discontent of the people led to a new insurrection headed by Francis Racoczv, which was suppressed in 1711 by the peace of Szathmar. This peace again reaffirmed the rights, which had been granted to Protestants. New complaints of disturbances of Protestant worship induced Charles VI (as king of Hungary, Charles III) to appoint a royal commission, on the recommendation of which it was decreed that the evangelical preachers should be superintended by Catholic archdeacons; that the ministerial functions of the preachers of the two Protestant Confessions must be limited to those churches (at most two in each comitat) in which a resolution of the Diet of Oedenburg, held in 1681, expressly authorized the Protestants to hold divine service; that the Protestants, when elected to office, must take their oaths with an invocation of the blessed Virgin and all the saints; and that all Protestants must take part in the celebration of the Catholic festivals and in the public processions. The establishment of a royal chancellery and stadtholdership, which in the name of the sovereign  had to promulgate and execute the imperial laws, was unfavorable to the Protestants. as a majority of the councilors were taken from the ranks of the bishops, magnates, and noblemen. Thus the Protestants were annoyed by this board in every possible way. Conversions from Catholicism to Protestantism were strictly forbidden; Catholics were forbidden to attend a Protestant school, and the Protestant youth to study at foreign schools; members of one Protestant denomination were not allowed to visit the divine service of the other; Protestant books were submitted to Protestant censors, their trials of divorce to Catholic judges. Maria Theresa expressed personal sympathy with the oppressed condition of Protestants but pretended to be unable to do any thing for them on account of her coronation oath and the laws of the country. An essential amelioration in the condition of Protestants was effected under Joseph II, who, in 1781, by the edict of toleration, granted to all the Protestants of his dominions freedom of conscience and of religion, and the right of public worship. Now a new era in the history of Protestantism began. A large number of new churches and schools were established, hundreds of clergymen were called. Protestants became eligible to every office; the religious oath was abolished; the Protestant superintendents were allowed to visit the churches, and persons living in mixed marriages to bring up their children in the evangelical faith, as well as to select for them any school they chose; the press was to be free and unfettered. Leopold II also showed a firm disposition to be just toward the Protestants.

The Diet of 1791 was petitioned by the Protestants to sanction the royal decree which had granted them religious freedom, Notwithstanding a violent opposition on the part of the bishops, the diet granted the request, chiefly moved by the eloquent plea of the Catholic count Aloysius Battlyani. Accordingly, the 26th article of religion of 1791 provides that the Protestants of both Confessions shall enjoy the free exercise of their religion; that they shall not be forced to attend processions, masses, or other ceremonies; that in ecclesiastical affairs they shall be subordinate only to their own ecclesiastical superiors; that they may build churches and schools, elect preachers and teachers; that they shall not have to contribute to the building of Catholic churches and schools. The Protestants at once hastened to perfect their ecclesiastical constitution. In the same year (1791), a synod of both the Protestant churches was held at Ofen and Pesth, at which long-pending controversies between the clergy and prominent laymen were settled, and the establishment of a general Consistory proposed. The protest of a few evangelical clergymen, as well  as that of the Catholic clergy and the early death of the sovereign, prevented the resolutions of this diet from receiving the royal sanction. During the reign of Francis I the rights of the Protestants were often encroached upon, especially in the case of mixed marriages. The Diet of 1843 to 1844 interfered, however, in favor of the Protestants, and enlarged, in its provisions concerning mixed marriages and the right of joining the Protestant Church, the law of 1791.

The fullness of equal rights was finally secured to Protestants by a law of 1848. In consequence of the failure of the Hungarian War of Independence in 1848 and 1849, these rights were, however, for a time suspended. The imperial commander, baron Haynau, himself a Protestant, abolished the offices of general inspector and the district inspectors for the Church of the Augsburg Confession, and that of curators for the Church of the Helvetic Confession The holding of conventions was forbidden, and only after a time the holding of “several conventions' allowed when attended by an imperial commissioner. After repeated petitions and representations, the minister of public worship and instruction, on August 21, 1856, laid the draft of a law on the reorganization of the Constitution of the Protestant churches before the superintendents. The latter declined this draft, and unanimously asked for the convocation of the General Synod. On September 1, 1859, an imperial patent was published, which undertook, on the ground of the law of 1791, to give to the Protestant churches a new Constitution. Nearly the entire evangelical Church of both Confessions protested against the legality of this imperial patent, claiming for the Church the right to make herself the necessary changes in her Constitution on the legal basis of the law of 1791. Only a few congregations of the Lutheran Slovaks, numbering together about 54 congregations, accepted the patent. All the efforts to break the opposition of the Protestants failed; and when, in 1867, the Austrian government concluded to make peace with Hungary, the patent of 1859, and all the decrees accompanying it, were repealed. The two Protestant churches were assured that they would be at liberty to rearrange their Church matters in a constitutional way. At the General Convention of the Confession of Augsburg, which was held in Pesth in September, the reunion of the Lutheran Slovaks who had accepted the patent with the remainder of the Church was consummated. In December, 1867; a General Convention of the ‘two Protestant churches was held under the presidency of baron Nicholas Vay, in order to acquaint the Hungarian Diet with the wishes and opinion of the churches concerning religious and school questions. The Convention resolved,  1, that the affairs of the Protestants be regulated by general laws, and not by special laws for each of the two denominations;

2, that no privileges be granted to any on account of religion;

3. that the equality pronounced in the 20th article of the law of 1848 extend to all denominations;

4, that the Church with regard to the state be autonomous, and that to the state belong only the right of supreme inspection and of protection. Other liberal resolutions were adopted by this and by a later Convention respecting a change of religion, mixed marriages, divorces, schools, and endowment. The majority of the Diet showed itself just toward the Protestants, and their chief demands were fulfilled. The reconciliation which took place in 1867 between the people of Hungary and the emperor of Austria gave to Hungary a greater independence than it had ever enjoyed before. A special ministry was appointed for the countries of the Hungarian crown, which also had their own diet, and retained only a few points of administration in common with the remainder of the monarchy. One of the most important reforms, introduced into Hungary in consequence of the new Constitution, was the declaration of the autonomy of all the religions recognized in Hungary, and the transfer of the extensive rights in ecclesiastical affairs, which had formerly been connected with the Hungarian crown, to elective assemblies representing the several religious denominations. The first assemblies of those churches, which had thus far been without them, were convoked by the government; they fixed the mode of election for the subsequent assemblies. Thus, with the other denominations, the Roman Catholic Church received an autonomy congress, the only elective assembly of this kind in the Church, and regarded with great distrust by the ultramontane party. It consists of all the bishops, and of chosen delegates of the lower clergy and the laity. The preliminary congress was held on June 24,1869, and consisted of 157 members.

II. Statistics. — According to the last official census of 1857, the religious statistics of the countries belonging to the Hungarian crown were as follows:

According to an official calculation, the Hungarian countries had, in 1880, 7,558,558 Latin Catholics, 1.559,628 Greek Catholics, 5133 Armenian Catholics, 2,589,319 Oriental or Non-United Greeks, 3,144,759  Evangelicals, 54,922 Unitarians, 553,641 Israelites, 3603 belonging to other sects.

The Roman Catholic Church has four archbishops, those of Gran (who is primate of all Hungary), Kalocza, Erlau, and Agram. The archbishopric of Gran, which was founded by St. Stephen, had in 1870 ten suffragan sees, namely, the Latin bishoprics of Veszprim, Neusohl, Waitzen, Neutra, Stahlweissenburg, Fiinfkirchen, Steinamanger, Raab, and the United Greek sees of Muncacz and Eperies. The archdiocese of Colocza (and Bacz) has the Latin suffragan sees of Czanad, Gran Wardein, and Transylvania. The suffragans of the archbishop of Erlau are the bishops of Zips, Rosenan, Kaschau, and Szathmar. Agram, which had formerly been a suffragan of Gran, and was constituted an archbishopric on Dec. 20,1852, embraces Croatia and Slavonia, and has as suffragans the Latin bishoprics of Zengg- Modruss and Diacovar (Bosnia-Syrmium), and the Greek bishop of Creutz.

The Greek Catholic (United Greek) Church has, besides the bishops of Muncacz, Eperies, and Creutz, who have already been mentioned, an archbishop (since 1853) at Fogaras, who has as suffragans the bishops of Lugos, Gran Wardein, and Szamos-Ujvar.

The Oriental, or Non-United Greek Church, has for the Servian nationality a patriarch at Carlovicz, and suffragan sees at Alt-Ofen. Arad, Temesvar, Neusatz, Pakratz, and Carlstadt; for the Romanian nationality, a metropolitan of Transylvania.

The Church of the Augsburg Confession (evangelical Lutherans) has four superintendencies (Cis-Danubian Trans-Danubian, Montan District, and Theiss District); the superintendencies are subdivided into seniorats, the latter into congregations. The Church of the Helvetic Confession has likewise four superintendencies, which are also subdivided into seniorats and congregations. Transylvania has one Lutheran and one Reformed superintendent. Each congregation of the two Protestant churches chooses its own pastors and a presbytery, which is presided over in the Church of the Augsburg Confession by a local inspector, and in the Church of the Helvetic Confession by a curator, in common with the pastor. The congregations belonging to one seniorat choose a senior and a senioral inspector (Lutheran), or subcurator (Reformed). In the Reformed seniorats, the senior presides in the senioral conventions; in the Lutheran Church, the inspector. The superintendents and the superintendential inspectors (Lutheran) or curators (Reformed) are chosen for lifetime by all  the congregations. The superintendential conventions, which are held annually, and composed of all the seniors, and of one clerical and one lay deputy from each seniorat, are presided over by the superintendent in common with the superintendential inspector or curator. The Protestants of the Helvetic Confession are all Magyars, with the exception of eight German congregations; to the Church of the Augsburg Confession belong about 200,000 Germans, 200,000 Magyars, and 400,000 Slavs.

The Unitarians in Transylvania have a superintendent (bishop) and Supreme Consistory at Clausenburg, 104 parishes, and 120 ministers.

Hungary has a national university at Pesth, 48 Catholic and 39 Protestant gymnasia. The number of elementary schools amounted (1864) in Hungary to 11,452, in Transylvania to 1793, in Croatia and Slavonia to 490, in the Military Frontier to 907. A large number of communities were in 1869

still without a school There are also five normal schools at Pesth, Sgezedin, Neuhaiusel, Miskolcz, and Grosskanizsa. — Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 16, 636 Mather, Kirchl. Chronik, 1867 and 1869; Neher, Kirchl. Geogr. u. Statistik, i, 216 sq.; Wiggers, Kirchl. Statistic, 2, 123. (A.J.S.)

## Hunger[[@Headword:Hunger]]

             (רָעָה, raah'; πεινάω) AND THIRST are the symbols of affliction. Thus in Deu 8:3, “He humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger,” where the latter is the instrument of the former. So Deu 32:24, “They shall be burnt with hunger;” i.e. they shall be tormented or afflicted. So tofaist is often called to afflict one's soul, as in Lev 16:29-31; Isa 58:5. In Aristophanes (Aves) hunger is proverbially used for great misery. See 1Co 4:11; 2Co 11:27; Php 4:12. In our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, to hunger and thirst signifies to long for and relish the Gospel (Mat 5:6; Luk 6:21), but elsewhere to be in want of hearing God's word; that is, to be hindered by persecution from worshipping God in peace (Psalms 23; Ecclesiastes 24:19; Joh 4:13; Joh 6:35; Amo 8:11; Eze 7:26). SEE FAMINE.

## Hunnius, AEgidius[[@Headword:Hunnius, AEgidius]]

             an eminent German Lutheran theologian, was born at Winenden, in Wurtemberg, Dec. 21, 1550, and studied theology at Tübingen, where he  afterwards became first tutor, and deacon in 1574. In 1576 he went to Marburg as professor and preacher, Here his strict adherence to the doctrine of ubiquity in the Eucharist, and his advocacy of the Formula of Concord, sowed the germ of the separation of the Hessian Church. In 1592 he became professor at the University of Wittenberg, where he opposed the moderate views of Melancthon. In 1594 he accompanied the duke Frederick William to the Imperial Diet at Regensburg, where his influence opposed the union of the different evangelical free cities. In 1595 he sustained a sharp controversy with Samuel Huber (q.v.) on the doctrines of election and predestination, and in 1602, at the Conference of Ratisbon, he was one of the principal opponents of the Jesuits Gretzer and Tanner. He died April 4,1603. His principal works are, Confession v. d. Person Christi (1577, 1609); also in Latin, De persona Christi (1585): — Calvinius Judaïzans (1593): — Antiparaeus (194 and 1599): — Josephus, a drama (1597). His works in Latin have been collected and published by Garthius (Wittenb. 1607-9, 5 vols. folio). See Hutter, Lebensbeschreibung (1603); Adami, Vites Theologorum; Ersch und Gruber, Encyklopadie; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25; 554; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6:316 sq.; Kurtz, Ch. Hist. ii, 140; Bayle, Hist. Dict. 3:534 sq.

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

             son of AEgidius Hunnius, was born at Marburg July 11, 1585. He studied philology, philosophy, and theology at Wittenberg, where he began lectures on theology and philosophy in 1609. In 1612 he went as superintendent to Eilenburg, and in 1617 returned to Wittenberg as professor, in the place of Hutter (q.v.). In 1623 he became head pastor of the Church of Mary at Lubeck, and superintendent of the Church in the same city the following year. He died April 12, 1643. He resembled his father as well in his attachment to the Lutheran orthodoxy as in his learning and controversial powers. He devised the plan of a Collegium Irenicum, which was called, after him, “Collegium Hunnianum,” and which was to form a supreme tribunal in all theological disputes. He was also distinguished as an able opponent of Popery. His principal works are, Ministerii Lutherani divini adeoque legitimi demonstratio (Witteub. 1614): — Examen errorum Photinianorum (1618, 1620): — Epitome credendorum (Wittenberg, 1625; 18 eds., and translated into Dutch, Swedish, and Polish): — Διάσχεψις theol. de fundamentali dissensu doctrinae evangel. Lutheranae et Calvlinianae (Wittenb. 1626): — Bedenkent ob u. wie d. is d. Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche d.  schwebende Religionstreitigkeit beilegen od fortstellen u. endigen misgen (Lub. 1632, 1638,1666,1667): — Anweisung zum rechten Christenthum (Lub. 1637 and 1643). See Heller, Lebensbeschreibung (1843); Pierer, Universal Lex. vol. 8; Herzog, Real Encyklop. 6, 321 sq.; Kurtz, Ch. Hist. 2, 201.

## Hunolt, Franz[[@Headword:Hunolt, Franz]]

             a distinguished Roman Catholic pulpit orator, was born in the duchy of Nassau towards the close of the 17th century. He was a member of the Jesuit order, and his Sermons (Cologne, 1737, 6 vols. fol., and often) gave him rank as one of the best preachers (of the 18th. century. He died at Trier in 1746. — Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 12, 606.

## Huns[[@Headword:Huns]]

             (Latin Hunni), a nation of Asiatic origin, and in all likelihood of Mongolian or Tartar stock, therefore akin to. and perhaps to be identified with, the Scythians and the Turks, were, according to De Guignes (Hist. des Huns), whose theory was accepted by Gibbon, and is now entertained by all competent critics, lineal descendants from the Hiong-now nation, “whose ancient seat was an extensive but barren tract of country immediately to the north of the great wall of China. About the year B.C. 200 these people overran the Chinese empire, defeated the Chinese armies in numerous engagements, and even drove the emperor Kao-ti himself to an ignominious capitulation and treaty. During the reign of Vou-ti (B.C. 141- 87) their power was very much broken. Eventually they separated into two distinct camps, one of which, amounting to about 50,000 families, went southwards, while the other endeavored to maintain itself in its original seat. This, however, it was very difficult for them to do; and eventually the most warlike and enterprising went west and north-west in search of new homes. Of those that went northwest, a large number established themselves for a while on the banks of the Volga.” About the earlier part of the 4th century they crossed this river, and advanced into the territories of the Alani, a pastoral people dwelling between the Volga and the Don. The incursion was resisted with much bravery and some effect, until at length a bloody and decisive battle was fought on the banks of the Don, in which the Alan king was slain, and his army utterly routed, and the vast majority of the survivors agreed to join the invaders. They next encountered successfully the aged leader of the Goths, who claimed as his dominions  the land situated between the Baltic and the Euxine, and then his successor Withimir, whom they slew in battle. The Goths still remaining placed themselves under the protection of the emperor Valens, who in 376 gave permission to a great number of them to cross the Danube, and settle in the countries on the other side as auxiliaries to the Roman arms against further invasion. The Huns thus became the occupants of all the old territories of the Goths; and when these, not long afterwards, revolted against Valens, the Huns also crossed the Danube, and joined their arms to those of the Goths in hostilities against the Roman empire.

In the wars that followed, the Huns were less conspicuous than the Goths, their former enemies. In the 5th century they were strengthened by fresh hordes of their brethren, and they determined to gain further conquests. In the reign of Theodosius, under their king Attila (q.v.), they were even strong enough to receive an annual tribute from the Romans to secure their empire against external injury. With Attila's death, however, in 454, their power was totally broken. A few feeble sovereigns succeeded him, but there was now strife everywhere among the several nations that had owned the firm sway of Attila, and the Huns never regained their power. Many of them took service in the armies of the Romans, and others again joined fresh hordes of invaders from the north and east; which were undoubtedly tribes related to them, especially the Avares, whom they joined in great numbers and hence perhaps the reason why, at this period of their history, they are frequently called Hunnavares They now made themselves masters of the country known by us as Lower Austria. But the Slaves (Slavonians?) in Bohemia and Moravia regained their territory in the 8th century, and many of the Hunnavares were made slaves, and were thus brought to a knowledge of Christianity.

Their inclinations, however, led them to oppose most fiercely all the inroads of Christianity, and they transformed Christian churches into heathen temples wherever they were successful in gaining territory. About 791 Charlemagne waged war against the Avares, as the Huns were then called, in which many of them were slain, and but few weak tribes remained. About the year 799 they were finally conquered, and their power broken. Charles himself regarded this war as a sort of crusade or holy war, and sent to the pope and the Church all the tribute paid him by the vanquished foe. The first great convert to Christianity was one of their princes, called Tudem, who sent a legation to Charlemagne in 795, with the declaration that he would become tributary to him and accept the Christian religion. He was baptized at Aix-la-Chapelle in 796, but shortly after his return to his tribe he abjured the newly-accepted faith. King Pepin paid  particular attention to the conversion of the Huns, in whose behalf Alcuin (q.v.) also was greatly interested. By peopling the territory assigned to them with ‘Germans, especially Bavarians, and by founding several monasteries and cathedrals, the subsequent Christian princes furthered Christianity among them, until they became amalgamated with the Germans.

The Huns are said to have been of a dark complexion, almost black; deformed in their appearance, of uncouth gesture, and shrill voice. The ancient descriptions unmistakably ally them to the Tartars. “They were distinguished from the rest of the human species by their broad shoulders, flat noses, and small black eyes deeply buried in the head; and, as they were almost destitute of beards, they never enjoyed either the manly graces of youth or the venerable aspect of age. A fabulous origin was assigned worthy of their form and manners-that the witches of Scythia, who for their foul and deadly practices, had been driven from society, had copulated in the desert with infernal spirits, and that the Huns were the offspring of this execrable conjunction” (Gibbon). See Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 5, 397 sq.; Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 462; Appleton, Am. Cyclop. 9, 318; Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (Milman's ed.), vol. 6 (see Index). (J. H.W.)

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

             For a general description of this people and their history see volume 4. It is the design in this place to pay some attention to particulars which are merely alluded to in the former article, and especially to examine the question of Attila's influence upon Christendom. The name Huns (Hunni, Ουννοι, Χοῦνοι)"is a comparatively recent one in history, and its derivation is altogether uncertain. The usual theory, that it is only the Chinese Hun-jo transferred into the dialects of the West, is not so well established as to make it impossible, or even unlikely, that Chinese writers may have first found the name used by Byzantine historians, and appropriated it from them. It is evidently a collective name, and designates a people composed of many distinct tribes, which are mentioned in some detail by early writers.

This people belonged to the Turkish family, and can best be accounted for, so far as that portion which enters into European history is concerned, by regarding it as included among the Scythian tribes of which the later classics make mention. An Asiatic branch, whose western limits did not reach beyond the modern Turkestan, is wholly outside the scope of our inquiry. The Huns of history are first discovered as occupants of the district about the Caspian Sea, lying to the north and north-east of the Alans, who occupied the Caucasus and adjoining regions. Emerging thence, they engaged in a bloody struggle with the Alans, whom they defeated and afterward incorporated with their armies; and the allied nations then precipitated themselves on the Goths, whose territories lay beyond and contigtious to those of the Alans, and, by fircing them from. their homes, produced the general irruption of barbarians into the Roman empire. In the revolt of the Goths against the empire the Huns crossed the Danube as allies of their recent enemies, and, though they were, for a time less conspicuous than the Goths, they were yet able to impose a tribute, under their king Rouas, upon the Romans. Bleda and Attila, the sons of Mundzuk and nephews of Rouas, succeeded the latter in 433; and after the death of Bleda, said by some authorities to have been caused by his brother, while others deny the charge, Attila became the acknowledged head of the, vast hordes collected under or affiliated with the Hunnish name, and entered on a career of conquest and diplomacy which made him the most noted personage of his age, and under the embellishing hand of legend and myth has secured to him and his followers a notable place in the recollections of the world for all time. Seven hundred thousand warriors,  Huns, Alans, Avars, Bulgarians, Acatzirs, and many other tribes are said to have followed him into battle. An expedition into Persia for plunder is assumed by some writers as his first distinct enterprise; but history gives clear evidence of but three campaigns conducted by Attila, all of them European wars.

1An invasion of the Eastern or Byzantine empire in 441, in which he defeated the emperor Theodosius II in successive battles, ravaged Illyricum, Thrace, and Greece, and after several years of desultory warfare conquered a peace in 447, which gave him possession of a territory in Thrace. Having devastated the country south of the Danube, he accepted an indemnity from the emperor, and renounced all claim to its control. In addition, he exacted, however, an annual tribute and the return of deserters from his army.

2. An incursion into Gaul in 450, during which he took the towns of Treves, Metz, Rheims, Tongres, Arras, Laon, St. Quentin, Strasburg, etc. Orleans, which was the objective point of the campaign, was relieved by the Roman general AEtius when the gates had already been opened to the Huns, and pillage was beginning. Attila thereupon retreated precipitately to Chalons on the Marne, and was there attacked by the united armies of JEtins and Theodoric, the Visigoth king, and defeated in a terrible battle in which historians report a slaughter of from 252,000 to 300,000 men — the last great battle ever fought by the Romans. Returning to his possessions on the Danube, he prepared for a new campaign, which he undertook

3. In 452. The ostensible reason alleged for his incursion of that year into Italy was the refusal of the emperor Valentinian III to confer upon him the hand of his sister Honoria, accompanied by a dowry of half the empire. He crossed the Julian Alps and laid siege to Aquileia, then the second city in Italy, and at the end of three months overcame its obstinate resistance.: A century later the historian Jornandes could scarcely trace the ruins of the place. Other towns were sacked, e.g. Milan, Pavia, Parma, and quite certainly also Verona, Maitua, Brescia, Bergamo, and Cremona. The whole of Lombardy was ravaged, and Attila was preparing to march on Rome when an embassy from that city, headed by Pope Leo the Great, succeeded in persuading him to a peaceful evacuation of Italy. Retiring into Pannonia by way of Augsburg, which he pillaged, he consoled himself by adding a new wife, Ildico, Hilda, or Mycolth, to the large number which he already possessed; but on the morning after this marriage he was found dead,  having ruptured a blood-vessel or been foully dealt with, A.D. 453. His kingdom fell to pieces almost as soon as the great king was dead; the different nations which had followed his banner became alienated from each other, and separated, some to serve in the armies of the empire, others to seek alliance with tribes in the north and east, which were of similar race and character with themselves.

The effect of the Hunnish incursions was indirectly beneficial to Christianity. The Burgundians, for example, when threatened by Attila's uncle, Oktar-or Ouptar, submitted to be baptized, in the hope that they might thus acquire power to resist the foe. The deliverance of Troyes in the Chalons campaign by the supplications of bishop Lupus, and of Rome in the following year by those of Leo the Great, convinced the mind of that and succeeding ages that piety could accomplish what armies might fail to achieve. The profound impressions wrought upon the mind of Christendom appear most clearly, however, in the legendary histories of Attila, which are preserved in three distinct currents of tradition — the Latin, Germanic, and Hungarian.

The Latin legends originated in the reaction from the panic into which Attila's conquests had thrown the whole of Europe, and sprang from ecclesiastical sources. They seek to explain his successes by exaggerating his power, and both chronology and geography are violated in the attempt to magnify his career. They describe sieges and captures which never took place, make the Hunnish army to sweep over the whole of France, derive the name of the city of Strasburg from the fancy that Attila made four roads through the city walls, and despatch the broken remnants of his army after the battle of Chalons into Spain to fight the Moors. In the title "The Scourge of God," applied to Attila, these Latin. legends reach their culmination. A hermit of Chamipagne says to Attila before Chalons- misplaced in that province by the legend — "Tu es flagellum Dei — but Gods breaks, when he pleases, the instruments of his vengeance. God will take this sword from thee and give it to another." At Troves Attila announces himself to St. Lupus as "the king of the Huns, the Scourge of God;" whereupon the bishop responds, "Welcome, then, scourge of the God whom I serve. Enter, and go where thou wilt." The Huns are, however, smitten with supernatural blindness, and see nothing until they have passed through the city and out at the opposite gate. Some of these legends endow Attila with diabolical attributes, sarcasm, pride, and hideous ugliness, joined with a sardonic humor, while others go to the opposite  extreme, and describe him as a champion of the pope and extirpator of heresies. Some of the latter sort even represent him as preaching, morality, encouraging good marriages, and portioning virtuous maidens. One reports that a great battle was fought by Attila under the walls of Rome, on the conclusion of which the dead rose again and continued the fight with great fury for three days and nights; and the location, with all its details, was afterwards pointed out.

The Germanic legends differ widely from the Latin. In them Attila is a hero, the type of royal majesty, furnished with almost superhuman bravery and strength. He is as wise as Solomon, and richer and more generous than was he. The great Theodoric and Hermanaric are always associated with him, as his inferiors. The oldest of these legends is a fragment of the 8th century at Fulda, which proves that they were circulated in the Frank dialect in Gaul during the Merovingian period. The Germanic form of Attila legend was current in England also at an early period, and receives its fullest development in the Icelandic and Scandinavian handling. The episode of Walter of Aquitaine and the Nibelungenlied are offshots from the primitive stock of this tradition.

The Hungarian legends associate Attila with all the phases of their early national life. Deriving the Magyar stock from Magog, the son of Japhet and king of Scythia, they trace it down to Attila and his son Arpad, the common patrons of the Magyars and Huns. When the Magyars become Christians, it is because Attila, by his docility under the hand of God, whose scourge he was, has prepared the way for their conversion through his merits. He is the inseparable patron of that people, changing when they change, and living through all the stages of their national existence.

Attila was not only a barbarian, but also a heathen, and while he fought Rome rather than the Church, and even showed regard for the sanctity of its eminent representatives, the success of his arms was universally felt to be destructive to Christianity. In the course of time, accordingly, the minds of writers, saturated with ideas derived from the churchly legends, discovered that so mighty an impersonation of the principle of evil as was Attila could be no other than Antichrist himself; and artists, under the same influence, represented him as having almost diabolical features and goat's horns. See frontispiece to Italian legend of Attila, frequently printed at Venice in the later years of the 15th century.  For the later history of the Huns, down to the time when the name and people became extinct, see the article HUNS in volume 4.

Literature. — For the early history Ammianus Marcellinus and Priscus, especially the latter, are the principal sources. Sidonius Apollinaris notices the invasion of Gaul. Later authorities are Jornandes, Procopius, Agathius, Gregory of Tours, and Cassiodorus. Jornandes was a Goth, bitterly hostile to the Huns. and openi to the charge of excessive credulity; but he is the only authority for certain portions of Attila's history.

Among modern works De Guignses's Histoise des Huns must be assigned the first place, as it furnishes all the speculations upon which the earliest accepted history of the Huns is based. Gibbon's account in the Decline and Fall .(Milman's ed. volume 6) is scarcely more than an abridgment of De Guignes's. See also Creasy, Decisive Battles of the World (Chalofis); Neumann, Volker des Sudlichen Russlands; Klenmm, Attila (1827); J. v. Miiller, Attila, der Held des 5. Jahrhunderts (1806); Herbert, Attila, or the Triumph of Christianity (1838); Grimm, Deutsche Heldensagen (Gottingen, 1829); Zeuss, Deutsche u. Nachbarstamme and Ostfinnen. Also, Bertazzalo, Vita. San Leone Primo et di Attila Flagello di Dio (Mantuma, 1614, 4to). Gibbon gives leading authorities on Attila. See the Church Histories and leading Dictionaries, etc., and the articles SEE HUNS, SEE LEO I, SEE POPE, etc., in this Cyclopaedia.

## Hunt, Aaron[[@Headword:Hunt, Aaron]]

             an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born of Episcopal parents at Eastchester, N. Y., March 28, 1768, and emigrated to New York City at seventeen. Here he was converted in 1789, and licensed to preach in 1790. He was first employed as assistant to Dr. Wm. Phoebus on the Long Island Circuit. In 1791 he entered the New York Conference, and was sent to Fairfield Circuit. In a few years his labors were extended all through the state of Connecticut, on the east as well as on the west side of the river by that name, and into adjoining states, exploring new ground, and contending with opposition and difficulties common to Methodist ministers of those times. After this we find him laboring on various circuits in the state and city of New York, having charge of the whole work in that great city. He was sixty-seven years in the ministry, thirty-seven of which he was an effective laborer in the regular itinerant work; and whether located, supernumerary, or superannuated, he continued to labor and preach as he had opportunity, and health would permit, until March, 1855. He died at  Sharon, Conn., April 25, 1858. See Minutes of Conferences, 7, 158; Stevens, Memorials of Methodism.

## Hunt, Absalom[[@Headword:Hunt, Absalom]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Virginia Dec. 4,1773, and emigrated when a boy to East Tennessee, and later removed to Fleming Co., Kentucky. He was licensed as a local preacher about 1793. In 1815 he joined the Kentucky Conference on trial, and was sent to the Madison Circuit. He was next appointed to the Lexington Circuit, and two years afterwards successively to the Hinkstone, Limestone, Mt. Sterling, and Fleming Circuits. In 1823 he was superannuated, but returned at the next session of the Conference, and was sent to the Liberty Circuit. From 1825- 28 he served as supernumerary at Paris, Lexington, and Hinkstone, and then returned to the superannuated list, finding his health inadequate to the active work of the ministry. He died February 21,1841. Hunt was a “natural orator,” and, “though comparatively illiterate and unpolished, such was his native good sense, his deep acquaintance with the human heart, his quick perception of the characters of men, and the unaffected kindness of his manners, that he was not only generally popular as a preacher, but was often the admired favorite with the learned and the refined.” — Methodist Monthly, 1850; Redford, Methodism in Kentucky, 2, 346 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Hunt, Christopher[[@Headword:Hunt, Christopher]]

             a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Tarrytown, N. Y., near the opening of our century; graduated at Rutgers College in 1827, and at New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1830. He was settled at Clarkstown, N. Y., 1830-2: at Nassau, N.Y., 1832-7; and at Franklin St., N. York, 1837-9. Bereft of both parents when very young, he made his home an orphan asylum, where Christian kindness and spiritual training were blessed to him. He was an earnest, devoted preacher, a man of comprehensive views, and well qualified by natural endowments, as well as by divine grace, for the large and important charge in which he ended his ministry. His memory is ardently cherished among the churches, which he served. He fell in the prime of life, a victim of pulmonary disease. His last words were, “All is well.”-Corwin's Manual of the Reformed Dutch Church, p. 119. (W. J. R. T.) Hunt, Jeremiah, D.D., a learned English dissenter, was born in London June 11. 1678. He studied first in that city under Mr. Thomas Rowe, and afterwards at Edinburgh and Leyden. On his  return to England he preached at Tunsted, near Norwich. He received the degree of D.D. from the University of Edinburgh in 1707, and died Sept. 5, 1744. Dr. Lardner preached his funeral sermon, which contained a biographical sketch. Dr. Benson edited Hunt's sermons, which are elaborate and exact compositions, but not interesting. His principal works are An Essay towards explaining the History and Revelations of Scripture in their several Periods, pt. i; to which is added a Dissertation on the ‘all of Man (Lond. 1731, 8vo): — Sermons aid Tracts (Lond. 1748, 4 vols. 8 5). — Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, 1, 1580.

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

             a Congregational minister, was born at Northampton Nov. 20,1744, and was educated at Harvard (class of 1764). From 1765-69 he taught a grammar School at his native place. While in this position he was converted, and having pursued a theological course in his last years of teaching, he was licensed to preach in 1769. Only two years later he was called to the old South Church, Boston, as associate of the Rev. John Bacon (q.v.). In 1775, while on a visit to his home, he died (Dec. 20). Though young even when he died, Hunt had already acquired a great reputation as a ready Speaker and a superior thinker. He published two of his sermons (1771). — Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, i, 686 sq.

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

             a Wesleyan missionary to the Fiji Islands, and a model of Christian excellence, was born at Hykeham Moor, near Lincoln, England, June 13,1812. His early education was very limited, and John was brought up to assist his father on a farm, over which he was bailiff or overseer. When seventeen years old he was converted, and joined the Wesleyan society, to whose service he resolved to devote all his powers. He began at once to preach, and by close application acquired considerable knowledge. In 1835 he received the recommendation from a Quarterly Meeting to join Conference, and in May, 1836, he was accepted by that body as a “preacher on trial.” His intention was to preach a short time at home, and, after sufficient preparation, go to Africa as a missionary. Upon examination at London before the Missionary Committee, he was found to be so far beyond the average standard that it was decided that Hunt should be sent to the theological institution at Hoxton. In 1838, when it became the task of the Missionary Committee at London to determine the future course of  Hunt, the wants of Fiji seemed to press upon them, and they overruled the original design of sending him to Africa. He was ordained March 27, and sailed, with his lately wedded bride, April 29, 1898, and they entered on their work at Rewa Jan. 3, 1839. His only object was to do successfully the work for which he was sent. He labored earnestly to acquire a thorough mastery of the language of the natives, and soon met with such success as has rarely crowned the work of a Christian missionary. Indeed, he became a living example to all missionaries through those islands. “Neither distance nor danger delayed or daunted him. In one of his tours he preached the Gospel to five different nations and kingdoms, who had never before seen a missionary. He died in the midst of his labors, Oct. 4, 1848. Besides a translation of the New Testament for the Fijis, Hunt wrote a work on Entire Sanctification, “the matured thoughts of a Christian profoundly submissive to divine teachings; written amidst the most robust labors of untiring activity, prompted by the principle of holiness; and himself able, through grace, to illustrate the truths he taught by his spirit and life. The book will live; for it is a thorough discussion of the doctrine of Holy Scripture, untinctured with mysticism, free from enthusiastic extravagance, and not burdened, like some recent writings, with extraneous matters interesting only to the writer.” See Rowe, Life of John Hunt (Lond. 1860, 12mo). (J. H. W.)

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

             a very pious and devoted clergyman of the Church of England, and one of the petitioners for the charter granted by king James I to the “London Company” April 10, 1606, emigrated for this country as preacher of the first colony to Virginia Dec. 19, 1606. The history of Mr. Hunt's life previous to this time is not known, neither is it definitely known whether he spent the remainder of his life in Virginia, though this is generally supposed to have been the case, nor is the time of his death at all ascertained. During his connection with the colony their church was burned, and with it. Mr. Hunt's library, but he lived to see at last the church rebuilt (1608). — Hawks, Rise and Progress of the Prot. Episc. Ch. in Va. p. 17 sq.

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

             a distinguished English Hebraist, was born in 1696. He studied at the University of Oxford, where he took the degree of M.A. in 1721. He was one of the first fellows of Hertford College, and applied himself especially  to philosophical researches in the O. Test. He greatly assisted Walton in publishing the London Polyglot. In 1738 he was called to the chair of Arabic founded by Laud. In 1747 he became professor of Hebrew at Oxford; in 1740 he was mace fellow of the Royal Society of London, and received the degree of D.D. in 1744. He died at Oxford October 31, 1774. Hunt wrote De Benedictione patriarchae Jacoli (Oxford, 1724, 4to): — De antiquitate, elegantia et utilitate Linguce Arabicae (Oxford, 1739, 4to): — De Usu Dialectorum Orientalium, etc. (Oxford, 1748): — Observations on several Passages of the Book of Proverbs, with two Sermons (Oxford 1775, 4to), his best and a most valuable work, published after the author's death, under the care of Kennicott. (J. N. P.)

## Hunter[[@Headword:Hunter]]

             SEE HUNTING.

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

             a Scotch Presbyterian divine, born at Culross, Perthshire, in 1741, was educated at the University of Edinburgh. In 1766 he became minister of South Leith, and in 1771 minister of the Scotch Church, London Wall, London. He died at Bristol Hot Wells, October 27, 1802. Hunter was a mall of learning, and an eloquent writer. His principal works are Sermons, collected and republished in their respective order, etc. (Lond. 1795, 2 vols. 8vo): — Sacred Biography, or the History of the Patriarchs; being a course of lectures delivered at the Scotch Church, London Wall (6th ed. Lond. 1807, 5 vols. 8vo). This work has often been reprinted both in England and America, and has had great popularity. It is, to a large extent, an unacknowledged translation from Saurin's Discours Historiques. Huater edited several other French books, and excelled in this line of labor. After his death appeared a collection of his Sermons and other Pieces, with a Sketch of his Life and Writings (Lond. 1804,2 vols. 8vo). See Jones, Christian Biography, s.v.; Darling, Cyclopedia Bibliographica, 1, 1582; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 922.

## Hunter, Humphrey[[@Headword:Hunter, Humphrey]]

             a Presbyterian minister and patriot, was born near Londonderry, Ireland, May 14, 1755. His widowed mother came to this country When Humphrey was only four years old. During the Revolution he served our nation in the struggle for independence, first as a private, and later, for a short time, as  lieutenant, against the Cherokee Indians. He finally decided to prepare himself for a literary career, and to this end pursued a course of study at the Queen's Museum, afterwards called Liberty Hall Academy, at Charlotte, N. C. After the surrender of Charlestown he re-enlisted, and was taken prisoner at the battle of Camden. He succeeded in making his escape from the enemy, and took a gallant part in the battle at Eutaw Springs. After this he resumed his studies at Mount Zion College, Minnsborough, S. C., and graduated in 1787. Two years later he was ordained for the ministry, and in 1805 was installed as pastor over the Steele Creek Church, N.C., where he remained until his death, Aug. 21, 1827. (J. H.W.)

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

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in the County of Tyrone, Ireland, May 10, 1710. When about twenty-four years old he was converted, and joined the Wesleyan Methodist Society, and shortly after his connection with the Church began to preach. He became personally acquainted with Mr. Wesley, and felt so drawn towards him that he decided to accompany him from place to place, to profit by the godly life of the founder of Methodism. In May 1790, he immigrated to this country, and settled in Delaware. He was admitted on trial in the traveling connection in 1793, was ordained deacon in 1794, and in 1796 an elder. He successively traveled Chester, Bristol, Dover, Cecil, Kent, Queen Anne's, Strasburg, Dauphin, and Lancaster circuits. For two years he labored as a missionary in Pennsylvania, and during four years he presided on the Schuylkill District. In 1814 he was returned superannuated, but in 1816 he again resumed his labors. In 1819 he was returned supernumerary, and from 1822 to 1827 continued, and so remained, till his I death at Coventry, Pa., Sept. 27, 1833. In the various appointments he filled in the Church “he was acceptable and useful as a preacher, and discharged the duties of his vocation with simplicity and fidelity.” — Minutes of Conf.

## Hunting[[@Headword:Hunting]]

             (צִיַד, Gr. ἄγρα). The pursuit and capture of beasts of the field was one of the first means of sustenance to which the human race had recourse. In process of time, however, when civilization had made some: progress, when cities were built and lands cultivated, hunting was carried on not so  much for the food which it brought as for the recreation it gave and its conduciveness to health. Hunting has always borne somewhat of a regal character, and in Persia immense parks (παράδεισοι) were enclosed for nurturing and preserving beasts of the chase. The monarch himself led the way to the sport, not only in these preserves, but also over the wide surface of the country, being attended by his nobles, especially by the younger aspirants to fame and warlike renown (Xenoph. Cyr. 8, 1, 38). Scenes of this character are abundantly portrayed on the Assyrian and Babylonian monuments recently discovered by Botta and Layard. The king is represented as pursuing not only smaller game on horseback, but also engaged in the chase of more formidable animals, such as lions and wild bulls, in the chariot (Layard's Nineveh, 1st ser. ii, 328). SEE LION. This was especially a favorite employment of princes, and Darius caused to be engraved on his tomb an epitaph recording his proficiency as an archer and hunter (Strabo, 15, 212).

In the Bible we find hunting connected with royalty as early as in Gen 10:9. The great founder of Babel was in general repute as “a mighty hunter before the Lord.” SEE NIMROD. The patriarchs, however, are to be regarded rather as herdsmen than hunters, if respect is had to their habitual mode of life. The condition of the herdsman ensues next to that of the hunter in the early stages of civilization, and so we find that even Cain was a keeper of sheep. This, and the fact that Abel is designated “a tiller of the ground,” would seem to indicate a very rapid progress in the arts and pursuits of social life. The same contrast and similar hostility we find somewhat later in the case of Jacob and Esau; the first “a plain man dwelling in tents,” the second “a cunning hunter, a man of the field” (Genesis 25 sq.). The account given of Esau in connection with his father seems to show that hunting was, conjointly with tillage, pursued at that time as a means of subsistence, and that hunting had not then passed into its secondary state, and become an amusement.

In Egypt the children of Israel doubtless were spectators of hunting carried on extensively and pursued in different methods, but chiefly, as appears probable, with a view rather to recreation than subsistence (Wilkinson's Anc. Egypt. vol. 3). Wild oxen are represented on the Egyptian sculptures  as captured by means of the lasso, but dogs appear to have been usually employed in the chase. SEE DOG.

That the land of promise into which the Hebrews were conducted on leaving Egypt was plentifully supplied with beasts of the chase appears clear from Exo 23:29, “I will not drive them out in one year, lest the land become desolate and the beast of the field multiply against thee” (comp. Deu 3:22). Also from the regulation given in Lev 17:15, it is manifest that hunting was practiced after the settlement in Canaan, and was pursued with the view of obtaining food. Pro 12:27 proves that hunting animals for their flesh was an established custom among the Hebrews, though the turn of the passage may serve to show that at the time it was penned sport was the chief aim. If hunting was not forbidden in the “year of rest,” special provision was made that not only the cattle, but the beast of the field,” should be allowed to enjoy and flourish on the uncropped spontaneous produce of the land (Exo 23:11; Lev 25:7). Harmer (iv, 357) says, “There are various sorts of creatures in the Holy Land proper for hunting; wild boars, antelopes, hares, etc., are in considerable numbers there, and one of the Christian kings of Jerusalem lost his life (Gesta Dei, p. 887) in pursuing a hare.” That the lion and other ravenous beasts of prey were not wanting in Palestine many passages of the Bible make obvious (1Sa 17:34; 2Sa 23:20; 1Ki 13:24; Harris, Natural History of the Bible; Kitto's Pictorial Palestine).

The lion was even made use of to catch other animals (Eze 19:3), and Harmer long ago remarked that as in the vicinity of Gaza, so also in Judmea, leopards were trained and used for the same purpose (Harmer, 4, 358; Hab 1:8). That lions were taken by pitfalls as well as by nets appears from Eze 19:4; Eze 19:8 (Shaw, p. 172). In the latter verse the words of the prophet, “and spread their net over him” (comp. 2Sa 22:6), allude to the custom of inclosing a wide extent of country with nets, into which the animals were driven by hunters (Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians, 3:4). The spots thus enclosed were usually in a hilly country and in the vicinity of water-brooks; whence the propriety' and force of the language of Psa 42:1, “As the (hunted) hart panteth after the water-brooks.” These places were selected because they were those to which the animals were in the habit of repairing in the morning and evening. Scenes like the one now supposed are found portrayed in the Egyptian paintings (Wilkinson). Hounds were used for hunting in Egypt, and, if the passage in Josephus (Ant. 4, 8, 9) may be considered decisive, in Palestine as well. From Gen 27:3, “Now take thy weapons, thy quiver and thy bow,”  we learn what arms were employed at least in capturing game. Bulls, after being taken, were kept at least for a time in a net (Isa 51:20). Various missiles, pitfalls, snares, and gins were made use of in hunting (Psa 91:3; Amo 3:5; 2Sa 23:20). See the various animals and means of capture enumerated above in their alphabetical place. That hunting continued to be followed till towards the end of the Jewish state appears from Josephus (War, 1, 20, 13), where the historian speaks of Herod as “ever a most excellent hunter, for in one day he caught forty wild beasts.” The same passage makes it clear that horses were employed in the pursuits of the chase (compare Josephus, Ant. 15, 7, 7; 16:10, 3). SEE CHASE.

The prophets sometimes depict war under the idea of hunting: “I will send for many hunters,” says Jeremiah. “and they shall hunt them from every mountain, and from every hill, and out of the holes of the rocks” (16:16), referring to the Chaldaeans, who held the Jews under their dominion, or, according to others, to the Persians, who set the Hebrews at liberty. Ezekiel also (Eze 32:30) speaks of the kings, who were persecutors of the Jews, under the name of hunters. The psalmist thanks God for having delivered him from the snares of the hunters [Eng. trans. “fowler”] (Psa 91:3). Micah complains (Mic 7:2) that every one lays ambuscades for his neighbor, and that one brother hunts after another to destroy him. Jeremiah (Lam 3:52) represents Jerusalem as complaining of her enemies, who have taken her, like a bird, in their nets. SEE NET.

## Huntingdon, Selina, Countess of[[@Headword:Huntingdon, Selina, Countess of]]

             a lady distinguished in the religious history of the 18th century, was born Aug. 24, 1707, and was one of the three daughters and co-heirs of Washington Shirley, earl of Ferrers. Selina, the second daughter, married, in 1728, Theophilus Hastings, earl of Huntingdon, a nobleman of retired habits, with whom she appears to have had a very happy life till his sudden death, on the 13th of October, 1746, of a fit of apoplexy. She had many children, four of whom died in youth or early manhood. It was probably these domestic afflictions, which disposed this lady to take the course so opposite to that which is generally pursued by the noble and the great. She became deeply religious. It was at the time when the preachers and founders of Methodism, Wesley and Whitefield, were rousing in the country, by their exciting ministry, a spirit of more intense devotion than  was generally prevalent, and leading men to look more to what are called the distinguishing truths of the Gospel than to its moral teachings, to which the clergy had for some time chiefly attended in their public ministrations. She found in these doctrines matter of consolation and delight, and she sought to make others participate with her in the advantages they were believed by her to afford. The character of her religion, as well as of her mind, was too decided to allow it to shrink from prominence; on the contrary, her high soul compassionated the fearful condition of the wealthy and noble, and she boldly sought to spread the influences of Methodism, not only through the highest aristocracy of the realm, but to the royal family itself. She took Whitefield under her especial patronage, defied all ecclesiastical order, and even engaged him to hold services in her own residence, which she invited her friends of the nobility to- attend. She persuaded the highest ladies of the court to listen to the preaching of the great evangelists, with and influence more or less powerful upon some, and a saving change in others.

Among the former were the celebrated duchess of Marlborough and the duchess of Buckingham; among the latter the duchess of the celebrated Chesterfield, lady Ann Frankland, and lady Fanny Shirley, the theme of the admiring muse of Pope. She numbered among her friends some of the most venerated personages of English history: Watts, Doddridge, Romaine, Venn, and the sainted Fletcher. When Mr. Wesley and his conference of preachers came to the conclusion that they had “leaned too much to Calvinism,” lady Huntingdon, who had imbibed from Whitefield the Calvinism by him imported from New England, received the impression, erroneous but inveterate, that Mr. Wesley denied the doctrine of justification by faith, and insisted upon the saving merit of works. Her relative, Rev. Walter Shirley, with the small remnant of Calvinistic preachers, called for recantation. A controversy arose, in which the virulent Toplady was chief champion of Calvinism, and love and truth, on the Armenian side, found their model in Fletcher. Each party went on, in spite of the break, in spreading the essential truths of the Gospel maintained by both. Lady Huntingdon and Mr. Wesley never again met on earth; but when, near the close of her own career, she read the dying ascription made by Mr. Wesley of his salvation to the blood of the Lamb, and when she learned from Wesley's fellow-traveler, Bradford, that such had ever been the tenor of his preaching, her soul melted, and, bursting into tears, she lamented that the unhappy separation had ever taken place. Whitefield made no attempt to found a separate sect, but the countess chose to assume a sort of leadership among his followers, and to act herself as the  founder of a sect, and those who might properly have been called Whitefieldian Methodists came to be known as “the countess of Huntingdon's Connection.”

On Whitefield's death in 1777 she was appointed by will sole proprietrix of all his possessions in Georgia (U. S. A.), and a result of this was the organization of a mission to America. But the countess had also at her own command a considerable income during the forty-four years of her widowhood, and, as her own personal expenses were few, she established and supported, with the assistance of other opulent persons, members of her own family, or other persons who were wrought upon as she was. a college at Trevecca, in Wales, for the education of ministers; built numerous chapels, and assisted in the support of the ministers in them. He died June 17,1791, and the number of her chapels at the time of her death is stated to have been sixty-four, the principal of which was that at Bath, where she herself frequently attended. She created a trust for the management of her college and chapels after her death. The college was soon after removed to Cheshunt, Herts, where it still flourishes; but her chapels have, for the most part, become in doctrine and practice almost identical with those of the Congregational or Independent body, the chief distinction being in the use of a portion” at least of the “Book of Common Prayer,” though, where not expressly directed in the trust-deed, that practice has in many instances been abandoned. In 1851 there were, according to the census, 109 chapels belonging to the countess of Huntingdon's Connection in England and Wales. See English Cyclopaedia; Methodist Quarterly Review, January, 1858, p. 162; Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, i, 167; Life and Times of the Countess of Huntingdon (Lond. 1840, 2 vols. 8vo); Mudge, Lady Huntingdon portrayed (New York, 1857, 12mo); Skeats, Hist. of the Free Churches of England, p. 388 sq.

## Huntingford, George Isaac, D.D[[@Headword:Huntingford, George Isaac, D.D]]

             an English prelate, was born in Winchester in 1748, and was educated at Winchester School and at New College, Oxford. In 1772 he became master of Westminster School; in 1789, warden of Winchester School; in 1802, bishop of Gloucester; and in 1815 bishop of Hereford. He died in 1832. Besides several Greek and Latin class-books, he published Thoughts on the Trinity, with Charges, etc. (2nd edit. Lond. 1832, 8vo); and a number of occasional sermons and charges. See Gentleman's Magazine, June and Dec. 1832; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, 1, 1584 Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 924. Huntington, Joseph, D.D., a Congregational minister,  was born in 1735, at Windham, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1762, and was ordained pastor of the First Church, Coventry, Conn., June 29, 1763, where he died Dec. 25, 1794. In 1780 he was made a member of the board of overseers of Yale College. He published A Plea before the Ecclesiastical Council at Stockbridge in the Case of Mrs. Fiske, excommunicated for marrying a profane Man (1779): — An Address to his Anabaptist Brethren (1783): — Thoughts on the Atonement of Christ (1791): — Calvinism improved (post, 1796); and a few occasional sermons. — Sprague, Annals, 1, 602.

## Huntington, Joshua[[@Headword:Huntington, Joshua]]

             a Congregational minister, was born Jan. 31,1786, at Norwich, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1804, entered the ministry in Sept. 1806, and was ordained co-pastor of the Old South Church, Boston, May 18,1808, where he labored until his death, Sept. 11,1819. He was one of the founders of the “American Educational Society,” and President of the. “Boston Society for the Religious and Moral Instruction of the Poor” from its formation in 1816. — Sprague, Annals, 2, 501.

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

             a distinguished English theologian and Orientalist, was born in February, 1636, at Deorhyrst, in Gloucestershire, where his father, of the same names, was parish clergyman. He was educated at the free-school of Bristol, was admitted in 1652 a portionist of Merton College, Oxford, received his bachelor's degree in 1658, and was shortly after elected to a fellowship in that college. He took his degree of Master of Arts in 1663, and, having then applied himself with great success to the study of the Oriental languages, he was in 1670 appointed to the situation of chaplain at Aleppo. From 1677 to 1682 he traveled in the East, and a short time after his return, in 1683, was appointed provost or master of Trinity College, Dublin, receiving about this time the degree of D.D.; he resigned this position in 1691, and once more returned to England. In August, 1692, he was presented by Sir Edward Turner to the rectory of Great Hallingbury, in Essex; and while there he married a sister of Sir John Powell, one of the justices of the King's Bench. In 1701 he was elected bishop of Raphoe, but he died before consecration, Sept. 2, of this year. Dr. Huntington is principally distinguished for the numerous Oriental manuscripts which he procured while in the East and brought with him to England. Besides those  which he purchased for archbishop Marsh and bishop Fell, he obtained between six and seven hundred for himself, which are now in the Bodleian Library, to which he first presented thirty-five of them, and then sold the rest in 1691 for the small sum of £700. Huntington, however, missed the principal object of his search, the very important Syriac version of the epistles of St. Ignatius, a large portion of which was recovered in 1843 by Mr. Tattam from one of the very monasteries in Nitria, which Huntington had visited in the course of his inquiries. Several of Huntington's letters, which are addressed to the archbishop of Mount Sinai, contain inquiries about the manuscript of St. Ignatius, and the same earnest inquiries are made in his letters to the patriarch of Antioch. See Vita I. et epistolae, edited by Thomas Smith (Lond. 1704, 8vo); English Cyclop. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 924; Hook, Eccles. Biog. 6:224; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 1, 1585. (J. H. W.)

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

             a Calvinistic Methodist preacher, was born in 1744. He passed his early life in: menial service and dissipation, but after conversion he entered the ministry, and became a popular preacher in London. On his books he took the title of S. S., or Sinner Saved. He died in 1813. — A review of his works by Southey will be found in the Quarterly Review, 20, 462. His writings have been collected and published: Works (London, 1820, 20 vols. 8vo, and his select works, edited by his Song of Solomon , 6 vols. 8vo, 1838, and reprinted in 1856): Contemplations on the God of Israel, in a series of letters to a friend (Sleaford, 1830, 12mo): — The Law established by the Faith of Christ, a sermon oil Rom 3:31 (Lond. 1786, 8vo): — The Epistle of Faith (Lond. 1789, 8vo):The Kingdom of Heaven taken by Prayer, with Life of the author (Andover, 1832, 32mo): — The wise and foolish Virgins described, the substance of two sermons on Mat 25:3-4 (Lond. 1803, 8vo). — Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, 1, 1586.

## Huntingtonians[[@Headword:Huntingtonians]]

             a class of Antinomians (q.v.) in England, followers of William Huntington (q.v.), a Calvinistic Methodist preacher of London. Huntington maintained that the elect are justified from all eternity, an act of which their justification in this world by faith is only a manifestation; that God sees no sin in believers, and is never angry with them; that the imputation of our sins to Christ, and of his righteousness to us, was actual, not judicial; that faith, repentance, and holy obedience are covenant conditions on the part of Christ, not on our part; and, finally, that sanctification is no evidence of justification, but rather renders it more obscure. These doctrines still continue to be taught in a number of chapels, especially in Sussex.

## Hunyad, Johannes Corvinus[[@Headword:Hunyad, Johannes Corvinus]]

             SEE HUNGARY.

## Hupfeld, Hermann, D.D[[@Headword:Hupfeld, Hermann, D.D]]

             a German theologian, and one of the most distinguished Hebraists of Europe, son of the clergyman Bernhard Karl Hupfeld, who died at  Spangenburg, Hesse, in 1823, was born March 31, 1796, at Marburg, and educated at the university of his native place, under the especial protection of the great Orientalist Arnoldi (q.v.). After preaching a short time as assistant to the first Reformed preacher of Marburg, he accepted in 1819 the position as third teacher at the gymnasium at Hanau. He resigned in 1822 on account of impaired health, and, after a summer's journey through Switzerland, and the use of mineral waters at the springs of two watering- places in Wurtemberg, he went first to his father's house at Spangsenburg to resume his theological studies and to prepare for the ministry, and later to the University of Halle, where he became acquainted with Gesenius, and was led to a more thorough study of the Scriptures, especially the Old Testament. In 1824 he began to lecture at the university, and prepared an elaborate essay on the Ethiopic language (Exercitationes AEthiopiae, Leipzig, 1825), which was favorably received and commented upon in the Heidelberger Jahrbücher and the Hallische Literatur Zeitung.

In 1825 he was appointed extraordinary professor of theology at the University of Marburg, and in 1827, after Hartmann's death, professor ordinairius of the Oriental languages, retaining the chair of theology, which was made a regular professorship in 1830. During the Revolution of 1830 he was on the side of those who favored a reform of the ecclesiastical constitution of Hesse, and strongly opposed the conservative minister Hassenpflug. In 1843 he went to Halle as the successor of Gesenius, by whose influence Hupfeld had received the degree of D.D. in 1834. During the revolution of 1848 he was active in the interests of a popular form of government, and urged the establishment of a German empire on a historical basis. He died April 24,1866. In theology, Hupfeld was called orthodox in Germany, but in America he would be much more likely to have been classed with “Liberals.” On inspiration, for instance, he held that only certain portions of the sacred writings are of divine origin, and that the Spirit reveals to all sincere readers the real character of such passages. In criticism, he belonged to the school of his friend De Wette (q.v.). “His researches were extensive, but guarded in their deductions by his caution. In the Elaboration of his works he was extremely fastidious.

A connoisseur in work, he could not go on if the machinery were not exact, if one slight element were lacking to harmony and completeness. This sensibility sometimes impeded the activities of a mind whose powers of acquisition and production were immense. In his department he was among the first scholars of his day. Few burial-grounds, indeed, enclose the ashes of two such savans as Hupfeld and his predecessor Gesenius. At the close of his  arduous life, when in his seventy-first year, his mental vigor, showed no decline, his diligence no slackening. As a religious man, Hupfeld belonged to the Pietists, who correspond in the religious scale with our strict evangelical Christians. He was a devout man, though not after our stamp of devotion. It is doubtful whether he knew anything by experience of our immediate conversion. Probably he was never in a prayer meeting; and he looked upon revivals as questionable, if not objectionable measures. Of devotional methods and exercises, then, he had limited knowledge; but he believed, nevertheless, ‘with the heart unto righteousness.'

He lived as all Christians must live, by faith” (N. Y. Methodist, 1866, No. 313). Hupfeld left mere monographs, the results of most careful inquiry on certain points bearing on the subjects to which he devoted his later years, and but few books proper. Thus, in 1841, he commenced a Hebrew grammar, in which he attempted to pursue the same course in the Shemitic as Grimm did in. the Germanic language, viz. the development of the Hebrew genetically by a consideration of its sounds. Only a few sheets of the work were published, under the title Kritisches Lehrb. der hebr. Sprache und Schrift (Cassel, 1841). His most important works are, Ueber d. Begriff u. d. Methode d. bibl. Einleit. (Marb. 1844):De antiquioribus apud Judceos accentunim scriptoribus (Halle, 1846 and 1847, 2 vols.): — De primit. et vera festorum apud Hebreos ratione (1851, 1852, 1858, 1865, 2 vols.): — Quaest. in Jobeidos locos (1853): — Die Quellen d. Genesis (Berl. 1835): — Die Psalmen, übersetzt u. erkldrt (1855-62, 4 vols. 8vo; of a 2nd ed., begun in 1867 by Dr. Edward Riehm, 3 vols. are now [1870] published): — Die heutige theosoph. u. mytholog. Theologie und Schrifterklarung (Berlin, 1861). A biography of Hupfeld was published by Dr. Riehm (Dr. Hermann Hupfeld, Halle, 1867). See Theol. Univ. Lex. 1, 374; Pierer, Universal Lex. 8, 631; Stud. u. Krit. 1868, 1, 184 sq.; Jahrb. deutsch. Theolog. 1868, 4:758 sq.; Bib. Sac. 1866, p. 673 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Hupham[[@Headword:Hupham]]

             (Heb. Chiupham', חוּפָם, according to Gesenius perh. coast-man, according to Furst screened; Sept. omits, but some eds. have Ο᾿φαμ; Vulg. Hupham), a person apparently mentioned as one of the sons of Benjamin (Num 26:39); elsewhere less correctly called HUPPIM (Gen 46:24). His descendants are called HUPHIMITES (Hebrew Chuphanzi', חוּפָמַי, Sept. omits, but some eds. Ο᾿φαμί,Vulg. Huphamitce, Num 26:39). B.C. 1856. The name Huppim being in the plural  (Heb. Chuppim', חֻפַּים, coverings; Sept. omits in Gen 46:21, but some copies have ᾿Θφμίν or Ο᾿φιμίμ; as a son of Bela; Vulg. Ophim.), suggests the possibility that it is a contraction for Huphamites. SEE SHUPPIM.

The only other passages where it occurs are 1Ch 7:12 (Sept. Α᾿φείμ, Vulg. Hapham) and 15 (Sept. Α᾿φφείμ, Vulg. Happhim), in both which it has the same fraternity with Shuppim, and in the latter mention is made of a sister Maachah as married to Machir, the son of Manasseh by a concubine, while in the former Huppim and Shuppim are expressly called the sons of Ir, apparently a son of Benjamin additional to the three mentioned in 1Ch 7:6, but probably not the Iri mentioned in 1Ch 7:7. Hence results the probability that Hupham, whose descendants are thus spoken of, was a grandson of Benjamin, and consequently a son of one of his five sons expressly named in order in 1Ch 8:1-2, but whether of the fourth or fifth is uncertain. SEE BENJAMIN.

## Huphamite[[@Headword:Huphamite]]

             (Num 26:39). SEE HUPHAM.

## Huppah[[@Headword:Huppah]]

             (Heb. Chuppah', חֻפָּה, a covering or bridal canopy, as in Psa 19:6; also protected, as in Isa 4:5; Sept. Ο᾿φφά v.r. Ο᾿πφά, and even Ο᾿χχοφφά), the head of the thirteenth of the twenty-four classes into which David divided the priests (1Ch 24:13). B.C. 1014.

## Huppim[[@Headword:Huppim]]

             (Gen 46:21; 1Ch 7:12). SEE HUPHAM.

## Hur[[@Headword:Hur]]

             (Heb. Chûr, חוּר, a hole, as of a viper, Isa 11:8; also a narrow and filthy subterranean prison, Isa 42:22; comp. the “black hole” of Calcutta; otherwise noble; Sept. ῎Ωρ, Οὔρ, but Σούρ in Neh 3:9; Josephus ῎Ορος and Οὔρης), the name of five men.

1. A son of Caleb (Judah's great-grandson through elzron), the first one by his second wife Ephrath, and grandfather of Bezaleel (q.v.), the famous artificer, through Uri (1Ch 2:19; 1Ch 2:50; 1Ch 4:1; 1Ch 4:4; comp. 2:20; 2Ch 1:5; Exo 31:2; Exo 35:30; Exo 38:22). B.C. between 1856 and  1658. By some (after Josephus, Ant. 3:6,1) he has been confounded with the following.

2. The husband of Miriam, the sister of Moses, according to Josephus (Ant. 3:2, 4). During the conflict with the Amalekites he assisted Aaron in sustaining the arms of Moses in that praying attitude upon which the success of the Israelites was found to depend (Exo 17:10-12); and when Moses was absent on Sinai to receive the law, he associated Hur with Aaron in charge of the people (Exo 24:14). B.C. 1658.

3. The fourth named of the five princes or petty kings of Midian (מִלְכֵי מַדנְיָן), who were defeated and slain shortly before the death of Moses by the Israelites, under the leadership of Phinehas, the son of Eleazar (Num 31:8; Josephus, Ant. 4:7, 1). B.C. 1618. In Jos 13:21 these five Midianites are termed סַיהוֹן נְסַיכֵי, the vassals of Sihon, and are also described as ישְׁבֵי הָאָרֶוֹ, dwellers in the land, which Keil (ad loc.) explains as meaning that they had for a long time dwelt in the land of Canaan with the Moabites, whereas the Amorites had only recently effected an entrance. After the defeat of Sihon these chieftains appear to have made common cause with Balak, the king of Moab (Num 22:4; Num 22:7), and to have joined with him in urging Balaam to curse the Israelites. The evil counsel of Balaam having been followed, and the. Israelites in consequence seduced into transgression (Num 31:16), Moses was directed to make war upon the Midianites. The latter were utterly defeated, and “Balaam also, the son of Beor, they slew with the sword.” SEE SIHON.

4. A person whose son (Ben-Hur) was Solomon's purveyor in Mount Ephraim (1Ki 4:8). Josephus calls him Ures (Οὔρης), and makes him to have been himself military governor of the Ephraimites (Ant. 8:2, 3). B.C. ante 995.

5. Father of Rephaiah, which latter is called “ruler of the half part of Jerusalem” after the exile, and repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 3:9). B.C. ante 446.

## Hurai[[@Headword:Hurai]]

             (Heb. Churay', חוּרִי, Chald. perhaps linen worker, otherwise noble; Sept. Οὐρί, Vulg. Hurai), a native of the valleys (“brooks”) of Mount Gaash,  one of David's heroes (1Ch 11:32); called less correctly in the parallel passage (2Sa 23:30) HIDDAI. B.C. 1046.

## Huram[[@Headword:Huram]]

             (a, 1Ch 8:5; b, 1Ch 14:1, marg.; 2Ch 2:3; 2Ch 2:11-12; 2Ch 8:2; 2Ch 8:18; 2Ch 9:10; 2Ch 9:21; c, 2Ch 3:13; 2Ch 4:11; 2Ch 4:16). SEE HIRAM.

## Hurd, Carlton, D.D[[@Headword:Hurd, Carlton, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in New Hampshire in. 1795. He graduated from Dartmouth College in 1818, and from Andover  Theological Seminary in 1822; was ordained, September 17, 1823, pastor at Fryeburg, Maine, and died there, December 6, 1855. See Trien. Cat. of Andover Theol. Sem. 1870, page 51.

## Hurd, Isaac, D.D[[@Headword:Hurd, Isaac, D.D]]

             a Unitarian and subsequently a Trinitarian minister, was born at Charlestown, Massachusetts, December 7, 1785. He graduated at Harvard College in 1806; completed his theological studies at Divinity Hall, Edinburgh, Scotland; and preached his first sermon in London. He was ordained pastor of the Unitarian Society in Lynn, Massachusetts, September 15, 1813, and was dismissed May 22, 1816. Although he had so far changed his sentiments as to become an avowed Trinitarian, he was called to be the pastor of the Second (Unitarian) Society in Exeter, N.H., and was installed, September 11, 1817. "Notwithstanding a conscientious difference of opinion on certain important points, he continued to enjoy the cordial respect and affection of his people." In his advanced years his society secured for him the services of colleague pastors. He died at South Reading (now Wakefield), at the residence of his son, October 4, 1856. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8:446; Necrology of Harvard College, page 116. (J.C.S.)

## Hurd, Richard, D.D[[@Headword:Hurd, Richard, D.D]]

             an eminent English prelate, was born at Congreve, Staffordshire, in 1720. He was admitted at Emanuel College, Cambridge, in 1733. In 1750, by recommendation of his friend, bishop Warburton (q.v.), he became one of the Whitehall preachers, and in 1757 rector of Thurcaston. He afterwards became successively rector of Folkton, Yorkshire, in 1762, preacher of Lincoln's Inn in 1765, archdeacon of Gloucester in 1767, and finally bishop of Lichfield and Coventry in 1775, whence he was translated to Worcester in 1781. In 1783 he was offered the archbishopric of Canterbury, which he declined. He died in 1808. His Sermons (5 vols. 8vo), distinguished by elegant simplicity of style, perspicuity of method, and acuteness of elucidation, are to be found, with his other miscellaneous writings, in his Works (London, 1811, 8 vols. 8vo). His most important contribution to theology is his Introduction to the Study of the Prophecies (1772, 8vo; 1788, 2 vols. 8vo; 1839, edited by Bickersteth, 12mo). This was the first of the “Warburtonian Lectures.” Notwithstanding the polemical cast of some of these sermons, the clear exposition of the general principles of prophecy and of the claims which this portion of the sacred Scriptures has on the serious and unprejudiced attention of thoughtful readers, conveyed in perspicuous and even elegant language, has secured a large amount of popularity for the work even up to recent times (Kitto, Bib. Cyclop. ii, 343). — He also edited The Works of' Warburton (1788. 7 vols.), and published a Life of Warburton (Lond. 1794, 4to). See Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 925; Quarterly Review (London), 7:383; Hallam, Lit. Hist. of Europe (4th edit., Lond. 1854), 3:475; Life. and Writings of Hurd, by Francis Kilvert (Lond. 1860); Christ. Remembrancer, 1860, p. 262; North British Rev. May 1861, art. 4; Hook, Eccles. Biog. 6 225 sq.

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

             an English divine, was born at Bishopstone, Sussex, in 1763, and was educated first at Chichester School and next at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford. In 1782 he was chosen demy of St. Mary Magdalene College, and some time after was made a fellow. In 1785 he became curate of Burwash, in Sussex, and in 1791 was presented to the living of his native place. In 1793 he was elected to the professorship of poetry, having previously published some poems of great excellence. He took the degree of B.D. in 1794, and that of D.D. in 1797. He died Dec. 23, 1801. Besides poetical works, Hurdis published several works of interest to the Biblical student. They are: Select Critical Remarks upon the English Version of the first ten Chapters of Genesis (Lond. 1793, 8vo): — A short critical Disquisition upon the true Meaning of the Word תִּנַּינַים (Gen 1:21) (ibid. 1790, 8vo), in which he contends that this word, wherever it occurs, signifies crocodile. “His remarks on the various passages in which it is found are, to say the least, very ingenious.” He also wrote Twelve Dissertations on the Nature and Occasion of Psalm and Prophecy (ibid. 1800). — Kitto, Bib. Cycl. 2, 343; Hook, Eccl. Biogr. 6, 227 sq.; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 925.

## Hurdwar[[@Headword:Hurdwar]]

             (more accurately HARDWAR, i.e. Gate of Hari), also called GANGADWARA (Ganges Gate), an Indian city, is celebrated on account of the pilgrimages which are made to it. More than two million people from all parts of India resort to this place to take the sacred bath in the Ganges (q.v.), that flows by the side of it. As in Mecca, the occasion is also improved for business purposes, and great fairs are held annually in April. — Brockhaus, Conv. Lex. 8, 167-8.

## Huret, Gregoire[[@Headword:Huret, Gregoire]]

             a reputable French engraver, was born at Lyons in 1610. The following are some of his principal plates: Life and Passion of Our Saviour, a set of thirty-two; The Stoning of Stephen; St. Peter Preaching; Christ Crowned with Thorns; The Holy Family with St. Catharine. He died at Paris in 1670. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Huri[[@Headword:Huri]]

             (Heb. Churi', חוּרַי, according to Gesenius perhaps linen-work-er, like Arab. Hariri; so also Furst; Sept. Opi, Vulg. Huri), son of Jaroah and father of Abihail of the descendants of Gad in Bashan (1Ch 5:14). B.C. ante 781.

## Huris[[@Headword:Huris]]

             SEE HOURIS; SEE MOHAMEDANISM.

## Hurlburt, Russell Higley, M.D., D.D[[@Headword:Hurlburt, Russell Higley, M.D., D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Winchester, Connecticut, April 21, 1826. He was converted in 1845, joined the Erie Conference in 1850, and filled important stations in it until his death, at Marion, Iowa, April 14, 1883. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1883, page 319.

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

             an English Independent minister, was born about 1675. He became pastor of a congregation at Denton, Norfolk, in 1696. In 1724 he removed to London as minister to a congregation in Hare Court, and died in 1731. He employed his time greatly in study, chiefly of the Church fathers. — His style is natural, unaffected, and manly. His writings include a Treatise on the Holy Spirit (1734, 8vo), and a large number of sermons and lectures, all of which have been collected and published under the title The whole Works of John Hurrion, now first collected; to which is prefixed the Life of the Author (Lond. 1823,.3 vols. 12mo). — Darling, Cyclopedia Bibliographica, 1, 1587; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 926; Lond. Evang. Mag. Jan. 1827.

## Hurter, Friedrich Emanuel von[[@Headword:Hurter, Friedrich Emanuel von]]

             a Swiss theologian who became a convert to Romanism, was born at Schaffhausen March 19,1787. He studied Protestant theology at the University of Göttingen, became pastor of a country congregation in his native canton, 1824, first pastor of the city of Schaffhausen, 1835, antistes (chief of the clergy of the canton) and dean of the synod. His intimate association with some of the ultramontane Roman Catholics, and the great attention paid him by communicants of the Church of Rome on a journey through Bavaria and Austria, brought on him the stigma of Cryptocatholicism, and he was requested by his colleagues at Schaffhausen to define his position to the Reformed Church in which he held orders. As the declaration which Hurter made gave dissatisfaction to his Protestant friends and brethren in the ministry, he resigned his position in 1841, and in June, 1844, made open declaration of his abjuration from the Reformed and adherence to the Romish Church. He now devoted his time mainly to the study of history, and in 1845 accepted a call to Vienna as imperial historiographer. Under the liberal ministry of Pillersdorf he had to resign this position, but recovered it in 1851, when he was also ennobled. He died at Gratz Aug. 27,1865. His works of especial interest to the theologian are, Geschichte des Papstes Innocenz III u. s. Zeitalter (Hamb. 1834-42, 4 vols. 8vo): — Befeindung d. Kathol. Kirche in d. Schweiz (Schaffh. 1840): — Geburt u. Wiedergeburt (ibid. 1845, 4 vols. 8vo; 4th ed. 1867, etc.): — Geschichte Ferdinand II und seiner Eltern (Schaffhaus. 1850-64, 11 vols.). The researches made for his history of Innocent III, the Roman  Catholics claim, led to Hurter's conversion to their Church. — Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8, 633; Werner, Gesch. der Kathol. Theol. p. 521 sq.

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

             a German Pietist and philanthropist, was born in the latter half of the 17th century. Of his early history we know but little. He was pastor of a church at Schaffhausen from 1704. He is often called “an Augustus Hermann Francke in miniature” on a account of the school and orphan-houses which he built without possessing the necessary means, relying solely, like Francke, on providential help. His first undertaking was the building of a school-house for the instruction of the children of his own scattered congregation, who were obliged to go a long way to the town school, and of whom many could not get there at all. “In December, 1709, seventy children, with their pastor, Hurter, at their head, celebrated, with prayer and thanksgiving, their entrance into their new house.” The contributions which he had received for the undertaking had been so numerous and so ready that on the completion of the school-house he decided to build an orphan asylum. One benevolent man laid the cornerstone by a gift of 200 florins. To make a beginning, one of the rooms in the schoolhouse was set apart for the reception of orphans, and in July 1711, a widow with seven children was received. The contributions multiplied, and with them the children. Hurter contributed even much of his own means; and when in 1716 he, with other Pietists, was rewarded for his service by deposition from the ministry, he modestly secluded himself in a little room in his orphan asylum, and there spent the latter years of his life. He died in 1721. This article is based altogether on Hurst's' translation of Hagenbach, Hist. of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries (N. York, Scribner and Co., 1869, 2 vols. 8vo), 1, 181.

## Hurwitz, Hyman[[@Headword:Hurwitz, Hyman]]

             a distinguished Jewish scholar, of whose early life but little is known, was, up to the time of his death (about 1850), professor of Hebrew in the University College, London. He is best known as the author of Vinsdiciae Hebraicae, or A Defence of the Hebrew Scriptures (Lond. 1820, 8vo), which, at the time of its appearance, was highly commented upon by the London Quarterly Review, and by Home in his Bibl. Bib. Hurwitz also published a volume of Hebrew Tales, collected chiefly from the Talmud, to which he pays a very high tribute, and of which, while endeavoring to free  it from the objection so frequently made to some of its indecent passages and many contradictions, he says, “I do not hesitate to avow my doubts whether there exists any uninspired work of equal antiquity that contains more interesting, more various and valuable information, than that of the still-existing remains of the ancient Hebrew cases.” In 1807 Hurwitz began the publication of text-books for the study of the Hebrew language, which are considered among the best extant in the English language. They were, Elements of the Hebr. Lang. pt. 1, Orthography (Lond. 1807, 8vo; 4th ed. 1848, 8vo): — Etymology and Syntax of the Hebr. Lagn. (4th ed. 1850, 8vo): — Hebrew Grammar (4th ed. 1850, 8vo). — Etheridge, Introd. to Hebr. Lit. p. 183 sq.; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 926.

## Husband[[@Headword:Husband]]

             (prop. אַישׁor אנֵוֹשׁ, a man, ἀνήρ; also בִּעִל, master,חָתָן, spouse [in Exo 4:24, the phrase “bloody husband” has an allusion to the matrimonial figure in the covenant of circumcision (q.v.)], etc.), a married man, the house-band, or band which connects the whole family, and keeps it together. Johnson (Engl. Dict. s.v.) refers the term to the Runic, house- bonda, master of the house; but several of his instances seem allied to the sense of binding together, or assembling into union. So we say, to husband small portions of things, meaning to collect and unite them, to manage them to the greatest advantage, etc., which is by associating them together; making the most of them, not by dispersion, but by union. A man who was betrothed, but not actually married, was esteemed a husband (Mat 1:16; Mat 1:20; Luk 2:5). A man recently married was exempt from going out to war (Deu 20:7; Deu 24:5). The husband is described as the head of his wife, and as having control over her conduct, so as to supersede her vows, etc. (Num 30:6-8). He is also the guide of her youth (Pro 2:17). Sarah called her husband Abraham lord, a title which was continued long after (Hos 2:16) [baali, my lord]. The apostle Peter seems to recommend it as a title implying great respect, as well as affection (1Pe 3:6). Perhaps it was rather used as an appellation in public than in private. Our own word master [Mr.] (and so correlatively mistress) is sometimes used by married women when speaking of their husbands; but the ordinary use made of this word to all persons, and on all occasions, deprives it of any claim to the expression of particular affection or respect, though it was probably in former ages implied by it or connected with it, as it still is in the instances of proprietors, chiefs,  teachers, and superiors, whether in civil life, in polite arts, or in liberal studies. SEE MARRIAGE.

## Husbandman[[@Headword:Husbandman]]

             (properly אַישׁ אֲדָמָה, man of the ground; γεωργός), one whose profession and labor is to cultivate the ground. It is among the most ancient and honorable occupations (Gen 9:20; Gen 26:12; Gen 26:14; Gen 37:7; Job 1, 2, Isa 28:24-28; Joh 15:1). All the Hebrews who were not consecrated to religious offices were agriculturists. Husbandmen at work are depicted on the ancient monuments of Egypt. It was remarked by the members of the French Commission that there is a great similarity between the joyless looks of the husbandmen on the monuments and the somber countenances of the modern fellahs, whose toil is so miserably remunerated. In reference to the husbandmen of Syria, Dr. Bowring says, “The laboring classes, if left to themselves, and allowed unmolested to turn to the best account the natural fertility and richness of the country, would be in a highly favorable condition. But this cannot be considered as the case when their services may be and are called for as often as the government require them, and for which they are always inadequately paid; they are likewise frequently sent from one part of the country to another wholly without their consent. The fellah, or peasant, earns little more than a bare subsistence. In Syria a great proportion of the labor is done by females, and they are constantly seen carrying heavy burdens, and, as in Egypt, a large portion of their time is employed in fetching water from the wells for domestic use. They bring home the timber and brushwood from the forests, and assist much in the cultivation of the fields.” — Bastow. SEE HIRELING.

God is compared to a husbandman (Joh 15:1; Corinthians 3:9); and the simile of land carefully cultivated, or of a vineyard carefully dressed, is often used in the sacred writings. The art of husbandry is from God, says the prophet Isaiah (28:24-28), and the various operations of it are each in their season. The sowing of seed, the waiting for harvest, the ingathering when ready, the storing up in granaries, and the use of the products of the earth, afford many points of comparison, of apt figures, and similitudes in Scripture. SEE HUSBANDRY.

## Husbandry[[@Headword:Husbandry]]

             (in Heb. by circumlocution , אֲדָמָה, the ground; Gr. prop. γεωργία, 2Ma 12:2; also γεώργιον, a plot of tilled ground, 1Co 3:9). The culture of the soil, although coeval with the history of the human race (Gen 2:15; Gen 4:2; Gen 9:20), was held of secondary account by the nomad Hebrews of the early period (Gen 26:12; Gen 26:14; Gen 37:7; see Job 1:3; comp. Harmer, 1, 88 sq.; Volney, Travels, 1, 291; Burckhardt, Beduin. p. 17; see Michaelis, De antiquitatibus aecon. patriarch. 1, Halle, 1728, and in Ugolini Thesaurus, 24 etc.), but by the Jewish lawgiver it was elevated to the rank of a fundamental institution of national economy (Michaelis, Mos. Recht, i, 249 sq.), and hence became assiduously and skillfully practiced in Palestine (comp. 1Sa 11:5; 1Ki 19:19; 2Ch 26:10; Pro 31:16; Sir 7:15; also Isaiah 27:27, and Gesenius, ad loc.), as it continues in a good degree to be at the present day in the East. Upon the fields, which were divided (if at all) according to a vague land-measure termed a yoke (צֶמֶד, 1Sa 14:14), and occasionally fenced in (see Knobel, Zu Jesaias, p. 207), were mostly raised wheat, barley, flax, lentils (2Sa 23:11), garlic, and sometimes spelt, beans, a kind of durra or holcus (דֹּחִן), cummin, fennel, cucumbers, etc. (Isa 28:25). See these and other vegetables in their alphabetical place; for the later periods, compare the Mishna, Chilaim, 1. The fertility of Palestine (q.v.), especially in many parts, made the cultivation tolerably easy, and it was gradually increased by the clearing away of forests (Jer 4:3), thus enlarging the arable plains (נַיר, novale; comp. Pro 13:23); the hills (2Ch 26:10; Eze 38:6; Eze 38:9) being formed into terraces (compare Niebuhr, Beschreib. 156; Burckhardt, Trav. 1, 64), upon which the earth was kept by a facing of stones, while the low grounds and flats along streams were intersected by ditches (פִּלְגֵּי מִיַם, Pro 21:1; comp. Psalms 1:13) for drainage (comp. Mishna, Maoed Katon, 1, 1; Niebuhr, Beschr. 156; Trav. 1, 356, 437; Harmer, 2, 331 sq.), or, more usually, irrigation by means of water wheels (Mishna, Peah, 5, 3). The soil was manured (דָּמִן) sometimes with dung (compare Jer 9:22; 2Ki 9:37), sometimes by the ashes of burnt straw or stubble (Isa 5:24; Isa 47:14; Joe 2:5). Moreover, the keeping of cattle on the fields (Pliny, 18:53), and the leaving of the chaff in threshing (Korte, Reisen, p. 433), contributed greatly to fertilization. For breaking up the surface of the ground (חָרִשׁ, also יָגִב), ploughs ( מִהֲרֶשֶׁת?),  probably of various construction, were used (“Syria tenui sulco arat:” Pliny, 18:47; comp. Theophrast. Caussae plant. 3, 25; on אַתַּים Joel 4:10, see Credner, ad loc.). The latter, like the harrows, which were early used for covering the seed (Pliny, 18:19, 3; see Harduinm, ad loc.), were drawn by oxen (1Ki 19:19 sq.; Job 1:14; Amo 6:12) or cows (Jdg 14:18; Baba Mez. 6, 4), seldom by asses (Isa 30:24; Isa 32:20; Varro, 2, 6, 8, “Ubi levis est terra”), but never with a yoke of the two kinds of animals together (Deu 22:10), as is now customary in the East (Niebuhr, Beschreib. p. 156): the beasts were driven with a cudgel (מִלְמָד, goad). (Delineations of Egyptian agriculture may be seen in Wilkinson, 2nd ser. 1, 48; Rosellini, Mon. civ. table 32, 33.) See each of the above agricultural implements in its alphabetical 1,.ce. The furrows (מִעֲנָה תֶּלֵם), among the Hebrews, probably ran usually lengthwise and crosswise (Pliny. 18:19; Niebuhr, Beschr. p. 155). The sowing occurred, for winter grain, in October and November; for summer fruit, in January or February; the harvest in April. The unexceptionable accounts of fifty-fold and hundred-fold crops (Gen 26:12 [on the reading here, see Tuch, ad loc]; Mat 13:8 sq.; compare Josephus, War, 4, 8, 3; Herod. 1, 193; Pliny, 18, 47; Strabo, 15, 731; 16, 742; Heliod. Eth. 10, 5, p. 395; Sonnini. Trav. 2, 306; Shaw, Trav. p. 123; Burckhardt, 1, 463; yet see Ruppel, — Abyss. 1, 92; Niebuhr, Beschreib. p. 151 sq.) seem to show that the ancients sowed (planted, i.e. deposited the grain, שׂוּם, Isa 28:25) in drills, and with wide spaces between (Niebuhr, Beschreib. p. 157; Brown's Travels in Africa, p. 457), as Strabo (15, 731) expressly says was the case among the Babylonians. (See further under the above terms respectively; and comp. generally Ugolini, Comment. de re rustica yet. Heb., in his Thesaur. 29; H. G. Paulsen, Nachrichten vom Ackerbau der Morgenländer, Helmstadt, 1748; id. Ackerbau d. Morgenländer, Helmstidt, 1748; Norbery, De agricultura orient., in his Opusc. Acad. ii, 474 sqq.; P. G. Purmann, 5 progr. de re rustica yet. Hebr. Franckf. 1787; also the Calendar. Palcest. aeconom. by Buhle and Walch, Gotting. 1784; Reynier, L'Economie rurale des Arabes; Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians; Layard's Nineveh, 1849; his Nineveh and Babylon, 1853; Kitto's Physical Hist. of Palest. 1843.) SEE AGRICULTURE.

a. The legal regulations for the security and promotion of agriculture among the Israelites (compare Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 23 sq.) were the following: a. Every hereditary or family estate was inalienable  (Lev 25:23); it could indeed be sold for debt, but the purchaser held only the usufruct of the ground; hence the land itself reverted without redemption at the year of jubilee to its appropriate owner (Lev 25:28), whether the original possessor or his heirs-at-law; and at any time during the interval before that period it might be redeemed by such person on repayment of the purchase-money (Lev 25:24). SEE LAND; SEE JUBILEE.

b. The removal of field-lines marked by boundary-stones (‘termini”) was strongly interdicted (Deu 19:14; compare Deu 27:17; Pro 22:28; Hos 5:10), as in all ancient nations (comp. Plato, Leg. 8 p. 843 sq.; Dougtsei, Annalect. 1, 110; since these metes were established with religious ceremonies, see Pliny, 18:2; compare Ovid, Fasti, 2, 639 sq.); yet no special penalty is denounced in law against offenders. For any damage done to a field or its growth, whether by the overrunning of cattle or the spreading of fire (Exo 22:5 sq.), full satisfaction was exacted (Philo, Opp. 2, 339 sq.). But it was not accounted a trespass for a person to pluck ears of grain from a stranger's field with the naked hand (Deu 23:24; Mat 12:1; Luk 6:1). This last prescription, which prevails likewise among the Arabs in Palestine (Robinson's Researches, 2, 419, 430), was also extended to the gleanings (לֶקֶט, comp. Robinson's Res. 3:9) and to the corners, of the field (see Mishna, Peak, 1, 2, where these are computed at a sixtieth part of the field), which were left for the poor, who were in like manner to share in the remnants of the produce of vineyards and fruit trees. SEE GLEANING.

c. Every seventh year it was ordained that all the fields throughout the entire land should lie fallow, and whatever grew spontaneously belonged to the poor (Lev 25:4 sq.). SEE SABBATICAL YEAR.

d. Various seeds were not allowed to be planted in the same field (Lev 19:19; Deu 22:9). These beneficent statutes, however, were not uniformly observed by the Israelites (before the Exile). Covetous farmers not only suffered themselves to remove their neighbor's land-mark (Hos 5:10; comp. Job 24:2) but even kings bought large tracts of land (latifundia) together (Isa 5:8; Mic 2:2), so that the entailment and right of redemption of the original possessor appear to have fallen into disuse; neither was the Sabbatical year regularly observed (Jer 34:8 sq.). (For further agricultural details, see Jahn's Bibl. Archaeol. chap. 4.) SEE FARM.

## Huscanawer[[@Headword:Huscanawer]]

             a ceremony formerly practiced by the North American Indians of Virginia when they wished to prepare a candidate for the priesthood, or for enrollment among their great men. The principal men of the place where the ceremony was to be performed selected the handsomest and most vigorous youths for the purpose. They shut them up for several months, giving them no other sustenance than the infusion of certain roots, which strongly affected the nervous system. The result was that they quite lost their memory; they forgot their possessions, parents, friends, and even their  language, becoming at length deaf and dumb. The purpose of this strange treatment was alleged to be to free the novices from the dangerous impressions of infancy, and to relieve the mind of all prejudice.

## Husgen, Johann[[@Headword:Husgen, Johann]]

             a German Roman Catholic divine, was born at Giesenkirchen, near Cologne, in 1769. In 1792 he became vicar and teacher at his native place, and after filling different vicarages, was appointed superintendent over the Roman Catholic schools at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1816, in 1825 general vicar to archbishop Spiegel of Desenberg and dean in Cologne, and in 1835, upon the death of the archbishop, presiding officer of the archiepiscopacy pro tem, in which offices he greatly distinguished himself by his kind and conciliatory spirit towards all sects. He died in 1841. — Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8, 635.

## Hushah[[@Headword:Hushah]]

             (Hebrew Chushah', חוּשָׁה, haste; Sept. ᾿Ωσάν,Vulg. hosa), son of Ezer and grandson of Hur, of the family of Judah (1Ch 4:4); whence probably the patronymic HUSHATHITE (Heb. Chushathi', חוּשָׁתַי, Sept. Α᾿σωθί, Οὐσαθί), 2Sa 21:18; 1Ch 11:29; 1Ch 20:4. He seems to be the same person called SHAII in 1Ch 4:11. SEE HUSHAN. B.C. post 1612.

## Hushai[[@Headword:Hushai]]

             (Heb. Chushay ‘, חוּשִׁי, quick; Sept. and Josephus [Ant.7, 9, 2] Χουσί), called “the Archite” (q.v.) (comp. Jos 16:2) and “the king's companion,” i.e. vizier or intimate adviser (1Ch 27:33), a post which he doubtless attained by his eminent services to David in defeating (B.C. cir. 1023) the plots of Ahithophel, in league with the rebellious Absalom (2Sa 15:32; 2Sa 15:37; 2Sa 16:16-18; 2Sa 17:5-15). SEE DAVID. Baanah, Solomon's vicegerent in Asher, was doubtless the son of the same (1Ki 4:16).

## Husham[[@Headword:Husham]]

             (Heb. Chusham', חוּשָׁם, but defectively חֻשָׁםin Gen 36:34-35, hasty; Sept. Α᾿σώμ and Α᾿σόμ), a Temanite, successor of Jobab and predecessor of Bedad among the native princes of Mount Seir before the usurpation of the Edomites (Gen 36:34-35; 1Ch 1:45). B.C. long ante 1093, and probably ante 1618.

## Hushathite[[@Headword:Hushathite]]

             (2Sa 21:18; 2Sa 23:27; 1Ch 11:29; 1Ch 20:4; 1Ch 26:11). SEE HUSHAH.

## Hushim[[@Headword:Hushim]]

             (Heb. Chushimz', חוּשַׁים, or defect. חֻשַׁיםin Gen 46:23 : 1Ch 7:12, haste; Sept. ᾿Ωσίμ, but Α᾿σόμ in Gen 46:23, and Ασόβ in 1Ch 7:12), the name of two men and one woman.

1. A son of Dan (Gen 46:23); more properly called SHUHAM (Num 26:42). “Hushim figures prominently in the Jewish traditions of the recognition of Joseph, and of Jacob's burial at Hebron. See the quotations from the Midrash in Weil's Bib. Legends, p. 88, note, and the Targum Pseudojon on Genesis 1, 13. In the latter he is the executioner of Esau”

2. A name given as that of “the sons of Aher” or Aharah, the third son of Benjamin (1Ch 7:12; comp. 8:1), and therefore only a plural form for Shuhanz (see the foregoing name, and compare the fact that the following is a fem. appellation) as a representative of his brethren. SEE HUPIHII, and SEE BENJAMIN. B.C. post. 1856.

3. One of the wives of Shaharaim, of the tribe of Benjamin, in the country of Moab, by whom he had Ahitub and Elpaal (1Ch 8:8; 1Ch 8:11). B.C. cir. 1618.

## Husi[[@Headword:Husi]]

             is the name given to the devil among the Finns. He is described as having only three fingers on each hand, but these are armed with large nails, with which he tears in pieces all who fall into his power. He is supposed to reside in the forest, whence he sends out all manner of diseases and calamities, with which he afflicts mankind.

## Husk[[@Headword:Husk]]

             (זָג, zag, the skin of a grape, so. called as being transparent, Num 6:4; צַקְלוֹן, tsiklôn', a sack for grain, so called from being tied together at the mouth, 2Ki 4:42) occurs also in Luk 15:16 as a rendering of κεράτιον:(from its horned extremities), in the parable of the prodigal son, where it is said that “he would fain have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat; and no man gave [even this poor provender, so Meyer, ad loc.] unto him.” In the Arabic Version of the New Testament, the word kharûb, often written kharnûb, is given as a synonym of keratia. According to Celsius, the modern Greeks have converted the Arabic name into χάρουβα, and in a similar form it has passed into most European  languages. Though with us little more than its name is known, the carob- tree is extremely common in the south of Europe, in Syria, and in Egypt. (See Thomson, Land and the Book, i, 21.)

The Arabs distinguish it by the name of Kharnub shanmi — that is, the Syrian Carob. The ancients, as Theophrastus and Pliny, likewise mention it as a native of Syria. Celsius states that no tree is more frequently mentioned in the Talmud (Mishna, i, 40; 4:164; 6:494), where its fruit is stated to be given as food to cattle and swine: it is now given to horses, asses, and mules. During the Peninsular War the horses of the British cavalry were often fed on the beans of the carob-tree. Both Pliny (Hist. Nat. 15, 23) and Columella (7, 9) mention that it was given as food to swine (comp. Mishna, Shaab. 24, 2), yet was sometimes eaten by men (Horace, Epist. 2, 1,123; Juv. 11, 58; Pers. 3, 55; Sonnini, Travels in Greece, p. 26). By some it has been thought, but apparently without reason, that it was upon the husks of this tree that John the Baptist fed in the wilderness: from this idea, however, it is often called St. John's Bread and Locust-tree.' Ceratia or Ceratonia is the name of a tree of the family of leguminous plants, of which the fruit used to be called Siliqua edulis and Siliqua dulcis. By the Greeks, as Galen and Paulus AEgineta, the tree is called κερατία, κερατωνία, from the resemblance of its fruit to κέρας, a horn; also συκῆ αἰγυπτία, or Egyptian fig (Theophr. Plant. i, 18). The carob-tree grows in the south of Europe and north of Africa, usually to a moderate size, but it sometimes becomes very large, with a trunk of great thickness, and affords an agreeable shade. It has been seen by travelers near Bethlem (Rauwolf, Travels, p. 458; Schubert, 3:115), and elsewhere (Robinson's Researches, 3, 54). Prof. Hackett saw it growing around Jerusalem, and the fruit exposed for sale in the market at Smyrna; and he describes its form and uses (Illustra. of Scripture, p. 129, Bost. 1855).

Wilde, being in the plain near Mount Carmel, observed several splendid specimens of the carob-tree. On the 15th of March he noticed the fruit as having been perfected. The husks were scattered on the ground, where some cattle had been feeding on them. It is an evergreen, and puts forth a great many branches, covered with large pinnated leaves. The blossom is of a reddish or dark purple color, and is succeeded by large, slender pods or capsules, curved like a horn or sickle, containing a sweetish pulp, and several small, shining seeds. These pods are sometimes eight or ten inches long, and an inch and a half broad; the color is dark brown, and the seeds which they contain are about the size of an ordinary dry pea, not perfectly round, flattened, hard and bitter, and of a dark red color. The quantity of pods borne by each tree is  very considerable, being often as much as 800 or 900 pounds weight; they are of a subastringent taste when unripe, but when come to maturity they secrete within the husks and around the seeds a sweetish-tasted pulp. When on the tree the pods have an unpleasant odor, but when dried upon hirdles they become eatable, and are valued by poor people, and during famine in the countries where the tree is grown, especially in Spain and Egypt, and by the Arabs. They are given as food to cattle in modern, as we read they were in ancient times, but at the best can only be considered very poor fare. (See Celsius, 1, 227; Oedmann, 6, 137 sq.; Salmas. Exercit. Plin. p. 45 sq.; Hasselquist, Travels, p. 531; Arvieux, Voyage, p. 206 sq.; Penny Cyclopaedia, s.v. Ceratonia.)

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

             (more properly Hus, the other mode of spelling his name being a mere usage which has established itself in the English language), was the illustrious Bohemian reformer before the Reformation, and the precursor of the Church of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren.

I. Sketch of his Life. — He was born July 6, 1369, or, according to some authorities, 1373, at Husinec, a small market town of Bohemia, on the Planitz. His parents were common people, but in good circumstances for their station in life. Very little is known of his early years. He entered the University of Prague, and took his first degree in 1393. The development of his mind was slow but his behavior was distinguished by the strictest probity and the most genuine godliness. In his intercourse with others he was modest and kind. A spirit of melancholy gave a subdued tone to his bearing. He was a tall man, with a thin, pale, sad face. His public career began in 1398, when he was appointed a professor in the university. In 1401 he became dean of its theological faculty, and in 1402 its rector. At the same time he was pastor of the Bethlehem Chapel at Prague, erected by John de Milheim (1391), in order to give the people ail opportunity of hearing the Gospel in their native tongue, and in this position he exerted great influence.

Multitudes flocked to his chapel, among them Queen Sophia, who also chose him for her confessor. His sermons were not oratorical, but lucid, fervent, and simple, displaying a thorough knowledge of the Bible, and leaving an indelible impression upon the minds of the people. It was from the pulpit of this church that he set forth the truth with such force as to make Rome tremble. The Reformation, which Huss may be said to have inaugurated, may be dated from the 28th of May, 1403,  when the doctrines of John Wickliffe were publicly condemned in a meeting of the faculties and doctors of the university, in spite of the efforts of Huss and his friends to prevent such a decision. The formation of two parties was the result; the one in favor of reform, the other opposed to it. At the head of the first stood Huss, who labored with zeal and boldness, uncovering the putrid sores of the Church, and particularly the gross immoralities of the clergy. For a time Zybnek, the archbishop of Prague, recognized the honesty of Huss's intentions. But soon disagreements occurred between them; and when thousands of students left the university because of a new distribution of votes on academic occasions (1409), which Huss had been mainly instrumental in bringing about, the archbishop openly arrayed himself on the side of his enemies. An opportunity soon offered for showing Zybnek's ill will.

The clergy of Prague laid before him formal accusations of heresy against Huss, which the latter met with common accusations against Zybnek. Both appealed to the pope. In response, Alexander V conferred extraordinary powers on the archbishop to root out heresies from his diocese. Accordingly, the latter prohibited preaching in private chapels; caused more than 200 volumes of Wickliffe's writings to be committed to the flames, amidst the chanting of the Te Deum; and excommunicated Huss (July 18, 1410). In this emergency king Wenzel came to the rescue, commanding Zybnek to reimburse the owners for the loss of their books, and annulling the ban against Huss. Nor was the prohibition touching chapels carried out. Meantime Alexander died, and was succeeded by John XXIII, an atrocious wretch, formerly a pirate, and now the embodiment of vice. To him, Wenzel, the queen, many nobles, and Huss himself appealed for redress. But the new pope adhered to the policy of his predecessor, confirmed the acts of Zybnek, and cited Huss before his tribunal in person. The king, however, sent two advocates to Bologna, where the papal court had its seat, to plead Huss's cause, and they were joined by three more delegated by Huss himself. But they effected only a transfer of the suit to other hands; while an attempt on the part of Zybnek, at Prague, to lay an interdict upon the city, caused an open rupture between him and the king, who coerced him by violent means. At last, in the summer of 1411, the archbishop yielded, and a pacification, including Huss, was brought about. But in September of the same year Zybnek died, and was succeeded by Albicus, a weak and miserly old man, who received, in the following spring (1412), a papal bull commanding a crusade against Ladislaus, king of Naples, an adherent of the anti-pope, and offering plenary indulgence to all who would take part in it, or contribute money  towards its prosecution. The publication of this bull put a sudden end to the peace which had been patched up in the Church of Bohemia. Huss regarded the bull as an infamous document, contrary to all the principles of the Holy Scriptures, and at once publicly took this stand.

A number of his friends, on the contrary, maintained that the will of the pope must be obeyed under all circumstances; they accordingly broke with him, and went over to the anti-reform party. Several of them afterwards became his most embittered foes; and one of them, Stephen de Palec, was the chief instigator of his subsequent condemnation at Constance. In nothing terrified by his adversaries, however, Huss continued to preach against the bull, and held a public disputation upon it in the aula of the university; on which occasion his friend and coadjutor, Jerome of Prague, delivered an address of such fervid eloquence that the students formed a fantastical procession the next day, bearing as many copies of the document as they could find to the outskirts of the city, where they were heaped up and burned. Huss took no part in these proceedings. King Wenzel now became alarmed. He had a reputation-to support in Romish Christendom, and issued a decree making any further revilement o the pope or the papal bull punishable with death. In consequence, three young men were executed, who, on the following Sunday, publicly gave the lie to a priest while advocating the plenary indulgence offered by the pope. Huss buried them in the Bethlehem Chapel, with all the rites of the Church, and extolled them as martyrs. When John XXIII was informed of these events, he excommunicated the Reformer a second time, ordered his arrest, commanded his chapel to be razed to the ground, and laid an interdict upon the whole city of Prague. Wenzel again interfered, saved Huss from arrest, and prevented the chapel from being destroyed: but, as the ban was every where published, and the interdict rigidly enforced, he advised Huss to leave the city for a time. Huss obeyed, and, after having affixed a protest to the walls of his chapel, appealing from the corrupt Romish tribunal to the only incorruptible and infallible Judge, Jesus Christ, he retired to the Castle of Kozi Hradek (December, 1412). There, and subsequently at the Castle of Krakowec, he remained until August, 1414, engaged in literary labors, which resulted in some of the most important both of his Latin and Bohemian works, carrying on a voluminous correspondence, and preaching to the people of the neighboring villages.

Meanwhile a general council of the Church had been called to meet at Constance on the 1st of November 1414, under the auspices of Sigismund,  a brother of Wenzel, and designated emperor. This monarch invited Huss to attend, that his cause might be examined and peace given to the Bohemian Church. He pledged himself to grant him a safe-conduct, and to send him back unharmed, even in the event of his not submitting to the council. Modern Romish historians try to disprove the reality of such a promise. But it is incontrovertible. The instrument which Sigismund actually furnished says: “Ut ei transire, stare, morari, redire libere permittatis.” Huss joyfully obeyed the summons, for it was the great wish of his heart to defend his doctrines in the presence of the assembled representatives of Latin Christendom, and to unite with them in reforming the Church, for which purpose the Council had been specially convened. Leaving Prague on the 11th of October, with testimonials of orthodoxy from the papal inquisitor and the archbishop, and accompanied by an escort of nobles whom the king appointed to defend him, he traveled through Bohemia and Germany, held disputations upon his doctrines in all the towns where he passed a night, and arrived at Constance on the 3rd of November. The next three weeks he spent in strict seclusion. Sigismund had not yet come, and the pope had temporarily suspended the sentence of excommunication, besides giving him the most solemn pledges for his personal safety. But Stephen de Palec and others among his Bohemian enemies began so persistently to incite the ecclesiastics against him, that he was arrested on the 28th of November, and on the 6th of December he was cast into the dungeon of the Dominican monastery. When Sigismund reached the city, Huss's escort vainly attempted to secure his release. The emperor was persuaded by the priests that it would be wrong to keep faith with a heretic. Huss not only remained a prisoner, but, after the lapse of three months, was conveyed to the Castle of Gottlieben, where a mere hole, so low that he could not stand upright in it, was assigned him as his cell, and where his feet were fastened to a block with heavy irons, and at night his right arm was chained to the wall. In this miserable plight he remained from the end of March to the beginning of June, in spite of the unceasing efforts of his friends, and the solemn protest of the whole Bohemian nation.

Huss had three hearings before the council; the first on the 5th of June (1415), the second on the 7th, and the third on the 8th. For the most part they were stormy debates, or irregular philippics against him. He was not permitted to explain and defend his doctrines. An immediate and explicit recantation was required of him, which he declined giving, unless convicted  of heresy by the testimony of Christ and his apostles. After the last hearing several weeks elapsed, in which every conceivable effort was made to induce him to recant. But he remained firm, and calmly prepared for death. On Saturday, July 6, he was once more cited before the council, condemned as a heretic, degraded from the priesthood, and delivered into the hands of the secular power for execution. The proper officers immediately conveyed him to the outskirts of the city, where, at about ten o'clock in the morning, he was burned alive at the stake, while the council continued in session. He suffered with the heroism of the early martyrs. His ashes were cast into the Rhine. A simple monument, erected by the present generation of his countrymen, marks the spot. Erasmus pithily said: “Joannes Hus exustus, non convictus.” The tradition of a peasant woman bringing a fagot to the pile, and moving him to exclaim “O sancta simplicitas!” is very doubtful; the other tradition of a prophecy with regard to Luther, under the image of a swan, uttered by Huss on his way to execution, lacks all historic basis. Jerome of Prague (q.v.), who had stood faithfully by the side of Huss, and, on the death of his friend, himself led the followers of the lamented Huss, soon suffered the same fate. The disturbances which then followed we treat under HUSSITES SEE HUSSITES .

II. Huss's Literary Labors. — Besides the many letters which Huss wrote, and which clearly set forth his theological views, he was the author of fifteen Bohemian, and a large number of Latin works. Of the former, among which his Postills and Treatise on Simony are particularly important, several have, unfortunately, never been translated, and others remain in manuscript. Of the latter, his Tractatus de Ecclesia deserves to be particularly mentioned, together with the polemical treatises against Palec and Stanislaus, that form its supplements (Historia et Monumenta Joannis Hus, 1, 243-331, ed. of 1715). Other of his Latin works are of an exegetical character. He also composed numerous hymns and didactic hexameters. Many of his hymns were adopted by the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, and some of them are still in use in the Moravian Church. Moreover, he carefully revised the old Bohemian version of the Bible, which had been translated as early as the 13th century; and quite recently, Palacky, the great Bohemian antiquary and historian, has discovered a catechism in that language, which he supposes to be from the pen of Huss, and which, no doubt, formed the basis for the catechism of the Brethren, published in 1522. As a writer of his mother language the  merits of Huss cannot be overestimated. He purified it; fixed etymological and syntactical rules, and invented a new system of orthography, distinguished by its simplicity and precision. It was brought into general use by the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren in the sixteenth century, since which time it has remained the acknowledged standard. Ulrich yon Hutten was the first to publish the Latin works of Huss. The edition by O. Brunfels (Strasb. 1525, 4to, with woodcuts), is very scarce. A more complete edition appeared at Nuremberg in 1558, entitled Historia et Monumenta Joannis Huss atque Hieronymi Pragensis, in two fol. volumes. Still more complete is the edition of 1715, which came out at the same place with the same title. A small but very important volume of his sermons, translated from a copy of the Bohemian Postills, brought to Herrnhut by the Moravian refugees, appeared at Görlitz in 1855. Its title reads as follows: Johannes Hus Predigten uber die Sonn- und Festtags-Evangelien des Kirchenjachrs. Aus der Bömischen in die Deutsche Sprache übersetzt von Dr. Johannes Nowotny. They are pre-eminently sermons for the times, and abound in polemics. His letters have been translated into English (Edinb. 1859, 1 vol.) and other modern languages. A collection of his writings in Bohemian was begun by Erben (Prague, 1864, etc.).

III. Huss's Theological Views, and the Principles of His Reformation The views of Huss were molded by the writings of two men in particular; the one Matthias of Janow, a Bohemian, the other Wickliffe, the English Reformer. He was attracted by the latter, inasmuch as Wickliffe always traced the truth up to its source in the New Testament., and desired to renew Christianity in its apostolic sense. Hence he made him his guide in those principles which he had, first of all, learned from Janow, but which Wickliffe developed more fully and consistently. Not having passed through the same conflict which brought Luther into the inner sanctuary of divine grace, through Christ, and justification by faith, he did not turn his attention so much to doctrine as to practice, and set forth the Saviour of the world rather from the standpoint of that perfect law whereof he is the author, than from that of his redeeming work. As a necessary consequence, he insisted more upon the reformation of the Church in regard to life than in regard to its unsound and corrupt dogmatical views. This was the weak point of his Reformation, bringing it to a premature end, and him to the stake. In order to success, an absolute reform of the dogmas of the Church was essential. Huss did not see this, because he had formed no plan of operations antagonistic to Rome. He advanced, not in obedience to a.  systematic process inwardly developed, but under the influence of outward circumstances. While Christ was the center of his own faith, and he held to Christ's Word alone as the norm of the faith of all, he did not, on that account, reject Romish dogmas until he became conscious of a contradiction between them and the Scriptures. The more any theological question was made prominent by the circumstances of the times, the more clearly he apprehended the truth in its evangelical import. Upon some points, however, as, for instance, the seven sacraments, and transubstantiation in the Lord's Supper, he never changed the views, which were his by education. No outward impulse was given him to investigate these points in a reformatory spirit. So also he allowed, with certain qualifications and great caution, prayers for the dead, although he did not deem them of any importance; also confession to a priest and absolution, though none, he said, could forgive sins but God only; and he was, at first, satisfied with the holy communion in one kind. When this latter usage, however, grew to be a subject of dispute between the national and the Romish party in Bohemia, he emphatically endorsed the position of Jacobellus of Mies, who was the great advocate of the cup. For an exposition of his views on the Church, as set forth in the work mentioned above, see Neander's Kirchengeschichte, 6. 395, etc., or Torrey's Translation, 5, 299, as also Gillett's Life and Tines of Huss, 1, 244, etc. In general, it may be said that it was not until his trial before the council that he recognized the necessity of breaking with the Church of Rome in order to effect a reformation. If he had been able, at that time, to escape from the hands of his enemies and return to Bohemia, he would have been the Luther of the world, and Protestantism would have begun its enlightening course a century earlier. SEE REFORMATION. While Huss failed to bring about a general reformation, his principles, developed and purified, found an ecclesiastical form forty-two years later in the Church of the Brethren, and have, through that channel, come down to the present day as a power in Christendom. SEE MORAVIANS.

IV. Literature. — For a study of the life of Huss, in addition to the histories of the Council of Constance, the most important works are: Lebensbeschreibung des M. Johannes Hus von Hussinecz, von Aug. Zitte, Weltpriester (Prague, 1790); an anonymous history, in German, “Of the manner in which the Holy Gospel, together with John Huss, was condemned in the Council of Constance by the Pope and his faction,” written by an eye-witness, and published in 1548; Becker's Life of Huss;  Koehler's Huss und seine Zeit; Hist. of the Hussites, by Cochleius; Hodgson, Reformers, p. 123 sq.; Neander's Kirchengeschichte, vi; Gillett's Life and Times of John Huss; and especially Palacky, F., Geschichte von Bohmen, 3 pt. 1, c. 3-5; Palacky, F., Documenta Mag. J. Hus vitam, doctrinam, causamt in Cone. Constant. actam, etc., nunc ex ipsisfontibus hausta (Prag. 1869); Bonnechose (Emile de), Les Reformations avant la Reforme (Paris, 1847, 2 vols. 12mo); Good Words, Jan. 6, 1866, p. 21 sq.; Ranke, Hist. of the Popes, 2, 79 sq.; Zitte, Lebenbeschreib. d. Mag. J. Huss (Prag. 1789-95,2 vols.); Wendt, Gesch. v. Huss und d. Hussiten (Magdeb. 1845); Helfert, Huss u. Hieronymus (Prag. 1853); Bohringer, D. Kirche Christi v. ihre Zeugen (ultrampntane) (Zur. 1858, vol. 2, pt. 4); Krummel, J. HuIss (Darmst. 1863); Hofler, 3 Mag. J. Huss (Prague, 1864); Contemp. Rev. April and July, 1869; Stud. u. Krit. 1863, 4; Meth. Quart. Rev. 1864, p. 176. (E. DE S.)

## Hussey, Robert, B.D[[@Headword:Hussey, Robert, B.D]]

             an eminent minister of the Church of England, was born at Sunderland, Kent, Oct. 7,1801. He studied at Christ Church, Oxford, and graduated in 1825 with great credit. He discharged for a while the office of proctor, and was afterwards appointed one of the public examiners in the classical school. In 1837 he took the degree of B.D. In 1842 he was appointed regius professor of ecclesiastical history, which position he held until his death, December 2,1858. Hussey possessed an immense fund of information, to which his numerous works on all kinds of subjects bear full testimony. The principal of these are: Sermons, mostly academic, with a preface containing a refutation of the theory founded upon the Syriac fragment of the epistles of St. Ignatius (Oxford. 1849, 8vo): — The Papal Supremacy, its Rise and Progress, traced in three Lectures (Lond. 1851, 8vo). This little work demonstrates that “the papal system grew up and increased by means of usurpation and frequent acts of oppression, favored by the weakness of other parts of the Church, and the vices of ages.” He had previously prepared for the University Press an edition of Homer's Odyssey (Oxford 1827): — also the Latin text of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of England, with short notes (Oxford 1846): — and the Greek text of Socrates's Ecclesiastical History (1844). In 1853 he edited, again for the University Press another edition of Socrates, and this time not a mere text-book for his lectures, but an elaborate edition, with a Latin, version, notes, and index, forming three volumes 8vo. In 1854 he published a sermon, by request, on University Prospects and University Duties, and in  1856 an ordination sermon on The Atonement. An edition of Sozomen was suspended by his death.

## Husseyites[[@Headword:Husseyites]]

             the followers of Joseph Hussey, a learned but eccentric divine, formerly of Cambridge, who held the Antinomian views of Tobias Crisp (q.v.). He maintained also the pre-existence of Christ's human soul, or, rather, of a spiritual or glorious body, in which he appeared to Adam, Abraham, and others; this body being the image of God in which man was created.

## Hussites[[@Headword:Hussites]]

             a general name for the followers of JOHN HUSS SEE JOHN HUSS (q.v.). The Council of Constance, in its dealings with Huss, seems to have forgotten that the adherents to his cause were not the handful of men who had gathered around their friend and teacher in his last hours, but were scattered throughout Bohemia and Moravia. No sooner had the news of the execution of Huss reached them than disturbances became the order of the day. Everywhere in the two kingdoms named the life of the priests was in danger. The archbishop of Albicus (q.v.) himself was obliged to flee for his life. King Wenceslas, of Bohemia, was indignant at the action of the council, and the queen hesitated not to espouse openly the cause of the Hussites. September 3, 1415, the Diet of Bohemia addressed a manifesto to the council, full of reproaches and threats; and September 5 it voted that every landowner should be free to have the doctrines of Huss preached on his estate. Fearful of the danger threatened, the priesthood, and, indeed, all strict adherents of the Romish Church, formed (October 1) a league (Herrenbund), vowing obedience to the council and fidelity to the Romish Church. Encouraged by these associations, deemed strong enough not only to oppose successfully any further attacks on Romanists, but even any further inroads of the heretics among the people, the council assumed a more authoritative position. Not satisfied with the mischief it had already done, it now threatened all adherents of Huss with ecclesiastical punishments. Jerome of Prague (q.v.), the friend and disciple of Huss, was the first to suffer. He was summoned before the council, summarily tried and condemned and, like his master, burned at the stake (May 30, 1416). The 452 signers of a protest against the execution of Huss were the next summoned before the bar of the council to answer for their heretical conduct. Indeed, had not the emperor Sigismund interfered, the king and queen of the Bohemians would have been added to this number. But the execution of Jerome, following that of Huss, was too great an outrage in the eyes of the Bohemians not to destroy the last vestige of respect for the body by whose order these atrocious deeds were committed.

The threats of the council became to them a mere brutum fulmen. They treated them with contempt.  Meanwhile, the adherents of Huss had divided into two parties, the moderate and the extreme. The moderate party, led by the University of Prague, took the name of Calixtines (q.v.), who derived their name from the chalice (calix), holding that communion in both kinds was essential to the sacrament; the extreme party were called the Taborites, from the mountain Tabor (now Austin), which was originally their headquarters. Here, where Huss himself had formerly preached, they assembled in the open air, sometimes to the number of over 40,000, and partook of communion under both kinds on tables erected for the occasion. The Calixtines preserved the belief in purgatory, praying for the dead, images of the saints, holy water, etc.; but in March 1417; they declared openly for the right of all to receive communion in both kinds. In consequence of this declaration, all the privileges of the university were suspended by the council, and the forcible abolition of the heresy demanded by pope Martin V. In the early part of 1419 king Wenceslas, unwilling to lose the favor of either party, and fearing the wrath of Rome, decreed the restoration of Roman Catholic priests to their former offices. But no sooner had the Romanists learned of the enactments in their favor than they attacked the Hussites, and began all manner of persecutions against them.

February 22, 1418, Martin V issued a bull against the followers of Wickliffe and Huss. All who should be found “to think or teach otherwise than as the holy Roman Catholic Church thinks or teaches;” all who held the doctrines, or defended the characters of Huss or Wickliffe, were to be delivered over to the secular arm for punishment as heretics. The document is a model from which bigoted intolerance and persecution might copy and exhausts the odium of language in describing the character of the objects of its vengeance. They are schismatic, seditious, impelled by Luciferian pride and wolfish rage, duped by devilish tricks, tied together by the tail, however scattered over the world, and thus leagued in favor of Wickliffe, Huss, and Jerome. These pestilent persons had obstinately sown their perverse dogmas, while at first the prelates and ecclesiastical authority had shown themselves to be only dumb dogs, unwilling to bark, or to restrain, according to the canons, these deceitful and pestiferous heresiarchs.” These intolerant measures added strength to the party whom it was their object to extirpate. The Bohemians, threatened at home by a feeble and vacillating king, and abroad by the official emissaries of the papal pontiff, felt themselves obliged to gather in numbers for self-defense, and chose Nicholas of Hussinecz (q.v.) and John Zisca (q.v.) as their leaders. They also prepared an answer to the bull, and circulated it far and wide. It was  entitled “A faithful and Christian Exhortation of the Bohemians to Kings and Princes, to stir them up to the zeal of the Gospel,” amid was signed by four of their leading captains. “It is honorable at once to their courage, their prudence, their Christian intelligence, and their regard for the supreme authority of the Word of God.”

Their first aim was to secure, if possible, the capital of the kingdom. July 30, Zisca entered the old city, or that part of the city in which resided the reformers, and prepared for an assault on the new city, joined by the inhabitants of the old. His aim, however, for the present, was only to intimidate the papal party. After Zisca had gained the city, some of his men sought entrance in churches to observe their religious rites. They were denied admission to some of them, and the consequence was a forcible entrance, and the summary execution of the fanatic priests. With the council of the city also they experienced trouble. While a number of the Hussites were in a procession from one of the churches, their minister, bearing the chalice, was struck by a stone which had been thrown from one of the windows of the state-house. The Hussites became enraged. Under the command of Zisca himself, the state house was stormed. Seven of the councilors, who had been unable to make their escape, were thrown from the upper windows and impaled on the pikes of the soldiers below. The king, when the news reached him, became so excited that he died of a fit of apoplexy. General anarchy now ensued. The Hussites, undisputed masters of Prague, restored the forms of civil government by the appointment of four magistrates to hold office until the next general election, and then withdrew, under Zisca, to Pilsen. The queen Sophia sought not only to secure the aid of the emperor Sigismund against these armed heretics, but even endeavored to influence the citizens-of Prague to admit Sigismund as the successor of Wenceslas. The people appealed to Zisca for aid against the probable invasion of the city by Sigismund. November 4, 1419, Zisca re-entered the city. The emperor, involved in a war with the Turks, neglected at first to attend to Bohemia. Finally, in 1420, he besieged Prague, but was driven from his positions.

Widely differing in their political and religious sentiments, the Hussites became daily more divided. Some favored the Calixtines, others the Taborites, and between these two parties strong jealousies were constantly springing up. In the old town of Prague the Calixtines prevailed, in the new the Taborites held sway, and, finding it thus difficult to satisfy and please all parties, and even fearing a union of the Calixtines with the Royalists, Zisca finally withdrew to the country. During the siege the Praguers had  presented to the emperor, as conditions of submission and adherence to him as subjects, four articles (Articles of Prague). These were stipulations for,

1, the free and untrammeled preaching of the Word of God, throughout the kingdom of Bavaria, by evangelical preachers;

2, the free use of communion in both kinds by all true Christians who had not committed mortal sin;

3, the keeping of all priests and monks out of any temporal power, and obliging them to live according to the example of Christ and the apostles;

4, the punishment of all mortal sins, and of all disorders contrary to the law of God committed by the priests. The Taborites, however, presented no less than twelve articles, namely, the suppression of all unnecessary churches, altars, images, etc.; the application of capital punishment for other sins, such as drinking in taverns, luxury in clothes or in the style of living, etc. But the continued persecutions of the Hussites, and the unqualified approval of them by Sigismund, ever united the two parties for common defense. March 1, 1420, Martin V invited a regular crusade against them, incited thereto in a great measure, no doubt, by Sigismund, who felt himself too weak to gain the kingdom with his army. The Hussites were now to be dealt with as “rebels against the Roman Church, and as heretics;” and the emperor exerted himself for the publication of this bull throughout his dominions. Even more than the previous documents of like character, it shows the blind zeal and persecuting bigotry of Rome.

A Christian, not a heathen people, were now, however, to be the objects of its vengeance — a people whose great heresy was that they made the Word of God their supreme authority, and contended for the institutions of the Gospel in their primitive simplicity and integrity.” To animate his followers with greater fervor in the execution of the bull, the pope, “by the mercy of Almighty God, and the authority of the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, as well as by the power of binding and loosing bestowed by God upon himself, granted to those who should enter upon the crusade, or to such even as should die upon the road plenary pardon of their sins, ... and eternal salvation;” and to such as could not go in person, but contributed to it in any wise, full remission of their sins. Thus “all Christendom, with its generals and armies, was summoned to crush out the heresies of men whom the council chose to burn rather than refute.” “But the result disappointed all human expectations. The forces of the empire dashed and  shattered themselves against the-invincible resolution and desperate courage of a band of men sustained by religious enthusiasm, and conducted by able generals.”

Measures for defense were at once taken by the Hussites. The citizens of Prague, who had frequently been divided, now united against the common foe. Calixtine and Taborite were ready to join hands in a league of mutual defense. Never was there a more signal defeat than the imperial forces now sustained, although their army was 140,000 to 150,000 strong. Prague was the first city freed from the beleaguering enemy; but the great battle which decided the fate of the Imperialists was fought at Galgenberg or Witkow, known thereafter as the Ziscaberg (Hill of Zisca). Yet the opposition of the Taborites to all hierarchical pomp, and the threatened ruin of some of the most splendid structures of Prague, inclined the Calixtines, as soon as the danger had passed, to accept the terms of peace which Sigismund seemed very anxious to grant, provided, however, they could induce the emperor at the same time to remove the stigma of heresy which rested on the four “Articles of Prague.” This they failed to accomplish, and peace was further delayed. A second and third attempt of Sigismund at pacification met with no better success. An effort was now made to compromise the differences between the Calixtines and Taborites.

But the greatest obstacle to this was found to be their political rather than religious views. The question who should wear the crown of Bohemia was a matter of no little importance, and each party seemed anxious to secure it for one of their number. A convention of the states was held at Czaslau, July 1421, to determine the matter. A regency was appointed of twenty members, taken from the different orders of the nation. Zisca appeared in it in the first rank of the nobles. It was resolved, with remarkable unanimity, that the four Articles of Prague should be universally received. Sigismund was declared incapable of reigning over Bohemia, and the crown was offered to the king of Poland. He refused, however, to accept it. Withold, grand duke of Lithuania, was next chosen; he also declined, but recommended Sigismund Corybut, his brother, to the Bohemian barons, and accompanied him to Prague, where they both, by partaking of the communion of the cup, sealed their adherence to the faith of the Calixtines, who held now the supremacy at Prague, and who had revived their old hostility against the Taborites.

The nation divided into two “fierce parties, embittered by prejudice and mutual aggressions,” so that the opposition to Corybut became irreconcilable, even although Zisca himself espoused his cause, as the  Taborites were unwilling to follow their leader blindly. A diet held at Prague in November, 1421, to determine the question, brought it no nearer to its solution, while it effected the estrangement of Zisca from the Calixtines, who now regarded him and his followers as their enemies. An army was gathered against them; but, as often before, the Taborites were victorious, and the Calixtines severely beaten. Another attempt proved even less favorable to them, and, thus driven to desperation, Zisca now attempted to crush the Calixtines, who were virtually leagued with the Imperialists. After various victories over his enemies, Zisca appeared before Prague September 11, 1423, and invested the city, suffering no one to issue forth from its gates. When everything was ready to storm the city, a deputation of the Calixtines appeared before him and offered terms of submission, which he readily accepted. Zisca entered Prague with great honors, and was entrusted with the exercise of paramount authority. The emperor's hopes of being king of Bohemia had of late been based upon the divisions of the nation, and, baffled by this new agreement between the Hussites, he now sought to win them over by liberal concessions. He offered to Zisca the government of the kingdom, and asked for himself only the wearing of the crown.

“But, at this culminating point of Zisca's fortunes, death over took him (October 11, 1424). He lived to foil the purposes of Sigismund, and died at the moment when his death was, in some respects, another defeat to his hopes.” Zisca's death left the Taborites without any real leader. Their success they chiefly owed to him, and some of them, to indicate their deep sense of the loss they had suffered, took the name of Orphanites (q.v.). Others were absorbed by the Horebites (q.v.), while still others retained their old name, and chose St. Procopius “the Great” (q.v.) as their leader. The Orphanites, however, had relapsed to a belief in transubstantiation: they observed the fasts; honored the saints, and their priests performed worship in robes, all which the strict Taborites continued to reject. Among the Orphanite leaders, Procopius “the Lesser” was the most eminent. Vainly did the pope, assisted by the emperor, preach another crusade against the Hussites, who sallied out from Bohemia in troops to make invasions into neighboring countries, and, considering always Bohemia as their home, and other places as the land of the Philistines, treated the latter accordingly. Bands of robbers of all nations soon joined them. Frederick ‘the Valiant” made war against them, and entered Bohemia in 1425, and again in 1426, with 20,000 men, but was repulsed, on the second occasion  suffering a terrible defeat at the battle of Ausch, June 15. A panic now seized all Germany, which was increased by the storming of Miess and Tachow by the Hussites in 1427. Another crusade, instigated against them by the emperor Sigismund in the same year, met with no better success than before.

At the opening of 1428, a Convention was called at Beraun to bring about, if possible, a general pacification of the nation. But so varying were the views of the different sects, especially the doctrines of free will, justification, and predestination, that the Convention was broken up without accomplishing anything. In 1429, the Orphanites, assisted by a portion of the Taborites, made a great invasion into Saxony and Silesia. They took Dresden, marched along the Elbe to Magdeburg, then turned into the province of Brandenburg, and finally returned to Bohemia by way of Silesia, distributing themselves into different bands in various places, and adopting names according to their fancy. Some were known as Collectors, some as “Small Caps” (Petit Chapeaus, says L'Enfant), some as Little Cousins, others as Wolf-bands. In the spring of 1430 they were ready to undertake another invasion. With 20,000 cavalry, 30,000 infantry, and 3000 chariots, and with Procopius and other able generals at their head, they repeated the invasion of the countries that had been visited the previous year.

Dividing into several bands, they desolated or reduced to ashes more than a hundred towns and villages, beat a Saxon army at Grimma, then wept to Franconia, and returned home through Lower Bavaria. Meanwhile the pope had been busy with his bigots crying a new crusade against the Hussites. November 1, 1429, a diet had been summoned to meet at Vienna, but the delay of Sigismund in reaching the place had caused its transfer to Presburg. Here the deliberations were protracted for eight months, and at length nearly all the prelates and princes of the empire were brought together, either in person or by ambassadors. “It was finally resolved to make still another invasion of Bohemia. The papal legate came provided for the emergency. He had brought with him a bull of Martin V, ordaining a crusade, which was now opportunely to be published. Indulgences were profusely promised to those who should engage in the enterprise, or contribute to its promotion. Those who should fast and pray for its success should have a remission of penance for sixty days. From other vows interfering with enlistments in the holy war, a dispensation should be freely bestowed.” Great efforts were made to insure the successful issue of this, the sixth invasion of Bohemia  by the Imperialists (or the third papal crusade urged by Martin V). June 24,1431, was the time appointed for it. But, before it was undertaken, the emperor, to test the spirit of the Bohemians, made again propositions for the crown. The Orphanites were the only Hussites that opposed him. The Calixtines and Taborites returned a deputation of four to confer with Sigismund. But, even before this deputation had returned to Prague, the Hussites became distrustful, and the most cautious and moderate among them felt satisfied that the emperor only intended to mislead them into a state of security, and then surprise and conquer them. “The old leagues and confederations were revived. Old feuds were forgotten.

The barons of Bohemia and Moravia, the Calixtines of Prague, and the indomitable Taborites and Orphanites, again united to repel the invader. In a few weeks 50,000 infantry, 7000 cavalry, and 3600 chariots were gathered.” The crusading force also had been collecting, and now numbered 80,000 (some say 130,000) men, under the command of the elector of Brandenburg. This army, immense as it was, and powerful and invincible as it seemed, was, like its predecessors, completely routed at Tausch, August 14, 1431, and the hopes of the Imperialists of subjecting the Bohemians by force of arms effectually crushed. Sigismund now most earnestly endeavored to make peace, and entrusted the negotiations to the Council of Basle (which met December, 1431). The Bohemians were invited, promised a safe-conduct, and freedom to remain at Basle, to act, decide, treat, and enter into arrangements with the council; also “perfect liberty to celebrate in their houses their peculiar forms of worship; that in public and in private they should be allowed from Scripture and the holy doctors to advance proof of their four Articles, against which no preaching of the Catholics should be allowed while they remained within the city.” But even with these proffered favorable conditions the Bohemians at first kept aloof, mistrusting the sincerity of the offers made them; yet in 1432 they consented to send envoys to the council. It was in the beginning of the next year (January 4,1433) that the Bohemian deputation, numbering 300, was chosen from the most noble in the land, and with Procopius “the Great,” the colleague of Zisca, the hero of many battles, the leader of many invasions, at its head. On the 16th of January the Bohemian deputation appeared before the council, and presented the four Articles of Prague as the basis of negotiations.

After discussing them for fifty days, the parties had been brought no nearer together, and the Bohemians, growing impatient, prepared for their return to Prague. Towards the close of the same year, however, the council sent envoys to Prague, and finally the  Treaty of Prague was concluded, November 30, 1433, known in history as the Compactata, stipulating first for the restoration of peace and the abolition of ecclesiastical censorship, then for the admission of the four Articles of Prague, modified as follows: 1, the Eucharist to be administered equally under one or both kinds; 2, that preaching should be free, but only permitted to regularly ordained ministers; 3, that priests should have no possessions, but should be permitted to administer upon them.; 4, that sin should be punished, but only by the regularly constituted authorities. The Taborites disapproved the proceedings; a diet, held at Prague in 1434, in which the Calixtines acknowledged the authority of the pope, brought the difficulty to a crisis, and the Calixtines, joined by the Roman Catholics, defeated the Taborites near Böhmischbrod, May 30,1434. The two Procopiuses were killed. The Taborites were now driven to their strongholds, which they were obliged to surrender one by one. In another diet, held at Prague in 1435, all Bohemians acknowledged Sigismund for their king, he granting them, on his part, very advantageous conditions for their country and sect. The Romish Church, in accepting the four Articles, having conceded to them the use of the cup in the Eucharist, and many other privileges, they were finally absolved from ecclesiastical interdict, and the emperor came to Prague August 23,1436. The Taborites submitted gradually, and the thus united Hussites took the name of Utraquists (q.v.).

Sigismund, however, did not keep the promises he had made on ascending the throne of Bohemia, but rather used every means to restore the Roman Catholic faith in that country. The chief of the Hussites, John Rokyzan, whom the emperor himself had at first confirmed in the office of archbishop, came to be in danger of his life. This created new disturbances, which continued until the death of Sigismund in 1437. The Roman Catholic party now elected Albrecht of Austria king, but the Hussites chose Casimir of Poland. The former finally prevailed; but at his death, in October, 1439, during the minority of his son Ladislaus, two governors were appointed (in 1441), the one a Roman Catholic, the other a Hussite, to govern the kingdom. In 1444, George de Podiebrad was the Hussite governor chosen, and in 1450 he assumed the sole control. This change created no disorder, as the Roman Catholics, who were busily engaged undermining the Hussite doctrine and gaining over its adherents, were anxious to avoid an open conflict with them. At the death of Ladislaus in 1457, George himself was elected king. In order to conciliate the pope, he caused himself to be crowned by Roman Catholic bishops, and swore obedience to the Church  and to the pope. During his reign the Calixtines enjoyed full religious liberty; and when Pope Pius II declared the treaty abolished in 1462, George sent the papal legates to prison without further forms. For this he was put under the ban, and finally deposed by the pope in 1463.

“Meanwhile the warlike Taborites had disappeared from the scene. They no longer formed a national party. But the feeble remnants of that multitude which had once followed the standards of Zisca and Procopius still clung to their cherished faith, and, with the Word of God as their only supreme authority, the United Brethren (q.v.) appear as their lineal representatives. How, from such an origin, should have sprung a people whose peaceful virtues and missionary zeal have been acknowledged by the world, is a problem only to be solved by admitting that, in the faith of the old Taborites, however they may have been guilty of fanatical excesses, there was to be found that fundamental principle of reverence for the authority of Scripture alone which they bequeathed as a cherished legacy to those who could apply and act upon it in more favorable circumstances and in more peaceful times.” The successor of George, Ladislaus of Poland, who came to the government in 1471, held fast to the conditions of the treaty though himself a Roman Catholic.

In 1485 he concluded the peace of Kuttenberg, according to which the Utraquists and Subunists (Roman Catholics who communed but in one kind) were promised equal toleration; and in 1497 he gave the Utraquists the right to appoint an administrator of the archbishopric of Prague as their ecclesiastical chief. When the Reformation began in Germany, it was gladly hailed by both the Calixtines and the Bohemian Brethren, and in 1524 they decided to continue, under the guidance of Luther, the reform begun by Huss. A large part of them now divided themselves into Lutherans and Calvinists, and in 1575 both these united with the Bohemian Brethren in a joint confession, and became a strictly Protestant denomination. They were permitted to enjoy religious liberty until 1612, when they were subjected to many restrictions by the emperor Matthias, and to still more by the emperor Rudolph in 1617. This was the first cause of the Thirty-years' War, and it was only under Joseph II that the Calixtines recovered their religious liberty. See Cochlaus, Hist. Hussitarum (Mayence, 1549, fol.); Theobald, Hussitenkrieg (Wittenberg, 1609; Nuremb. 1623; Bresl. 1750, 3 vols.); Geschichte d. Hussiten (Lpz. 1784); Schubert, Geschichte d. Hussitenkriegs (Neustadt, 1825); Pierer, Universal Lexikon, 8:636; Koppen, Der alt. Huss. Brüderkirche (Lpz. 1845); The Reformation and Anti-Reformation in Bohemia (London,  1849, 2 vols. 8vo); Palacky, Geschichte v. Behmen (1845, 3 vols.), vol. iii; Beziehungen u. Verhaltniss do Waldenser z. d. ehemaligen Sekten in Bohmen (Prag. 1869); Vorlaufer d. Hussitenthums in Bohmen (new edit. 1869); Jean Gochlee and Theobaldus, Hist. de la Guerre des Hussites; Neander, Church Hist. 5, 172; Gindely, Gesch. d. Bohnmisohen Brider (Prague, 1857, 2 vols. 8vo); and especially Gillett, Life and Times of John Huss (Boston, 1863, 2 vols. 8vo), from which extracts have frequently been made in this article. Roman Catholic-Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, 3:348 sq.; Gesch. Kaiser Sigmunds (Hamb. 1838-45, 4 vols. 8vo). See Huss. (J. H.W.)

## Hutangi[[@Headword:Hutangi]]

             an apartment which is generally found in the houses of the wealthy Chinese, and devoted to ancestor-worship (q.v.). The room contains the image of the most illustrious ancestor of the family, and a record of the names of all the members of the family. Twice a year, generally in spring and autumn, the relations hold a meeting in this room, when rich presents of various kinds of meats, wines, and perfumes, with wax tapers, are laid on the table with great ceremony as gifts to their deceased ancestors.

## Hutch[[@Headword:Hutch]]

             (1) A medieval term for a chest, box, or hoarding-cupboard, found in use in the Vision of Piers Plowman.

(2) This word was sometimes applied to an aumbry for the sacred vessels of the altar, as in the Accounts of Louth Spire; or

(3) to one for the sacramental oil, baptismal shell, stoles, and towel used in baptism.

(4) Any locker for books, church music, sconces, etc.

## Hutcheson, Francis[[@Headword:Hutcheson, Francis]]

             called by Mackintosh the “father of speculative philosophy in Scotland,” was the son of a Presbyterian minister in Ireland, and was born Aug. 8, 1694. He entered the University of Glasgow in 1710, and afterwards became minister of a Presbyterian church in the north of Ireland; but, preferring the study of philosophy to theology, he was induced to open a private academy at Dublin. The publication of some of his works soon procured him the friendship of many distinguished persons, and in 1729 he was called as professor of moral philosophy to the University of Glasgow. He died in 1747. His principal works are, Philosophiae moralis institutio compendiaria, ethices et jurisprudentiae naturalis elementa continens (Glasgow, 1742, 12mo): — A short Introduction to Moral Philosophy, containing the Elements of Ethics and the Law of Nature, translated (Glasgow, 1747, sm. 8vo): — An Essay on the Vature and Conduct of Passions and Affections (3rd ed. Glasgow 1769, sm. 8vo): — Synopsis metaphysicae, Ontologicam et Pneumatologiams complectens (editio sexta, Glasgow 1774, small 8vo): — An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue, in two treatises (5th edit. corrected, London, 1753, 8vo): — Letters between the late Mr. Gilbert Burnet and IM. Hutcheson concerning the true Foundation of Virtue or Moral Goodness, etc. (London, 1735, 8vo). After his death, his System of Moral Philosophy was published by his son, Francis Hutcheson, M.D., with a sketch of his life and writings by Dr. William Leechman (Glasgow 1755, 2 vols. 4to). “In his metaphysical system Hutcheson rejected the theory of innate ideas and principles, but insisted upon the admission of certain universal propositions, or, as he terms them, metaphysical axioms, which are self- evident and immutable. These axioms are primary and original, and do not derive their authority from any simpler and antecedent principle.  Consequently, it is idle to seek a criterion of truth, for this is none other than reason itself, or, in the words of Hutcheson, ‘menti cogenita intelligendi vis.' Of his ontological axioms two are important: Everything exists really; and no quality, affection, or action is real, except in so far as it exists in some object or thing.

From the latter proposition, it follows that all abstract affirmative propositions are hypothetical, that is, they invariably suppose the existence of some object without which they cannot be true. Truth is divided into logical, moral, and metaphysical. Logical truth is the agreement of a proposition with the object it relates to; moral truth is the harmony of the outward act with the inward sentiments; lastly, metaphysical truth is that nature of a thing wherein it is known to God as that which actually it is, or it is its absolute reality. Perfect truth is in the infinite alone. The truth of finite things is imperfect, inasmuch as they are limited. It is, however, from the finite that the mind rises to the idea of absolute truth, and so forms to itself a belief that an absolute and perfect nature exists, which, in regard to duration and space, is infinite and eternal. The soul, as the thinking essence, is spiritual and incorporeal. Of its nature we have, it is true, but little knowledge; nevertheless, its specific difference from body is at once attested by the consciousness. It is simple and a active; body is composite and passive. From the spiritual nature of the soul, however, Hutcheson does not derive its immortality, but makes this to rest upon the goodness and wisdom of God.” In moral philosophy he was the first to use the term “moral sense” to denote “the faculty which perceives the morality of actions,” and he held it to be an essential part of human nature.

“He allows the appellation of good to those actions alone which are disinterested and flow from the principle of benevolence. The last has no reference to expediency nor personal advantages, nor even to the more refined enjoyments of moral sympathy, the obligations of reason and truth, or of the divine will. It is a distinct and peculiar principle, a moral sentiment or instinct of great dignity and authority, and its end is to regulate the passions, and to decide, in favor of virtue, the conflict between the interested and disinterested affections. On this foundation Hutcheson erected all the superstructure of the moral duties.” See English Cyclopedia; Mackintosh, History of Ethical Philosophy, p. 126; Tennemann, [Manual History of Philosophy, § 350; Stud. u. Krit. 1866, p. 406; Morell, History of Mod. Philippians p. 179 sq.; M'Cosh, Intuitions of the Mind, p. 92, 248, 411 sq.; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 926. Hutcheson, George, an English Biblical scholar, of' whose early life but little is known, flourished about the middle of the 17th century. He was a  minister first at Colomonell, and later at Edinburgh, but was ejected for nonconformity about 1660. In 1669 he preached at Irvine, though he continued steadfastly to oppose the use of the Episcopal liturgy. He died hi 1678. He wrote, Exposition of the twelve Minor Prophets (Lond. 1655, sm. 8vo): — Exposit. of John (1657, fol.): — Exposition of Job (1669, fol.): — Forty-five Sermons on the 130th Psalm (Edinb. 1691, 8vo). — Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. 2, 345; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 927. (J. H. W.)

## Hutchins, Richard, D.D[[@Headword:Hutchins, Richard, D.D]]

             a minister of the Church of England, was Hervey's tutor, and a very faithful member of the Oxford Methodist Society. He became a fellow of Lincoln College, December 8, 1720; subrector, November 6, 1739; bursar and librarian, November 6, 1742; rector, July 9, 1755; and died August 10, 1781. His only publication is a Latin sermon, Elucidatio Sexti Capitis Evangelii Secundum Johannem (1847, 8vo, page 51). "In more respects  than one Dr. Hutchils continued an Oxford Methodist long after all his old friends had been dispersed." See Tyerman, The Oxford Methodists, page 370.

## Hutchinson, Anne[[@Headword:Hutchinson, Anne]]

             an American religious enthusiast, and founder of a party of Antinomians (q.v.) in the New England colony, emigrated from Lincolnshire, England, to Boston in 1636. She claimed to be a medium of divine revelation, and, being “a woman of admirable understanding, and profitable and sober carriage, she won a powerful party in the country, and her enemies could never speak of her without acknowledging her eloquence and ability.” She held that the Holy Spirit dwells in every believer, and that the revelation of the Spirit is superior to the ministry of the word. As her doctrines affected not only the religious, but also the political professions of the people, great controversies ensued; a synod was finally called, in which her teachings were condemned, and she and her associate leaders were banished from the colony. Anne and her friends now obtained from the chief of the Narragansetts permission to reside in Rhode Island. Here “they set up a community on the highly commendable principle that no one was to be ‘accounted a delinquent for doctrine.”‘After the decease of her husband (who shared her opinions), she removed to a Dutch settlement in the colony of New York. In 1643, she and her whole family of fifteen persons were taken prisoners by the Indians, and all but one daughter barbarously murdered. See Bancroft, Hist. of the United States, 1, 388 sq.; Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 472; American Presb. Rev. 1860, p. 225. (J. H. W.)

## Hutchinson, John , 1[[@Headword:Hutchinson, John , 1]]

             a Puritan colonel in the Parliamentary army during the time of the English Civil War, was born at Nottingham in 1617. He was a nonconformist (Baptist), and, being of a religious turn of mind, much of his time was given to the study of theology. At the outbreak of the Civil War he sided with the Parliament, and was appointed governor of Nottingham Castle. At the trial of the king (Charles I) he concurred in the sentence pronounced on him, having first “addressed himself to God by prayer.” Cromwell's  conduct after this unfortunate affair Hutchinson disapproved; and while various sentiments are entertained on his political conduct, “none question his integrity or piety.” At the Restoration he suffered the general fate of the Republicans, and died in prison, Sept. 11, 1664. See Neale, Hist. of the Puritans (Harper's edit.), 2, 378 sq.; Appleton's Amer. Cyclop. 9, 396.

## Hutchinson, John , 2[[@Headword:Hutchinson, John , 2]]

             inventor of a theory of hermeneutics which gave rise to much discussion in the 17th century, and still has a few adherents, was born in 1674, at Spennithorne, in Yorkshire. After private education, he became, at the age of 19, steward to Mr. Bathurst, and afterwards to the duke of Somerset, who bestowed upon him many marks of confidence, and finally procured for Hutchinson a sinecure appointment of £200 per annum from the government. His time was now mainly devoted to religious study. He also made a large and valuable collection of fossils. In 1724 he published the first part of a curious work entitled Moses's Principia, in which he attempted to refute the doctrine of gravitation as taught in the Principia of Newton. In the second part of this work, which appeared in 1727, he continued his attack upon the Newtonian philosophy, and maintained, on the authority of Scripture, the existence of a plenum. From this time to his death he published yearly one or two volumes in further elucidation of his views, which evince extensive knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures. He died August 28,1737.

“According to Hutchinson, the Old Testament contains a complete system of natural history, theology, and religion. The Hebrew language was the medium of God's communication with man; it is therefore perfect, and consequently, as a perfect language, it must be coextensive with all the objects of knowledge, and its several terms are truly significant of the objects which they indicate, and not so many arbitrary signs to represent them. Accordingly, Hutchinson, after Origen and others, laid great stress on the evidence of Hebrew etymology, and asserted that the Scriptures are not to be understood and interpreted in a literal, but in a typical sense, and according to the radical import of the Hebrew expressions. By this plan of interpretation, he maintained that the Old Testament would be found not only to testify fully to the nature and offices of Christ, but also to contain a perfect system of natural philosophy.” His editors give the following compendium of the Hutchinsonian theory: “The Hebrew Scriptures nowhere ascribe motion to the body of the sun, or fixedness to the earth;  they describe the created system to be a plenum without any vacuum, and reject the assistance of gravitation, attraction, or any such occult qualities, for performing the stated operations of nature, which are carried on by the mechanism of the heavens in their threefold condition of fire, light, and spirit, or air, the material agents set to work at the beginning: the heavens, thus framed by Almighty wisdom, are an instituted emblem and visible substitute of Jehovah Elohim, the eternal three, the coequal and co- adorable Trinity in Unity: the unity of substance in the heavens points out the unity of essence, and the distinction of conditions the triune personality in Deity, without confounding the persons or dividing the substance. From their being made emblems, they are called in Hebrew Shermim, the names, representatives, or substitutes, expressing by their names that they are emblems, and by their conditions or offices what it is they are emblems of.” As an instance of his etymological interpretation, the word Berith, which our translation renders Covenant, Hutchinson construes to signify “he or that which purifies,” and so the purifier or purification “for,” not “with,” man. From similar etymologies, he drew the conclusion “that all the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish dispensation were so many delineations of Christ, in what he was to be, to do, and to suffer, and that the early Jews knew them to be types of his actions and sufferings, and that, by performing them as such, were in so far Christians both in faith and practice.” All his writings are collected in The Philosophical and Theological Works of the late truly learned John Hutchinson, Esq. (Lond. 1749, 3rd edit. 12 vols. 8vo).

“Hutchinson's philological and exegetical views found numerous followers, who, without constituting a doctrinal sect, came to be distinguished as ‘Hutchinsonians.' In their number they reckoned several distinguished divines in England and Scotland, both of the Established Church and of Dissenting communities. Among the most eminent of these were bishop Home, and his biographer, Mr. William Jones; Mr. Romaine, and Mr. Julius Bates, to whom the duke of Somerset, on the nomination of Mr. Hutchinson, presented the living of Sutton, in Sussex; Mr. Parkhurst, the lexicographer; Dr. Hodges, provost of Oriel; and Dr. Wetherell, master of University College, Oxford; Mr. Holloway, author of Letter and Spirit; and Mr. Lee, author of Sophron, or Nature's Characteristics of Truth. The principles of Mr. Hutchinson are still entertained by many divines without their professing to be followers of Mr. Hutchinson, but the number of professing Hutchinsonians is now very small.” See English Cyclop. s.v.;  Jones of Noyland, Works, vols. 3 and 13; Bishop Horne, Works, vol. vi (ed. 1809); Bate, Defense of Hutchinson (Lond. 1751, 8vo); Spearman, Abstract of Hutchinson's Works (Edinb. 1755, 12mo); Kitto., Bibl. Cyclop. 2, 345.

## Hutchinson, John Russell, D.D[[@Headword:Hutchinson, John Russell, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Columbia County, Pennsylvania, February 12, 1807. He graduated from Jefferson College in 1826, and studied two years in Princeton Seminary. He was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Philadelphia, April 22, 1829, and went to Mississippi the following October. He preached at Rodney, Mississippi; Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Vicksburg, Mississippi; Bethel Church, Prytanea Street, and Carrolton, New Orleans, Louisiana, January 1, 1834, he became connected with the College of Louisiana. In 1842 he was called to occupy the chair of ancient languages in Oakland College, Mississippi, which he held twelve years, and for a time, in 1851, he was acting president. In 1854 he removed to New Orleans, purchased property, and established a classical school of a high order. In 1860 he took charge of the public academy in Houston, Texas. He died February 24, 1878. He was a preacher for nearly half a century, and in his prime a man of mark. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1878, page 17.

## Hutchinsonianism[[@Headword:Hutchinsonianism]]

             SEE HUTCHINSON, John , 2.

## Huth, Caspar Jacob[[@Headword:Huth, Caspar Jacob]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Frankfort-on-the-Main, December 25, 1711. He studied at Jena, commenced his academical career in 1735, was professor of theology at Erlangen in 1743, and died September 14, 1760, leaving, Pauperes Spiritu (Erlangen, 1745): — De Schiloh Vaticinium (eod.): — Spes Regenitorum Viva per Resurrectionem Christi (1746): — Fides Matris. Viventium (1748): — Schilo Bethlehemitanus (eod.): — Petrus non Petra (1757): — Questiones Theologicae (1758), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Jocher, Algemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:418 sq. (B.P.)

## Huth, Johann Ernest[[@Headword:Huth, Johann Ernest]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died at Altenburg, January 4, 1873, superintendent, is the author of De Loco Epistolae Pauli ad Gal 3:19-20 (Altenburg, 1854). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:600. (B.P.)

## Huther, Johann Eduard[[@Headword:Huther, Johann Eduard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born September 10, 1807, at Hamburg. He studied at Bonn, Gottingen, and Berlin; was in 1842 religious instructor in the gymnasium at Schwerin; in 1855 pastor at Wittenforden, near Schwerin; and died March 17, 1880, leaving, Cyprians Lehre von der Kirche (Gotha, 1839): — Commentar uber den Brief Pauli an die Colosser (Hamburg, 1841): — Der Religions-Unterricht in den Gymnasien (Rostock, 1848). For Meyer's Commentary he prepared the epistles to Timothy and Titus and the Catholic epistles. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:600. (B.P.)

## Hutten, Ulrich von[[@Headword:Hutten, Ulrich von]]

             a German knight and Reformer, was born April 20 (or 22), 1488, at Castle Steckelberg, in Hesse-Cassel, and entered the monastery of Fulda in 1498, intending to become a monk, but fled in 1504 to Erfurt, where he continued his theological studies for a while. In 1505 he went to Cologne, and the following year to Frankfort on the Oder, where the new university had recently been established. Here he applied himself to the study of philology and poetry. From Frankfort he went to Greifswald, and afterwards to Rostock, where he lectured on philosophy. In 1510 he went to Wittenberg, and thence to Vienna, where he remained until 1512. He afterwards visited Pavia and Bologna, studied law, and devoted himself particularly to the humanities and poetry. What he saw in Italy had the effect of making him an enlightened opponent of popery. Later he joined the army of the emperor Maximilian, and returned to Germany in 1517.. Taking part in Reuchlin's quarrel against the Dominicans of Cologne, he wrote against the state of the Romish Church, and particularly against the pontiff. Bolder, and more open in the expression of his opinions than most men of his age, he did much to prepare the way for the Reformation, though he sympathized with Luther only in his attack upon the pope, his great aim being not so much to change the Church as to free Germany from the tyranny of which popery was the basis. In 1522 he made an alliance with Franz von Sickingen, who was chosen chief of the nobility of the Upper Rhine at Landau. In that year, as the German princes did not approve of Sickingen's plan of freeing Germany from the Romish rule, he appealed to the States, and endeavored to make them side with the nobility against the princes. But Sickingen succumbed in 1523, and Hutten was obliged to flee from Germany. In Switzerland, his former friend Erasmus withdrew from him, and the Council of Zurich drove him out of their territory. He then retired to the island of Ufnau, on the lake of Zutrich, where he died, Aug. 29, 1523. Hutten has been very variously judged,  according to the different stand-points of his critics; yet it is certain that he was honest in his convictions, and, though not a partisan of the Reformation from any religious feeling, he did all he' could to free his native land from the subjection to the papacy. For that end he gave Luther all the aid in his power. He was one of the authors of the greater part of the Epistolce obscurorum virorum, and most of his writings were satires against the pope, the monks, and the clergy. Several editions of his works have been published; the principal are Munch's (Berlin, 1821-23, 6 vols.) and Ed. Bocking's (Lpz. 1859 sq., 7 vols.). See Epistolce U. ab Hutten ad R. Crocum (Leipzig, 1801); Bocking, Ein Verzeichniss der Schriften Hutten's, Index bibliographicus Huttenianus (Leipz. 1858); Schubart, Biographie (Lpz. 1791); Tischer, Biographie (Lpz. 1803); Panzer, Ulrich von Hutten, in literarischer Hinsicht (Nirnburg, 1798); Giess, H. u. sein Zeitalter (1813); E. von Brunnow, Ulrich von H. (Lpz. 1842, 3 vols.); Burck, Ulrich v. H. (Dresden u. Lpz. 1846); David Friedrich Strauss, Ulrich v. H. (Lpz. 1857, 2 vols.); Revite Germanique, March, 1858; Eclectic Review (Lond.), July, 1858, p. 54 sq.; Pierer, Universal Lexikon, vol. 8; Hase, Ch. History, § 314. Ulrich von Hutten, transl. from Chauffour-Kestner's Etudes sur les Réformateurs du 16me siecle, by A. Young (Lond. 1863); Lecky, Hist. of Rationalism, 2, 188; Hardwick, Reformation, p. 32 sq.; National Magazine, 1858, p. 243 sq.; Lond. Quart. Rev. 1857 (April); 1867 (April).

## Hutter, Edwin W., D.D[[@Headword:Hutter, Edwin W., D.D]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born at Allentown, Pennsylvania, September 12, 1813. After attending the village school he entered a printing-office. When seventeen years of age his father died, and he succeeded him as editor and proprietor of two weekly newspapers, one German, the other English. For several years he resided at Washington, D.C., as private secretary to James Buchanan, then secretary of state. Removing to Baltimore, Maryland, he studied theology under Dr. B. Kurtz, at the same time discharging the duties as office editor of the Observer. Subsequently he took charge of St. Matthew's Church, Philadelphia, the only pastorate upon which he ever entered, and which he served with great success for twenty-three years. The Northern Home for Friendless Children was founded largely through his influence. He died in September 1873. See Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry, 1878, page 194.

## Hutter, Elias[[@Headword:Hutter, Elias]]

             a German Hebraist, was born at Gorlitz in 1554, studied the Oriental languages in the universities of Jena and Leipzig, and became in 1579 Hebrew teacher of the elector August of Saxony. He next resided successively in different parts of Germany, set up a printing establishment in Nuremberg, and finally retired to Augsburg, where he died (others say he died at Frankfort) in 1605. His reputation as a linguist he established by editing several Polyglot Bibles. The first of them, Opus quadripartitum Script. Sacra (Hamb. 1596), contained the O.T. in Hebrew and three other versions. In 1599 he published at Nuremberg the New Test. in twelve different versions, and in 1602 his Nov. Test. Harmon. Ebr. Gr. Lat. et Germ. At present, however, Hutter's works are more curious than useful. Among them is a Hebrew Bible in remarkably bold and large letter, in which the serviles are distinguished by hollow type, and the defective radicals interlined in small characters, as in Bagster's edition of the Psalms. Pierer, Unic. Lex. 8, 646 sq.; Kitto, Biblical Cyclop. 2, 346.

## Hutter, Leonhard[[@Headword:Hutter, Leonhard]]

             a German Lutheran theologian, was born at Nellingen, near Ulm, in January, 1563, studied philosophy, philology, and theology at Strasburg, Leipzig, Heidelberg, and Jena; became private tutor in the latter university in 1594, and in 1596 professor at Wittenberg, where he died, Oct. 23,1616. He was a zealous upholder-of Lutheran orthodoxy. His Conpendium locorum theologicorum (Wittenb. 1610, etc.), prepared by order of the elector Christian, took the place of Melancthon's Loci as a text-book, and was translated into several languages (into German by Holstenius [Lib. 1611], and by Hutter himself [1613, etc.] into Swedish [Stock. 1618]), and commented on by Cundisius (Jena, 1648, etc.), Glassius (1656), Chemnitz (1670), Lachmann (1690), etc. It has lately been reproduced by Hase under the title fitterus redivivus (Berl. 1854), and translated into English, under the title of Compend of Lutheran Theology, by the Rev. H. E. Jacobs and the Rev. G. F. Spieker (Phila. 1868, 8vo). He carried out the Compendiun further in his Loci communes theolog. (Wittenb. 1619, fol., etc.). He also wrote against John Sigismund of Brandenburg, who had embraced Calvinism, his Callvinista aulico-politicus (Wittenb. 1609-14, 2 vols.),-and against Hospinian's Concordia discors another work, entitled Concordia concors (Wittenb. 1614). His other writings are De Voluntate Dei circa ceternum praedestinationis salvandoraum Decretum (Wittenb. 1605, 4to): — Explicatio libri Christiane concordantiae (Wittenberg, 1608. 8vo; twice reprinted): — Irenicum vere Christianum, sire tractatus de synodo et unione evangelicorum non fucata concilianda (Rost. 1616, 4to; 1619, folio), against the plan of fusion between the Lutheran and Reformed churches of Pareus, and especially against the latter's Irenicum. See J.C.Erdmann, Lebensbesch. u. Literarische Nachricht. v. d. Wittenberg Theologen seit 1502 bis 1802 (Wittenberg, 1804); Bayie, Dict. Hist.; J. G.Walch, Bibl. Theologica Selecta; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25 655; Univ. Lex. i, 376; Hook, Eccles. Biog. 6:238.

## Hutterians[[@Headword:Hutterians]]

             the followers of Hutter, an Anabaptist leader in Moravia in the 16th century. SEE ANABAPTISTS.

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

             a preacher of the Moravian Brethren was born in London in 1715. He was the son of a clergyman, and served an apprenticeship to a printer and a bookseller; but, coming under the influence of Mr.Wesley's preaching, he was awakened, and was converted under the labors of the distinguished Moravian, Peter Bohler. Soon after his conversion he visited the brethren at Hernhut, and became a devoted disciple and servant of count  Zinzendorf, under whose direction he henceforth devoted all his time and energy to the unity of the Moravian brotherhood in England. “His counsel and aid were afforded it in all its complicated plans of government and projects of usefulness; he held, as years rolled on, every lay office in it, and preached and ministered as a deacon; he was the soul of its missionary labors as a ‘society for the furtherance of the Gospel;' he defended it in its distresses; helped it by his energy and skill through all its heavy financial embarrassments; traveled for it over Europe; and, towards the close of his life, became, as it were, its representative to the court and people of England.” lie died in 1795. Hutton was a man of great piety and indomitable energy. The history of the Moravian Brethren in the second half of the 18th century is eminently the history of his own life. See Memoirs of James Hutton, comprising the annals of his life, and connexion with the United Brethren, by Daniel Benham (Lond. 1856, 8vo); Lond. Qu. Rev. 8, 239 sq.

## Hutton, Mancius Smedes[[@Headword:Hutton, Mancius Smedes]]

             a Reformed (Dutch) minister, was born in Troy, N.Y., June 9, 1803. He attended the school of the famous blind teacher, Joseph Nelson, in New York city; graduated from Columbia College in 1823, and from the theological seminary at Princeton in 1826. He was licensed to preach the same year by what was then known as the Second Presbytery of New York, and acted as missionary of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in Ulster  County, N.Y., in 1827 and 1828. In the latter year he was called to the Presbyterian Church in German Valley, and remained there until 1834, when he was called to the city of New York to become the colleague of the late Reverend Dr. James M. Matthews, then pastor of the South Reformed Church in Exchange Place, the church which he had attended when a boy and up to the time of leaving the city. After the great fire of December 16, 1835, which destroyed most of the lower part of the city, including the Exchange Place Church, the Church divided, and the pastor went with that portion which built the edifice on the east side of Washington Square. The new church was dedicated in 1841. For many years this was one of the best-known churches in the city. The neighborhood was one of the most fashionable in the metropolis, and the congregation, a very large one, numbered among its members many of the most intelligent and wealthy of the residents of the west side. After the resignation of his colleague Dr. Hutton remained sole pastor until 1876, when the Church disbanded, caused by the removal from time to time of so many of its members to the upper part of the city. Thereafter Dr. Hutton continued without a charge until his death, April 11, 1880. Dr. Hutton was a trustee of Columbia College, a member of the Council of the New York University, president of the Board of Education of the Reformed Church for the education of young men destined for the ministry, and a director in the Bible and tract societies. By virtue of his descent from revolutionary stock, he was a member of the Society of the Cincinnati for the state of New York, and general chaplain of the society in the United States. He published a number of Sermons and Addresses, for which see Corwin, Manual of the Ref. Church in America, s.v.; also Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1882, page 15.

## Hutton, Matthew (1), D.D[[@Headword:Hutton, Matthew (1), D.D]]

             an English prelate, was prebend of Ely in 1560, Margaret professor of divinity in Cambridge in 1561, regius professor in 1562, master. of Pembroke Hall and prebend of London the same year, dean of York in 1567, bishop of Durham in 1589, archbishop of York in 1595, and died January 15 or 16, 1606.

## Hutton, Matthew (2), D.D[[@Headword:Hutton, Matthew (2), D.D]]

             an English prelate, was prebend of York in 1734, canon of Windsor in 1736, prebend of Westminster in 1739, bishop of Bangor in 1743, and  archbishop of York in 1747. He was translated to Canterbury in 1757. He died March 19, 1758, leaving occasional Sermons (1741, 1744, 1745, 1747). See Allibone, Diet. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Huyghens, Gummarus[[@Headword:Huyghens, Gummarus]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian and philosopher, was born at Liere or Lyre (Brabant) Feb. 1631. When only twenty-one years of age he was appointed professor of philosophy at Louvain, and here he distinguished himself greatly. In 1668 he was honored with the doctorate of theology, and in 1677 was made president of the college of pope Adrian VI. He died at Louvain Oct. 27, 1702. Huyghens wrote a number of works, of which the best are Conferentias theologicas, in 3 vols.; Breves observat., or a course of divinity, in 15 vols. 12mo. As he refused to favor the peculiar views of some of the French moralists, and opposed the celebrated four articles of the French clergy (1.682), he was involved in great controversies. — Jocher, Algem. Gelehrten Lex. 2, 1794; Hook, Eccles. Biog. 6, 239. (J. H. W.)

## Huz[[@Headword:Huz]]

             (Gen 22:21). SEE UZ. Huzoth. SEE KIRJATH-HUZOTH. Huz'zab (Hebrew Hutstsab', הֻצִּב), rendered as a proper name in the Auth. Version of Nah 2:7, is either Hoph. praet. of נָצִב, to place firmly; and so the clause may be translated, “And it is fixed! she is led away captive,” i.e. the decree is confirmed for the overthrow of Nineveh (so the margin, and most interpreters; see Lud. de Dieu; the Sept. and Vulg. both confound with מִצָּב, καὶ ἡ ὑπόστασις [military station] ἀπεκαλύφθη, et miles captivus  abductus est; the Talmud and Hebrew interpreters, confounding with הִצִּב, render “the queen sitting on her couch”); or, rather, of צָבִב, to flow, by Chaldaism, and the meaning will then be (with Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 1147, who joins the word to the last of the preced. verse), “the palace shall be dissolved and made to flow down,” i.e. the palaces of Nineveh, inundated and undermined by the waters of the Tigris, shall dissolve and fall in ruins (comp. Diodorus, 2, 26). Mr. Rawlinson supposes (Herod. i, 570, note) that Huzzab may mean “the Zab country,” or the fertile tract east of the Tigris, watered by the Upper and Lower Zab rivers (Zab Ala and Zab Asfal.), the A-diab-ene of the geographers. This province-the most valuable part of Assyria-might well stand for Assyria itself, with which it is identified by Pliny (Hist. Nat. 5, 12) and Ammianus (23:6). The name Zab, as applied to the rivers, is certainly very ancient, being found in the great inscription of Tiglath Pileser I, which belongs to the middle of the 12th century B.C.; but in that case the name would hardly be written in Heb. with צ.

## Hwergelmer[[@Headword:Hwergelmer]]

             in Norse mythology, is the spring in the centre of Helheim and Niflbeim, in which the drops collect that fall from the antlers of the reindeer Aeikthyrner. There are so many of them that the spring supplies thirty- seven rivers of hell. The spring is inhabited by many snakes, who gnaw at the root of the world ash-tree, Ygdrasil.

## Hwiid, Andreas Christian[[@Headword:Hwiid, Andreas Christian]]

             a Danish Orientalist, was born Oct. 20, 1749, at Copenhagen. He was highly educated, and enjoyed great advantages by travel in foreign countries. Thus from 1777 to 1780 he spent in Germany, especially at Gittingen, where he studied under the celebrated Michaelis and Heyne, and in Italy, where he enjoyed the society of several cardinals, although a Protestant in belief. On his return he was appointed professor at the Royal College. He died May 3,1788. Hwiid wrote Specimen meditce Versionis Arabico-Samaritance Pentateuchi (Romans 1780, 4to): — Libellus criticus de indole codicis MSS. N.T. biblioth. Caesareo Vindobonensis (Cop. 1785). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 25:688.

## Hyacinth[[@Headword:Hyacinth]]

             SEE JACINTH.

## Hyacinthia[[@Headword:Hyacinthia]]

             an ancient festival, celebrated annually at Amyclae, in Greece. It lasted three days, on the first and last of which sacrifices were offered to the dead; and lamentations were held for the death of Hyacinthus, all the people laying aside their garlands and partaking only of simple cakes, with every sign of grief and mourning. The intermediate day, however, was spent in mirth and rejoicings, paeans being sung in honor of Apollo, while the youth spent the day in games of various kinds.

## Hyacinthus de Janua[[@Headword:Hyacinthus de Janua]]

             a Capuchin monk of distinction, who flourished in the first half of the 17th century, was named after his native city, Genoa. He was general preacher of his order, and enjoyed the confidence of Maximilian to such an extent that in 1622 he was charged by Gregory XV with a special commission to the Spanish court lie translated Castiglio's history of the Dominican order  into Italian (Palermo, 1626,2 vols. fol.). — Jocher, Allgem. Gelehrt. Lex. 2, 1795; Ranke, Hist. of the Popes, 2, 485.

## Hyads[[@Headword:Hyads]]

             a common appellation given to the seven daughters of Atlas by his wife Aethra, viz. Ambrosia, Eudora, Pasithoe, Coronis, Plexaris, Pytiho, and Tyche. These virgins bewailed so immoderately the death of their brother Hyas, who was devoured by a lion, that Jupiter, out of compassion, changed them into stars and placed them in the head of Taurus, where they still retain their grief, their rising and setting being attended with extraordinary rains (ὕω, to rain).

Some make them the daughters of Lycurgus, born in the isle of Naxos, and translated to the skies for their care in the education of Bacchus, probably because their rains were of great benefit in forwarding the vintage.

## Hyaena[[@Headword:Hyaena]]

             SEE HYENYA

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

             a Calvinistic Methodist preacher of considerable talent, was born at Sherborne, in Dorsetshire, in 1767. He became minister of a congregation at Mere, Wiltshire, in 1798, but removed in 1800 to one at Frome, Somersetshire, and soon afterwards to Tottenham Court Chapel and the Tabernacle, London. Here he was co-pastor with the Rev. Matthew Wilks until his death in 1826. His principal works are, Christian Duty and Encouragement in Times of Distress (2nd edit. Lond. 1810, 8vo): — Sermons on select Subjects (2nd ed. London, 1811, 8vo): — Sermons on various Subjects, edited by his son, Charles Hyatt, with memoir of the author by the Rev. John Morison, etc. (2nd ed. Lond. 1828, 8vo). — Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, 1, 1597.

## Hydaspes[[@Headword:Hydaspes]]

             ( ῾Υδάσπης), a river noticed in Judith 1, 6, in connection with the Euphrates and Tigris, mentioned by Arrian (Ind. 4) and Strabo (15, 697), which flowed westwards into the Indus, and is now called Jelam (Rawlinson, Herod. i, 558). The well-known Hydaspes of India is too remote to accord with the other localities noticed in the context. We may perhaps identify it with the Choaspes or Euloeus of Susiana, which was called Hydaspes by the Romans (Voss, ad Justin. ii, 14).

## Hyde, Alvan, D.D[[@Headword:Hyde, Alvan, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born Feb. 2, 1768, at Norwich, Conn. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1788, entered the ministry in June, 1790, and was ordained pastor in Lee June 6, 1792, where he remained until his death, Dec. 4, 1833. Hyde published Sketches of the Life of the Rev. Stephen West, D.D. (1818): — An Essay on the State of Infants (1830); and several occasional Sermons. — Sprague, Annals, 2, 300; Theol. Rev. 5, 544.

## Hyde, Edward[[@Headword:Hyde, Edward]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Norwich, Conn., March 31, 1786. He was converted in 1803, entered the New England Conference in 1809, was presiding elder on Boston District in 1822-26, and again in 1830, and meantime four years on New London District, and in 1831 was appointed steward of the Wesleyan Academy at Wilbraham, where he remained until his death, March 16, 1832. His indefatigable and successful labors were very valuable to the Church. — Minutes of Conferences, 1, 162; Stevens, Memorials of Methodism, 2, 142; Funeral Sermon, by Dr. Fisk. (G. L. T.)

## Hyde, Lavius[[@Headword:Hyde, Lavius]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Franklin, Conn., Jan. 29, 1789. He lost his father while quite young, and was prepared for college by his brother, the Rev. Alvan Hyde, D.D. He graduated at Williams College in 1813, and afterwards pursued a course of theological studies at Andover. In 1818 he was ordained minister over a church in Salisbury, Conn.; in 1823 he changed to Bolton, Conn., served subsequently at Ellington, Wayland, and Becket, Mass., and finally again at Bolton. At the age of seventy he retired from the active work of the ministry, and removed to Vernon, Conn., where he died, April 3, 1865. He wrote a biography of his brother, Alvan Hyde, and edited Nettleton's Village Hymns. — Appleton, Am. Annual Cyclop. 1865, p. 636.

## Hyde, Mrs. Abby Bradley[[@Headword:Hyde, Mrs. Abby Bradley]]

             (her maiden name), a poetess, was born at Stockbridge, Massachusetts, September 28, 1789; married Lavius Hyde (q.v.), a Congregational minister in 1818, and died at Andover, Connecticut, April 7, 1872. Some of her pieces were inserted in Nettleton's Village Hymns (1824), and a few have been incorporated into some later hymnals.

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

             a learned English divine and Orientalist, was born in Shropshire in 1636. He was educated at King's College, Cambridge. In 1653 he went to London, and rendered essential service in the preparation of Walton's Polyglot Bible. He was admitted fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, in 1659, and afterwards became keeper of the Bodleian Library. In 1666 he became prebendary of Salisbury, in 1678 archdeacon of Gloucester, Arabic professor in 1691, and finally regius professor of Hebrew and canon of Christ Church in 1697. He died in 1703. His principal work is Historia religionis veterum Persarumn eorumque Magorumn, ubi etiami nova Abrahami et Alithrce, et Vestae, et Manetis, etc. (Oxonii, 1700, 4to; 2nd edit., revised and augmented by Hunt and Costar, under the title Veteruma Persarum, Parthorum et laedorum Religionis Historia, Lond. 1760, 4to, illustrated). The work evinces great research and considerable acumen in  sifting the ancient Greek writers and some Persian works posterior to the Hegira, but, in consequence of the want of the most essential documents, such as the sacred books of the ancient Persians, which were then unknown in Europe, Hyde necessarily fell into some errors. Thus he maintains that Monotheism prevailed at first in Persia, was afterwards mixed with Sabaeism, was brought back to its original purity by Abraham, and was finally lost again by being connected with the worship of the heavenly bodies. The incorrectness of the opinion has since been shown by abbot Foucher (in Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles- Lettres, 1759), and especially by Anquetil Duperron, who brought to France the sacred books of the Persians. Hyde's other writings are collected in Syntagnma dissertationum, quas olim auctor doctissimus Thomas Hyde, S.T.P., separatim edidit, accesserunt nonnulla ejusdem opuscula hactenus inedita, etc., omnia diligenter recognita, a Gregorio Sharpe, LL.D. (Oxonii, 1767, 2 vols. 4to). See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, , 1598; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25:691; English Cyclopaedia, s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. 6:239; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 930.

## Hydromancy[[@Headword:Hydromancy]]

             (from ὕδωρ, water, and, μαντεία, divination), a species of divination, in which, by the aid of certain incantations, the images of the gods were seen in the water. The practice was brought from Persia, and employed by Numa and Pythagoras.

## Hydroparastatae[[@Headword:Hydroparastatae]]

             (ὑδροπαραστάται, aquarii, “offerers of water”), a name given to the Encratites (q.v.) because they avoided wine, and even in the Lord's Supper used nothing but water. See Theodoret, Her. Fab. 1, c. 20; Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. 15: ch. 2, § 7.

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

             ( ῾Υδροπαραστάται), a Greek term for those who anciently pretended to celebrate the holy communion with water.

## Hyemantes[[@Headword:Hyemantes]]

             (winterers, or tossed by a winter blast), an epithet given by the Latin fathers to demoniacs.Neale's Introd. to the Hist. of the Eastern Ch. 1, 209. SEE ENERGUMENS; SEE EXORCIST.

## Hyena[[@Headword:Hyena]]

             (ὕαινα, Sir 13:18) does not occur in the A.V. of the canonical Scriptures, but is probably denoted by צָבוּע(tsabu'a, streaked or ravenous, only Jer 12:9; so Sept. ὕαινα, but Vulg. avis discolor, and Auth. Vers. “speckled bird”), as the context and parallelism of the preceding verse require; an identification disputed by some, on the ground that the animal is not mentioned by ancient authors as occurring in Western Asia before the Macedonian conquest, and was scarcely known by name  even in the time of Pliny; it has since been ascertained, however, that in Romaic or modern Greek the word krokalos and glanos have been substituted for the ancient term hyena, and that the animal is still known in those regions by names cognate with the Hebrew (see Ruppel, Abyss. 1, 227; Shaw, Tray. 154; Kimpfer, Anasen. 411 sq.; Russell's Alfppo, 2, 65 sq.; comp. Pliny, 8, 44; 11, 67). The only other instance in which it occurs is as a proper name, Zeboim (1Sa 13:18, “the valley of hyenas,” Aquila; Neh 11:34). SEE ZEBOIM.

The Talmudical writers describe the hyena by no less than four names, of which tsabua is one (Lewysohn, Zool. § 119). Bochart (Hieroz. 2, 163 sq.) and Taylor (continuation of Calmet) have indicated what is probably the true meaning in the above passage in Jeremiah, of עִיַט צָבוּעִ, ait tsabua, the striped rusher, i.e. the hyena, turning round upon his lair-introduced after an allusion in the previous verse to the lion calling to the beasts of the field (other hyenas and jackals) to come and devour. This allusion, followed up as it is by a natural association of ideas with a description of the pastor, feeder, or rather consumer or devourer of the vineyard, treading down and destroying the vines, renders the natural and poetical picture complete; for the hyena seeks burrows and caverns for a lair; like the dog, it turns round to lie down; howls, and occasionally acts in concert; is loathsome, savage, insatiable in appetite, offensive in smell, and will, in the season, like canines, devour grapes. The hyena was common in ancient as in modern Egypt, and is constantly depicted on monuments (Wilkinson, 1, 213, 225); it must, therefore, have been well known to the Jews, as it is now very common in Palestine, where it is the last and most complete scavenger of carrion (Wood, Bible Animals, p. 62 sq.). Though cowardly in his nature, the hyena is very savage when once he attacks, and the strength of his jaws is such that he can crunch the thigh-bone of an ox (Livingstone's Travels, p 600).

“Tsabua, therefore, we consider proved to be, generically, the hyena; more specifically, the Canis hyaena of Linn., the Hyena vulgaris of more recent naturalists, the food of Barbary, the dub, dubbah, dabah, zabah, and kaftaar of modern Shemitic nations; and, if the ancients understood anything by the word, it was also their trochus. The striped species is one of three or four-all, it seems, originally African, and, by following armies and caravans, gradually spread over Southern Asia to beyond the Ganges,  though not as yet to the east of the Bramapootra. It is now not uncommon in Asia Minor, and has extended into Southern Tartar; but this progress is comparatively so recent that no other than Shemitic names are-well known to belong to it. The head and jaws of all the species are broad and strong. the muzzle truncated; the tongue like a rasp; the teeth robust, large, and eminently formed for biting, lacerating, and reducing the very bone; the neck stiff; the body short and compact; the limbs tall, with only four toes on each foot; the fur coarse, forming a kind of semi-erectile mane along the back; the tail rather short, with an imperfect brush, and with a fetid pouch beneath it. In stature the species varies from that of a large wolf to much less. Hyenas are not bold in comparison with wolves, or in proportion to their powers. They do not in general, act collectively; they prowl chiefly in the night; attack asses, dogs, and weaker animals; feed most willingly on corrupt animal offal, dead camels, etc.; and dig into human graves that are not well protected with stakes and brambles. The striped species is of a dirty ashy buff, with some oblique black streaks across the shoulders and body, and numerous cross-bars on the legs; the muzzle and throat are black, and the tip of the tail white.” (See Pliny Cyclopedia, s.v.) SEE JACKAL; SEE WOLF; SEE BEAR.

## Hyenae[[@Headword:Hyenae]]

             a name applied by Porphyry to the priestesses of Mithras, or the sun. Hydriaphoria (from ὕδωρ, water, and φέρω, to bear), a ceremony in which the married alien women carried a vessel with water for the married  women of Athens as they walked to the temple of Athena in the great procession of the Panathenaia.

## Hygden, Ranulph[[@Headword:Hygden, Ranulph]]

             SEE RANULPH OF CHESTER.

## Hygea[[@Headword:Hygea]]

             in Greek mythology, was the goddess of health, the daughter and constant companion of AEsculapius. SEE HEBE.

## Hyginus[[@Headword:Hyginus]]

             considered as the eighth or tenth bishop of Rome, appears to have held that station from A.D. 137 to 141. According to the Liberpont ficalis, he was a native of Athens, and before his election to the see of Rome taught philosophy. Nothing is known of his life, and the Liber pontif merely says of him, “Clerum composuit et distribuit gradus.” The Pseudo Decretals SEE DECRETALS ascribe to him a number of rules on Church discipline, and he is said to have introduced the customs of godfathers and Church consecrations, but this is doubtful The Martyrologies give some the 10th, others the 11th of January, 142, as the date of his death. Some critics deny his having been more than a simple confessor. A certain Hyginus, bishop of Cordova, is said to have been the first opponent of Priscillian (q.v.). See Papebroch, Acta Sanctorum; Tillemont, Memoires Baillet, Vies des Saints; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 705; Dupin, Eccles. Writers, cent. 2.

## Hyksos[[@Headword:Hyksos]]

             ( ῾Υκσώς, correctly explained [comp. Rawlinson, Herod. 2, 297] by Josephus [Apion, i, 14] as being compounded of the Egyptian hyk, “king,”  and sos, “shepherd” or “Arab,” i.e. nomade), a race who invaded Egypt, and constituted the 15th and one or two of the following dynasties, according to Manetho (see Kenrick, Egypt under the Pharaohs, 2, 152 sq.), especially as preserved by Josephus (ut supra): “In the reign of king Timaus there came up from the east men of an ignoble race, who had the confidence to invade our country, and easily subdued it without a battle, burning the cities, demolishing the temples, slaying the men, and reducing the women and children to slavery.” They made Salatis, one of themselves, king: he reigned at Memphis, and made the upper and lower region tributary. Of the 17th dynasty also were forty-three shepherd kings, called Hyksos, who reigned, perhaps contemporaneously with the preceding, at Diospolis. In the 18th dynasty of Diospolis a rising took place, and the shepherd kings were expelled out of the other parts of Egypt into the district of Avaris, which they fortified. Amosis besieged and compelled them to capitulate; on which they left Egypt, in number 240,000, and “marched through the desert towards Syria, and built the city of Jerusalem.” The last few words seem to render it probable that Manetho confounded the Hyksos with the Israelites, which is the less surprising, since the Hyksos were, as he rightly calls them, Phoenicians of the ancient, if not original race which inhabited Phoenicia, or Palestine (taken in its widest sense), before the conquest of the country by the Hebrews.

Chronological considerations seem to refer the time of the dominion of the Hyksos to the period of Abraham and Joseph (say from B.C. 2000 to 1500). When Joseph went into the land he found the name of shepherd odious — which agrees with the hypothesis that places the irruption of the shepherd kings anterior to his time; and possibly both the ease with which he rose to power and the fact that Jacob turned towards Egypt for a supply of food when urged by want may be readily accounted for on the supposition that a kindred race held dominion in the land, which, though hated by the people, as being foreign in its origin and oppressive in its character, would not be indisposed to show favor to members of the great Shemitic family to which they themselves belonged. The irruption into Egypt, and the conquest of the country on the part of the Phoenician shepherds, seems to have been a consequence of the general pressure of population from the north-east towards the south-west, which led the nomad Shemitic tribes first to overcome the original inhabitants of Palestine, and, continuing in the same line of advance, then to enter and subdue Egypt. The invasion of the Hyksos is indeed to be regarded as the result of the movement from the Euphrates westward of the most powerful  and (comparatively) most civilized people then found in Western Asia, who in their progress subdued or expelled in the countries through which they not improbably were urged by a pressure from other advancing tribes, nation and tribe one after another, driving them down towards the sea, and compelling those who dwelt along the shores of the Mediterranean to seek shelter and safety in the islands of that sea and other distant parts. To conquerors and aggressors of the character of these shepherd hordes Egypt would offer special attractions.

They continued sweeping onwards, and at last entered and conquered Egypt, establishing there a new dynasty, which was hateful because foreign, and because of a lower degree of culture than the Egyptians themselves had reached. Nor would these shepherds be less odious because, coming from the east and immediately from the deserts of Arabia, they were from the quarter whence the mild and cultivated Egyptians had long been wont to suffer from the predatory incursions of the wild nomad tribes (Die Phonizier, by Movers, Bonn, 1841; Bertheau, Geschichte der Israeliten, Gottingen, 1842), between whom and the agricultural natives of the country different pursuits, habits, and tastes would naturally engender animosities. This feeling of alienation exists at the present day. The Arab is still a depressed and despised being in Egypt. Bowring, in his Report on the country, remarks, “It is scarcely allowable even to send a message to a person in authority by an Arab servant” (p. 7). The expulsion of the shepherds seems to have been strangely confounded by Josephus, after Manetho, with the Exodus of the Israelites. The shepherds were conquerors, rulers, and oppressors; the Israelites guests and slaves. The shepherds were expelled, the Israelites were delivered. Josephus elsewhere (Apion, 1, 26) gives from Manetho a narrative of another event which wears a much nearer likeness to the Exodus (although Josephus expressly combats such an identification) in the case of a king Amenophis, who was ordered by the gods to cleanse Egypt of a multitude of lepers and other unclean persons; many of whom were drowned, and others sent in great numbers to work in the quarries which are on the east side of the Nile. After a time they were permitted to establish themselves in Avaris, which had been abandoned by the shepherds.

They then elected a ruler, Osarsiph, whose name was afterwards changed to that of Moses. This chief made this law for them, that they should not worship the Egyptian gods, but should kill the animals held sacred by the Egyptians; nor were they to have intercourse with any but such as were members of their own body-in. all respects aiming to oppose the customs and influence of the nations. These, sending for aid to the shepherds who had settled in  Jerusalem, and having received troops to the number of 200,000 men, were met by Amenophis, the king, with a yet larger force, but not attacked. “On a subsequent occasion, however, they were assailed by the Egyptians, beaten, and driven to the confines of Syria.” Lysimachus gives an account not dissimilar to this, adding that, under the leadership of Moses, these mixed hordes settled in Judaea.(Cory's Ancient Fragments). The account which Diodorus gives of the migration of the Israelites from Egypt to Palestine is of a similar tenor. The deviations from the sacred narrative may easily be accounted for by Egyptian ignorance, vanity, and pride. (See Akers's Biblical Chronology , chap. 5). It is also apparent that Josephus considerably travesties the original narrative of Manetho (Kenrick, Egypt, 2, 159). The expulsion of the Hyksos seems to have taken place about two centuries after the Exode (q.v.)

If, as we have some reason to believe, and as the reader may see satisfactorily established in Movers and Bertheau (ut supra), a race of the Shemitic family, coming down from the upper (Aram) country into the lower (Canaan), in course of time subjugated Egypt and established their dominion, maintaining it for some-five hundred years, such a historical event must have had a marked influence on the religion of the land. These invaders are described (Herod. 2, 128) as enemies to the religion of Egypt, who destroyed or closed the temples, broke in pieces the altars and images of the gods, and killed the sacred animals. Their influence on the Egyptian religion was probably not unlike that of the Persians on the Grecian, having for its aim and effect to discountenance and destroy a low and degrading system of idolatry; for the worship of the heavenly bodies, to which the Phoenician equally with the Persian invaders were given, was higher in its character and effects than the service of the ordinary gods of Greece, and still more so than the degrading homage paid by the Egyptians to the lowest animals. By this means the Shemitic religion exerted on the native Egyptian religion a decided and improving influence, which may be seen and traced in that element of the religion of Egypt which contains and presents the worship of the heavenly bodies. The two systems, that of the Egyptians be-, fore it received inoculation from the East, and that of the Eastern invaders, agreed in this, that they were both the worship of the powers of nature; but they differed in this, and an important difference it was, that the. Egyptians adored the brute creation, the Phoenicians the host of heaven. — Kitto. (See Stud. und Krit. 1839, 2, 393, 408; Saalschtitz, Forschungen, abth. 3:1849; Schulze, De Jontibus historice Hyksorum,  Berlin, 1848; Uhlemann Issraeliten- und Hyksos in Aegypten, Lpz. 1856.) SEE EGYPT; SEE SHEPHERD-KINGS.

## Hylaret, Maurice[[@Headword:Hylaret, Maurice]]

             a French theologian, was born at Angoulême Sept. 5, 1539. In 1551 he entered the order of the C' Cordeliers.” About 1552 he went to Paris to continue his studies, and returned to Angoulême in 1557 to be ordained for the priesthood. He now devoted his time exclusively to the study of theology, and in 1562 was made a professor of philosophy, and a short time later a professor of theology. In 1566 he made himself quite conspicuous by a public controversy with the Calvinist Godet. In 1568 he was called to the Sorbonne, and was honored with the doctorate two years later. Henceforward he preached much, and the celebrity he gained as a pulpit orator procured him a position as preacher at Orleans in 1572. He died in December, 1591. His works are, Sacrae Decades quinquepartitce, concones quadragesimales, atque Paschales numero quinquaginta (Lyons, 1591, 2 vols. 8vo): — Concionum per adventum Enneades sacrae quatuor, homilics triginta sex complectentes, e quibus viginti septem priores Joelem prophet. explicant novera vero posteriores Evangelia adventus et festorum per id tempus occurrentium. explicant (Paris, 1591, 8vo): — Homilie in Evangelia dominicalia per totum annum (Paris, 1604, 2 vols. 8vo). Dupin also ascribes to Hylaret De non conveniendo cum haereticis et de non ineundo cum haeretica a viro catholico conjugio (Orl. 1587). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 707 sq.

## Hyle[[@Headword:Hyle]]

             (ὕλη, matter) was, according to the doctrines of the Manicheaans (q.v.), the Lord of darkness. They: held that the world is governed by two primary principles, viz. “a subtle and a gross sort of matter, or light and darkness, separated from each other by a narrow space,” over each of which presides an eternal Lord. God they termed the Lord of the world of Light; Hyle the Lord of the world of darkness; and both of these worlds, “although different in their natures, have some things in common. Each is distributed into five opposing elements, and the same number of provinces; both are equally eternal, and, with their respective lords, self-existent, both are unchangeable, and exist forever; both are of vast extent, yet the world of light seems to fill more space than the empire of darkness. The condition of the two lords presiding over the two kinds of matter is equal, but they  are totally unlike in their natures and dispositions. The Lord of Light, being himself happy, is beneficent, a lover of peace and quietness, just and wise; the Lord of darkness, being himself very miserable, wishes to see others unhappy, is quarrelsome, unwise, unjust, irascible, and envious. Yet they are equal in the eternity of their existence, in their power to beget beings like themselves, in their unchangeableness and in their power and knowledge; and yet the King of light or God, excels the Prince of darkness, or the Daemon, in power and knowledge.” — Mosheim, Ch. Hist. of the first three Centuries, 2, § 41, p. 275; Meander, Hist. of Dogmas, 1, 118, 127, 181, etc.

## Hylozoism[[@Headword:Hylozoism]]

             (ὕλη, wood, used by ancient philosophers to signify the abstract idea of matter; and ζωή, life) is a term for the atheistical doctrine which teaches that life and matter are inseparable. But the forms which have grown out of this doctrine have been rather variable. Thus, “Strato of Lampsacus held that the ultimate particles of matter were each and all of them possessed of-life,” approaching, of course, in this sense, to pantheism; but “the Stoics, on the other hand, while they did not accord activity or life to every distinct particle of matter, held that the universe, as a whole, was animated by a principle which gave to it motion, form, and life.” The followers of Plotinus, who held that the “soul of the universe” animated the least particle of matter; or, in other words, while they admitted a certain material or plastic life, essential and substantial, ingenerable and incorruptible, attributed all to matter, especially favored the Stoical doctrine, and “Spinoza asserted that all things were alive in different degrees (‘omnia quamvis diversis gradibus animata tamen sunt').” All the various forms of this doctrine evidently mistake force for life. According to Leibnitz, Boscovich, and others, “Matter is always endowed with force. Even the vis isertice ascribed to it is a force. Attraction and repulsion, and chemical affinity, all indicate activity in matter; but life is a force always connected with organization, which much of matter wants. Spontaneous motion, growth, nutrition, separation of parts, generation, are phenomena which indicate the presence of life, which is obviously not coextensive with matter.” See Fleming, Vocabulary of Philos. (edited by Krauth), p. 219 sq.; Cudworth, intellect. System, 1, 106 sq., 144 sq., etc.; Hallam; Hist. of Europe, 4, 188.

## Hymen[[@Headword:Hymen]]

             or Hymeneus, in Grecian mythology, is the god of marriage. Originally the word seems to have denoted only the bridal song of the companions of the bride sung by them as she went from her father's house to that of the bridegroom. The god Hymen is first mentioned by Sappho. “The legends concerning him are various; but he is generally said to be a son of Apollo and some one of the Muses. He is represented as a boy with wings and a garland, a bigger and graver Cupid, with a bridal-torch and a veil in his hands.” — Chambers, Encyclop. 5, 494.

## Hymenaeus[[@Headword:Hymenaeus]]

             ( ῾Υμέναιος, hymeneal), a professor of Christianity at Ephesus, who, with Alexander (1Ti 1:20) and Philetus (2Ti 2:18), had departed from the truth both in principle, and practice, and led others into apostasy (Neander, Pfianz. 1, 475). The chief doctrinal error of these persons consisted in maintaining that “the resurrection was past already.” The precise meaning of this expression is by no means clearly ascertained: the most general, and perhaps best-founded opinion is, that they understood the resurrection in a figurative sense of the great change produced by the Gospel dispensation. See below. Some have suggested that they attempted to support their views by the apostle's language in his Epistle to the Ephesians (νεκροὺς - συνεζωποίησεν - συνήγειρεν, etc., 2, 1-5); but this is very improbable; for, if such misconception of his language had arisen, it might easily have been corrected; not to say that one of them appears to have been personally inimical to Paul (2Ti 4:14), and would scarcely have appealed to him as an authority. Most critics suppose that the same person is referred to in both the epistles to Timothy by the name of Hymenaeus (see Heidenreich, Pastoralbr. 1, 111). Mosheim, however, contends that there were two. He seems to lay great stress on the apostle's declaration in 1Ti 1:20, “Whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme.” But, whatever may be the meaning of this expression, the infliction was evidently designed for the benefit and restoration of the parties (comp. 1 Corinthians 5, 5), and was therefore far from indicating their hopeless and abandoned wickedness. See below. Nor do the terms employed in the second epistle import a less flagrant violation of the Christian profession than those in the first. If in the one the individuals alluded to are charged with having “discarded a good conscience” and “made shipwreck of faith,”  in the other they are described as indulging “in vain and profane babblings, which would increase to more ungodliness,” as “having erred concerning the truth,” and “overthrowing the faith” of others. These can hardly be said to be “two distinct characters, having nothing in common but the name” (Mosheim's Commentaries, 1, 304-306). For other interpretations of 2Ti 2:18, see Gill's Commentary, ad loc., and Walchii Miscellanea Sacra, 1, 4; De Hymenaeo Phileto, Jen. 1735, and Amstel. 1744. Two points referred to above require fuller elucidation.

1. The Error of Hymenaeus. — This was one that had been in part appropriated from others, and has frequently been revived since with additions. What initiation was to the Pythagoreans, wisdom to the Stoics, science to the followers of Plato, contemplation to the Peripatetics, that “knowledge” (γυῶσις) was to the Gnostics. As there were likewise in the Greek schools those who looked forward to a complete restoration of all things (ἀποκατάστασις, see Heyne, ad Virg. Ecc 4:5; comp. Gen. 6, 745), so there was “a regeneration” (Tit 3:5; Mat 19:28), “a new creation” (2Co 5:17; see Alford, ad loc.; Rev 21:1), “a kingdom of heaven and of Messiah or Christ” (Matthew 13; Revelation 7) —and herein popular belief among the Jews coincided unequivocally propounded in the N.T.; but here with this remarkable difference, viz., that in a great measure it was present as well as future-the same thing in germ that was to be had in perfection eventually. “The kingdom of God is within you,” said our Lord (Luk 17:21). “He that is spiritual judgeth all things,” said Paul (1Co 2:15). “He that is born of God cannot sin,” said John (1Jn 3:9). There are likewise two deaths and two resurrections spoken of in the N.T.; the first of each sort, that of the soul to and from sin (Joh 3:3-8), “the hour which now is” (ibid. 5, 24,25, on which see Augustine, De Civ. Dei, 20, 6); the second, that of the body to and from corruption (1Co 15:36-44; also Joh 5:28-29), which last is prospective. Now, as the doctrine of the resurrection of the body was found to involve immense difficulties even in those early days (Act 17:32; 1Co 15:35 : how keenly they were pressed may be seen in Augustine, De Civ. Dei, 22:12 sq.), while, on the other hand, there was so great a predisposition in the then current philosophy (not even extinct now) to magnify the excellence of the soul above that of its earthly tabernacle, it was at once the easier and more attractive course to insist upon and argue from the force of those passages of Holy Scripture which enlarge upon the  glories of the spiritual life that now is under Christ; and to pass over or explain away allegorically all that refers to a future state in connection with the resurrection of the body. In this manner we may deride the first errors of the Gnostics, of whom Hymenaeus was one of the earliest. They were spreading when John wrote' and his grand-disciple, Irenaeus, compiled a voluminous work against them (adv. Haer.). A good account of their full development is given by Gieseler, E. H., Per. 1, Div. 1, § 44 sq. SEE RESURRECTION.

2. The Sentence passed upon him. — It has been asserted by some writers of eminence (see Corn. a Lapide, ad 1Co 5:5) that the “delivering to Satan” is a mere synonym for ecclesiastical excommunication. Such can hardly be the case. The apostles possessed many extraordinary prerogatives, which none have since arrogated. Even the title which they bore has been set apart to them ever since. The shaking off the dust of their feet against a city that would not receive them (Mat 10:14), although an injunction afterwards given to the Seventy (Luk 10:11), and one which Paul found it necessary to act upon twice in the course of his ministry (Act 13:51; Act 18:6), has never been a practice since with Christian ministers. “Anathema,” says Bingham, ‘is a word that occurs frequently in the ancient canons” (Antiq. 16, 2, 16), but the form “Anathema Maranatha” is one that none have ever ventured upon since Paul (1Co 16:22). As the apostles healed all manner of bodily infirmities, so they seem to have possessed and exercised the same power in inflicting them-a power far too perilous to be continued when the manifold exigencies of the apostolical age had passed away. Ananias and Sapphira both fell down dead at the rebuke of Peter (Act 5:5; Act 5:10); two words from the same lips, “Tabitha, arise,” sufficed to raise Dorcas from the dead (Act 9:40). Paul's first act in entering upon his ministry was to strike Elymas the sorcerer with blindness, his own sight having been restored to him through the medium of a disciple (Act 9:17. and Act 13:11), while soon afterwards we read of his healing, the cripple of Lystra (Act 14:8). Even apart from actual intervention by the apostles, bodily visitations are spoken of in the case of those who approached the Lord's Supper unworthily, when as yet no discipline had been established: “For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and a good number (ἱκανοί, in the former case it is πολλοί) sleep” (1Co 11:30).  On the other hand, Satan was held to be the instrument or executioner of all these visitations. Such is the character assigned to him in the book of Job (Job 1:6-12; Job 2:1-7). Similar agencies are described 1Ki 22:19-22, and 1Ch 21:1. In Psa 78:49, such are the causes to which the plagues of Egypt are assigned. Even our Lord submitted to be assailed by him more than once (Mat 4:1-10; Luk 4:13 says, “Departed from him for a season”); and “a messenger of Satan was sent to buffet” the very apostle whose act of delivering another to the same power is now under discussion. At the same time, large powers over the world of spirits were authoritatively conveyed by our Lord to his immediate followers (to the Twelve, Luk 9:1; to the Seventy, as the results slowed, Luk 10:17-20). SEE SATAN.

It only remains to notice five particulars connected with its exercise, which the apostle himself supplies:

1. That it was no mere prayer, but a solemn authoritative sentence pronounced in the name and power of Jesus Christ (1Co 5:3-5);

2. That it was never exercised upon ally without the Church: “Them that are without (God judgeth” (ibid. 5, 13), he says in express terms;

3. That it was “for the destruction of the flesh,” i.e. some bodily visitation;

4. That it was for the improvement of the offender: that “his spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus” (ibid. 5, 5) and that “he might learn not to blaspheme” while upon earth (1Ti 1:20);

5. That the apostle could in a given case empower others to pass such sentence in his absence (1Co 5:3-4). SEE ANATHEMIA.

Thus, while the “delivering to Satan” may resemble ecclesiastical excommunication in some respects, it has its own characteristics likewise, which show plainly that one is not to be confounded or placed on the same level with the other. Nor again does Paul himself deliver to Satan all those in whose company he bids his converts “not even to eat” (1 Corinthians 5, 11). See an able review of the whole subject by Bingham, Ant. 6, 2, 15. SEE EXCOMUNICATION.

## Hymn[[@Headword:Hymn]]

             (῞Υμνος). This term; as used by the Greeks, primarily signified simply a song (comp. Homer, Od. 8, 429; Hesiod, Op. et Dies, 659; Pindar, 01. 1,170; 11, 74; Iisthm. 4, 74; Pyth. 10, 82; AEsch. Eum. 331; Soph. Antig. 809; Plato, Republ. 5, 459, E. etc.); we find instances even in which the cognate verb ὑμνεῖν is used in a bad sense (φαύλως ἐκλαμβάνεται, Eulstath. p. 634; comp. Soph. Elect. 382; (Ed. Tyr. 1275; Eurip. Med. 425); but usage ultimately appropriated the term to songs in praise of the gods. We know that among the Greeks, as among most of the nations of antiquity, the chanting of songs in praise of their gods was an approved part of their worship (Clem. Alex. Strom. 6, 633, ed. Sylburg., Porphyr. de Abstin. 4 sec. 8; Phurnutus, De Nat. Deor. c. 14; Alex. ab Alex. Genesis Dies, 4:c. 17, s.f..; Spanheim in not. ad Callimachum, p. 2; comp. Meiners, Geschichte aller Religionen, c. 13) and even at their festive entertainments such songs were sometimes sung (Athen. Deipnos. 14, 15, 14; Polyb. Hist, 4, 20, ed. Ernesti). Besides those hymns to different deities which have come down to us as the composition of Callimachus, Orpheus, Homer, Linus, Cleanthes, Sappho, and others, we may with confidence refer to the choral odes of the tragedians as affording specimens of these sacred songs, such of them, at least, as were of a lyric character (Snedorf, De Hymnis Vet. Graec. p.19). Such songs were properly called hymns. Hence Arrian says distinctly (De Exped. Alex. 4, 11, 2), ὔμνοι μὲν ἐς τοὺς θεοὺς ποιοῦνται, ἔπαινοι δὲ ἐς ἀνθρώπους. So also Phavorinus: ὕμνος, ἡ πρὸς θεὸν ᾠδήAugustine (in Psalms 72) thus fully states the meaning of the term: “Hymni laudes sunt Dei cum cantico. Hymni cantus sunt, continentes laudes Dei. Si sit laus, et non sit Dei, non est hymnus. Si sit laus et Dei laus, et non cantatur, non est hymnus. Oportet ergo ut si sit hymnus, habeat haec tria, et lauden et Dei et canticum.” See CHANT.

“Hymn,” as such, is not used in the English version of the O.T., and the noun only occurs twice in the N.T. (Eph 5:19; Col 3:16), though in the original of the latter the derivative verb (ὑμνέω) occurs in four places (“sing a hymn,” Mat 26:30; Mar 14:26; “sing praises,” Act 16:25; Heb 2:12). The Sept., however, employs it freely in translating the Hebrew names for almost every kind of poetical composition (Schleusn. Lex. ὕμνος). In fact, the word does not seem to have in the Sept. any very special meaning, and hence it calls the Heb. book of Tehillim the book of Psalms, not of Hymns; yet it frequently  uses the noun ὕμνος or the verb ὑμνέω as an equivalent of psalm (e.g. 1Ch 25:6; 2Ch 7:6; 2Ch 23:13; 2Ch 29:30; Neh 12:24; Psa 40:1, and the titles of many other psalms). The word psalm, however, generally had for the later Jews a definite meaning, while the word hymn was more or less vague in its application, and capable of being used as occasion should arise. If a new poetical form or idea should be produced, the name of hymn, not being embarrassed by a previous determination, was ready to associate itself with the fresh thought of another literature. This seems to have actually been the case. SEE SONG.

Among Christians the hymn has always been something different from the psalm; a different conception in thought, a different type in composition. SEE HYMNOLOGY. The “hymn” which our Lord sung with his disciples at the Last Supper is generally supposed to have been the latter part of the Hallel, or series of psalms which were sung by the Jews on the night of the Passover, comprehending Psalms 113-118; Psalms 113, 114 being sung before, and the rest after the Passover (Buxtorth Lex. Tam. s.v. הלל, quoted by Kuinol on Mat 26:30; Lightfoot's Heb. and Talm. Exercitations on Mar 14:26; Works, 11, 435). SEE HALLEL.

But it is obvious that the word hymn is in this case not applied to an individual psalm, but to a number of psalms chanted successively, and altogether forming a kind of devotional exercise, which is not inaptly called a hymn. The prayer in Act 4:24-30 is not a hymn, unless we allow non-metrical as well as metrical hymns. It may have been a hymn as it was originally uttered; but we can only judge by the Greek translation, and this is without meter, and therefore not properly a hymn. In the jail at Philippi, Paul and Silas “sang hymns” (A.V. “praises”) unto God, and so loud was their song that their fellow-prisoners heard them. This must have been what we mean by singing, and not merely recitation. It was, in fact, a veritable singing of hymns. It is remarkable that the noun hymn is only used in reference to the services of the Greeks, and in the same passages is clearly distinguished from the psalm (Eph 5:19; Col 3:16), “psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs.” It has been conjectured that by “psalms and hymns” the poetical compositions of the Old Testament are chiefly to be understood, and that the epithet “spiritual,” here applied to “songs,” is intended to mark those devout effusions which resulted from the spiritual gifts granted to the primitive Church; yet in 1Co 14:26, a production of the latter class is called “a psalm.” Josephus, it may be  remarked, used the terms ὕμνοι and ᾠδαί in reference to the Psalms of David (Ant. 7, 12, 3). SEE PSALM.

It is probable that no Greek version of the Psalms, even supposing it to be accommodated to the Greek meters, would take root in the affections of the Gentile converts. It was not only a question of meter, it was a question of tune; and Greek tulles required Greek hymns. So it was in Syria. Richer in tunes than Greece, for Greece had but eight, while Syria had 275 (Benedict. Pref. vol. 5, Op. — Eph. Syr.), the Syrian hymnographers reveled in the varied luxury of their native music; and the result was that splendid development of the Hymn, as molded by the genius of Bardesanes, Harmonins, and Ephraem Syrus. In Greece, the eight tunes which seem to have satisfied the exigencies of Church music were probably accommodated to fixed meters, each meter being wedded to a particular tune; an arrangement to which we can observe a tendency in the Directions about tunes and measures at the end of our English version of the Psalms. This is also the case in the German hymnology, where certain ancient tunes are recognized as models for the meters of later compositions, and their names are always prefixed to the hymns in common use. See Music.

It is worthwhile inquiring what profane models the Greek hymnographers chose to work after. In the old religion of Greece the word hymn had already acquired a sacred and liturgical meaning, which could not fail to suggest its application to the productions of the Christian muse. So much for the name. The special forms of the (Greek hymn were various. The Homeric and Orphic hymns were written in the epic style, and in hexameter verse. Their meter was not adapted for singing; and therefore, though they may have been recited, it is not likely that they were sung at the celebration of the mysteries. We turn to the Pindaric hymns; mid here we find a sufficient variety of meter, and a definite relation to music. These hymns were sung to the accompaniment of the lyre, and it is very likely that they engaged the attention of the early hymn-writers. The dithyramb, with its development into the dramatic chorus, was sufficiently- connected with musical traditions to make its form a fitting vehicle for Christian poetry; and there certainly is a dithyrambic savor about the earliest known Christian hymn, as it appears in Clem. Alex. p. 312, 313, ed. Potter.

The first impulse of Christian devotion was to run into the moulds ordinarily used by the worshippers of the old religion. This was more than an impulse — it was a necessity, and a twofold necessity. The new spirit  was strong; but it had two limitations: the difficulty of conceiving a new music-poetical literature; and the quality so peculiar to devotional music, of lingering in the heart after the head has been convinced and the belief changed. The old tunes would be a real necessity to the new life; and the exile from his ancient faith would delight to hear on the foreign soil of a new religion the familiar melodies of home. Dean Trench has indeed labored to show that the reverse was the case, and that the early Christian shrank with horror from the sweet but polluted enchantments of his unbelieving state. We can only assent to this in so far as we allow it to be the second phase in the history of hymns. When old traditions died away, and the Christian acquired not only a new belief, but a new social humanity, it was possible, and it was desirable too, to break forever the attenuated thread that bound him to the ancient world. Thus it was broken; and the trochaic and iambic meters, unassociated as they were with heathen worship, though largely associated with the heathen drama, obtained an ascendant in the Christian Church. In 1Co 14:26, illusion is made to improvised hymns, which, being the outburst of a passionate emotion, would probably assume the dithyrambic form. But attempts have been made to detect fragments of ancient hymns conformed to more obvious meters in Eph 5:14; Jam 1:17; Rev 1:8 sq.; Rev 15:3. These pretended fragments, however, may with much greater likelihood be referred to the swing of a prose composition unconsciously culminating into meter. It was in the Latin Church that the trochaic and iambic meters became most deeply rooted, and acquired the greatest depth of tone and grace of finish. As an exponent of Christian feeling they soon superseded the accentual hexameters; they were used mnemonically against the heathen and the heretics by Commodianus and Augustine. The introduction of hymns into the Latin Church is commonly referred to Ambrose. But it is impossible to conceive that the West should have been so far behind the East: similar necessities must have produced similar results; and it is more likely that the tradition is due to the very marked prominence of Ambrose as the greatest of all the Latin hymnographers.

The trochaic and iambic meters, thus impressed into the service of the Church, have continued to hold their ground, and are, in fact, the 7's, S.M., C.M., and L.M. of our modern hymns, many of which are translations, or, at any rate, imitations of Latin originals. These meters were peculiarly adapted to the grave and somber spirit of Latin Christianity. Less ecstatic than the varied chorus of the Greek Church, they  did not soar upon the pinion of a lofty praise so much as they drooped and sank into the depths of a great sorrow. They were subjective- rather than objection; they appealed to the heart more than to the understanding; and, if they contained less theology, they were fuller of a rich Christian humanity. (See Deyling, Obss. Sacrc. 3, 430; Hilliger, De Psal. Hymn. atque odar. sac. discrimine. Viteb. 1720; (Gerbert, De cantu et ,musico, Bamb. et Frib. 1774, 2 vols. 4to; Rheinwald, Christl. Archaöl. p. 262.) Our information respecting the hymnology of the first Christians is extremely scanty: the most distinct notice we possess of it is that contained in Pliny's celebrated epistle (Ep. 10:97): “Carmen Christo quasi deo, dicere secum invicem.” (See Augusti, Handbuch der Christlichen Archäologie, 2, 1- 160; Walchii, Miscellanea Sacra, i, 2; De hymnis ecclesie Apostolicae, Amstel. 1744; and other monographs cited in Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 133).

## Hymnar or Hymnal[[@Headword:Hymnar or Hymnal]]

             is the name by which is designated a Church book containing hymns. Such a hymnar, according to Gennadius, was compiled by Paulinus of Nola (q.v.). — Walcott, Sacred Archceöl. p. 320: Augusti, Christ. Archaöl. 3, 710 sq.

## Hymnarium[[@Headword:Hymnarium]]

             SEE HYMNAR.

## Hymnology[[@Headword:Hymnology]]

             “Poetry and its twin sister music are the most sublime and spiritual arts, and are much more akin to the genius of Christianity, and minister far more copiously to the purposes of devotion and edification than architecture, painting, and sculpture. They employ word and tone, and can speak thereby more directly to the spirit than the plastic arts by stone and color, and give more adequate expression to the whole wealth of the world of thought and feeling. In the Old Testament, as is well known, they were essential parts of divine worship; and so they have been in all ages, and almost all branches of the Christian Church. Of the various species of religious poetry, the hymn is the earliest and most important. It has a rich history, in which the deepest experiences of Christian life are stored. But it attained full bloom (as we will notice below) in the evangelical Church of the German and English tongue, where it, like the Bible, became for the  first time truly the possession of the people, instead of being restricted to priest or choir” (Schaff, Ch. History). “A hymn is a lyrical discourse to the feelings. It should either excite or express feeling. The recitation of historical facts, descriptions of scenery, narrations of events, meditations. may all tend to inspire feeling. Hymns are not to be excluded, therefore, because they are deficient in lyrical form or in feeling, if experience shows that they have power to excite pious emotions. Not many of. Newton's hymns can be called poetical, yet few hymns in the English language are more useful” (Beecher, Preface to the Plymouth Collection). The hymn, as such, is not intended to be didactic, and yet it is one of the surest means of conveying “sound doctrine,” and of perpetuating it in the Church. The Greek and Latin fathers well understood this. Bardesanes (see below) “diffused his Gnostic errors in Syriac hymns; and till that language ceased to be the living organ of thought, the Syrian fathers adopted this mode of inculcating truth in metrical compositions.

The hymns of Arius were great favorites, and contributed to spread his peculiar doctrines. Chrysostom found the hymns of Arian worship so attractive that he took care to counteract the effect of them as much as possible by providing the Catholic Church with metrical compositions. Augustine also composed a hymn in order to check the errors of the Donatists, whom he represents as making great use of newly composed hymns for the propagation of their opinions. The writings of Ephraem Syrus, of the 4th century, contain hymns on various topics, relating chiefly to the religious questions of the day which agitated the Church.” Yet a mere setting forth of Christian doctrine in verse does not constitute a hymn; the thoughts and the language of the Scriptures must be reproduced in a lyrical way in order to serve the needs of song. The most popular and lasting hymns are those which are most lyrical in form, and at the same time most deeply penetrated with Christian life and feeling. Nor can hymns, in the proper sense of the word, be other than popular. The Romish Church discourages congregational worship, and therefore she produces few hymns, notwithstanding the number of beautiful religious compositions, which are to be found in her offices, and the fine metrical productions of the Middle Ages, of which more in a later portion of this article. Hymns for Protestants, being “composed for congregational use, must express all the varieties of emotion common to the Christian. They must include in their wide range the trembling of the sinner, the hope and joy of the believer; they must sound the alarm to the impenitent, and cheer the afflicted; they must summon the Church to an earnest following of her Redeemer, go down with the dying to the vale of  death, and make it vocal with the notes of triumph; they must attend the Christian in every step of his life as a heavenly melody. There can be nothing esoteric in the hymn. Besides' this, the hymn, skillfully linked with music, becomes the companion of a Christian's solitary hours. It is the property of a good lyric to exist in the mind as a spiritual presence; and thus, as a ‘hidden soul of harmony,' it dwells, a soul in the soul, and rises, often unsought, into distinct consciousness. The worldly Gothe advised, as a means of making life less commonplace, that one should ‘every day, at least, hear a little song or read a good poem.' Happier he who, from his abundant acquaintance with Christian lyrics, has the song within him; who can follow the purer counsel of Paul, and ‘speak to himself in hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in his heart to the Lord' (Eph 5:19)” (Methodist Quarterly, July, 1849). For the vocal execution of hymns as a part of Church service, SEE SINGING; and for their instrumental accompaniments, SEE MUSIC.

On the question of the use of hymns of human composition. in the Church, there were disputes at a very early period. The Council of Braga (Portugal), A.D. 563; forbade the use of any form of song except psalms and passages of Scripture (Canon 12). On this subject, Bingham remarks that it was in ancient times “no objection against the psalmody of the Church that she sometimes made use of psalms and hymns of human composition, besides those of the sacred and inspired writers. For though St. Austin reflects upon the Donatists for their psalms of human composition, yet it was not merely because they were human, but because they preferred them to the divine hymns of Scripture, and their indecent way of chanting them, to the grave and sober method of the Church. St. Austin himself made a psalm of many parts, in imitation of the 119th Psalm; and this he did for the use of his people, to preserve them from the errors of Donatus. It would be absurd to think that he who made a psalm himself for the people to sing should quarrel with other psalms merely because they were of human composition.

It has been demonstrated that there always were such psalms, and hymns, and doxologies composed by pious men, and used in the Church from the first foundation of it; nor did any but Paulus Samosatensis take exception to the use of them; and he did so not because they were of human composition, but because they contained a doctrine contrary to his own private opinions. St. Hilary and St. Ambrose made many such hymns, which, when some muttered against in the Spanish churches because they were of human composition, the  fourth Council of Toledo made a decree to confirm the use of them. together with the doxologies ‘Glory be to the Father,' etc., ‘Glory be to God on high,' threatening excommunication to any that should reject them. The only thing of weight to be urged against all this is a canon of the Council of Laodicea, which forbids all ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμούς, all private psalms, and all uncanonical books to be read in the Church. For it might seem that by private psalms they mean all hymns of human composition. But it was intended rather to exclude apocryphal, hymns, such as went under the name of Solomon, as Balzamon and Zonaras understand it, or else such as were not approved by public authority in the Church. If it be extended further, it contradicts the current practice of the whole Church besides, and cannot, in reason, be construed as ally more than a private order for the churches of that province, made upon some particular reasons unknown to us at this day. Notwithstanding, therefore, any argument to be drawn from this canon, it is evident the ancients made no scruple of using psalms or hymns of human composition, provided they were pious and orthodox for the substance, and composed by men of eminence, and received by just authority, and not brought in clandestinely into the Church” (Orig. Eccles. bk. 14:ch. 1).

The Christian Church, in all periods, has been accustomed, as we have already stated, to use psalms and hymns in public worship. The psalms are portions of the Psalms of David; the hymns are human compositions. On the history of singing in worship generally, SEE PSALMODY, under which head will also be given an account of the standard hymnbooks in the several evangelical denominations.

I. Ancient Hymns. — A few hymns have come down to us from very remote antiquity. “Basil cites an evening hymn from an unknown author, which he describes as in his time (4th century) very ancient, handed down from the fathers, and in use among the people. Dr. J. Pye Smith considers it the oldest hymn extant. The following is his translation of it: “Jesus Christ, Joyful light of the holy! Glory of the Eternal, heavenly, holy, blessed Father! Having now come to the setting of the sun, beholding the evening light, we praise the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit of God. Thou art worthy to be praised of sacred voices, at all seasons, ( Son of God, who givest life. Wherefore the universe glorifieth thee!” (Coleman, Ancient Christianity, ch. 16:§ 5). From the letter of the elder Pliny to Trajan we know that as early as the beginning of the 2nd century the Christians praised Christ as their God in songs; and from Eusebius (Eccles.  Hist. 5, 28) we learn that there existed a whole multitude of such songs. But the oldest hymn to Christ, remaining to us complete from the period of persecution, is that of Clemens Alexandrinus (q.v.). It is given in full Greek and Latin, in Coleman (1. c.): see also Piper Cementis Hymnus is Salvatorem (Götting. 1835), and Balt, Defensio fidei Nicceae, § 111, ch. 2, cited by Coleman. “Though regarded as a poetical production, it has little claim to consideration; it shows the strain of the devotion of the early Christians: we see in it the heart of primitive piety laboring to give utterance to its emotions of wonder, love, and gratitude, in view of the offices and character of the Redeemer. It is not found in the later offices of the Church, because, as is supposed, it was thought to resemble, in its measure and antiphonal structure, the songs used in pagan worship” (Coleman, Prim. Church, p. 370). The oldest Christian hymn-writers, however, were mostly Gnostics in their doctrines, and they seem to have used their songs as “a popular means of commending and propagating their errors.” The first of these was Bardesanes, in the Syrian Church of the 2nd century, who wrote in imitation of the Psalms 150 hymns, with Gnostic additions. Valentinus of Alexandria belongs also to the oldest hymn- writers (comp. Muinter, Odae Gnosticae, Copenh. 1712). The Gloria in Excelsis (q.v.), which is still retained in use, is ascribed to the third century. SEE ANGELICAL HYMN.

1. Oriental and Greek. — The Therapeutae in Egypt sang in their assemblies old hymns transmitted by tradition. When, under Constantine the Great, Christianity became the religion of the state, the hymns acquired the importance of regular liturgical Church songs. Ephraem Syrus (q.v.), in the 4th century, who may be considered as the representative of the whole Syrian hymnology, sought to bring the heretical hymns of the Gnostics into disuse. In the Eastern Church the hymns of Arius had, by their practical Christian spirit, acquired more popularity than the orthodox hymns, which consisted mostly of an assemblage of dogmatic formulas. To oppose this tendency, Gregory of Nazianzum and Synesius composed a number of new orthodox hymns but, not being adapted to the comprehension of the people generally, these did not become popular, and thus failed to answer the purpose of the writers. Sacred poetry in general began to decline among the Greeks; and as in the next century the strife concerning the adoration of Mary and the saints began, the orthodox hymns became mere songs of praise to these. Such are the hymns of Cosmas, bishop of Majumena (780); Andreas, bishop of Crete (660-732); Germanus, patriarch of  Constantinople (634-734); John Damascenus in the 8th century, and Theophanes, metropolitan of Nicea, and Josephus, deacon of Constantinople, in the 9th.

In the history of hymnology, Schaff distinguishes three periods, both in the Greek and Latin Church poetry:

(1.) that of formation, while it was slowly throwing off classical meters and inventing its peculiar style, down to about 650;

(2.) that of perfection, down to 820;

(3.) that of decline and decay, to 1400, or to the fall of Constantinople. “The first period, beautiful as are some of the odes of Gregory Nazianzen and Sophronius of Jerusalem has impressed scarcely any traces on the Greek office books. The flourishing period of Greek poetry coincides with the period of the image controversies, and the most eminent poets were at the same time advocates of images; pre-eminent among them being John of Damascus, who has the double honor of being the greatest theologian and the greatest poet of the Greek Church. The flower of Greek poetry belongs, therefore, to a later division of our history. Yet, since we find at least the rise of it in the 5th century, we shall give here a brief description of its peculiar character. The earliest poets of the Greek Church, especially Gregory Nazianzen in the 4th, and Sophronius of Jerusalem in the 7th century, employed the classical meters, which are entirely unsuitable to Christian ideas and Church song, and therefore gradually fell out of use. Rhyme found-no entrance into the Greek Church. In its stead the metrical or harmonic prose was adopted from the Hebrew poetry and the earliest Christian hymns of Mary, Zacharias, Simeon, and the angelic host. Anatolius of Constantinople († 458) was the first to renounce the tyranny of the classic meter and strike out a new path. The essential points in the peculiar system of the Greek versification are the following: The first stanza, which forms the model of the succeeding ones, is called in technical language Hirmos, because it draws the others after it. The succeeding stanzas are called Troparia (stanzas), and are divided, for chanting, by commas, without regard to the sense. A number of troparia, from three to twenty or more, form an Ode, and this corresponds to the Latin Sequence, which was introduced about the same time by the monk Notker in St. Gall. Each ode is founded on a hirmos, and ends with a troparion in praise of the holy Virgin. The odes are commonly arranged (probably after the  example of such Psalms as the 25th, 112th, and 119th) in acrostic, sometimes in alphabetic order. Nine odes form a Canon. The older odes on the great events of the incarnation, the resurrection, and the ascension, are sometimes sublime; but the later long canons, in glorification of unknown martyrs, are extremely prosaic and tedious, and full of elements foreign to the Gospel. Even the best hymnological productions of the East lack the healthful simplicity, naturalness, fervor, and depth of the Latin and of the evangelical Protestant hymn.

“The Greek Church poetry is contained in the liturgical books, especially in the twelve volumes of the Menmea, which correspond to the Latin Breviary, and consist, for the most part, of poetic or half poetic odes in rhythmic prose. These treasures, on which nine centuries have wrought, have hitherto been almost exclusively confined to the Oriental Church, and, in fact, yield but few grains of gold for general use. Neale has latterly made a happy effort to reproduce and make accessible in modern English meters, with very considerable abridgments, the most valuable hymns of the Greek Church. We give a few specimens of Neale's translations of hymns of ‘t. Anatolius, patriarch of Constantinople, who attended the Council of Chalcedon (451). The first is a Christmas hymn, commencing in Greek: Μέγα καὶ παράδοξονθαῦμα.

‘A great and mighty wonder, The festal makes secure: The Virgin bears the Infant With Virgin-honor pure.

The Word is made incarnate, And yet remains on high: And cherubim sing anthems To shepherds from the sky.

And we with them triumphant Repeat the hymn again: “To GOD on high be glory, And peace on earth to men!”

While thus they sing your Monarch, Those bright angelic bands, Rejoice, ye vales and mountains Ye oceans, clap your hands!  Since all He comes to ransom, By all be He adored, The Infant born in Bethlehem, The Savior and the LORD!

Now idol forms shall perish, All error shall decay And CHIRST shall wield His scepter, Our LORD and GOD for aye.'

Another specimen of a Christmas hymn by the same, commencing ἐν Βηθλεέμ:

‘In Bethlehem is He born! Maker of all things, everlasting God! He opens Eden's gate, Monarch of ages! Thence the fiery sword Gives glorious passage; thence, The severing mid-wall overthrown, the powers Of earth and Heaven are one; Angels and men renew their ancient league, The pure rejoin the pure, In happy union! Now the Virgin-womb Like some cherubic throne Containeth Him, the Uncontainable: Bears Him, whom while they bear The seraphs tremble! bears Him, as He comes To shower upon the world The fullness of His everlasting love!'

One more on Christ calming the storm, ζοφερᾶς τρικμίας, as reproduced by Neale:

‘Fierce was the wild billow, Dark was the night; Oars labor'd heavily; Foam glimmer'd white; Mariners trembled; Peril was nigh; Then said the God of God, “Peace! It is.”

Ridge of the mountain-wave, Lower thy crest!  Wail of Euroclydon, Be thou at rest! Peril can none be Sorrow must fly Where saith the Light of light, “Peace! It is I.

Jesu, Deliverer! Come Thou to me: Soothe Thou my voyaging Over life's sea! Thou, when the storm of death Roars sweeping by, Whisper, O Truth of truth! “Peace! ‘tis I.”

2. Latin Church. — Of far more importance to the Christian Church than the Greek are the Latin hymns produced in the earlier ages, or the period covering the 4th to the 16th centuries. Though smaller in compass, Latin hymnology far surpasses the Greek “in artless simplicity and truth, and in richness, vigor, and fullness of thought, and is much more akin to the Protestant spirit. With objective churchly character it combines deeper feeling and more subjective appropriation and experience of salvation, and hence more warmth and fervor than the Greek. It forms in these respects the transition to the evangelical hymn, which gives the most beautiful and profound expression to the personal enjoyment of the Savior and his redeeming grace. The best Latin hymns have come through the Roman Breviary into general use, and through translations and reproductions have become naturalized in Protestant churches. They treat, for the most part, of the great facts of salvation and the fundamental doctrines of Christianity” (Schaff, Ch. Hist. 2, 585).

But many of them, like the later productions of the Greek Church, are devoted to the praises of Mary and the martyrs, and are vitiated with all manner of superstitions. One of the oldest writers of Latin hymns is Hilary of Poitiers (Pictaviensis), who died in 368. Banished to Phrygia, he was incited by hearing the singing of Arian hymns to compose some for the Orthodox Church, and among these productions his Lucis largitor splendide is the most celebrated. There is no doubt that the authorship of a great many hymns is spurious, especially in the case of Ambrose (q.v.), bishop of Milan, who died in 397, and who is generally considered the proper father of Latin Church song. Among his genuine productions we find the grand hymns O lux beata trinitas; Veni redemptor omnium; Deus creator omnium, etc. The so-called Ambrosian song of  praise, Te deum laudamus, “by far the most celebrated hymn,” formerly ascribed to Ambrose, “which alone would have made his name immortal,” and which, with the Gloria in excelsis, is “‘by far the most valuable legacy of the old Catholic Church poetry, and which will be prayed and sung with devotion in all parts of Christendom to the end of time,” he is said to have composed for the baptism of Augustine. But it is now agreed by our best critics that this hymn was written at a later date (Schaff, Ch. Hist. ii, 592). Another distinguished hymn writer of the Middle Age was Augustine, ‘the greatest theologian among the Church fathers († 430), whose soul was filled with the genuine essence of poetry.” He is said to have composed the resurrection hymn, Cum rex gloriae Christus; the hymn on the glory of Paradise, Ad perennis vitae fontem Mens sitivit arida, and others. Damascus, bishop of Rome († 384), who is said to have been the author of the rhyme of which we spoke above, is perhaps not less celebrated than the preceding names. Very prominently rank also Prudentins, in Spain († 405), whom Neale calls “the prince of primitive Christian poets,” the author of Jam moesta quiesce querela, and others; Paulinus of Nola; Sedulius, who composed two Christmas hymns, A solis ortus cardine and Hostis Herodes impie; Enodius, bishop of Pavia († 521); and Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers (about 600), who wrote the passion hymns, Pange lingua gloriosi Praelium certaminis and Vexillca regis prodeunt. These hymns (the text and translations of most of which are given by Schaff, 1. c.) soon became popular, and though many of them, long in use in the Church, were not to be set aside, still the Council of Toledo (633) recommended the use only of such hymns as those of Hilary, Ambrose, etc., in public worship. Gregory the Great, who introduced a new system of singing into the Church SEE GREGORIAN CHANT, also composed hymns, among others the Rex Christefactor omnium; Primo dierum omnium, generally regarded as his best, etc.

After him the most noteworthy hymn-writers are Isidorus, bishop of Sevilla; Eugenius, Ildefonsus, and Julianus, bishops of Toledo; and Beda Venerabilis. Charlemagne (8th century), who introduced the Gregorian chant into France and Germany, also attempted sacred poetry, and is said to be the author of the Pentecost hymn, Veni creator spiritus, though others ascribe it, and perhaps on better grounds, to Rhabanus Maurus. Alcuin and Paulus Diaconus also composed hymns. Although Christianity, during that century and the next, spread through France, Germany, and northwards, yet Latin hymns remained in exclusive use during the whole of the Middle Ages, as the clergy alone took an active part in divine worship. In the 9th century appeared some noteworthy hymn-writers. Theodulf,  bishop of Orleans, whose Gloria laus et honor tibi was always sung on Palm Sunday; Rhabanus Maurus; Walafrid Strabo, the first German hymn- writer; Notker († 912), who introduced the use of sequences and recitatives in the hymns, and composed the renowned alternate chant, Media vita in morfe sumus. During the 10th and 11th centuries sacred poetry was cultivated by the Benedictines of Constance, among whom Hermann of Veringen († 1054) was especially distinguished. King Robert of France wrote the Pentecost hymn, Veni sancte ritus; Petrus Damiani wrote also penitential hymns. To the 11th century belongs the alternate hymn to Mary entitled Salve Reginae mater misericordiae. In the 12th century hymnwriting flourished, particularly in France, where we notice Marbord (1123); Hillebert of Tours; Petrus Venerabilis; Adam of St. Victor; Bernard- of Clairvaux, author of the Salve ad faciem Jesu, and the hymn beginning Salve caput cruentatum; Abelard, writer of the Annunciation hymn, Mttit ad virginem; and Bernard of Cluny, author of “The Celestial Country,” about A.D. 1145. It was, moreover, a practice of conventual discipline to connect hymns with all the various offices of daily life: thus there were hymns to be sung before and after the meals, on the lighting of lamps for the night, on fasts, etc. In the 13th century the sentimentalism of the Franciscans became a rich source of poetry, and the Latin hymns perhaps attained their highest perfection under writers of that order. Francis of Assisi himself wrote sacred poetry. Among the Franciscan hymn writers are especially to be noticed Thomas of Celano (after 1255), author of the grand Judgment hymn, Dies irae dies illa SEE DIES IRAE; Bonaventura; Jacoponus, who wrote the Stabat mater dolorosa and Stabat mater speciosa. SEE STABAT MATER.

Among the Dominicans, Thomas Aquinas distinguished himself by his Pange lingua gloriosi and Lauda Sion Salvatorem. After attaining this eminence Latin hymns retrograded again during the 14th and 15th centuries, and became mere rhymed pieces. The mystics Henry Suso (q.v.) and Thomas a Kempis (q.v.) alone deserve mention among the writers of good hymns.

On hymns of the Ancient and Middle Ages, see Bingham, Oriq. Eccles. bk. 13 chap. 5, and bk. 14 chap. 1; Daniel, Thesaurus Hymnologicus, sive hymnorum, etc., collectio amplissima (Leipz. 1841-56, 5 vols. 8vo); a good selection in Königsfeld, Lat. Hymnen und Gesdnge, in which the Latin- and German versions are printed face to face, with an Introd. and notes by A.W. von Schlegel (Bonn, 1847, 12mo, and second collection 1865, 12mo); Trench, Sacred Latin Poetry, chiefly Lyrical, with Notes,  etc. (2nd ed. Lond. 1864, 18mo); Coleman, Apostolic and Primitive Church, ch. 12; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, ch. 16; Walch, De Hymnis Eccles. Apostolicae (Jena, 1837); Rambach, Anthologie Christl. Gesange (Altona, 1817-33); Bjorn, Hymni Vet. Patrum Christ. Eccles. (Hafn. 1818); Kehrein, Lateinische Anthologie (Frankf. 1840); (Ultramontane) Mone, Lat. Hymnen des Mittelalters (Freib. 18i53.sq., 3 vols 8vo.); Moll, Hymnasarium (Halle, 1861, 18mo); Wackernagel, Das deutsche Kirchenleid (Lpz. 1864-65, 2 vols.), part of vol. 1, p. 9-362; Chandler, Hymns of the Primitive Church (Lond. 1837); Neale, Hymns' of the Eastern Church (3rd edit. London, 1866); Mediaeval Hymns and Sequences (3rd ed. London, 1867); The Voice of Christian Life in Song, or Hymns and Hymn writers of many Lands and Ages (N.Y. 1864, 12mo); Miller, Our Hymns, their Authors and Origin (Lond. 1866, 12mo); Koch, Gesch. d. Kirchenl. (2nd edit. Stuttgart, 1852 sq., 4 vols., especially, 1, 10- 30); Edilestand du Meril, Poesies populaires Latines anterieres tau douzieme siecle (Paris, 1843); Fortlage, Gesange Christl. Vorzeit (Berlin, 1844); Milman, Latin Christianity, 8:302 sq.; Hill, English Monasticism, p. 324-373 (on mediaeval books and hymns); Rheimvald, Kirchl. Archaöl. p. 262 sq.; Augusti, tiandb. der christl. Archaöl. 2, 106 sq.; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 384 sq.; Martigny, Dict. des Antiquites, p. 475 sq.; Christ. Examiner, 28 art. 1; Christian Remembrancer, 44, art. 4; N. Amer. Rev. 1857, art. 4; and on the first six centuries a very excellent article, first published in the British and Foreign Ev. Rev. (Oct. 1866), in Schaff, Ch. Hist. 3:575 sq.

II. A Modern Hymnography. —

1. German. — The origin of German hymns, which are without question the richest of any in modern tongues, may be traced to the 9th century. But the history of German hymnology, strictly speaking, does not begin earlier than the Reformation. For “it was not until the people possessed the Word of God, and liberty to worship him in their own language, that such a body of songs could be created, though vernacular hymns and sacred lyrics had existed in Germany throughout the Middle Ages. It was then that a great outburst of national poetry and music took place, which reflected the spirit of those times; and on a somewhat smaller scale the same thing has happened both before and since that time. at every great crisis in the history of the German people.” The most marked of these periods are, besides the Reformation, the 12th and 13th centuries, or the Crusading period, and- the latter part of the 17th, and 18th centuries. The earliest  attempts at German hymns are traced to the 9th century. For some centuries preceding the Roman Church had abandoned congregational singing, and the hymns formed part of the liturgical service performed by the priests and the canonical singers. In some churches, however, the people still continued ‘the old practice of uttering the response Kyrie Eleison, Christe Eleison, at certain intervals during the singing of the Latin hymns and psalms, which finally degenerated into a confused clamor of voices. The first attempt to remedy this was made by adding, soon after Notker, who originated the Latin Sequence or Prose, a few German rhymes to the Kyrie Eleison, “from the last syllables of which these earliest German hymns were called Leisen.” But as they were never used in Mass service, but were confined to popular festivals, pilgrimages, and the like, they did not come into general use, and it may be said that the real employment of Leisen (or Leiche, as they were also called) did not begin before the 12th century. At that time they had become the common property of the German people, and hymns in the vernacular were freely produced, among them the oldest German Easter hymn, Christus ist auferstanden, attributed to Sperrvogel, which has descended to our own day as a verse of one of Luther's best hymns:

Christ the Lord is risen

Out of death's dark prison;

Let us all rejoice today,

Christ shall be our hope and stay:

Kyrie eleison.

Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia!

Several of the great Latin hymns were also translated into German, and although their use in the Church was more or less restricted, and was always regarded with suspicion by the more papal of the clergy, yet they continued to be favored by the people, as is fully evinced by the quantity of sacred verse written from this time onwards. Thus Wackernagel, in his work on religious poetry, prior to the Reformation (Das deutsche Kirchenleid v. d. altest. Zeit bis zu Anfang d. 17 th Jahrhundert), exhibits nearly 1500 specimens, and the names of no less than 85 different poets, with many anonymous authors. Among the writers named we find not a few of the celebrated knightly mine-singers, as Hartmann von deer Aue, Wolfram von Eschenbach, Walther von der Vogelweide, and others. But the German sacred songs of this time, like the old Latin hymns, were confined to addressing the saints, and, above all, the Virgin Mary. “The  former class is not very important, either as to number or to quality; but the Marien-Lielder and, in a minor degree, Annen-Lieder (hymns to Mary and to Anne), constitute a very large anti well-known class among the poems of the ante-Reformation times in Germany. ... They form a sort of spiritual counterpart to the minne-songs or love-songs addressed to his earthly lady by the knight. It was easy to transfer the turn of expression and tone of thought from the earthly object to the heavenly one, and the degree to which this is done is to us very often startling. The honors and titles belonging to our Lord Jesus Christ are attributed to his mother; God is said to have created the world by her, and to have rested in her on the seventh day; she is said to have risen from the grave on the third day, and ascended into heaven; she is addressed not only as a persuasive mediator with her Son, but as herself the chief source of mercy and help, especially in the hour of death and at the day of judgment. By degrees, her mother is invested with some of her own attributes; for it is said, if Christ would obey his own mother, ought not she much more to obey hers? So a set of hymns to Anne sprang up, in which she is entreated to afford aid in death, and obtain pardon for the sinners from Christ and Mary, who will refuse her nothing” (Winkworth, Christiana Singers of Germany, p. 96, 97). SEE HYPERDULIA. It is no wonder that in the face of such extravagances Wackernagel is constrained to say that the existence of so many godless hymns addressed to the Virgin and the saints, or teaching the whole doctrine of indulgences, is an indisputable testimony to the degeneracy into which the nation had fallen, rendering the Reformation necessary; and that the existence of so many breathing an unstained Christianity is at the same time a witness to the preservation of so much true religion as made the Reformation at all possible. The use of German hymns was taken up by the heretical sects that began to spring up under the persecuting influence of Rome. The German Flagellants, the Bohemians, the Waldenses, and the Mystics, who all encouraged the study of the Scriptures, of course favored the singing of German hymns; and they contributed not a few sacred songs themselves to those already existing. Thus the Mystic Tauler (q.v.) (to whom was long attributed the Theologia Germania. in all probability the work of Nicholas of Basle) wrote several hymns, which became widely known. His best, perhaps, are the following:  WHAT I MUST DO.

“From outward creatures I must flee,

And seek heart-oneness deep within

If I would draw my soul to Thee,

O God, and keep it pure from sin,” etc.

ONLY JESUS.

“O Jesu Christ, most good, most fair,

 More fragrant than May's flowery air

Who Thee within his soul doth bear,

True cause for joy hath won!

But would one have Thee in his heart,

From all self-will he must depart;

God's bidding only where thou art

Must evermore be done.

Where Jesus thus doth truly dwell,

His presence doth all tumults quell,

And transient cares of earth dispel

Like mists before the sun,” etc.

A marked improvement, however, took place in German hymnology during the 15th century, especially near its close. The chief hymn-writer of this period was Henry of Laufenberg, who was particularly active in transforming secular into religious songs, as was frequent at this time; he also translated for the Germans many of the old Latin hymns. One of the best specimens of a religious song transformed we cite here. The original was “Innsbruck, I must forsake thee.”

FAREWELL.

O world, I must forsake thee,

And far away betake me,

To seek my native shore;

So long I've dwelt in sadness,

I wish not now for gladness,

 Earth's joys for me are o'er.

Sore is my grief and lonely,

And I can tell it only

To Thee, my Friend most sure!

God, let Thy hand uphold me,

Thy pitying heart enfold me,

For else I am most poor.

My refuge where I hide me,

From Thee shall naught divide me,

No pain, no poverty:

Naught is too bad to fear it,

If Thou art there to share it;

My heart asks only Thee.

Many of these transformed hymns were preserved, like the one above cited, through the Reformation. Another very popular hymn, Den liebsten puelen den ich Fan der ist in des Himels Trone, was transformed from the song “Den liebsten puelen den ich han der liegt beim Wirt im Keller.” Of the transformation of ballads by the minnesingers into hymns to Mary and Anne we have already spoken. We return, therefore, to Laufenberg, and cite one of his hymns, which well deserves to be called not only one of the best of his age, but one of the loveliest sacred songs that has ever been written. We copy the first stanza of it from Mrs. Winkworth (p. 93):

CRADLE SONG.

Ah Jesu Christ, my Lord most dear,

As Thou wast once an infant here,

So give this little child, I pray,

Thy grace and blessings day by day:

Ah Jesu, Lord divine,

Guard me this babe of mine!

Laufenberg also wrote and widely introduced the use of many hymns in mixed Latin and German, a kind of verse which was the favorite amusement of the monks, and which had acquired considerable popularityat his time. The best known of these productions was a Christmas carol, dating from the 14th century, In dulci jubilo, Nu signet und seid fro. Peter Dresdensis was generally, but erroneously, regarded as the author of these perhaps properly termed “Mixed Hymns.” His real work, however, lay in the strenuous efforts he made to introduce hymns in the vernacular more freely into public worship, especially into the service  of the Mass,” from which they had, as we have already had occasion to observe, been excluded. But these efforts met with violent opposition from the Church, and the use of hymns in the vernacular still continued to be almost exclusively confined to festivals and like occasions. Among these vernacular hymns are particularly celebrated “Ein Kindelein so lobelich,” “Christ fure zu Himmel,” “Gott sei gelobet und gebenedeist,” “Wir danken dir lieber Herre,” etc. After the invention of the art of printing, the followers of Huss, who had formed themselves into a separate and organized Church of their own in 1467 (Bohemian and Moravian Brethren), and who made it one of their distinctive peculiarities to use hymns in the vernacular, as their service was mainly conducted in their mother tongue, especially their prayers, gave new encouragement to the writing of German hymns. In 1504, Lucas, then chief of the Bohemians, collected 400 of the most popular of the German hymns and had them printed. This is “the first example of a hymn-book composed of original compositions in the vernacular to be found in any Western nation which had once owned the supremacy of Rome.” Previous to this time, towards the close of the 15th century, there existed two or three collections of German versions of the Latin hymns and sequences, but they are of very inferior merit.

The Reformation in the 16th century marks the next era in the history of German hymnology. The introduction of the vernacular into the liturgy of the Church gave an impulse to the German language that was only eclipsed by Luther's translation of the Bible for the edification and education of the entire German people. But it was Luther's aim not only to furnish his followers the Book of books, but also to introduce everywhere the singing of such hymns as already existed in the vernacular, and by the creation of a taste among the people for German sacred ‘song to promote its cultivation. Of this he set himself the best example. As in the cause of religion he knew how to enlist a large circle of eminent men and scholars to carry out his great designs, so also, with a true appreciation of sacred art, both in poetry and song, he soon gathered about him many friends, who became the compilers of several collections of hymns, that were issued from the press at remarkably short intervals. SEE PSALMODY.

Luther himself, besides translating anew many of the Latin hymns, “which he counted among the good things that God's power and wonderful working had kept alive amid so much corruption,” and, besides transforming or reproducing some four of the early German hymns, composed some twenty-one in the vernacular,  most of which are known in our own day by most of the Protestant nations of the globe, and some of which are particular favorites even with the English-speaking people. The special object of the composition of these hymns, into which Luther threw “all his own fervent faith and deep devotion;” was undoubtedly “to give the people a short, clear confession of faith, easy to be remembered. For the doctrines which Luther propagated were yet too new to be well understood by all as he desired them to be. He wished men to know what they professed. Protestantism meant the profession of a faith by choice, and not by compulsion; a belief that was cherished by the confessor, and not a blind following after the teacher. He required a comprehension of his great doctrines of justification by faith, of the one Mediator between God and man, which gave peace to the conscience by delivering it from the burden of the past sins, and a new spring of life to the soul by showing men that their dependence was not on anything in themselves, on no works of their own performance, but on the infinite love and mercy of God, which he had manifested to all mankind in his Son; of his doctrine of the universal priesthood of all believers, which put a new spirit into the Church, by vindicating for every member of it his right and duty to offer for himself the sacrifice of praise and prayer, and to study for himself God's word in the Scriptures” (comp. Winkworth, p. 105). One of Luther's hymns best known to us is that founded on the 46th Psalm, the famous “Marseillaise of the Reformation,” as Heine called it. He is generally supposed to have written it on his way to the Diet of Worms. Some, however, think that it was composed at the close of the second Diet of Spire (1529). It has been again and again translated. Mrs. Winkworth gives us the following:

THE STRONGHOLD.

A sure stronghold our God is he,

A trusty shield and weapon;

Our help he'll be, and set us free,

Whatever ill may happen.

That old malicious foe Intends us deadly woe;

Armed with the strength of hell,

And deepest craft as well

On earth is not his fellow.

Through our own force we nothing can,

Straight were we lost forever,

But for us fights the proper Man

By God sent to deliver.

Ask ye who this may be?

Christ Jesus named is he,

Of Sabaoth the Lord,

Sole God to be adored;

Tis he must win the battle.

And were the world with devils filled,

All eager to devour us,

Our souls to fear should little yield;

They cannot overpower us.

Their dreaded prince no more

Can harm us as of yore;

Look grim as e'er he may,

Doomed is his ancient sway,

A word can overthrow him.

Still shall they leave that world its might,

And yet no thanks shall merit;

Still is he with us in the fight

By his good gifts and Spirit.

E'en should they take our life,

Goods, honor, children, wife,

Though all of these were gone,

Yet nothing have they won God's kingdom ours abideth!

Another hymn of Luther's which has gained a worldwide circulation is the one that was written by him on the burning of two martyrs for their faith at Brussels in 1523, and which was translated, or, rather, transformed by D'Aubigne in his History of the Reformation, beginning,

“Flung to the heedless winds,

Or on the waters cast,

Their ashes shall be watched,

And gathered at the last,” etc.

As an example of the songs he transformed most successfully, we quote the old ditty,

“O thou naughty Judas!

What hast thou done,

To betray our Master,

God's only Son!

Therefore must thou suffer

Hell's agony Lucifer's companion

Must forever be. Kyrie, Eleison!”

This Luther changed to the following:

“Twas our great transgression

And our sore misdeed Made the Lord our Saviour

On the cross to bleed.

Not then on thee, poor Judas,

Nor on that Jewish crew,

Our vengeance dare we visit-

We are to blame, not you. Kyrie, Eleison!

“All hail to thee, Christ Jesus,

Who hungest on the tree,

And bor'st for our transgressions

Both shame and agony.

Now beside thy Father

Reignest thou on high;

Bless us all our lifetime,

Take us when we die! Kyrie, Eleison!”

(Christian Examiner, 1860, p. 239 sq.)

Of the friends whom Luther was successful in enlisting as writers for his new hymnbooks we have space here to mention only the most prominent names. One of them, Justus Jonas, was a colleague of Luther and Melancthon at the University of Wittenberg. His special service was the transformation of the Psalms into metrical German versions, “‘choosing, as one can well understand, those which speak of David's sufferings from his enemies, and his trust in God's deliverance.” One of his best is on the 124th Psalm, beginning thus:

“If God were not upon our side,

When foes around us rage;

Were not Himself our Help and Guide,

When bitter war they wage

Were He not Israel's mighty Shield,

To whom their utmost crafts must yield,

We surely must have perished.”

Another of Luther's co laborers was Paul Eber, whose hymns have “a tone of tenderness and pathos which is much less characteristic of this period than the grave, manly trustfulness of Luther and Jonas.” But they became very extensively known, and during the trying period of the Thirty-years' War they were constantly heard both in public and around the family hearthstone. A special favorite at that time was the one, composed when the imperial armies were besieging Wittenberg (1547), beginning:

“When, in the hour of utmost need,

We know not where to look for aid,

When days and nights of anxious thought

Nor help nor comfort yet have brought,

Then this our comfort is alone,

That we may meet before Thy throne,

And cry, O faithful God, to Thee,

For rescue from our misery.”

Two of Eber's hymns for the dying have been great favorites by the side of deathbeds and at funerals, not only among the German Protestants, but also among the Roman Catholics. The one is Herr Jesu Christ, wahr Mensch und Gott (Lord Jesus Christ, true man and God); the other is the following childlike expression of perfect trust, beautifully rendered by Mr. Winkworth (p. 12):

DEATH IN THE LORD.

“I fall asleep in Jesu's arms,

Sin washed away, hushed all alarms,

For his dear blood, his righteousness,

My jewels are, my glorious dress,

Wherein before my God I stand

When I shall reach the heavenly land.

With peace and joy I now depart,

God's child I am with all my heart:

I thank thee, Death; thou leadest me

To that true life where I would be.

So cleansed by Christ I fear not Death,

Lord Jesu, strengthen thou my faith!”

But Luther and his associates were only the founders of the new German hymnology, which soon spread over a much more extended field. Hymn- writers became common all over the land, and their number is legion, so that it is almost impossible for us, in our limited space, to give more than a brief account of the most distinguished, and the names only of those of lesser note. Thus Nicholas Decius, a converted monk, produced a translation of the Gloria in Excelsis (“Allein Gott in der Hoh', sei Ehr.,” All glory be to God on high), which, with its noble chorale, soon came into use all over Germany. Paul Speratus (von Spretten), the chaplain of the duke of Prussia, is perhaps the most noted of all the hymnologists of this period, and is best known as the author of the hymn on the doctrine of Justification by faith:

“Salvation hath come down to us

Of freest grace and love,

Works cannot stand before God's law,

A broken reed they prove;

Faith looks to Jesus Christ alone,

He must for all our sins atone,

He is our one Redeemer.”

This, in Luther's day, was as popular among the Germans as one of his own hymns. Indeed, it is said that when Luther first heard it sung by a beggar on the roadside he gave him the last coin he had. Princes also became sacred poets, such as the margrave of Brandenburg and Hesse, known as the author of:

“Grant me, eternal God, such grace

That no distress

May cause me e'er to flee from Thee,” etc.

The elector John of Saxony was also, at that time, courted among hymn- writers, but it now appears that he never wrote any hymns himself, although he was passionately fond of them. Hans Sachs (1494-1576), the celebrated and popular poet of this period, also wrote sacred verse, and figures not less prominently than the persons whose names we have already mentioned. The most famous of his hymns he wrote during the siege of  Nuremberg, his native city, in 1561: “Why art thou thus cast down, my heart?” (Warum betrübst du dich mein Herz?). He wrote also a very beautiful hymn on the explicit confidence in the saving merits of Christ, entitled “The Mediator,” which is translated by Mrs. Winkworth (Christ. Sing. p. 134). Among the Bohemian Brethren, who. as is well known, were on intimate terms with the Lutherans, Michael Weiss is distinguished both as the translator of Bohemian hymns into German, and as the author of a number of beautiful German hymns. Two of them, “Once he came in blessing,” and the well-known “Christ, the Lord, is risen again” (Christus ist erstanden von des Todes Banden), translated into English by Mrs. Winkworth, may be found in her Lyra Gernanica, 2, 62, and in Schaff, Christ in Song, p. 15, 259. Not less worthy of notice, though perhaps not quite so prominent in their day, are Johann Matthesius († 1561) and Nicholas Hermann († 1561). The former wrote, among others, the beautiful morning hymn, “My inmost heart now raises” (Aus meines Herzen's Grunde), which was a favorite with king Gustavus Adolphus Hermann's hymns are to be found in nearly all German hymn-books. Among his best hymns are' Lobt Gott ihr Christen allzugleich, and Wenn mein Stündlein vorhanden ist. Mrs. Winkworth gives Matthesius's “Miner's Song” (p. 144) and Hermann's “Hymn for the Dying.”

In the latter half of the 16th, and even at the opening of the 17th century, a gradual decline is manifest in the quality of the hymns, though the quantity continued. They were now no longer the spontaneous production of men of all classes, moved to worship God in songs of praise, but the work of professional hymnologists. “Still this period, too, has some very good and fine hymns, but a marked change of tone is perceptible in most of them; they are no longer filled with the joyful welcome of a new day: they more often lament the wickedness of the age, and anticipate coming evil times, or the end of the world itself.” Most prominent among the hymn-writers of this period are the following:

(1.) Ambrose Lobwasser, who translated the French Psalter of Marot and Beza; but the literary merit of the work was rather mediocre. “It does not rise above the level of a sort of rhymed prose, and it furnished an unfortunate model for a flood of very prosaic rhymed paraphrases of doctrinal statements or passages of Scripture, which became wonderfully numerous at this time.”  (2.) Bartholomaeus Ringwaldt (1530-98) is the author of the hymn, in England erroneously attributed to Luther, “Great God, what do I see and hear,” which was written in imitation of the “Dies irae, dies illa.” He really deserves to be placed first among the hymnologists of this period. It is incorporated in the New Congregational Hymn-book (London), No. 420. His hymns partake of the penitential style, by which, as above remarked, this period is characterized. One of his best on “Penitence” Mrs. Winkworth has clothed in English dress (p. 149).

(3.) Nicolaus Selnecker (1530-92), author of Gleich wie sein Haus der Vogel baut, based on the 84th Psalm.

(4.) Louis Helmboldt, the poet laureate of the emperor Maximilian, who wrote “The true Christian's Vade-Mecum” (From God shall naught divide me, Mrs. Winkworth, p. 154), which is contained in all German hymn- books, “and has rooted itself among the people.” To this period belong also Martin Schalling (15321608), among whose hymns Herzlich lieb hab' ich Dich o Herr (“O Lord, I love thee,” in Schaff, Christ in Song, p. 609) is best known; Kaspar Melissander (“Herr, wie du willst, so schick's mit mir”), Mart. Moller, Mart. Behemb. Mart. Rutilius (“Ach; Herr u. Gott, wie gross u. schwer!”), Job. Pappus (“Ich hab mein Sach' Gott heimgestellt”), and more especially Philip Nicolai (1556-1608), who was the first to reintroduce, after the Reformation, the mystical union of Christ with the soul in his hymns, whence they have often been called the ‘Hymns of the Love of Jesus.” His two best hymns have gained a remarkable popularity, “and are indeed admirable for their fervor of emotion and mastery over difficult but musical rhythms.” They are, Wachet auf; ruft uns die Stimme (“Wake, awake, for night is flying,” in Schaff, Christ in Song, p. 382; in the New Congregational Hymn-book, No. 749), and Wie schon leuchtet der Morgenstern (“How lovely shines the Star,” Christ in Song, p. 551), which latter especially “became so popular that its tunes were often chimed by city bells, lines and verses were printed from it by way of ornament on the common earthenware of the country, and it was invariably used at weddings and certain festivals.” All German hymnbooks still contain it, though in a somewhat modified form.

The tempest of war which for thirty years swept over Germany, and caused a tale of disasters from which it would seem society could have never recovered, even promoted, or at least did not impede in any way, the literary and intellectual activity of the German mind; and this period is not  only recognized as having been signalized by “a great outburst of religious song,” but as having produced the most famous hymnologists of Germany. First among these stands the great Martin Opitz (1597-1639), of the Silesian school of German poets, who greatly improved all German poetry. He wrote many versions of some of the epistles, and of many of the Psalms, and of the Song of Solomon. But his original versions are by far the best; e.g. his morning hymn, “O Light, who out of Light wast born” (Winkworth, p. 173). Next to him we find Paul Fleming (q.v.) (1609-40), author of “In allen unseren Thaten.” But most famous at this time were undoubtedly Johann von Rist (q.v.) (1607-67), Johann Heermann (q.v.) (1685-1647), and, a little later, Paul Gerhard (q.v.) (1606-76), who was the greatest of them all, “the prince of German hymnists.” Rist wrote as many as 600 to 700 religious poems and hymns, “intended to supply every possible requirement of public worship or private experience.” His best are perhaps “Werde munter mein Gemuthe,” “Auf, auf ihr Reichsgenossen,” and “Werde Licht, du Volk der Heiden” (translation in Schaff, Christ in Song, p. 118). Heermann's best hymns are “Herzliebster Jesu, was hast du verbrochen” (Christ in Song, p. 171), “Jesu. deine tiefe Wunden,” “Zion Klage mit Angst u. Schmerzen” (Winkworth, p. 198), “Fruth Morgens da die Sonn' aufgeht” (Christ in Song. p. 263), and “O Jesu Christe, wahres Licht” (Christ in Song, p. 116). Very beautiful is the following (transl. by Mrs. Winkworth):

IN TEMPTATION.

“Jesu, victor over sin,

Help me now the fight to win.

Thou didst vanquish once, I know,

Him who seeks my overthrow;

So to Thee my faith will cleave,

And her hold will never leave,

Till the weary battle's done,

And the final triumph won;

For I too through Thee may win,

Victory over death and sin.”

In Gerhard's hands the German hymn reached its highest perfection, and his name is to the German justly dearer than that of any other save Luther. His hymns are “‘pervaded by a spirit of the most cheerful and healthy piety- a piety which shows itself not merely in direct devotion to God and to  Christ, but in a pure and childlike love of nature, and good will towards men. They exemplify Coleridge's lines:

‘He prayeth best who loveth best

All things both great and small;

For the dear God who loveth us,

He made and loveth all.'

They have the homely simplicity of Luther's, and a strength like his, if not quite equal to it, with a versatility, smoothness, and literary finish not to be found hi Luther's, and unsurpassed in any period of German hymnology” (Christian Examiner, 1860, p. 247). Gerhardt has been aptly considered “the typical poet of the Lutheran Church, as Herbert is of the English;” but it must not be thought that he was by any means a voluminous writer. On the contrary, he only wrote altogether about 120 hymns. His life and writings have been dwelt upon so much in detail that we can do no better here than leave him with a few words of tribute so ably paid by Mrs. Winkworth: “His hymns seem to be the spontaneous outpouring of a heart that overflows with love, trust, and praise; his language is simple and pure; if it has sometimes a touch of homeliness, it has no vulgarism, and at times it rises to a beauty and grace which always gives the impression of being unstudied, yet could hardly have been improved by art.

His tenderness and fervor never degenerate into the sentimentality and petty conceits which were already becoming fashionable in his days, nor his penitent and sorrow into that morbid despondency . for which the disappointments of his own life might have furnished some excuse.” Other hymn-writers of this period are Andreas Gryphius (1616-64) of the same country as Opitz, and, like him, also a great writer of secular literature; Martin Rinkart (q.v.), the writer of Nun danket alle Gott (“Let all men praise the Lord”); Simor Dach (q.v.), author of Ich bin ja Herr in Deinec Maccht; Heinrich Albertus (1604-68), whose best hymn is considered to be Gott d. Himnels u. d. Erden; Geors ‘Weissel (first half of the 17th century), who wrote Mach hoch die Thür. die Thor macht weit (in Christ in Song, p 17); the electoress Louisa Henrietta of Brandenburg who composed in 1649, after the death of her first husband, the hymn Jesus, meine Zuversicht, well known in the English dress, “Jesus, my Redeemer, lives” (see Christ; in Song, p. 265); Ernst Chr. Homburg (1605-81), whose hymns were published together under the title Geistliche Lieder (Naumb. 1758). Perhaps his best hymn is Jesu meines Lebens Leben, or “Christ, the life of all the living' (Christ in Song, p. 183); another, hardly less beautiful,  is his well-known “Man of Sorrows.” Johann Frank (1618 77), “who ranks only second to Gerhardt as a hymn writer, and, with him, marks the transition from the earlier to the later school of German religious poetry,” published his sacred songs under the title of Geistliches Zion (Guben, 1764). One of his best is Schmücke dich o liebe Seele, “Deck thyself, my soul” (Winkworth, Lyra Germanica, ii, 133; Schaff, Christ in Song, p. 590). We add here only Georg Neumark (q.v.) (1621-81), for a time professor of poetry and poet laureate at the University of Königsberg, whose most famous hymn is Wer nut den lieben Gott lasst walten, “Leave God to order all thy ways” (Lyra Germanica, p. 152); J.M. Meyfarth (15901642), Jerusalem du hochgebaute Stadt, translated in the Christian Examiner, 69, 254 (“Jerusalem, thou high-built, fair abode”), and in Lyra Germnanica, 2, 285); Friedrich V. Spee (1591 or 1595-1635), a Roman Catholic, who labored earnestly to introduce vernacular hymns into the divine service of his Church. wrote Auf, auf, Gott will gelobet sein; Johann Jacob Balde (160368), also a Roman Catholic, but he wrote mostly in Latin (his sacred poems being published under the title of Carmina Lyrica); Georg Philippians Harsdorfer (1607-58), of Southern Germany; A.H. Buchholz (1607-71); Johann Olearius (1611-84), belonging to a family who in this century were hymn-writers of some note.

Angelus Silesius (1624-77) (as a Lutheran, Johann Scheffer) wrote beautiful hymns, 205 of which were published under the title of Heilige Seelenlust, oder Geistliche Hirtenlieder (Bresl. 1657, and often). Particularly excellent are his Ich will dich lieben meine Stairke (“Thee will I love, my strength, my tower”), and Liebe, die Du sich zum Bilde (“O Love, who formedst me,” in Schaff, Christ in Song, p. 414; Christian Examiner, 69, 245). Angelus was the founder of the so-called second Silesian School of poets, as Opitz is regarded as the leader of the first. They wrote both secular and religious poetry, but the latter far excels the former. To this school belonged Homburg,. mentioned above; the two countesses of Schwarzburg Rudolfstadt; Knorr V. Rosenroth (1636-89), who wrote the lovely little hymn, Morgenglanz der Ewigkeit (“Dayspring of eternity”); Christian Scriver, author of Jesu meiner Seele Leben, and others; Sigismund v. Birken (1626-81), who, with Harsdorfer, already noticed, belonged to the sentimental school; Gottfried Wilhelm Sacer (1635-99), G. Hoffmann, B. Pratorius, Johann Neunherz, Kaspar Neumann who wrote Auf mein Herz des Herrn, also Tug, O Gott von dem wir Alles haben, and many others.  In striking contrast with the formal and unspiritual hymns of the second Silesian school stand the poetical writings of the so-called Pictists, originating with Spener, “who for nearly a hundred years exerted a most powerful influence both on the religious and social life of Germany.” The representatives of this school are Philip Jacob Spener (1635-1705); his friend and associate, August Hermann Francke (1663-1727), the founder of the Halle Orphan Asylum; Anastasius Freylinghausen, a son-in-law of Franke, who wrote 44 hymns, and published (1704) a collection which remained for some generations the favorite collection for private reading among pious persons in Germany. To the same period belong J. C. Schade; Fr. von Canitz; Joachim Ner ander (1640-80), of the Reformed Church, who wrote Lobe den Herrn den Machtigen; Johann C. Schütz, author of Sei Lob u. Ehr dent hochsten Gut; Christian Tittius; Adolph Drese; Samuel Rodigast, who composed in 1675 the world-renowned Was Gott that, das ist wohlgethan (“Whate'er my God ordains is right”); J. Ad. Hasslocher; Christ. Pressovius; Laur. Laurenti, whose best hymn Dr. Schaff designates Ermunztert euch ihr Frommen (“Rejoice all ye believers,” in Christ in Song p. e 383); J. B. Freistein; C. Ginther. Halt im Gedachtniss e Jesum Christ; Sal. Liskovius; J. T. Breithaupt; J. Lange; J. D. Herrnschmid; Christ. F. Richter; J. G. ‘Wolf; Chr. A. Bernstein; Chr. J. Koitsch; J. Tribechov vius; J. J. Winkler; J. H. Schrider; J. E. Schmidt; P. Lackmann; J. Chr. Lange; L. A. Gotter; B. Crasselius, Heiligster Jesu Heiligungsquelle; M. Müller; A. Hinkelmann; H. G. Neuss; A. Creutzberg; J. Muthmann; Ernst Lange (1650-1727), Im Abend blinkt der Morgenstern, or “The wondering sages trace from far” (Christ in Song, p. 120); L. J. Schlicht; C. H. von Bogatzky, the celebrated author of the “Golden Treasury” (Das goldene Schatzkstlein), also one of the compilers of the “Cothen Hymn-book;” J. J. Rambach; T. L. K. Allendorf L. F. F. Lehr; J. S. Kunth; E. G. Woltirsdorf, and many others. There were also the Wurtembergers, the best representatives of the pietism of South Germany, of whom Albert Bengel (1687-1732) may be looked upon as a prominent leader, though as a hymn-writer he was far excelled by another great light of this section of Germany, Philip Friedrich Hiller (1699-1769), who took Paul Gerhardt for his model. He published several volumes of hymns, of which the “Casket of Spiritual Songs” (Geistliches Liederklstlein), containing only his own sacred songs, “obtained very wide popularity,” and is “still the commonest book in Wirtemberg next to the Bible itself” (Winkworth, p. 283 sq.). Here deserve mention, also, J. R. Hedinger, S. Urlsperger, F. O. Hilleri Ph. H. Weissensee, E. L. Fischer, J. Chr. Storr, —  Ph; D. Bark, Chr. Fr. Ottinger, Chr. K. L. von Pfeil; J. T. von Moser, and still others. The school of Spener developed the Mystics and Separatists, who also furnished a number of contributors to hymnology; but, although some of them were quite able, the influence of the new schools, as a whole, on hymnology “was, for the most part, simply mischievous, and their hymn-books contain about the worst specimens to be found-poor as poetry, fiercely intolerant towards their fellow-Christians, and full of a fantastic and irreverent adoration of the Redeemer” (Winkworth, Christian Singers of Germany, p. 290). The only hymnologists who really deserve praise are Gottfried Arnold (1666-1714) and Gerhard Tersteegen (16971769). The former, although an extensive writer on Church History, etc., is, indeed, best remembered in our day by his hymns, of which he wrote 130, and among them several of very great beauty. Perhaps the best of Arnold's hymns is his deeply thoughtful “How bless'd to all thy followers, Lord, the road,” etc. Tersteegen (q.v.), who, although he never actually separated from the Reformed Church to which he belonged, was none the less “a Mystic of the purest type,” wrote more than 100 hymns; but he has become especially familiar to English-speaking Christians by the English dress which Wesley gave to two of his best hymns-” Lo! God is here; let us adore,” and “Thou hidden love of God, whose height,” etc. Lesser lights of these schools are J. Dippel, J. W. Petersen, G. Arnold, and others.

Here also, finally, deserve notice the hymn-writers of the Moravians, who have had no despicable influence on hymnology. Of especial credit are a few of count Zinzendorf's hymns, who, unfortunately, cared more for their quantity than their quality; he wrote more than 2000, many of which, naturally enough, found a place in English hymn-books. His own sect has inserted 128. Charles Wesley also translated some of them. Among his best are “Jesus, still lead on” (Jesu geh voran), and “Jesus, thy blood and righteousness” (Christi Blut u. Gerechtigkeit). We might also mention in the same connection J. Nitschmann, Chr. David, L. J. Dober, F. von Watteville, A. G. Spangenberg, Louisa von Hayni, and others.

By the end of the century the influence of pietism had made itself felt even among the so-called “orthodox,” who imitated the Pietists in producing many hymns which may be counted among the best written at this time. Of the representatives of this school we name a few: Benjamin Schmolke, who wrote more than 1000 hymns, many of which have been translated into English. Among his best we count “Welcome victor in the strife”  (Wilkommen Held ims Streite), and “Heavenward doth our journey tend” (Himamelan geht unsre Bathn). Wolfgang G. Dessler wrote Wie wohl ist mir o Freund der Seelen (Christ in Song, p. 491, 555, 342); and Salomon Frank; Schmücke dich, o liebe Seele (“Deck thyself, my soul,” in Lyra Germanica, 2, 133; Christ in Song, p. 590). Here deserve mention, also, Erdmann Neumeister, B. Marperger, J. G. Hermann, J. Chr. Wentzel, F. Fabricius, P. Busch, J. Lehmus, and others; of the Reformed Church: J. J. Spreug, C. Zollikofer, and, later. J. E. Lavater.

Modern German Hymnologists. — Towards the close of the 18th century Germany was waking to a new era in literature. But the philosophic, or, as some acutely call it, “the critical doubting” religion of this period by no means affected hymnology favorably, “for really good hymns must have in them something of the nature of the popular song; they must spring from a cordial, unquestioning faith, which has no misgivings about the response it will evoke from other hearts.” The influence of the Leibnitz-Wolfian philosophy, and of Gottsched's school of poetry, caused the sacred songs to be of a dry, stiff, and artificial style. “Even the classical hymns, though consecrated by association, could no longer satisfy the more pedantic taste of the age, and there sprang up a perfect mania for altering them, and for making new collections of such modernized versions.... These alterations generally consisted in diluting the old vigor, substituting ‘virtue' for ‘holiness' or ‘faith,' ‘the Supreme Being' for ‘our faithful God,' and so on,” so that these modified hymns may be said to have been changed from religious to moral songs. SEE PSALMODY. One, however, whose songs, on account of their “rational piety and quiet good taste,” deserve especial praise, is Christian Fürchtegott Gellert (q.v.). Other hymnologists of this time, for the mention of whose names we have only space here, are J. A. Schlegel, J. F. von Cronegk, J. P. Uz, J. F. Lowen, J. S. Diterich, J. S. Patzke, J. F. Feddersen, B. Münter, J. F. Mudre, H. C. Heeren, J. A. Hermes, F.W. Loder, J. Eschenburg, J. Chr. Frobing, S. G. Biirde, Chr. F. Neander, B. Hang, Christ. G. Goz, and others. The pathetical direction was taken by Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock (q.v.), in his Aufersteh'n, ja aulfersteh'n. He was followed by J. A. Cramer, a very popular hymnologist, and a friend of Gellert and Klopstock, G. P. Funk, C.W. Ramler, Chr. Chr. Sturm, A. H. Niemeyer, Chr. F. Dan, Schubart, and others.

But the one really “great step” that was made in German hymnology at this time was the official sanction of the use of vernacular hymns in the Roman  Catholic churches of South Germany and Austria. Naturally enough, many of the Roman Catholic hymns of the period are translations from the Latin; many of the original compositions follow closely in style both Gellert and Klopstock; nay, the productions of several Protestant hymnologists, especially those of the two last-named poets, were even used in the Roman Catholic Church, of course often in a somewhat modified and even distorted form. , Of their own hymn-writers, the following deserve especial mention: J. M. Sailer (bishop of Ratisbon), J. M. Fenneberg, J. H. C. von Wessenberg, J. Sperl, and J. Franz. Here deserve notice also the Moravians, Chr. Gregor, H. von Bruiinigk, C. von Wobeser, G. H. Loskiel, J. J. Bossart, and others; the Würtemburgers, C. F. Hartmann, W. L. Hosch, Chr. Ad. Daun, I. Hahn, Christ. G. Pregizer; in other German provinces, C. Liebich, Mat.th. Claudius, J. G. Schiner; and in the Reformed Church, H. Annoni, F. A. Krummacher, Jung-Stillilg, G. Menkein; the forerunner of the latest period is Friedrich von Hardenberg (Novalis).

Present German Hymnology. — The most modern period begins with the war of liberation (1813-15), and with the reawakening of a genuine religious life, which, after all, is slowly gaining the upper hand over that generally supposed dominating skepticism. Although in the modern productions the subjective greatly predominates, and they are still rather the work of art instead of popular songs, yet they do not quite attain to the force and condensed pregnancy of the classic hymns, so that there is very apparent in them a striving after objectivity, and “they have at least much sweetness, earnestness, and simplicity.” To the Romantic school of which Novalis was mentioned belong E. M. Arndt, M. von Schenkendorf, Fr. H. de la Motte Fouque, Louise Hensel, and Fr. Rückert. Of the other latest Lutheran hymnologists, whose most prominent representatives are Alb. Knapp,Vict. Strauss, J. C. Ph. Spitta, Chr. R. H. Puchta, C. A. Doring, deserve mention here: Chr. C. J. Asscelenfeld, J. F. Bahnmaier, Chr. G. Barth, J. Bentz, Ed. Eyth, F. A. Feldhoff, G.W. Fink, W. R. Freudenthal, C. von Grüneisen, W. Hey, Christ. G. Kern, J. Fr. Möller, Chr. F. H. Sachse, R. Stier, and Chr. H. Zeller; among the Reformed, J.P. Lange. Among the Moravians, the highest rank in this period belongs to J. B. von Albertini, one of their bishops, whose hymns, it is said, Schleiermacher asked to have read to him in his dying hours. C. B. Garve here deserves also high encomiums as a hymnologist. Among the Roman Catholics, whose prominent model is Spee, “with all the defects, no less than the beauties of style,” the Virgin serving as the most usual theme, M. von  Diepenbrock deserves especial mention. The extent of German hymnology may be inferred from the fact that the Evangelical Church alone has produced no less than 80,000 hymns. SEE PSALMODY. (J. H. W.)

2. English. — The sacred poetry of England antedates by many generations its true hymnology. The author of England's Antiphon (George Macdonald) devotes an interesting chapter to the sacred lyrics of the 13th century, in which he gives specimens of genuine devotional song from the Percy Society publications, taken from MSS. in the British Museum, and ascribed to the reign of Edward I. “Mary at the Cross,” “The Mourning Disciple,” and the “Canonical Hours” of William of Shoreham furnish illustrations of most tender and scriptural verse, but are written in a dialect that needs frequent translation into modern English. The “Miracle Plays” were originally introduced by the Normans after the Conquest, and are written in Norman French, but in 1338 the pope permitted them to be translated into English. In this 14th century “the father of English poetry,” Geoffrey Chaucer, gave a new voice to Christian song. It was full two hundred years from his advent before England produced another really great poet. But the age of Elizabeth, as if to make up for the barrenness of preceding centuries, is remarkable for the great number of its writers of sacred verse, as well as for its other literary prodigies. In a selection made and edited by Edward Farr, Esq., for the “Parker Society,” consisting. chiefly of devotional poems, he has given the names and brief biographical notices of no less than one hundred and thirty-seven different authors. Among the illustrious writers of sacred verses in this era we find queen Elizabeth, archbishop Parker, Edmund Spenser, George Gascoigne, Michael Drayton, Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Philip Sidney, the Fletcher brothers Giles and Phineas, Dr. Donne, George Withers, Lord Bacon, the countess of Pembroke (sister of Sir Philip Sidney, and joint author with him of a version of the Psalms). Later still we find quaint old Philip Quarles, and Robert Southwell, the martyr monk, and their contemporary, sweet George Herbert. The great dramatists of that golden age have left here and there some outbursts of deep religious poetry and song, which at least show forth their obligations to the Bible and to the Christianity of the period. Haywood, Shirley, and Ben Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher, and Shakespeare, greatest of all, swell the hymnic chorus. But the dramatic gave way gradually to lyric poetry, and in the succeeding century we have an increasing number of devout poets, of whom the immortal Milton must always be the chief. Yet the singular fact remains that during all these ages  there was “nothing like a People's Hymn-book in England.” It is true that Christian worship was not without its temple songs. The Psalms of David, the Te Deum, the Magnificat, the Glorias, and the “Song of the Angels,” the “Ambrosian Hymn,” and some of the hymns of the Middle Ages, were chanted in the churches and cathedrals. But the so-called hymns of Spenser and Milton, and of minor writers, never entered into the Christian heart, life, and worship of British Christianity. Germany possessed a classic literature of this sort a century and a half before England had a hymnal. The rude version of the Psalms by Sternhold and Hopkins, the smoother but' insipid version of Brady and Tate which superseded it, and the more faithful Scottish version, which was the work of an English Puritan (Rouse), were sung by those whose stern revolt against Romanism led them to reject even what was really good and scriptural in her order of worship and liturgical books. The faults of the age are conspicuous in its poetry. It is intellectual, metaphysical, reflective, literary, full of “quips,. and cranks, and wanton wiles;” cumbrous and overdone. With very few exceptions, there is nothing that people would care to sing, or could sing, for there is little of that emotional element which goes out in musical expression. The rhymes are rude and irregular, and the very art of the poetry seems to defy any attempts to set it to popular music. For “people cannot think and sing; they can only feel and sing.” Even Milton's magnificent hymn, “On the Morning ‘of Christ's Nativity,” is not adapted to common Sabbath worship; and there are few of George Herbert's verses that survive in the songs of the sanctuary.

The period succeeding this revival of literature produced some Christian poets of note, and a few hymns, which survive their authors. Bunyan, and Baxter, and Jeremy Taylor all wrote verses, but their prose had more of poetry in it than their attempts at song. Among those whose good old hymns have stood the test of time, we must not forget the Rev. John Mason, of Water-Stratford, who died in 1694, author of “Come, dearest Lord, and feed thy sheep, on this sweet day of rest,” “Now from the altar of our hearts,” “What shall I render to my God?” etc. He published a volume of “Spiritual Songs” in 1686. Dr. Watts borrowed much from him. The good non-juror, bishop Ken (1637-1711), bequeathed to Christendom his famous “Morning and Evening Hymns,” and that matchless doxology, “Praise God, from whom all blessings flow.” Next comes Joseph Addison, whose elegant version of the nineteenth Psalm, commencing “The spacious firmament on high,” first appeared in the Spectator in 1712, at the close of  an article on “the right means to strengthen faith;” and about the same time was published his sweet paraphrase of the twenty-third Psalm. Perhaps the most familiar of his hymns is that beginning “When all thy mercies, O my God.” SEE ADDISON.

The Reformation in England did not, as in Germany, grow by the spontaneous utterance of popular Christian song. That was left for the period of the great evangelical revival, which crowned the last century with its blessings. All that had been done before was as the broad and deep foundation-work, rude and unchiseled, but strong and essential to the majestic superstructure, which has risen upon it. The stream of Christian verse flowed on in its old channels until the publication of the Psalms and Hymns of Dr. Watts began a new era in English hymnology. The poet Montgomery says that “Dr. Watts may almost be called the inventor of hymns in our language, for he so far departed from all precedent that few of his compositions resemble those of his forerunners, while he so far established a precedent to all his successors that none have departed from it otherwise than according to the peculiar turn of mind of the writer, and the style of expressing Christian truth employed by the denomination to which he belonged.” Dissenter as he was, his Psalms and Hymns are so catholic in their spirit that many of them have been adopted by all denominations of Protestant Christians in their Sabbath worship. His Divine Songs for Children, and some of his Psalms, will live while' the language endures. The defects of his style are obvious in many of his lyrics, which evince haste and negligence, faulty rhymes, and a prosing feebleness of expression. Yet he broke bravely through the mannerisms of preceding ages, and inaugurated a style of Christian hymnology which has alike enriched the evangelical poetry of the English tongue, and filled the temples and homes of the race that speaks that language with the most delightful praises of the Most High. His example was soon followed with success by others. But to him belongs the undisputed honor of being the great presenter of the immense chorus which he will forever lead in these glorious harmonies. His first hymn was given to the Church under circumstances of prophetic interest. He had complained to some official in the Independent church of Southampton, of which his father was a deacon. “that the hymnists of the day were sadly out of taste.” “Give us something better, young man,” was the reply. The young man did it, and the Church was invited to close its evening service with a new hymn, which commenced,

“Behold the glories of the Lamb

Amidst His Father's throne;

Prepare new honors for His name,

And songs before unknown.”

From that time his ever-ready muse gave forth, in strains which are almost divine, “harmonies” for his Savior's name! and “songs before unknown.” We need only indicate a few of the first lines: “When I survey the wondrous cross,” “My God, the spring of all my joys,” “When I can read my title clear,” “Come, ye that love the Lord,” “Come, let us join our cheerful songs,” “He dies, the friend of sinners dies.” His “Cradle Hymn” has taught countless mothers and children to sing of Jesus, and the angels and manger of Bethlehem: “Hush, my dear, lie still and slumber.” It was while looking out from his quiet chamber window at Southampton “upon the beautiful scenery of the harbor and river, and upon the green glades of the New Forest on its farther bank, that the idea suggested itself of the image of the heavenly Canaan,” which he soon embodied in those sweetest of all his verses, “There is a land of pure delight,” etc. SEE WATTS.

Only seven years before the first edition of Watts's Hymns was given to the world, Philip Doddridge was born (1702); and before the death of his great predecessor, whose verses cheered his own dying hours in a distant land, he had published most of his sweetest hymns. Some of these are imperishable, for they have become part of the spiritual life of our Protestant Christianity. Many of them grew out of and were appended to his sermons, which he crystallized into such hymns as “Thine earthly Sabbaths, Lord, we love” (Heb 4:9), “Jesus, I love thy charming name” (1Pe 5:7). His Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul, which was written at the suggestion of Dr. Watts, and has beep translated into the leading languages of Europe, and his Family Expositor of the New Testament, are monuments of his wonderful religious power and usefulness. But his hymns will be sung where his larger works are never heard of, and the world will never cease to echo the strains of such songs as “Awake, my soul, stretch every nerve!” “Hark, the glad sound, the Savior's come!” “Grace, ‘tis a charming sound,” “Ye golden lamps of heaven, farewell!” SEE DODDRIDGE.

The most voluminous and successful of all English hymnists is the Rev. Charles Wesley. Over seven thousand psalms and hymns were written by his facile pen; and these were merely the by-play of a tireless itinerant evangelist, who, with his more celebrated brother John, himself also a  hymn-writer of no mean powers, preached the Gospel in the Old and New worlds, and gave a new style to Christian song. Their history, labors, persecutions, and triumphs are so well known that we need only mention their sainted names. John Wesley was the author or translator of several excellent hymns, and a capital-critic on hymnology. Of Charles Wesley's hymns a large number have taken a more than classic place in our poetic literature. The Christian Church will never cease to sing “Oh love divine, how sweet thou art!” “Jesus, lover of my soul,” “Hark! the herald angels sing,”“The earth with all its fullness owns,” “Come, let us join our friends above.” Dr. Watts said of Charles Wesley's inimitable rendering of the wrestling of Jacob at Peniel with the angel, “That single poem, ‘Wrestling Jacob,' is worth all the verses which I have ever written.” Doubtless much of the power of his hymns is attributable to the circumstances which gave rise to them, and to his facility in giving them the most fresh and vivid forms of expression. On the last projecting rock on Land's End, Cornwall, he stood and wrote that memorable hymn,” Lo! on a narrow neck of land,” etc. His judgment hymn, commencing “Stand, the omnipotent decree,” and two others, were written and published in 1756, just after the destruction of the city of Lisbon by an earthquake. “Glory to God, whose sovereign grace,” was written for the Kingswood colliers, whose wonderful conversion, under the preaching of Whitefield and the Wesleys, was among the miracles of grace which attended their apostolic ministry. “Oh for a thousand tongues, to sing my great Redeemer's praise,” commemorates his own spiritual birth, and was written in response to a German friend, the Moravian Peter Boehler, who said to him, when hesitating to confess publicly his conversion, “If you had a thousand tongues you should publish it with them all.” Another powerful accessory of the Wesleyan hymns was the music with which many of them were accompanied. The great composer Handel set some of them to noble tunes, the MSS. of which are still preserved in the library of Cambridge University. But their greatest interest and success doubtless comes from their scriptural character, their immense range over all varieties of Christian experience, and their intimate relation to the great revival of religion of which these remarkable men and their compeers were the leading instruments. (A striking illustration of all these features is given in the hymn at once expository and experimental-of which we have space for only part of one stanza:

“Tis mystery all-the Immortal dies!

Who can explore his strange design?

\* \* \*

Tis mercy all! let earth adore:

Let angel minds inquire no more.”)

They were among the providential and gracious developments of a period whose influences, at the end of a hundred years, are yet only beginning to show forth the high praises of their Master. SEE WESLEY, JOHN and SEE WESLEY, CHARLES.

We have given more space to these celebrated hymn writers because of their historical relations to the new sera of devotional and sanctuary song which they introduced. From that period the number, variety, and excellence of the contributions to our Christian lyrics has increased, until the hymnology of the English ‘tongue is second only to that of Germany in volume and diversity. The literary' character of these productions has been raised to a higher standard, and their scriptural and experimental value has been tested both by their denominational uses, and by that truly catholic spirit which has made them the property of the Church Universal. Inferior compositions have been gradually dropped, and replaced by others of undoubted merit, until the collections of the various Christian churches have overflowed with the very best hymns of all ages. The most remarkable evidence of these statements is found in the recent attention given to the history and literature of our sacred poetry by English and American writers, who have patiently explored the whole field, and have garnered its treasures in many admirable collections. Referring our readers to these accessible publications, we can devote the limited space left in this article only to brief notices of the principal contributors to the volume of divine praises since the Wesleys died.

Of their contemporaries, we can never forget Augustus Toplady (1741- 1778), and his almost inspired hymn, “Rock of Ages, cleft for me,” and others of his excellent collection. SEE TOPLAY. Nor will the churches cease to sing the magnificent strains of his theological opponent, Thomas Olivers (1725-1799), in his judgment hymn, beginning “Come, immortal King of glory.” SEE OLIVERS. Along with them came William Williams (1717-1791), the Methodist “Watts of Wales,” singing “O'er the gloomy hills of darkness,” and “Guide me, oh thou great Jehovah;” and John Cennick, the devout Moravian, to whom we are indebted for two of the finest hymns ever written-” Rise, my soul, and stretch thy wings,” and “Lo! he comes with clouds descending.” The latter has been erroneously  attributed to Olivers, in whose judgment hymn are stanzas which it resembles in some respects, but a close inspection shows them to be entirely different productions. Cennick's hymn first appeared in a “Collection of Sacred Hymns” in 1752. SEE CENNICK.

Next in order appeared the collection of hymns by the Rev. Benjamin Beddome (1717- 1795), a Baptist clergyman, whom a London congregation could not tempt to leave his little flock at Bourton, where he labored fifty-two years, and preached and sang of Jesus. He was the author of “Did Christ o'er sinners weep?” “Faith, ‘tis a precious grace,” “Let party names no more,” etc. Thomas Haweis, chaplain to the countess of Huntington, a theological author of note, and one of the founders of the London Missionary Society (1739-1820), was the author of over two hundred and fifty hymns, some of which are favorites still; but to the countess herself, the patron and friend of Whitefield, and Berridge, and Romaine, we are indebted for such undying-hymns as “Oh! when my righteous judge shall come,” “We soon shall hear the midnight cry.” She died in 1791, at the age of eighty-four, having devoted her fortune and life to the cause of Christ. Some of the sweetest hymns for the Church and the home which this age produced were written by the daughter of a Baptist clergyman at Broughton, Miss Anne Steele (1716-1778). She withheld her name from her poems, but the English-speaking Christian world still sings from its myriad hearts and tongues, “Father, whatever of earthly bliss,” “Jesus, my Lord, in thy dear name unite All things my heart calls great, or good, or sweet,” etc.; “Come, ye that love the Savior's name;” and some of her sacramental hymns are fine specimens of Christian song.

The next hymnbook of importance that appeared in Great Britain was the Olney Hymns, which is the joint production of those gifted and illustrious men, so different in their characters and lives, and yet so united in the love of Christ-the Rev. John Newton and William Cowper. To this book Newton furnished two hundred and eighty-six hymns, and Cowper sixty- two. It was published first in 1779, before Cowper's reputation as a poet was made. The hymns were written between 1767 and 1779, and doubtless would have contained more of Cowper's contributions but for a return of his insanity. The history of these noble coworkers for Christ is too well known to require more than this allusion. Their deep personal experiences are written in many of their delightful verses, and reflected in the Christian life of succeeding generations. Who that remembers Newton's marvelous conversion, and his subsequent life of piety and distinguished usefulness,  until his death at the age of eighty-two (1807), will not appreciate the fervor with which he sang,

“Amazing grace! how sweet the sound

That saved a wretch like me;”

or

“How sweet the name of Jesus sounds

In a believer's ear;”

or

“Sometimes a light surprises

The Christian while he sings;”

or

“Day of judgment, day of wonders,

Hark! the trumpet's awful sound?”

SEE NEWTON, JOHN. And the English language itself must die before Cowper's plaintive music ceases to vibrate through believers' souls in those almost perfect hymns in which he wrote out and yet veiled the strange, sweet, and attractive experiences of his own religious life: “To Jesus, the crown of my hope,” “Far from the world, O Lord, I flee,” “Oh! for a closer walk with God,” “There is a fountain filled with blood,” “God moves in a mysterious way.” It has been well said by Dr. Cheever that “if Cowper had never given to the Church on earth but a single score of those exquisite breathings of a pious heart and creations of his own genius, it had been a bequest worth a life of suffering to accomplish.” SEE COWPER. 5

It was long before another bard arose to take up the lyre, which this gentle singer laid down. A few strains come floating through the succeeding years, such as Robinson's “Come, thou fount of every blessing,” and “Jesus, and can it ever be, a mortal man ashamed of thee!” written in 1774 by Thomas Green of Ware, then a precocious boy of only ten years! Of female hymnists we have at this period Mrs. Barbauld (1743-1825) and Jane Taylor, both of whom left some sweet hymns for the sanctuary. The former will be best remembered by her beautiful lines on the death of a believer” Sweet is the scene when Christians die;” the latter by her Hymns for Infant Minds. To them we must add Miss Hannah More (1744-1833), whose practical Christian prose writings possess a masculine vigor and Biblical earnestness, and whose poetry, although not of the highest order,  yet often overflows with melody and tender feeling. Her Christmas hymn, “Oh! how wondrous is the story of our Redeemer's birth,” is a favorable specimen. Among the minor poets of this period we mention Dr. John Ryland, born in, 1753, author of “In all my Lord's appointed ways,” “Lord, teach a little child to pray,” “Sovereign Ruler of the skies,” “O Lord, I would delight in thee;” and the Rev. John Logan, who died in 1788, at the age of forty, a Scottish preacher famed for his eloquence, who wrote such hymns as “Where high the heavenly temple stands,” “Oh, city of the Lord, begin the universal song,” “Oh God of Bethel! by whose hand thy people still are fed,” “The hour of my departure's come,” etc. To the poet of the poor, Rev. George Crabbe, we are indebted for those delightful lines, “Pilgrim, burdened with thy sin, come the way to Zion's gate;” and to Rev. Samuel Medley, a Baptist minister of Liverpool (1738-1799), for the stirring lyrics, “Mortals, awake! with angels join,” and “Awake, my soul, in joyful lays.” The name of Henry Kirke White (1785-1808) will ever live in the splendid hymn in which he sang the story of the birth of the Redeemer and of his own conversion, “When marshaled on the mighty plain.” From his pen also flowed those characteristic hymns beginning “The Lord our God is full of might,” “O Lord, another day is flown,” “Through sorrow's night and danger's path.” SEE HENRY K. WHITE. The coronation hymn, “All hail the power of Jesus' name,” was written by the Rev. Edward Perronet, an English dissenting clergyman, who died at Canterbury in 1792, exclaiming, “Glory to God in the height of his divinity, glory to God in the depth of his humanity, glory to God in his all-sufficiency, and into his hands I commend my spirit!” The grand tune which has always been associated with these lines was composed for them by a Mr. Shrubsole, a friend of the author, and organist at the chapel of Spa Fields, London, 1784-1806. We can only allude in a sentence to the well-known occasional hymns of the great poets, Pope and Dryden, Wordsworth, Campbell, Moore, Southey, and some of their associates.

But the Church Universal owes a greater debt to James Montgomery (1771-1854). No man since the days of Cowper has added so many admirable versions of the Psalms and noble hymns to the English language as this gifted Moravian, whose prolific muse never ceased to lavish its treasures until. at fourscore years, he went up higher. His paraphrase of the seventy-second Psalm, commencing “Hail to the Lord's anointed,” is a classic full of the old Hebrew fire and of the best modern missionary spirit. His “Thrice holy” (Isa 6:3), beginning “Holy, holy, holy Lord,”  seems to blend the voices of “saints and seraphim” in one glorious prophetic anthem. Of his other hymns we need only name the Hallelujah, “Hark! the song of Jubilee;” the Christmas choruses, “Angels from the realms of glory,” and “Hail to the Lord's anointed;” the song of heaven,” Forever with the Lord;” the hymn on the death of an aged minister, “Servant of God, well done,” written in memory of his friend, Rev. Thomas Taylor; and that on the decease of the Rev. John Owen, secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, “Go to the grave in all thy glorious prime.” His verses, “Prayer is the soul's sincere desire,” “Oh! where shall rest be found?” “What are these in bright array?” are only a few of the priceless gems which he has set in the crown of our Christian praises. SEE MONTGOMERY, JAMES.

In this later period of English hymnology many and very sweet have been the singers and their sacred songs. There is Henry F. Lyte, the rector of Brixham (1793-1847), author of “Jesus, I my cross have taken,” and of those delightful “hymns from beneath the cloud,” “My spirit on thy care, blest Savior, I recline.” and he last that he ever wrote, “Abide with me, fast falls the eventide.” It was of his Tales in Verse that professor Wilson, in the “Noctes Ambrosianae,” wrote, “Now that is the right kind of religious poetry. He ought to give us another volume.” That volume soon came, entitled Poems, chiefly religious. The female hymnists increase in number and in power in this period. Mrs. Felicia Hemans, Caroline Bowles, and others of great repute, lead the way with their sweet music. We have learned to sing “Nearer, my God, to thee,” from Miss Sarah F. Adams, who died in 1849 in her old home, Dorsetshire; and Charlotte Elliott, of Torquay, struck a new chord for all the world when she wrote, in 1836, those inimitable verses, “Just as I am, without one plea.” She is the author of several volumes, and furnished one hundred and seventeen hymns to The Invalid's Hymnbook, the last edition of which she supervised. Mrs. Barret Browning, Mrs. Charles, of “Schonberg Cotta” fame, Miss Adelaide Proctor, Mary Howitt, and the Bronte sisters — Charlotte, Emily, and Anne, Isabella Craig, and Mrs. Craik, formerly Miss Mulock, author of John Halifix, Gentleman, are among the later chief singers of their sex whose verses have enriched our hymnals. Sir John Bowring, born in 1792, author of “In the cross of Christ I glory,” “Watchman, tell us of the night;” the dean of St. Paul's, Dr. Henry Hart Milman, archbishop Trench, John Keble, with his Christian Year, the poet leader of the Anglican Catholic movement in the English establishment, Alexander Knox, Allan  Cunningham, Robert Pollok, bishop Heber with his glorious advent, and judgment, and missionary hymns, Bernard Barton, the Quaker poet, canon Wordsworth, and the late dean Alford, of Westminster Abbey, Faber, the devout Romish hymnist, and Dr. John H. Newman, once of Oxford and now of Rome, Robert Murray M'Cheyne, and John R. M'Duff, the Scottish preachers, with Horatius Bonar, of Kelso, author of the delightful Hymns of Faith and Hope, many of which are already familiar as household words, and Edward H. Bickersteth, whose poem “Yesterday, to-day, and forever” is “one of the most remarkable of the age” all these, and more whom we cannot even name, swell the majestic volume of our most recent British sacred song. It is not any exaggeration to say that many of their hymns will compare favorably with the best that preceded them, and that some of them can never die while their mother tongue is the vehicle of Christian praise.

3. American Poetry was not cultivated in our heroic age for its own sake, and the singers were few and far between. The churches mostly used the psalms and hymns which they brought with them from the Old World until after the Revolutionary War. President Davies (1724-1761) left some poems, among which his lines on the birth of an infant, and the noble hymn commencing “Great God of wonders! all thy ways,” are most familiar. The celebrated Dr. Timothy Dwight, at the request of the Congregational ministers of Connecticut, revised the psalms of Dr. Watts, and added over twenty of his own versifications to the volume. Of all that he wrote, however, none have such beauty and vitality, as his rendering of Psalms 119, “How precious is the Book divine!” Psalms 137, “I love thy kingdom, Lord;” and of Psalms 150, “In Zion's sacred gates.” These are universal favorites. In his preface to that admirable volume, Christ in Song, Dr. Philip Schaff says, “The Lyra Sacra of America is well represented. Although only about thirty years old, it is far richer than our British friends are aware of.” Abundant proof of its richness is furnished in the Hymns of Immanuel, which the author has gathered into this remarkable collection of Christological poetry, a number of which were furnished by their authors for this work. It is scarcely necessary in these pages to quote at any length those hymns which have been adopted into nearly all of the recent books of praise for the various denominations. We shall therefore only refer to the most noted authors, and give parts of some of the hymns which seem destined to secure a permanent place in our American hymnals. The earlier poets — Percival, Pierpont, Henry Ware, Jr., Richard H. Dana,  Washington Alston, John Neal, N. P.Willis, Brainard, J.W. Eastburn, Carlos Wilcox, Hillhouse, with Bryant, Longfellow, Tuckerman, and Whittier, who are still living-have all made occasional contributions to the stock of popular hymns, chiefly of the Unitarian and ‘Universalist bodies. The clergy of the American churches have probably been the most fertile contributors to this department of sanctuary worship during this period.

The late bishop Doane (q.v.), of New Jersey, wrote some very beautiful hymns, which long ago passed beyond the body of which he was a champion into the hymnals of other churches. His evening hymn is worthy of comparison even with that of good bishop Ken: ‘Softly now the light of day.” There is a trumpet-like music in his majestic lines on the Banner of the Cross, which reminds us of Heber and Milman: “Fling out the banner! let it float,” etc. The same Church has also given us Dr.W. A. Muhlenbergh's well-known hymn, “I would not live alway,” and other delightful verses from his now patriarchal muse. Another bishop, Dr. Arthur Cleveland Coxe, among his fine Christian ballads and poems, has rendered into verse, with more spirit and power than any other English writer, those words of Christ, “Behold, I stand at the door and knock.”

To the late Dr. James W. Alexander (q.v.) we owe the best version in our language of Gerhardt's imperishable hymn, “Oh sacred head! now wounded.” One of the most chaste and fervid of our hymn-writers was the late Dr. George W. Bethune (q.v.), author of “It is not death to die,” “Oh Jesus, when I think of thee, thy manger, cross, and crown,” and many other well-known lyrics. The Rev. Dr. Alexander R. Thompson, of the Reformed Church, New York, has published some admirable original hymns for Christmas and Easter, and very spirited, translations from ancient and mediaeval hymns. We specify only his version of the “Aurora coelum purpurit,” which, with others from his pen, are given in full in Schaff's Christ in Song. Quite in another line, but not less happy, is a new hymn by the Rev. Hervey D. Ganse, a popular clergyman of the same Church in New York City. It is the story of Bartimaeus, so sweetly told that we regret we have not space for at least a part of it. There are no more delightful hymns in the language than those of the Rev. Ray Palmer, D.D., a Congregational clergyman, author of Hymns of my holy Hours, Hymns and sacred Pieces, and many sacred poems. That “selectest and most perfect of our modern hymns,” “My faith looks up to thee,” etc., was composed in 1830. It has been translated into Arabic, Tamil,. Tahitian, the Mahratta, and other languages, and seems destined to follow the Cross  over the whole world. Among his other hymns are those beginning “Jesus, these eyes have never seen that radiant form of thine;” “Alone with thee! alone with thee! O friend divine,” “O Jesus! sweet the tears I shed,” “Jesus! thou joy of loving hearts,” etc.

The Rev. Russell S. Cook (q.v.) wrote and sent to Miss Elliott, the author of “Just as I am, without one plea,” a counterpart to her own sweet hymn, so beautiful and complete that it seems almost as if the same pen had given them both to the world: “Just as thou art! without one trace,” etc. It has since been incorporated with Sir Roundell Palmer's Book of Praise and several American hymnbooks.

It would be inexcusable, in a summary like this, to omit a hearty tribute of acknowledgment to the female hymn-writers of our country. First among these, Mrs. Sigourney, who may be called the Hannah More of America, has:an established place among these honored authors, although most of her poetry was written in blank verse, or in meter not adapted to Church music. Yet her anniversary hymns for Sunday-schools and missionary meetings have been very popular. Her verses are full of a tender, devotional spirit, and expressed in chaste and beautiful language. Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, in some of her Religious Poems, published in 1867, has caught the spirit of the inspired word, and rendered its utterances into verse with singular felicity. We may instance the fine hymns commencing “When winds are raging in the upper ocean,” “Life's mystery deep, restless as the ocean,” “That mystic word of thine. O sovereign Lord,” and the one entitled “Still, still with thee.” The Cary sisters, Phoebe and Alice, have added a few graceful and touching hymns to our Lyra Americana, and have been particularly successful in their writing for the young. That favorite and delightful hymn (which reminds us of Cowper's sensitive strains), “I love to steal a while away from every cumbering care,” was written by Mrs. Phoebe H. Brown after being interrupted while at prayer. On giving up her only son to preach Christ to the heathen, she wrote that sweet missionary hymn beginning

“Go messenger of love, and bear

Upon thy gentle wing

The song which seraphs love to hear,

And angels joy to sing.”

Many a revival of religion has been sought and promoted in the use of her familiar strains,

“O Lord, Thy work revive

In Zion's gloomy hour.”

These are but specimens of a few of our best female hymnists. Many-others we cannot even mention, to whom the whole Church owes a debt of gratitude for “psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs,” in which they have taught her to “make melody unto the Lord.” For additional literature, SEE PSALMODY. (W. J. R. T.)

## Hyneck, Ludwig[[@Headword:Hyneck, Ludwig]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born July 4, 1795. He studied theology and philology at Leipsic, and received the degree of doctor of philosophy in 1817, on presenting his Adnotationes in Recentioris AEvi Liberos Educandi Rationem. Ins 1827 he was made licentiate of theology by the Marburg. University, for writing Quid sit quod Debeat Religioni Christiance Sexus Muliebris Imprimis Honestior Feminarum Pars. In 1856 he published Geschichte des feien adelichen Jungfrauenstiftes Fischbeck und seiner Aebtissinnen, and in 1870 he celebrated his fiftieth anniversary in the ministry, and the Marburg University honored him on that occasion with the diploma of doctor of theology. He died May 10, 1883, at Fischbeck, in the county of Schaumburg. (B.P.).

## Hypapante[[@Headword:Hypapante]]

             SEE CANDLEMAS.

## Hypatia of Alexandria[[@Headword:Hypatia of Alexandria]]

             born in the latter half of the 4th century, was the daughter of Theon the younger, by whom she was instructed in mathematics and philosophy, and professed, like her father, the old heathen doctrines, of which she was one of the most eloquent advocates. So eminent did she become in the ancient philosophy that, in the early part of the 5th century, she publicly lectured on Aristotle and Plato, both at Athens and Alexandria, with immense success. Socrates (Wells's translation, 1709, of the Latin of Valesius) thus narrates her history: “There was a woman at Alexandria by name Hypatia. She was daughter to Theon the philosopher. She had arrived to so eminent a degree of learning that she excelled all the philosophers of her own times, and succeeded in that Platonic school derived from Plotinus, and expounded all the precepts of philosophy to those who would hear her. Wherefore all persons who were studious about philosophy flocked to her from all parts. By reason of that eminent confidence and readiness of expression wherewith she had accomplished herself by her learning, she frequently addressed even the magistrates with a singular modesty. Nor was she ashamed of appearing in a public assembly of men, for all persons revered and admired her for her eximious modesty. Envy armed itself against this woman at that time; for because she had frequent conferences with Orestes [the prefect of Alexandria], for this reason a calumny was framed against her among the Christian populace, as if she hindered Orestes from coming to a reconciliation with the bishop. Certain persons therefore, of fierce and over hot minds, who were headed by one Peter, a reader, conspired against the woman, and observed her returning home from some place; and, having pulled her out of her chariot, they dragged her to the church named Caesareum, where they stripped her and murdered  her. And when they had torn her piecemeal, they carried all her members to a place called Cinaron, and consumed them with fire. This fact brought no small disgrace upon Cyrillus and the Alexandrian Church” (Hist. Eccles. bk. 7:c. 15). The death of Hypatia occurred in 415. Suidas ( ῾Υπατία), 3:533, puts the guilt of Hypatia's death more directly upon Cyril; but his account is by the best authorities, Gibbon of course excepted, not thought to be trustworthy (comp. Schaff, Ch. Hist. 3:943). There is a spurious epistle attributed to Hypatia, addressed to Cyril, in favor of Nestorius (Baluze, Concilia, 1, 216). Toland wrote a sketch of Hypatia (Lond. 1730, 8vo), and Kingsley has recently made her story the subject of a novel (“Hypatia”). See Cave, Hist. Lit. anno 415; Wernsdorf, Diss. Acad. de Hypatia (1747); English Cyclopedia; Monage, Hist. ul. Philosoph. p. 52; Munich, Hypatia, in his Vermischt. Schriften (Ludwigsb. 1828), vol. 1; Schaff, Ch. History, 2, 67; Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, 4, 502 sq.

## Hypatius of Gangra[[@Headword:Hypatius of Gangra]]

             a distinguished member of the Council of Nice, of whose life but little is known, was stoned to death March 31, 327, in a pass near Gangra, by a gang of Novatian ruffians, in all probability on account of the opposition which he had manifested towards the Novatians (q.v.) at the council. See Stanley, History of the Eastern Church, p. 266.

## Hyperbole[[@Headword:Hyperbole]]

             Any one who carefully examines the Bible must be surprised at the very few hyperbolic expressions, which it contains, considering that it is an Oriental book. In Eastern Asia the tone of composition is pitched so high as to be scarcely intelligible to the sober intellect of Europe, while in Western Asia a medium seems, to have been struck between the ultra extravagance of the far East and the frigid exactness of the far West. But, even regarded as a book of Western Asia, the Bible is, as compared with almost any other Western Asiatic book, so singularly free from hyperbolic expressions as might well excite our surprise, did not our knowledge of its divine origin permit us to suppose that even the style and mode of expression of the writers were so far controlled as to exclude from their writings what, in other ages and countries, might excite pain and offence, and prove an obstacle to the reception of divine truth. SEE INSPIRATION. Nor is it to be said that the usage of hyperbole is of modern growth. We  find it in the oldest Eastern writings which now exist; and the earlier Rabbinical writings attest that in times approaching near to those in which the writers of the New Testament flourished, the Jewish imagination had run riot in this direction, and has left hyperboles as frequent and outrageous as any which Persia or India can produce. SEE TALMUD.

The strongest hyperbole in all Scripture is that with which the Gospel of John concludes: “There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that the world itself could not contain all the books that should be written.” This has so much pained many commentators that they have been disposed to regard it as an unauthorized addition to the sacred text, and to reject it accordingly a process always dangerous, and not to be adopted but on such overwhelming authority of collated manuscripts as does not exist in the present case. Nor is it necessary, for as a hyperbole it may be illustrated by many examples in sacred and profane authors. In Num 13:33, the spies who had returned from searching the land of Canaan say that they saw giants there of such a prodigious size that they were in their own a sight but as grasshoppers. In Deu 1:28, cities with high walls about them are said to be “walled up to heaven.” In Dan 4:7, mention is made of a tree whereof “the height reached unto heaven, and the sight thereof unto the end of all the earth” and the author of Ecclesiasticus (47:15), speaking of Solomon's wisdom, says, “Thy soul covered the whole earth, and thou filledst it with parables.” In Josephus (Ant. 14:22) God is mentioned as promising to Jacob that he would give the land of Canaan to him and his seed; and then it is added, “they shall fill the whole sea and land which the sun shines upon.” Wetstein, in his note on the text in John, and Basnage, in his Histoire des Juifs (3, 1-9; 5, 7), have cited from the ancient Rabbinical writers such passages as the following: “If all the seas were ink, and every reed was a pen, and the whole heaven and earth were parchment, and all the sons of men were writers, they would not be sufficient to write all the lessons which Jochanan composed'” and concerning one Eliezer, it is said that “if the heavens were parchment, and all the sons of men writers, and all the trees of the forest pens, they would not be sufficient for writing all the wisdom which he was possessed of.” Homer, who, if not born in Asia Minor, had undoubtedly lived there, has sometimes followed the hyperbolic manner of speaking which prevailed so much in the East: thus, in the Iliad (20, 246,247), he makes AEneas say to Achilles, “Let us have done with reproaching one another, for we may  throw out so many reproachful words on one another that a ship of a hundred oars would not be able to carry the load.” Few instances of this are to be found in Occidental writers; yet it is observed that Cicero (Philippians 2:44) has “Praesertim quum illi eam gloriam consecuti sint, quae vix caelo capi posse videatur,” and that Livy (7, 25) says, “Hae vires populi Romani, quas vix terrarum capit orbis.” See bishop Pearce's Commentary on the four Evangelists, 1777, etc. Modern examples of equal hyperbole may be found cited in almost any work on rhetoric.

## Hyperboreans[[@Headword:Hyperboreans]]

             in Greek mythology, were a fabulous people, living north of the Riphaean mountain chain, and were said to be very wise and happy, living many hundreds and even thousands of years, and at last dying by leaping into the sea. But Herodotus, Strabo, and Pliny affirm that there is nothing else meant than northern nations, and that these are extravagant accounts of ordinary human beings.

## Hypercalvinism[[@Headword:Hypercalvinism]]

             SEE CALVINISM; SEE ULTRA-CALVINISM.

## Hyperdulia[[@Headword:Hyperdulia]]

             (ὑπέρ, above; δουλία, sworship, service), the worship of the Virgin Mary in the Roman Church. The Romanists speak of three kinds of adoration, namely, latria, hyperdulia, and dulia. “The adoration of latria,” they say, “is that which is due to God alone, and is given on account of his supremacy; hyperdulia is worship paid to the Virgin on account of what the Papists call the maternity of God, and other eminent gifts, and her super eminent sanctity; dulia is worship paid to saints on account of their sanctity.” These distinctions are too refined for the common people; and it is greatly to be feared that multitudes worship the Virgin instead of God, or take her as a mediator instead of Christ. The prayer books of the Roman Church are not free from the charge of encouraging a belief in the mediation of Mary. A book in, common use, called The Sacred Heart of Jesus and of Mary, which is published with an indult of pope Pins in favor of its use, contains the following passages: “Come, then, hardened and inveterate sinner, how great so ever your crimes may be, come and behold.

Mary stretches out her hand, opens her breast to receive you. Though insensible to the great concerns of your salvation, though unfortunately proof against the lost engagings invitations and inspirations of the Holy Ghost, fling yourself at the feet of this powerful advocate.” Again (p. 256): “Rejoice, O most glorious Virgin, such is thy favor with God, such the power of thy intercession, that the whole treasury of heaven is open to thee and at thy disposal. When thou art pleased to intercede in favor of a sinner his case is in sure hands; there is no danger of refusal on the part of Heaven when thy mediation appears in his behalf.” “Thou art the great mediatrix between God and man, obtaining for sinners all they can ask and demand  of the blessed Trinity.” Another book in common use The Glories of Mary, Mother of God, prepared by Liguori (q.v.), is full of similar passages. We extract only the following prayer: “holy Virgin! deign to manifest your generosity towards me, a miserable sinner. If you grant me your aid, what can I fear? No, I shall no longer apprehend either my sins, since you can repair them; or the devils, since you are more powerful than hell; or your Son, justly irritated, since one word from you will appease him. I shall only fear myself, and that, forgetting to invoke you, I may be lost. But this will not be the case. I promise you today to recur to you in all my wants, and that, curing life and at my death, your name and remembrance shall be the delight of my soul. Amen.” See Cumming and French, Protestant Discussion (London, 1856, 12mo), p. 288 sq.; Ferraris, Prompta Bibliotheca, Venerat. Sanct. § 34-39; Elliott, Delineation of Romanisms, bk. 4. ch. 4. SEE MARIOLATRY.

## Hyperius, Andrew Gerhard[[@Headword:Hyperius, Andrew Gerhard]]

             an eminent Protestant theologian of the 16th century, was born at Ypres, Belgium, May 16, 1511. His family name was Gerhard, but he assumed the name Hyperius from his birthplace. His father directed his first studies, after which Hyperius attended the University of Paris during the years 1528-35. After completing his studies he made a short stay at Louvain, then traveled through the Netherlands and visited Germany. On his return he was deprived of a benefice which had been obtained for him, on the ground that he had embraced the doctrine of the Reformation. He went to England, where he remained four years with the son of William Mountjov, a friend of Erasmus, studying at the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The persecutions directed against the Protestants after Cromwell's death compelled him, in 1541, to leave England, and he purposed going to Strasburg, attracted by the reputation of Bucer; but his friend Geldenhauer, professor of theology at Marburg, persuaded him to remain in the latter city, and he succeeded his friend in 1542 as professor. He died at Marburg Feb. 1, 1564. To profound and extensive learning Hyperius joined great intellectual powers, and a remarkably mild, yet straightforward disposition. Greatly in advance of his times as a scholar, he held deep and correct views on the system with which theological researches and studies should be conducted in striking contrast with the arbitrary proceedings of the exegetes of the 16th century, as well as the scholastic theories of contemporary theologians. His views have become the basis of modern scientific theology.

He had also a clearer and more practical notion of  preaching than the other preachers of his time, who, instead of expounding Christian doctrines to their hearers in view of edifying them, brought abstract discussions or irritating controversies into the pulpit. Hyperius wrote Def armandis Concionibus sacris, seu de interpretatione Scripturarum populari, Libri 2 (Dort, 1555, 8vo; latest ed., augmented, and containing a biography of the author, Halle, 1781, 8vo). It is the first complete work on Homiletics, and one of the best: — De theologo, seu de ratione studii theologici, Lib. iv (Basle, 1556, 8vo; often reprinted): this is a work of great merit, which may have had the most favorable effect on theological study, had not the largeness of views and the Zuinglian opinion of the author in regard to the Eucharist rendered it suspicious in the eyes of the orthodox Lutheran party. Laurentius Villavincentius, an Augustinian monk of Xeres, in Andalusia, made great use of this as well as of the preceding work, or, rather, caused them to be reprinted almost word for word, as his own production, with the exception of passages too favorable to Protestantism, in a work he published at Antwerp in 1565, and the plagiarism was not detected until half a century later: — Elementa Christiance religionis (Basle, 1563, 8vo): — Topica theologica (Wittemb. 1565, 8vo; Basle, 1573, 8vo): — Methodi Theologire, sive praecipuorum Christianes religionis locorum communium, Libri 3 (Basle, 1566, 1568, 8vo). This work was to have had three more parts, but it was left incomplete: — Opuascula Theologica varsia (Basle, 1570, 2 vols. 8vo). His exegetical works are among the most valuable productions in that department by the Reformers, and were frequently used by Bloomfield in his notes on the New Testament. His most important work in this department, a Commentary on the Epistles of Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews (Comment. in Epistolas ad Timothy, Titus, et Philem. 1582; Comment. in Pauli Epistolas, 1583; Comment. in Epist. ad Hebraeos, 1585), was published after his death by Mylius (Zurich, 1582-8, 4 vols. folio), and under the care of J. Andreas Schmidt (Helmstadt, 1704, 8vo). In it “Hyperius pursues the grammatico-historical method of interpretation, examining the meaning of the words, carefully tracing the connection of the passage, taking note of the analogy of Scripture, and so arriving at the true sense of the place. Not until he has thus done justice to the exegesis does he proceed to the dogmatical or practical use of the passage. He also frequently gives citations from the fathers to show the agreement of his conclusions with the understanding of the ancient Church” (Kitto). A collection of small pamphlets had been previously published separately; among them, De Sacrce Scripturae Lectione et Meditatione (Basle, 1581,  8vo). See Boissard, Icones Virorumn Iltustrium, pars 3; Melch. Adam, Vifte Germanorum Theologorums; Bayle, Dict. flist.; ,. M. Schrockh, Lebensbesch. beriihnt. GeleIhrten, vol. 1, ard Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref: vol. 5; Hoefer, Novus. Eiog. Ges. 25, 71; Mercersb. Rev. 1857, p. 271 sq.; Ch. Monthly, June, 1866; M'Crie, Reform. in Spain, p. 382; Haucl, Jethro. d. Theol. 2, 255. (J. H. W.)

## Hypocrisy[[@Headword:Hypocrisy]]

             (ὑπόκρισις; but in Jam 5:12, two words, ὑπὸ κρίσιν, as the A.V. justly) is the name for the successful or unsuccessful endeavor of a person to impart to others, by the expression of his features or, gestures, by his outward actions, and, in fine, by his whole appearance, a favorable opinion of his principles, his good intentions, love, unselfishness, truthfulness, and conscientiousness while in reality these qualities are wanting in him. It is, therefore, a peculiar kind of untruthfulness, which has its definite aims and means. It is precisely because these aims refer to the moral qualifications of the subject, because he speaks and acts as if an honest man, that hypocrisy has found room and opportunity in social life, in commerce and industry, in politics, and, above all, in the field of revealed religion. This may appear paradoxical, because this as well as the religion of the old covenant, places man before the face of an almighty Being who sees the heart, and who penetrates human thought even from its very beginning; who perceives clearly its development and ripening; so that the hypocrite, even if he should succeed in deceiving men, can certainly have no benefit from his acts in the end.

On the other hand, because religion consists not entirely in the performance of outward actions, but makes the worth of the person dependent on the righteous state of his heart and mind, it creates the greater desire in him to acquire the reputation of really having these qualities; and because these qualities, though they are of a purely spiritual nature, yet can only be manifested by outward acts, which, since they are material, strike the eye of the world, and may be enacted without the possession of the genuine-mental and moral state, it results that there is here such a wide field for hypocritical actions. We infer, therefore, from what we have said, that there is less opportunity for hypocrisy in heathenism than in Judaism; in Catholicism than in Protestantism. For wherever the principal weight is laid on the outward action, on the opius operatum, there one experiences far less the inclination to cover the inconsistency of the inner world by the outer world; while, on the other hand, where every thing depends on the inward state, and where, with the  mere enactment of outward ceremony, God and conscience cannot be appeased, there originates in the unregenerate man the temptation to do what may give him at least the semblance of a quality which he really does not possess.

When a frivolous, reckless fellow kneels at the Catholic altar to perform by feature and gesture his devotions, no one would think of accusing him of hypocrisy; while a Protestant, in a similar case, could not escape this judgment. Still, this does not fully solve the paradox how the hypocrite can hope to carry on his false game, while he knows very well that before the God of truth no one can pass for righteous who possesses simply the semblance of righteousness, but does not connect therewith the belief in its power. It must here be remembered that, in the one case, the person endeavors to acquire for himself, in the community to which he belongs, the epithet of a pious man; and, if he is satisfied herewith, then, in regard to his future state, in view of that day which will bring every thing to light, he is either thoughtless and careless, or else totally unbelieving. When his earthly scene has ended, the curtain drops for him, and all is over. But in another case the person is animated by the hope that, in virtue of those outward acts by which he thinks to do good, his praying, almsgiving, etc., he may prevail before God; this is the true Phariseeism, which dims the facility of knowing God, ands not only deceives men, but counterfeits truth itself, and thereby cheats itself worst of all. A special means of detecting the real hypocrite is his unmerciful judgment over others. This has its ground in the fact that by such expressions he not only seeks to confirm his own standing, but it is also a self-deceit into which he falls; the more he finds to blame in others, the more confident he grows of his own worth, and the more easily he appeases his conscience in regard to the inconsistency of his moral state with his actions and the incongruity of his secret with his open ways. Ethics finds among the different gradations of sill a certain state of hypocrisy which is far worse than absolute subjection to sin, inasmuch as in the latter state there may exist at least the earnest desire in the individual to rid himself of his faults, although he no longer possesses the power to do so; the hypocrite, on the other hand, is quite contented with himself, and has no desire whatever to repent of the sin so deeply lodged in his heart, but merely endeavors to hide it from God and men, in order to be able to gratify his sinful inclinations the more securely under the cover of an assumed sanctity. In certain respects the frivolous sinner is far better than the hypocrite, inasmuch as the former has at least no desire to deceive any one about his condition, and does not present himself to the world otherwise than he really is. This formal truthfulness in  the open sinner, however, is counterbalanced by the fact that the hypocrite recognizes at least a divine law and judgment; he is still alive to the consciousness of the incongruity of his state of mind and heart with this divine law; but yet hypocrisy, as a permanent untruthfulness, as a systematic deceit, as a life in dissimulation, must gradually annihilate all sense of its own condition. Thus, in the issue, publicans and harlots arc nearer to the kingdom of heaven than Pharisees. — Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 19:643 sq. SEE HYPOCRITE.

## Hypocrite[[@Headword:Hypocrite]]

             (Greek ὑποκριτής) signifies one who feigns to be what he is not; who puts on a false person, like actors in tragedies and comedies. It is generally applied to those who assume appearances of a virtue without possessing it in reality. Our Savior accused the Pharisees of hypocrisy. Hypocrisy is vain and foolish, and, though intended to cheat others, is, in truth, deceiving ourselves. No man would flatter or dissemble if he thought that he was seen and discovered. All his hypocrisy, however, is open to the eye of God, from whom nothing call be hid. The ways of man are before the eyes of the Lord, and he seeth all his doings; there is no darkness nor shadow of death where the workers of iniquity may hide themselves. Whoever dissembles, and seems to be what he is not, thinks that he ought to possess such a quality as he pretends to; for to counterfeit and dissemble is to assume the appearance of some real excellence.

But it is best for a man to be in reality what he would seem to be. It is difficult to personate and act a false part long, because, where truth does not exist, nature will endeavor to return, and make a discovery. Truth carries its own light and evidence with it, and not only commends us to every man's conscience, but to God, the searcher of our hearts. Hence sincerity is the truest wisdom, for integrity has many advantages over all the artful ways of dissimulation and deceit. On the contrary, a dissembler must be always upon his guard, lest he contradict his own pretences lie acts an unnatural part, and puts a continual force and restraint upon himself. Truth always lies uppermost, and will be apt to make its appearance; but he who acts sincerely has an easy task, and needs not invent pretences before, or excuses after, for what he says or does. Insincerity is difficult to manage; for a liar will be apt to contradict at one time what he said at another. Truth is always consistent with itself, needs nothing to assist it, and is always near at hand; but a lie is troublesome; it sets a man's invention upon the rack, and is frequently the occasion of many more. Truth and sincerity in our words and actions will carry us  through the world, when all the arts of cunning and deceit shall fail and deceive us. In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, plainness and sincerity will appear the most perfect beauty; the craftiness of men, who lie in wait to deceive, will be stripped of all its colors; all specious pretences, all the methods of deceit, will then be disclosed before men and angels, and no artifice to conceal the deformity of iniquity can there take place. Then the ill-designing men of this world shall with shame be convinced that the upright simplicity, which they despised, was the truest wisdom, and that those dissembling and dishonest arts which they so highly esteemed were in reality the greatest folly.

Hypocrites have been divided into four sorts:

1. The worldly hypocrite, who makes a profession of religion, and pretends to be religious merely from worldly considerations (Mat 23:5);

2. The legal hypocrite, who relinquishes his vicious practices in order thereby to merit heaven, while at the same time he has no real love to God (Rom 10:3);

3. The evangelical hypocrite, whose religion is nothing more than a bare conviction of sin; who rejoices under the idea that Christ died for him, and yet has no desire to live a holy life (Mat 13:20; 2Pe 2:20);

4. The enthusiastic hypocrite, who has an imaginary sight of his sin and of Christ; talks of remarkable impulses and high feelings; and thinks himself very wise and good while he lives in the most scandalous practices (Mat 13:39; 2Co 11:14). — Robinson, Theol. Dictionary; Buck, Theol. Dictionary; Warner, System of Morality, 3, 323; Grove, Moral Philosophy, 2, 253; Gilfillan, Essays on Hypocrisy (1825); Ellis, Sef Deceiver discovered (1731); Edwards, Worls (see Index). SEE HYPOCRISY.

## Hyponoia[[@Headword:Hyponoia]]

             (ὑπόνοια, under sense), a term applied to the hidden meaning supposed by some to underlie the language of Scripture. If by this is understood a signification totally different from the plain statements, the theory is to be condemned as savoring of mysticism (q.v.); but if it is only intended to designate the collateral and ulterior application of language which has likewise a more obvious or literal import, it may be received to a limited degree. SEE DOUBLE SENSE. The Scriptures themselves authorize such  a view of the deeper significance of Holy Writ, especially of prophecies which necessarily await their fulfillment in order to their complete elucidation (1Pe 1:11); and the apostle John accordingly invites his readers to the close examination of his symbols, under which, for prudential considerations, was couched a somewhat enigmatical allusion (Rev 13:18). SEE INTERPRETATION. To infer from this, however, that the sacred writers were not themselves aware of the meaning of what they uttered or penned is to take an unworthy and false view of their intelligent instrumentality (Stier, Words of Jesus, 1, 432 sq., Am. ed.). SEE INSPIRATION.

## Hypopsalma[[@Headword:Hypopsalma]]

             SEE ACROSTIC.

## Hyporchema[[@Headword:Hyporchema]]

             the sacred dance around the altar, which, especially among the Dorians, was wont to accompany the songs used in the worship of Apollo. It was practiced by both men and women.

## Hypostasis[[@Headword:Hypostasis]]

             (from ὐπό, under, and ἵστημι, to stand; hence subsistence), a term used in theology to signify person. Thus the orthodox hold that there is but one nature or essence in God, but three hypostases or persons. This term is of very ancient use in the Church. Cyril, in a letter to Nestormus, employs it instead of πρόσωπον, person, which did not appear to him sufficiently expressive. The term occasioned great dissensions, both among the Greeks and Latins. In the Council of Nicaea, hypostasis was defined to mean essence or substance, so that it was heresy to say that Christ n-as of a different hypostasis from his Father. Custom, however, altered its meaning. In the necessity they were under of expressing themselves strongly against the Sabellians, the Greeks used the word hypostasis, the Latins personia, which proved a source of great disagreement. The barrenness of the Latin language allowed them only one word by which to translate the two Greek ones οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, and thus prevented them' from distinguishing essence from hypostasis. An end was put to these disputes by a synod held in Alexandria about A.D. 362, at which Athanasius assisted, when it was determined to be synonymous with πρόσωπον. After this time the Latins made no great scruple in saying tres hypostases, or the Greeks three persons. — Farrar. SEE TRINITY; SEE HOMOUSIAN.

## Hypostatical Union[[@Headword:Hypostatical Union]]

             the subsistence (ὑπὀστασις) of two natures in one person, in Christ. While the reality of such a union is established by the Scriptures, and is on  that account maintained by our Church (see 2nd Article of Religion-” So that two whole and perfect natures,” etc.), it is to be lamented that many intricate and fruitless metaphysical questions have been debated among different sects of Christians as to the divine nature of our Lord, and the manner of the union between the Deity and a man-the parties engaged in these questions being too often hurried into presumptuous as well as unprofitable speculations-on points as far beyond the reach of the human intellect as colors to a man born blind; and forgetting that the union of the soul and body of any one among us can neither be explained nor comprehended by himself or any other, and appears the more mysterious the more we reflect upon it (Eden). SEE TRINITY; SEE CHRIST, PERSON OF; SEE MONOPHYSITES; SEE NESTORIANS.

## Hypothetical Baptism[[@Headword:Hypothetical Baptism]]

             is a phrase sometimes used to denote, in the Church of England, a baptism administered to a child of whom it is uncertain whether it has already been baptized or not.. The rubric states that “if they who bring the infant to the church do make such uncertain answers to the priest's questions as that it cannot appear that the child was baptized with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” then the priest, on performing the baptism, is to use this form of words, viz.: “If thou art not already baptized, N , I baptize thee in the name,” etc,

## Hypothetical Universalism[[@Headword:Hypothetical Universalism]]

             SEE HYPOTHETICI.

## Hypothetici[[@Headword:Hypothetici]]

             a name given to the followers (French Protestants) of Amyraut, who, while they asserted agratia univerasalis, none the less ought not to be classed with modern Universalists, as they simply taught that God desires the happiness of all men, provided they will receive his mercy in faith, and that none can obtain salvation without faith in Christ. SEE AMURAUT; SEE CAMERON; SEE UNIVERSALISM.

## Hypsistarians[[@Headword:Hypsistarians]]

             (worshippers of the θεὸς ὕψιστος, or “Most High God,” as such), a sect mentioned by Gregory of Nazianzum, whose father was a member of it before his conversion to Christianity. They are represented as combining. in  their doctrines the elements of Judaism and paganism. They assigned a place to fire and light in their worship, but rejected circumcision and the worship of images; they kept the Sabbath, and abstained from the eating of certain kinds of meats. Gregory of Nyssa also mentions the Hypsistarii, to whom he gives the surname ῾Υψιστιανοί. He says that, like the Christians, they acknowledge only one God, whom they call ὕψιστον or παντοχράτορα, but are distinguished from them in not considering him as Father.

All that subsequent writers have said of this sect is derived from the above statements. The Hypsistarii do not appear to have extended outside of Cappadocia, and they seem to have existed but a short time there, for no mention is made of them either before or after the 4th century. Contrary to the statement of the ancient writers, who described them as Monotheists, Bohmer concludes from the remark made by Gregory concerning his father, ὑπ᾿ εἰδώλοις πάρος ἠεν ζώων, that, though the Hypsistarii worshipped but one God, they did not formally deny the existence of more. It is not to be wondered at, in view of the scanty information we possess concerning this sect, that very great differences of opinion should exist in regard to them. Mosheim considers them as belonging to the Gnostic school; J. J. Wetstein (in Prolegom. I., N.T. p. 31, 38) and D. Harenberg consider them as identical with the Caelicol/e (q.v.), regarding them as descendants from the worshippers of Thor; others trace a resemblance between their doctrines and those of Zoroaster. That they were not a Christian sect is proved by the fact of Gregory of Nazianzum's father having belonged to it before his becoming a Christian. Ullmann considers them as Eclectics, combining the elements of Judaism with the Persian religion, while Bohmer looks upon them as identical with the Euphemites, which Neander (CG. Hist. 2, 507) also thinks probable. Their morals are represented as having been very good. See Herzog, Real- Encyclop. s.v.; Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch. 2, 380 sq.; Walch, Hist. d. Ketzereien, 2, 180 sq.; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 13, 278 sq.; C. Ullmann, De Hypsistariis (Heidelb. 1833); G. Bohmer, De Hypsistariis (Berol. 1834).

## Hyrcanus[[@Headword:Hyrcanus]]

             ( ῾Υρκανός, SEE HIRCANUS), the name of two of the high priests and kings of the Maccabwnn line of the Jews. SEE MACCABEES.

1. JOHN HYRCANUS, the son of Simon Maccabaeus, who sent him with his brother Judas to repel Cendebmus, the general of Antiochus VII, B.C.  137. On the assassination of his father and two brothers, John ascended the throne, B.C. 135. During the first year of his reign Jerusalem was besieged by Antiochus Sidetes, and at length Hyrcanus was obliged to submit. The walls of Jerusalem were destroyed, and a tribute imposed upon the city. Hyrcanus afterwards accompanied Antiochus in his expedition against the Parthians, but returned to Jerusalem before the defeat of the Syrian army. After the defeat and death of Antiochus, B.C. 130, Hyrcanus took several cities belonging to the Syrian kingdom, and completely established his own independence. He strengthened his power by an alliance with the Romans, and extended his dominions by the conquest of the Idumaeans, whom he compelled to submit to circumcision and to observe the Mosaic law; and also by taking Samaria, which he leveled to the ground, and flooded the spot on which it had stood. The latter part of his reign was troubled by disputes between the Pharisees and Sadducees. Hyrcanus had originally belonged to the Pharisees, but had quitted their party in consequence of an insult he received at an entertainment from Eleazar, a person of importance among the Pharisees. By uniting himself to the Sadducees, Hyrcanus, notwithstanding the benefits he had conferred upon his country by his wise and vigorous government, became very unpopular with the common people, who were mostly attached to the Pharisees. Hyrcanus died B.C. 106, and was succeeded by his son Aristobulus (Joseph. Ant. 13, 7 sq.; War, 1, 2; 1 Maccabees 15, 16; Justin, 26, 1; Diodorus, Exc. Haesch. 34, 1; Plut. Apophth. p. 184 sq.; Eusebius, Chronicles Arm. p. 94, 167). See Smith, Dict. of Classical Biography, s.v. SEE ANTIOCHUS.

2. HYRCANUS II, son of Alexander Janumeus, and grandson of the preceding. On the death of his father (B.C. 78) he was appointed high priest by his mother Alexandra, who ruled Judea herself for the next nine years. After her death (B.C. 69), his younger brother, Aristobulus, a braver and more energetic man, seized the government, and forced Hyrcanus to withdraw into private life. Induced by the Idlumsean Antipater, and aided by Aretas, king of Arabia Petraea, he endeavored to win back his dominions, but was not successful until Pompey began to favor his cause. After some years of tumultuous fighting, Aristobulus was poisoned by the partisans of Ptolemy (B.C. 49), and Hyrcanus, who had for some time possessed, if he had not enjoyed, the dignity of high-priest and ethnarch, was now deprived of the latter of these offices, for which, in truth, he was wholly incompetent. Caesar (B.C. 47), on account of the services rendered to him by Antipater, made the latter procurator of Judaea, and thus left in  his hands all the real power, Hyrcanus busying himself only with the affairs of the priesthood and Temple. Troubles, however, were in store for him. Antipater was assassinated, and Antigonus, son of Aristobulus, with the help of the Parthian king, Orodes I, invaded the land, captured Hyrcanus by treachery, cut off his ears, and thus disqualified him for the office of high-priest, and carried him off to Seleucia, on the Tigris. Some years later, Herod, son of his old friend Antipater, obtained supreme power in Judea, and invited the aged Hyrcanus home to Jerusalem. He was allowed to depart, and for some time lived in ease and comfort, but, falling under suspicion of intriguing against Herod, he was put to death (B.C. 30) (Josephus, Ant. 13, 16; 14, 1-13; War, 1, 511; Dio Cass. 37, 15, 16; 48, 26; Diod. 11, Ex. Vet. p. 128; Oros. 6:6; Euseb. Chronicles Arm. p. 94). See Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. s.v. SEE HEROD.

## Hyrokian (or Hirrokin)[[@Headword:Hyrokian (or Hirrokin)]]

             in Norse mythology, was a Jote-woman, a mighty, giant-like sorceress. She was called by the Asas to set the ship afloat upon which Baldur was to be burned. Thor was so angry that this woman excelled him in strength that he would have demolished her with his miolner had not the Asas interceded for her. Coin of Nicea, of the time of the emperor Lncins Verns, representing Hygea and AEsculapius, with Telesphorus.

## Hyssop[[@Headword:Hyssop]]

             (אֵזוֹב, &zb', of uncertain etymology; Gr. ὕσσωπος), a plant difficult to define, especially as the similarity ‘of the above terms has early led to their confusion. As the ϋσσωπος of Greek authors is generally acknowledged to be the common hyssop (Hyssopus officinalis of botanists), it has been inferred that it must also be the plant of' the Old Testament, as well as that referred to in the New Testament. This inference has not, however, been universally acquiesced in; for Celsius enumerates no less than eighteen different plants which have been adduced by various authors as the hyssop of Scripture. The chief difficulty arises from the fact that in the Sept. the Greek ὕσσωπος is the uniform rendering of the Hebrew ezob, and that this rendering is indorsed by the apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews (9:19, 21), when speaking of the ceremonial observances of the Levitical law.

Whether, therefore, the Sept. made use of the Greek ὕσσωπος as the word most nearly resembling the Hebrew in sound, as Stanley suggests (S. and Pal. p. 21, note), or as the true representative of the plant indicated by the latter, is a point which, in all probability, will never be decided. Botanists differ widely even with regard to the identification of the ὕσσωπος of Dioscorides. The name has been given to the Satureia Graeca and the S. Juliana, to neither of which it is appropriate, and the hyssop of Italy and South France is not met with in Greece, Syria, or Egypt. Daubeny (Lect. on Romans Husbandry, p. 313), following Sibthorpe, identifies the mountain hyssop with the Thymnbra spicata, but this conjecture is  disapproved of by Kihn (Comm. in Diosc. 3 27), who in the same passage gives it as his opinion that the Hebrews used the Origanum AEgypticum in Egypt, the O. Syriacum in Palestine, and that the hyssop of Dioscorides was the O. Smyrnaeum. The Greek botanist describes two kinds of hyssop, ὀρεινή and κηπευτή, and gives πεσαλέμ as the Egyptian equivalent. The Talmudists make the same distinction between the wild hyssop and the garden plant used for food. The hyssop is of three species, but only one of these is cultivated for use. The common hyssop is a shrub, with low. bushy stalks, growing a foot and a half high; small, pear-shaped, close-setting, opposite leaves, with several smaller ones rising from the same joint; and all the stalks and branches terminated by erect, whorled spikes of flowers, of different colors in the varieties. They are very hardy plants, and may be propagated either by slips or cuttings, or by seeds. The leaves have an aromatic smell, and a warm, pungent taste. It is a native of the South of Europe and the East.

The first notice of the scriptural plant occurs in Exo 12:22, where a bunch of hyssop is directed to be dipped in blood and struck on the lintels and the two side-posts of the doors of the houses in which the Israelites resided. It is next mentioned in Lev 14:4; Lev 14:6; Lev 14:52, in the ceremony for declaring lepers to be cleansed; and again. in Num 19:6; Num 19:18, in preparing the water of separation. To these passages the apostle alludes in Heb 9:19 : “For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people, according to the law, he took the blood of calves, and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people.” From this text we find that the Greek name ὕσσωπος: was considered synonymous with the Hebrew ezob; and from the preceding that the plant must have been leafy, and large enough to serve for the purposes of sprinkling, and that it must have been found in Lower Egypt, as well as in the country towards Mount Sinai, and onwards to Palestine. From the following passage we get some information respecting the habits and the supposed properties of the plant. Thus, in 1Ki 4:33, it is said, “Solomon spoke of trees, from the cedar-tree that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall;” and in the penitential psalm of David (Psa 2:7), “Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.” In this last passage, it is true, the word is thought by some commentators to be used in a figurative sense; but still it is possible that the plant may have possessed some general cleansing properties, and thus come to be employed in preference to other  plants in the ceremonies of purification. It ought, at all events, to be found growing upon walls, and in Palestine. In the account of the crucifixion of our Savior, the evangelist John says (Joh 19:29), “Now there was set a vessel, full of vinegar, and they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it upon hyssop, and put it to his mouth.” In the parallel passages of Matthew (Mat 27:18) and Mark (Mar 15:36) it is stated that the sponge filled with vinegar was put upon a reed or stick. To reconcile these statements, some commentators have supposed that both the sponge and the hyssop were tied to a stick, and that one evangelist mentions only the hyssop, because lie considered it as the most important; while, for the same reason, the other two mention only the stick; but the simplest mode of explaining the apparent discrepancy is to consider the hyssop and the stick to be the same thing-in other words, that the sponge was affixed to a stick of hyssop.

Of the different plants adduced by Celsius as having more or less claims to be regarded as the hyssop of Scripture, some belong to t he class of ferns, as Copcillus Veneris, maiden-hair, and Ruta mursaria, or wall-rue, because they will grow upon walls; so also the Polytrichum, or hair-moss, the Kloster hyssops, or pearlwort, and Saginal procumbens are suggested by others, because, from their growing on rocks or walls, they will answer to the passage in 1Ki 4:33, and from their smallness contrast well with the cedar of Lebanon, and are a proof of the minute knowledge of Solomon. Some again contend for species of wormwood, as being, from their bitterness, most likely to have been added to the vinegar in the sponge, that it might be more distasteful to our Savior. The majority, however, have selected different kinds of fragrant plants belonging to the natural family of Labiatae, several of which are found in dry and barren situations in Palestine, and also in some parts of the desert. (See Raumolf, Trae. p. 59, 456; Hasselquist, Trav. p. 554, 517; Burckhardt, Trav. 2, 913; Robinson, Researches, 1, 162, 157.)

Of these may be mentioned the rosemary, various species of lavender, of mint, of marjoram, of thyme, of savory, of thymbra, and others of the same tribe, resembling each other much in character as well as in properties; but it does not appear that any of them grow on walls, or are possessed of cleansing properties; and, with the exception of the rosemary, they are not capable of yielding a stick, nor are they found in all the required situations. If we look to the most recent authors, we find some other plants adduced, though the generality adhere to the common hyssop. Sprengel (Hist. Rei-Herb. 1, 14). seems to  entertain no doubt that the Thymbra spicata found by Hasselquist on the ruins about Jerusalem is the hyssop of Solomon, though Hasselquist himself thought that the moss called Gymnostoamum Truncatum was the plant. Lady Calcott asks “whether the hyssop upon which St. John says the sponge steeped in vinegar was put, to be held to the lips of Christ upon the cross, might not be the hyssop attached to its staff of cedar-wood, for the purposes of sprinkling the people, lest they should contract defilement on the eve of the Sabbath, which was a high-day, by being in the field of execution” (Scripture Herbal, p. 208). Rosenmüller, again, thinks that the Hebrew word ezob does not denote our hyssop, but an aromatic plant resembling it, the wild marjoram, which the Germans call Dosten, or Wohlgemuth, the Arabs Zatar, and the Greeks Origanun. In the Pictorial Bible (1, 161), Mr. Kitto observes “that the hyssop of the sacred Scriptures has opened a wide field for conjecture, but in no instance has any plant been suggested that, at the same time, has a sufficient length of stem to answer the purpose of a wand or pole, and such detergent or cleansing properties as to render it a fit emblem for purification;” and he suggests it as probable that “the hyssop was a species of Phytolacca, as combining length of stem with cleansing properties, from the quantity of potash which is yielded by the ashes of the American species, P. decandra, of this genus.” P. Abyssinica grows to the size of a shrub in Abyssinia. Wier (Bibl. Realwörterbuch, s.v. Ysop) observes that the Talmudists distinguish the hyssop of the Greeks and Romans from that mentioned in the law. He then adduces the Origanum, mentioned in the quotation from Rosenmüller, as the ezob of the Hebrews; but concludes by observing that a more accurate examination is required of the hyssops and Origana of that part of Asia before the meaning of the Hebrew term can be considered as satisfactorily determined. Five kinds of hyssop are mentioned in the Talmud.

One is called אזוב simply, without any epithet: the others are distinguished as Greek, Roman, wild hyssop, and hyssop of Cochali (Mishna, Negaim, 14, 6). Of these, the four last mentioned were profane, that is, not to be employed in purifications (Mishna, Parah, 11, 7). Maimonides (de Vacca Rufa, 3, 2) says that the hyssop mentioned in the law is that which was used as a condiment. According to Porphyry (De Abstin. 4, 7), the Egyptian priests on certain occasions ate their bread mixed with hyssop; and the zaatar, or wild marjoram, with which it has been identified, is often an ingredient in a mixture called-Adukkah, which is to this day used as food by the poorer classes in Egypt (Lane, Mod. Eng. 1, 200). It is not improbable, therefore, that this may have been the hyssop of  Maimonides, who wrote in Egypt; more especially as R. D. Kimchi (Lex. s.v.), who reckons seven different kinds, gives as the equivalent the Arabic zaatar, origanum, or marjoram, and the German Dosten or Wohlgemuth (Rosenmüller Handb.). With this agrees the Tanchum Hieros. MS, quoted by Gesenius. So in the Judaeo-Spanish version, Exo 12:22 is translated “y tomaredes manojo de origano” This is doubtless the species of “hyssop” (zaatar) shown to Dr. Thomson, who describes it as “having the fragrance of thyme, with a hot, pungent taste, and long slender stems” (Land and Book, 1,161). But Dioscorides makes a distinction between origanum and hyssop when he describes the leaf of a species of the former as resembling the latter (comp. Plin. 20:67), though it is evident that he, as well as the Talmudists, regarded them as belonging to the same family. In the Syriac of 1Ki 4:33, hyssop is rendered by lufo, “houseleck,” although in other passages it is represented by zûfé, which the Arabic translation follows in Psa 41:9, and Heb 9:19, while in the Pentateuch it has zaatar for the same. Patrick (on 1Ki 4:33) was of opinion that ezob is the same with the Ethiopic azub, which represents the hyssop of Psa 51:9, as well as ἡδύοσμον, or mint, in Mat 23:23. The monks on Jebel Musa give the name of hyssop to a fragrant plant called ja'deh, which grows in great quantities on that mountain (Robinson. Bibl. Res. 1, 157). It has been reserved for the ingenuity of a: German to trace a connection between AEsop, the Greek fabulist, and the ezob of 1Ki 4:33 (Hitzig, Die Sprüche Salmo's, Einl. § 2). (See Celsius,l ierobot. 1, 407 sq.; comp. Bochart, Hieroz. 1, 589; Plenk, Plant. Med. tab. 465; Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 284 sq.; Faber, in Keil's Analect. 1, 3 sq.; Geiger, Pharmaceut. Bot. 1, 491 Gesenius, Thesaur. 1. 57 sq.; Sprengel, ad Dioscor. 2, 506 sq.; Prosp. Alpin. Planst. Aegypt. c. 20; Spencer, Leg. Rit. 2, 15, 4; and the Talmudical, classical, and other authorities there cited.)

The latest result is that of Dr. J. F. Royle (communicated in a paper read before the Royal Asiatic Society, and published in their journal for November, 1844), who infers, first, that any plant answering to all that was required should be found in Lower Egypt (Exo 12:22); in the desert of Sinai (Lev 14:4; Lev 14:6; Lev 14:52; Num 19:6; Num 19:18); in the neighborhood of Jerusalem (Joh 19:29); secondly, that it should be a plant growing on walls or rocky situations (1Ki 4:33); and, finally, that it should be possessed of some cleansing properties (Psa 51:7), though it is probable that in this passage it is used in a figurative sense. It  should also be large enough to yield a stick, and it ought, moreover, to have a name in the Arabic or cognate languages similar to the Hebrew name. After a careful and minute examination of all the ancient and modern testimony in the case, he finds all these circumstances united in the caper- plant, or Capparis spinsosa of Linnaus. SEE CAPER-PLANT.

The Arabic name of this plant, asuf, by which it is sometimes, though not commonly described, bears considerable resemblance to the Hebrew. It is found in Lower Egypt (Forskal, Flor. Eg.-Arob.; Plin. 13:44). Burckhardt (Trav. in Syr. p. 536) mentions the aszefas a tree of frequent occurrence in the valleys of the peninsula of Sinai, “the bright green creeper which climbs out of the fissures of the rocks” (Stanley, S. and P. p. 21, etc.), and produces a fruit of the size of a walnut, called by the Arabs Felfel Jibbel, or mountain- pepper (Shaw, Spec. Phytogr. Afr. p. 39). Dr. Royle thought this to be undoubtedly a species of capparis, and probably the caper plant. The Calpparis spinosa was found by M. Bove (Rel. d'un Voy. Botan. en Eg., etc.) in the desert of Sinai, at Gaza, and at Jerusalem. Lynch saw it in a ravine near the convent of Mar Saba (Exped. p. 388). It is thus met with in all the localities where the ezob is mentioned in the Bible. With regard to its habitat, it grows in dry and rocky places, and on walls: “quippe quum capparis quoque seratur siccis maxime” (Plin. 19:48). De Candolle describes it as found “in muris et rupestribus.” The caper-plant was believed to be possessed of detergent qualities. According to Pliny (20, 59), the root was applied to the cure of a disease similar to the leprosy. Lamarck (Eivc. Botan. art. Caprier) says, “Les capriers . sont regardes comme antiscorbutiques.” Finally, the caper-plant is capable of producing a stick three or four feet in length. Pliny (13, 44) describes it in Egypt as “firmioris ligni frutex,” and to this property Dr. Royle attaches great importance, identifying, as he does, the ὑσσώπῳ of Joh 19:29 with the καλάμῳ of Matthew and Mark. To this identification, however, Dr. G. E. Post (in the Am. ed. of Smith's Bibl. Dict.) justly objects that the caper- plant has a thorny stem, and is too straggling and otherwise unsuitable in form for the uses designated; and, moreover that its Arab name really has little affinity with the Heb. ezob. He therefore returns to Celsius's idea of the Labiatce, or marjoram tribe, specially the Origanum maru (Arab. Zupha), which grows on the walls of terraces, has a long slender stem, or cluster of stems, with a bushy top, a fragrant odor, and a bitter but wholesome flavor. With this agrees one of the Arabic and Syriac renderings above noted.

## Hystaspes[[@Headword:Hystaspes]]

             ( ῾Υστάσπης, also HYSTASPAS, i.e. eydaspes), a prophetico-apocalyptic work among the early Christians, thought to contain predictions of Christ and the future of his kingdom, so called from a Persian savant (Magus), Hystaspes, under whose name it was circulated. As in the case of the Sibyllines (q.v.), the work in question seems to have been an attempt made by the early Church fathers to find in the religion and philosophical systems of the heathen predictions of and relations to the Christian religion. The first mention of these vaticinia Hystaspis we find in two passages of Justin (Apolog. 1, 20, cap. 21, p. 66 c, ed. Otho, i, p. 180, and cap. 44, p. 82 c, ed. Otho, p. 226). According to the first passage, the destruction of the world is predicted by Hystaspes as it is foretold by the Sibylla (Καὶ Σίβυλλα καὶ ῾Υστάσπις γενήσεσθαι τῶν φθαρτῶν ἀνάλωσιν διὰ πυρὸς ἔφησαν). In the second passage Justin asserts that the bad daemons, in their efforts to prevent man's knowing the truth, succeeded in establishing a law which forbids the reading of the βίβλοι ῾Υστάσπου ἣ Σιβύλλης ἣ τῶν προφητῶν under penalty of death; but the Christians, notwithstanding this law, not only read the books themselves, but even incited the heathen to study them. More particular information in regard to their contents is given us by Clement of Alexandria (Stromata, 5, 6, § 43, ed. Potter, p. 761). But so varying have been the interpretations of this passage that it is difficult to determine definitely whether the book is of older origin than the first half of the 2nd century. To this opinion Wagenmann (in Herzog's Real-Encyklop.) inclines. The information which Clement furnishes us is:

1. There existed in the 2nd century a βίβλος ῾Ελληνική, a work written in Greek, and circulated in Christian and heathen circles, entitled ὁ ῾Υστάσπης.

2. The Christians found in it, even more plainly than in the books of the Sibyllines, references to Christ and the future of his kingdom, and especially a reference to Christ's divine sonship, to the sufferings which awaited him and his followers, to the inexhaustible patience of the Christians, and the final return of Christ. The third and last of' the Church fathers who make mention of the Hystaspes is Lactantius. He speaks of it in three different passages (Instit. div. 7:cap. 15, cap. 18; Epitom. ii, 69). In the first passage Lactantius speaks of the Hystaspes in connection with the Sibyl, and in the two other passages he speaks of it in connection with the  Sibyl and Hermes Trismegistus. According to the first passage, Hystaspes, like the Sibyl, predicts the extinction of the empire and name of Rome. According to the second passage (cap. 18), the troubles and warfares which shall precede the final day of the world have been prophesied of by the prophetae ex Dei spiritu; also by the vates ex instinctu dceimonum. For instance, Hystaspes is said to have predicted and described the iniquitas sceculli hujus extremi, how a separation of the just from the unjust shall take place, how the pious, amid cries and sobs, will stretch out their hands and implore the protection of Jupiter (inamloraturos fidem Jovis), and how Jupiter will look down upon the earth, hear the cry of men, and destroy the wicked.

With regard to the person of Hystaspes, who is said to be the author of the work containing these predictions, Justin and Clement of Alexandria have left us no information, and we depend, therefore, solely on Lactantius, according to whom he was an old king of the Medes, who flourished long before the Trojan war, and after whom was named the river Hystaspes. In all probability, Lactantius here thinks of the father of king Darius I, known to us from the writings of Herodotus, Xenophon, and other Greek authors, but to whom the prophetic talents of Hystaspes were entirely foreign. Ammianus Marcellinus (23, 6), who flourished in the 4th century of our era, Informs us that one Hystaspes had studied astronomy with the Brahmas of India, and had even informed the Magi of his ability to know the future. Agathias, the Byzantine historian of the 6th century, knows of a Hystaspes who was a contemporary with Zoroaster, but he does not dare to assert that this Hystaspes was the same as the one spoken of as the father of Darius I. SEE PARSISM.

In view of the uncertainty of the authorship, it is well-nigh impossible to determine fully the origin, contents, form, and tendency of the Vaticinia Hystaspis. We know not even whether it emanated from Jewish, Christian, or heathen writers, although all our present knowledge points to the last as its probable origin. That the author was a Gnostic, as Huetius thinks (Quaest. Alnet. 1, 3, ep. 21, p. 230), is possible, but cannot be definitely stated, nor at all proved; beyond this, the only answer left us to all questions that might be put is a non liquet. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 19, 660 sq.; Walch, De Hystaspe ejusque vaticiniis, in the Comment. Societ. Gotting. hist. et phil. (1779), 2, 1-18; Fabricius, Biblioth. Grec. 1, 93 sq.; Lucke, Einleitung in d. Offenb. Joh. (2nd ed. 1848), p. 237; Reuss, Geschichte d. heil. Schrisft. d. N.T. (4th edit. 1864), p. 270; Neander, Ch. Hist. 1, 176 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Hyttavanes[[@Headword:Hyttavanes]]

             in the mythology of the Finns, is the name of the god of the chase, especially of hares.Pierer. Univ. Lex. 8:693.

## H?fling Johann Wilhelm[[@Headword:H?fling Johann Wilhelm]]

             an eminent German Lutheran minister, born in Drossenfeld, near Baireuth, in 1802, was educated at the. Gymnasium of Baireuth and at the University of Erlangen, where he was an attentive hearer of Schelling, whose lectures strengthened his regard for historical Christianity. In 1823 he was  appointed minister at Wuirzburg, and in 1827 at Jost, near Nuremberg. During his residence here he published two little pamphlets in defense of positive Christianity against Rationalism, which was then making rapid progress. These, it is thought, procured him the appointment as professor of practical theology at the University of Erlangen (1833). He died April 5, 1853. Höfling was a firm adherent to the old Protestant idea of the ministry and of the Church, and defended them vigorously with all the means of modern science. His theological writings were mainly in the department of practical theology, especially on the constitution of the Church, worship, and related dogmas. Of his earlier works the best are De symbolorum natura, necessitate, auctoritate et usu (Erlangen, 1835; 2nd ed. 1841): — Liturqische Abhandl. v. d. Composition der christl. Gemeinde Gottesdienste (ib. 1837). But his most important work is undoubtedly that on baptism: Das Sakranent d. Taufe, etc., dogmatisch, historisch, und liturgisch dargestellt (vol. 1, 1846; vol. 2, 1848). But his Grundsatze evangel. — luther. Kirchenverjfssung (1850; 3rd edition, 1852) attracted more general attention than any other work of his. Since his decease Thomasius and Harnack have edited and published his Liturgisches Urkundenbuch (1854), containing the rites of communion, ordination, introduction into the Church, and marriage. This book is only a fragment of a larger work, on which he had been engaged the last years of his life. See Zum Gedachtnisz J. W. F. Höfling's, etc., by Dr. Nagelsbach and Dr. Thomasius; Kurtz, Text-book of Ch. Hist. 2, 317, 373; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 6, 170, 171. (J. H. W.)